

Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gillman  
Gonzalez  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Gordon  
Goss  
Graham  
Granger  
Graves  
Green (TX)  
Green (WI)  
Greenwood  
Grucci  
Gutierrez  
Gutknecht  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hansen  
Harman  
Hart  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Herger  
Hill  
Hilleary  
Hilliard  
Hinchee  
Hinojosa  
Hobson  
Hoeffel  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hooley  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Hyde  
Inslee  
Isakson  
Israel  
Issa  
Istook  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Jenkins  
John  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Jones (OH)  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Keller  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MN)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kerns  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind (WI)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Kleczka  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
Kucinich  
LaFalce  
LaHood  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Largent  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Leach  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)

## NOT VOTING—22

Blagojevich  
Bono  
Cooksey  
Cubin  
Frelinghuysen  
Hastert

Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Rush  
Ryun (KS)  
Sabo  
Sanchez  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Sawyer  
Saxton  
Schaffer  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrock  
Scott  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shays  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Shmoo  
Shuster  
Simmons  
Simpson  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Souder  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Strickland  
Stump  
Stupak  
Sununu  
Neal  
Tancredo  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Terry  
Thomas  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thornberry  
Thune  
Thurman  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Toomey  
Towns  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Upton  
Visclosky  
Vitter  
Walden  
Walsh  
Waters  
Watkins (OK)  
Watson (CA)  
Watt (NC)  
Watts (OK)  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
Wexler  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Young (FL)

Hoyer  
Lampson  
Luther  
McDermott  
Oxley  
Riley  
Roukema  
Ryan (WI)  
Shaw  
Sherman  
Slaughter  
Traffican

Velazquez  
Wamp  
Wynn  
Young (AK)

□ 1208

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER  
PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes may be taken in two groups, the first occurring after debate has concluded on House Concurrent Resolution 312, and the second following the remainder of legislative business today.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE  
THAT SCHEDULED TAX RELIEF  
SHOULD NOT BE SUSPENDED OR  
REPEALED

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 312) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the scheduled tax relief provided for by the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 passed by a bipartisan majority in Congress should not be suspended or repealed.

The Clerk read as follows:

## H. CON. RES. 312

Whereas on June 7, 2001, President Bush signed into law the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001, which provides millions of taxpayers with the largest tax relief since 1981;

Whereas all Americans who pay Federal income taxes will benefit from the Act, which includes across-the-board income tax reductions, reduction of the marriage penalty, elimination of the death tax, tax rebate checks, doubling of the per-child tax credit, increasing tax-free contributions to Individual Retirement Accounts and a broad range of other beneficial provisions;

Whereas the Act was passed by a bipartisan majority in Congress of 211 House Republicans, 28 House Democrats, 1 House Independent, 46 Senate Republicans and 12 Senate Democrats, making the Act an important bipartisan achievement; and

Whereas several Members of Congress have recently called for repealing or delaying tax relief provisions of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—*

(1) the scheduled tax relief provided for by the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001, passed by a bipar-

tisan majority in Congress, should not be suspended or repealed;

(2) suspending, repealing or delaying provisions of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 is a tax increase;

(3) increasing taxes in the midst of a recession would not be helpful to the Nation's economy or American workers; and

(4) instead of increasing taxes, Congress should be working with the President to promote long-term economic growth through a fair tax code that puts the least possible burden on taxpayers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER).

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

Mr. Speaker, today our House of Representatives has the opportunity to speak very clearly on whether or not we should continue to lower taxes for American workers or to raise taxes on American workers.

The war on terrorism, homeland security, and economic recession has caused a fiscal deficit in our budget. Some are now calling for repeal of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act, something commonly know as the Bush tax cut, and they argue that higher taxes will give Washington more money to spend here in Washington. So today before us we have a choice: higher taxes or getting the economy moving again.

Let us remember at the beginning of last year: when President Bush became President, he inherited a weakening economy. The President proposed taking 20 percent of the budget surplus resulting from our Congress' fiscal responsibility and giving it back to the American worker so they could spend it at home for their own families.

We passed the President's tax cut in June, it was signed into law, and the President succeeded in lowering rates for small business and entrepreneurs, the engines of economic growth. We wiped out the marriage tax penalty, we wiped out the death tax, we increased opportunities for retirement savings, and we doubled the child tax credit. And our tax cut was working. Economists were telling us in late August and by Labor Day that the economy was beginning to recover.

Then the tragedy of September 11 occurred, a terrorist attack that cost thousands of Americans their lives and caused a psychological blow to the confidence of business investors as well as consumers. Today we have seen as a result of that terrorist attack on our economy that over 1 million Americans have lost their jobs.

Mr. Speaker, today we are at war against terrorism, we are building our homeland security, and we are in an economic recession. We must get this economy moving again. We must create jobs for those who lack work.

Today, no real-world economists have called for a tax increase in time

of recession. They point out that tax increases hurt our economy and that tax increases take money out of the pockets of America's workers and consumers, making it harder for them to meet the needs of their families. We must keep spending under control, and true fiscal responsibility is keeping spending under control. Fiscal responsibility is not increasing taxes.

This House has the opportunity to go on the record for higher taxes, or to maintain the Bush plan to lower taxes, which will be implemented over the rest of this decade. Repealing the Bush tax cut is a tax increase. Vote "aye" to not impose higher taxes and to keep the Bush tax cut in place.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am going to be trying to find out where this resolution came from. I will be asking the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER), I will be asking the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. I sit on this committee. I am proud to be a member of this committee.

Mr. Speaker, this concerns tax policy. This bill should not be coming out of the Committee on Rules, and it should have had a hearing and we should have had input in it. That has not happened, and in these 40 minutes I am going to try to find out how this political resolution reached the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and honored to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), our distinguished minority leader.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote "no" on this resolution. I am disappointed that the majority prevented us from offering a bill that would protect Social Security from further raids on the trust fund.

This is not a vote about taxes; it is a vote about protecting Social Security. It is about honoring our commitments to the American people who have paid their hard-earned dollars into the Social Security trust fund. It is about ensuring security and retirement for every citizen.

The resolution before us has no binding effect. It is an effort to divert attention from Republican mismanagement of the budget. Less than one year after passage of the Republican tax bill, an economic plan, more than \$4 trillion of the surplus has miraculously vanished, wiped out, gone, finished; and the Social Security trust fund will be attacked every year for the next 10 years.

One might say, what is happening, what is going on? Both parties repeatedly voted to safeguard the trust funds.

□ 1215

We voted for lockboxes. We said that they would be inviolate, that they could not be picked. For years we have

been promising the American people, the baby boomers, that the trust funds would only be used to strengthen Social Security and pay down the national debt. In fact, the Republican leadership insisted many times on bringing lockbox bills to the floor. Now we know that they were not serious about those bills. They were ploys. They were ruses. And the votes that were taken were not serious, and they were not honest.

We have had an historic reversal. Instead of talking about surpluses for as far as the eye can see, now we are again talking about deficits for as far as the eye can see. Instead of shoring up Social Security and Medicare, we are facing a situation where the trust fund will be tapped for other functions of government. Instead of preparing for the baby boomers and their retirement, instead of adding a prescription drug program to Medicare, we are faced with a debate about saving Social Security without resources and how to dig ourselves out of the deficit ditch. The Republican slogan seems to be: Save Social Security last, not first.

This resolution has a simple purpose. It is to hide the fact that Republicans are breaking their promises, going back on their commitments. This is an effort to change the subject. The American people should not and will not be fooled by this transparent ploy, and they should be reminded that the problem is that we are operating under a Republican economic policy and Republican budget priorities.

We need to invest in people. We need to pass tax cuts that promote long-term economic growth and opportunity, and we need to keep our commitments to the baby boomers who paid their money responsibly into the Social Security Trust Fund. That is our challenge, and that is what the American people want us to do. That is what we need to do this year, and we should do it together, not in a partisan manner.

Mr. Speaker, let us get about doing what we need to make the budget whole and to invest in the priorities that the American people want us to be investing in. This resolution is nonsense. Let us get about saving Social Security first.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, before I yield some time here, I yield myself such time as I may consume to remind my good friends on the other side of the aisle that we are at war against terrorism, that we are in an economic recession, and that a "no" vote on this resolution is a vote for a tax increase during an economic recession.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON), a leader in the effort to help working families in her home State of New Mexico.

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois. I have revised a little bit of what I will say based on what we have just heard from the minority leader,

because I think it shows a very clear contrast in what we are about in this House.

He talks about honesty and keeping promises. I take those things very seriously, and I take my own integrity very seriously. There has been an historic reversal, as the minority leader says. That historic reversal is that we are in a recession and that America has been attacked, and we are at war.

I believe there are two things this country must do now. We have to win the war on terrorism, and we have to create jobs. I think we are united, we are together on the first, and we are resolved we are going to win this war on terrorism, and we will spend what it takes to win it. But the worst thing we could do in a recession is to raise taxes. All of those little small businesses out there who are worrying about whether they are going to have to lay off more people because they cannot make the rent payment on their shop this month need the reassurance that we are with them, that we understand, that we are not going to raise their taxes.

Most of this tax relief that is going to be phasing in is for middle-income Americans and particularly for families. We eliminate the marriage penalty and, as a result, 43 million Americans are not going to be paying more just because they are married. It is about time that we started honoring marriage in this country and stop taxing it.

When the President of the United States came to New Mexico in August, he went with me to Griegos Elementary School in the north valley of Albuquerque, New Mexico, and as we were going down this little lane to get there, there was a sheet hung on a fence and in handwritten letters it said, Mr. President, thank you for my new bed. It cost \$300.

Maybe \$1,700 in the pocket of an American family is not a whole lot in Washington terms, but it is in New Mexico terms. It is a lot for a New Mexico family. I think we should let them keep their own money and give small businesses the confidence to be able to hire workers this next year and create jobs and not abandon them in their time of need.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), a voice that is respected on both sides of the aisle.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, this is an amazing debate. In listening to the gentlewoman from New Mexico talking about the recession, surely she does not mean that the economic game plan that was voted in last year is going to last us in a recession until 2004 or 2005. That is when the next part of the tax cuts that everybody is talking about is going to kick in. I believe we are going to be out of the recession before then, but obviously, the gentlewoman believes that we are not.

What we are talking about today is, are we going to borrow \$1.6 trillion of Social Security Trust Funds in order to finance an economic game plan that this side still thinks is a good one. I do not understand the logic there.

I do not care how many times the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) stands on the floor and says we are raising taxes; no one on this side is raising taxes. In fact, I voted for more of a tax cut last year for the economy than the gentleman did. I did.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I seem to recall a few years ago, my friends on the other side of the aisle, when we talked.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) yield 30 seconds additional to me so that we can continue?

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, we have additional speakers.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yielded to the gentleman. Will the gentleman give me 30 seconds so that we can continue whatever point the gentleman was wanting to make?

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I will yield myself some time.

Mr. RANGEL. I cannot believe this, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I will yield myself some time.

Mr. RANGEL. To yield to the gentleman from Texas. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) asked the gentleman to yield for a question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) to use himself, since he was courteous enough to yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER), but I will give him 30 seconds to see whether or not the gentleman would like to respond, to get a response to his question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) is recognized for an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER).

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I will make my question quick.

A few years ago my friends on the other side of the aisle said when we wanted to slow the rate of growth and increase some funding for Medicare, that was called a cut. So the same definition would apply. If the gentleman wants to repeal the Bush tax cut, that is a tax increase.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, no one is talking about repealing anything that has gone into effect. No one. The gentleman keeps saying this is a tax increase.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Bush tax cut is already law, so it is already in effect.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, it does not take effect until 2004. The logic that the gentleman from Illinois is following today, that means that he voted for the largest single tax increase in history in 2010 when the bill the gentleman voted for last year expires. The gentleman voted for the biggest tax raise in history. That is what he did by his own logic. I do not understand that logic.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), a real leader in helping bring jobs back to the great State of Alabama, as some of the American workers have been laid off by the terrorist attacks of September 11.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, we made a commitment to the American people to give them tax relief. Let us honor that commitment. The American people should get the tax cuts that they have been promised. We should not postpone them, we should not delay them. We are all going to have an opportunity in a few minutes to affirm those tax cuts. The gentleman from Texas says no one in this body has proposed delaying them, no one has proposed postponing them. We will get an opportunity to vote, yes or no. I say the American people should get the tax relief they need.

Now, the gentleman from New York who is rising said, tax matters are before the Committee on Ways and Means. They ought to have jurisdiction in that. They ought to have an interest in that. They ought to decide that.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I say that the Congress ought to decide.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. BACHUS. No, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not yield.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I cannot read the chart that is there.

Mr. BACHUS. Now, Mr. Speaker, the passage of President Bush's tax cut.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama has the time.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, the passage of President Bush's tax cut was an historic bipartisan achievement.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RANGEL. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. WELLER. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, do I have to get permission from the gentleman in the well to make a parliamentary inquiry of the Speaker, of the Chair?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. While that gentleman is under recognition, yes.

Mr. RANGEL. I thank the Speaker. I apologize.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I hope my time will be extended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time will not be curtailed by the interruption.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, President Bush's historic tax cut was a bipartisan achievement. Only three times since World War II have we had an across-the-board tax cut. The first one was in 1960 under President Kennedy, then under President Reagan in 1980, and finally, last fall, under President Bush. Yes, people are talking about delaying that. People are talking about postponing that. This is a joint resolution. Hopefully, the Members will support those tax cuts we gave, and among them are marriage penalty relief, the elimination of the death tax, and across-the-board income tax cuts. We left no one out. We doubled the per-child tax credit.

Hopefully, we will all stand up and be recorded, because the American people deserve to know where each and every Member of this House and this Senate stands. They deserve a recorded vote.

I say this: This resolution is plain and simple. It affirms our support for the tax cut. It says that it should not be repealed or delayed. If my colleagues want to repeal them, if they want to delay them, if they want to raise taxes, vote against the resolution.

The second thing, we have to revitalize our economy. Now, there has been a lot of talk about Social Security. Well, let me state this: The best way to ensure and to protect Social Security, which we all want, is to stimulate our economy. OMB Director Mitch Daniels said to the Committee on the Budget, the best way to protect the baby boomer generation and Social Security retirement is economic growth. We have to get the economy going. Couple that with Social Security system reforms. If we are serious about Social Security, let us reform Social Security. Let us get the economy growing.

We have had lost 800,000 jobs in the last 4 months because we had not passed an economic stimulus plan. Now, some in Congress have tried to maneuver and scheme for political advantage by blaming the President's tax relief plan for the deficit and recession. I am glad that the gentleman from Texas finally acknowledged that the tax cuts had nothing to do with deficits. Those that say they do are not telling the truth. These tax supporters try to sell the myth that we must increase taxes just 6 months after we started giving Americans rebate checks. The ink on this new tax relief bill is hardly dry, and now people are talking about repealing it.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. BACHUS. They would like to delay or postpone it.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. BACHUS. I will yield on the gentleman's time.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I was just wondering if the gentleman has charts to pass out, because while those charts are good for television, we cannot read them.

Mr. BACHUS. Well, this is from CBO, and what it says is that 87 percent of the deficit is because of the economic conditions are spending, spending, only 13 percent as a result of tax relief.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, does it say where that information came from?

Mr. BACHUS. From CBO, Congressional Budget Office.

Mr. RANGEL. I see. Does the gentleman have the date on that?

Mr. BACHUS. Yes. I will be glad to supply the gentleman with all of that information.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. As I said, we have got to revitalize this economy. Tax cuts stimulate the economy, get the economy moving. They create jobs. President Bush said it best when he said, the bottom line is jobs, creating good jobs.

□ 1230

Baby boomers, to protect their retirement, they need to be working; they need to be paying into their retirement accounts, not drawing unemployment checks. We have got a delay over in the Senate of the economic stimulus package that is being obstructed. Now it has actually been killed. We lost 300,000 jobs this last month while the Senate failed to act. Now these same people who killed the economic stimulus package want to kill the tax cut.

We know in Washington that if you want to kill something, you simply postpone it or delay it. That is Washington-talk for kill it.

We all know that if these taxes do not go into effect that taxpayers, American people will be paying more out of their pay check.

I will close simply by saying this. There will be a vote in a few minutes on whether we preserve the tax cuts, whether that money stays in the pocket of hardworking Americans or whether we bring it up here and spend it. We will all have a say. We will all take a position.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The Chair would admonish Members that they should refrain from improper references to the Senate such as characterizing their actions.

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

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

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I came here and asked the people in Tennessee to send me here in 1988 because I knew from my business and personal life that this country, not my business, not me personally and my wife could continue to borrow money every year, which is what we were doing then and pile up more and more debt without jeopardizing the future of this country.

Now, here we are in 2002. Everybody knows from the budget presented yesterday that the country has physically deteriorated in a breathtaking way in the last year. We do not have the money that we thought we were going to have, that we were told we were going to have last year. And now we are in a position as the budget was presented by the Secretary of the Treasury to committee yesterday to be in the next 10 years never in a surplus position from an on-budget surplus number. That is to say, we are going to borrow money every year for the next 10 years. It is going to cost another trillion dollars.

Let me state why deficits matter. Deficits matter because it is money you owe. And when you owe money, you have got to pay interest on it. Right now 13 cents out of every dollar that comes here goes to pay interest. They say we are paying for war. We are not paying for anything. We are borrowing for the war. That is wrong. We ask the young men and women in this country in uniform to go overseas and fight for us. We say no price is too high for you. We will protect you, give you everything you need; but we will not pay for it. We will borrow it from our kids. They are the ones making the sacrifice. This is a generational mugging, that is what is going on. It is like a heavyweight fight except that the kids are getting mugged and are paying for this because we are borrowing the money to pay for war. We are borrowing the money to pay for tax cuts. We are not paying for anything, nothing for the next 10 years, and that is absolutely wrong.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I would once again remind my colleagues on the other sides that today's vote is whether or not we maintain the Bush tax cut or increase taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), an advocate of helping working families go back to work by getting this economy moving again.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to watch the liberal psyche in this town. When they do not like something, they do not come out and say, I like bigger taxes. I like bigger government. In-

stead they nitpick things. It is like getting a great novel like "War and Peace" and saying I just did not like the novel because there is a grammatical error on page 352. I just could not accept it. It is like not liking the Superbowl because New England called the wrong play in the third quarter. I just could not possibly support them. It is that kind of mad-at-the-world, sour puss, liberal approach to issues; and it is always the nitpicking. Just come out and say, I am a liberal. As a liberal I like to spend money. I like the government to grow. And I want control of people from cradle to grave because that creates government dependency. And when the government controls you and you are dependent on the government, you have to keep coming back to Washington year after year and you have to beg for a new program or new relief or new regulations or a change that creates constituency groups, and that keeps me, a liberal, in power.

Now, conservatives on the other hand say, I want less government. I do not want people who have to come groveling to Washington year after year for relief, for regulatory relief for more freedom. Less government creates more freedom. When you have money in your pocket you have more choices. The working man can go out there and buy more hamburgers, take his family out to eat on a Friday night. He can buy more clothes, a set of tires for the car. He can go on a few more vacations. He can send his kids to college. Creating freedom for the working family.

What happens when the American people have more money in their pockets and they are buying more hamburgers and more clothes and more CDs? Businesses have to expand. Small businesses react by saying I have to increase my inventory.

When they do that, jobs are created. Small businesses say, I have to hire new employees to help me handle this new demand, and there are more opportunities and there is more upward mobility in society. It is an economic truth. More people are working, more revenues come in and then we have more revenues to address this deficit. That is why conservatives want to have permanent tax relief for the American people.

It is interesting. Al Gore wanted higher taxes. The American people said no. Dukakis wanted higher taxes. The American people said no. Bill Clinton said, I will give you a middle-class tax cut. He wins. Maybe there is a lesson there.

The ruling elite hates it when the working people get it right. They cannot stand it. Well, the working folks want this tax relief. They want it permanently. And I proudly support the effort of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER).

I hope that my colleagues will show some independence and do the same thing for the working people of America.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), a leader in our party and a spokesperson.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the state of the budget, so much has changed in the last several months. Our economy is struggling, unemployment is up, and we are fighting a war against terrorism. But with the President's budget released this weekend, now with this resolution it is clear one thing has not changed, and I am sorry that my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), left the floor, because what this resolution is about, what this budget is about is that, in fact, the other side of the aisle, that the Republican majority in this House will stop at nothing to raid Social Security and raid Medicare.

Despite their protestations over the last couple of years, they fundamentally do not believe in Social Security and Medicare. They take every opportunity to dismantle the current system which plays such a role in the lives of working families today.

Social Security has been a lifeline and Medicare is a lifeline to health care for seniors and for people who have worked all their lives, who, in fact, will need that retirement security. The Republican majority would deny that retirement security. They would move to privatizing Social Security. They would talk about investing in the stock market. And, my God, look at what has happened in recent times with the stock market and with Enron and with a variety of other companies. But that is the direction this majority would like to go.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) has 5½ minutes. The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) has 12½ minutes.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, it looks like they have a few more speakers than we do. I will reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to believe that today as the Senate moves to vote to help workers left unemployed by September 11, this House chooses to vote to reaffirm last year's massive and imprudent tax cut bill. Knowing what we know today, how can we vote for tax cuts that are tilted towards big business and the well-to-do?

Last year we were told in 2001 that we would have a surplus of \$300 billion into the year 2002. Now what do we know? That there is a deficit of \$100 billion in the President's budget.

Last year we were told that Social Security would be protected. We all voted for the so-called lock box. What do we know today? The President's

budget raids Social Security over 10 years of \$1.5 trillion. Last year we were promised that we would pay down the national debt of \$3.5 trillion. What do we know today? The Bush budget increases the debt.

Last year we were told prescription drug benefits would be available for all seniors. What do we know today? Only some seniors will get it. Last year we were promised we would support public education. Today what do we know? The Bush budget eliminates all funding for class-size reduction. It eliminates all funding for school construction. It cuts drug prevention programs. It cuts money for drop-out prevention programs.

Education came first?

Today we also know that September 11 left us with the need to fund homeland security and to address our terrorism needs. By the way, the President said it is costing us about \$1 billion a month, \$12 billion a year to fight terrorism. Extended out for 10 years, that is \$120 billion. Why are you taking \$1.5 trillion from Social Security? Stop showing those charts.

We also know today that we have lay-offs and unemployment as a result of September 11. American workers in need. We know today the corruption and greed of big business commands the attention of the American public because of companies like Enron inflicting real and heavy hits on our American workers and their pensions.

We also know that the Enrons of the world and the executives like Kenneth Lay who used to run Enron are the ones that would benefit from these tax cuts more than any of Enron's workers.

You cannot claim innocence. You cannot claim ignorance. You know what you are doing if you vote for this. Vote against it. Help the Senate in doing the heavy lifting in helping American workers, not this.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve my time.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), a veteran legislator.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, as we honor President Regan's birthday today, it is fitting that we remember one of his most famous lines, "There you go again." Well, tragically, there you go again and here we go again.

In the early 1980's President Reagan forced through a massive tax cut and military spending hikes that resulted in budget deficits over the next 12 years. The American tax payers paid trillions of dollars in additional interest costs. Long-term interest rates remained high. The penalty was on workers, on their families, on their children and on the poor of this Nation. Sounds familiar? There he goes again. President Bush's budget priorities.

In spite of everything we have learned, as the previous speaker said,

the world has changed since September 11. Everything has changed, the President said. Everything but this tax cut that was considered in an entirely different time.

What do we see? We see Governors all over the country postponing tax cuts because the reality of their State budgets is they cannot continue to provide tax cuts and provide the services that their States need, whether it is education or highways or infrastructure repairs.

What do we see now? Republican Governors postponing tax cuts. I do not think they think they are raising taxes. They think they are doing prudent economics on behalf of the citizens of their State. We should reject this proposal.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER).

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank our ranking member for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I must rise in opposition to this senseless sense of the Congress resolution.

I support tax cuts, and I even voted for last year's tax package because I believe hardworking Americans deserve tax relief. But in the year since we passed the tax cut, America's economic conditions have drastically worsened. We now face a future of budget deficits that threaten Social Security and Medicare. That is why yesterday I submitted an amendment to the Committee on Rules that would have added a trigger mechanism to the tax cut.

My amendment would have ensured that the tax cuts passed last year continue as planned as long as future cuts are not paid for with Social Security and Medicare money. Unfortunately, the rule does not allow me to offer this amendment.

It is simply irresponsible for Congress to jeopardize Social Security and its promise of a secure future. That is why I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote no on this senseless resolution and let us get back to work.

□ 1245

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

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

The question we are debating today could not be simpler. In a time of a \$6 trillion national debt and a growing deficit, a recession and a war, do we provide hundreds of billions of dollars in tax breaks to the wealthiest 1 percent of the population, people with a minimum income of \$375,000 a year, and in the process raid the Social Security Trust Fund and endanger that system? Further, do we cut back on Medicare and other important needs in order to

make the richest people in this country even richer?

Mr. Speaker, the answer is pretty obvious. According to an L.A. Times poll published yesterday, 81 percent of the American people think that the President's tax breaks should not go through if it means taking money out of Social Security; 81 percent of the American people believe that. I believe that, and I hope the United States Congress has the guts to stand up to the wealthy campaign contributors and believe it also.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) has 7 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I understand I have the right to close.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have one additional speaker.

I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), a leader in the fight to get the economy moving again.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) for the time.

I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 312 in support of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act we passed last year.

It seems to me one of the most important questions that we can be asking ourselves and should be asking is what do we do to get this economy moving again. Unfortunately several of my colleagues, and we have heard them just recently, have suggested exactly what we should not do. They are openly advocating that we raise taxes during a recession.

Some like to spin this proposal as not a tax hike really, but rather a repeal of future tax cuts. I am afraid that is a distinction without a difference. The fact is, current law establishes a specific declining series of tax rates that are known to all and on which people are planning and making their investment decisions. To replace that existing law with a new series of higher tax rates is simply a tax increase. There is no doubt about it.

The fact is this is a reckless plan, and it will endanger our economy, and that is just Economics 101. I mean, economists of all political parties, all stripes, people everywhere understand when we raise taxes, we slow the economy down, and when we slow an economy down, it results in job losses. Federal taxes right now are still a near postwar record high level, and we are in the midst of a recession that has cost hundreds of thousands of jobs.

If we were to adopt the irresponsible idea of repealing or delaying part of this tax plan that we adopted last year, it can only result in a slower economy and more job losses.

Instead of proposing that we raise taxes, frankly I think we should be fol-

lowing the example of a certain very prominent Kennedy. In 1962, with a Federal tax burden lower than it is today, President John F. Kennedy observed, and I will quote, "The largest single barrier to full employment and a higher rate of economic growth is the unrealistically heavy drag of Federal income taxes." He said that when the tax burden was lower than it is today.

President Kennedy then went on to lower Federal taxes dramatically and sparked 7 years of robust economic growth and job creation. Despite the lower rates, the government took in more revenue than before the tax cut, and the budget deficits were significantly reduced.

The fact is every time that the Federal Government has significantly cut taxes in the last century, the Mellon tax cuts of the 1920s, the Kennedy cuts of the 1960s, the Reagan tax cuts of the 1980s, the fact is the economy responded, jobs were created and tax revenue grew. And we just heard an allegation that the Reagan tax cuts of the 1980s caused deficits. When will we acknowledge the truth? The fact is after Ronald Reagan lowered taxes in the 1980s, Federal tax revenue nearly doubled. The problem was that spending tripled. Sure, we had deficits, but it was not because of the tax relief.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, support the American economy, support the people who are looking to get back to work.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, is it our understanding that the majority intend to reserve the balance of their time to close?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) has 3 minutes remaining and one additional speaker, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) has 7 minutes remaining. That is correct.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

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

I rise in strong opposition to this measure. This resolution is nothing more than an effort to divert attention from the Enron-like scandal in the Republican economic plan.

The Republicans are robbing Social Security and Medicare in order to guarantee additional future tax breaks to the richest Americans. In order to mask this irresponsible, risky and cynical behavior, they fall back on their old discredited mantra, that putting future tax cuts for the rich on hold equals a tax increase. They will say it over and over, but it will never be true.

Everyone in this House is for middle- and lower-income tax cuts, which, by the way, benefit the wealthy as well as the economy, but now that this administration has presided over the disappearance of a \$5 trillion surplus, they want to go after Social Security.

Ask the American people the real question. Should we sacrifice Social

Security and Medicare in order to give tax cuts to make the rich even richer? Actually the Los Angeles Times did ask the question, and 80 percent said stop the tax cut. We should vote no on this shameless resolution.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, we have not allocated a full hour in our short workweek to consider a resolution that would ensure the richest 1 percent of Americans receive their tax cut on time.

When it comes to policies that would benefit the mass of middle- and working-class Americans, the administration does not seem particularly punctual. After killing OSHA's ergonomics rules, the administration promised a new set of ergonomic standards. Nearly a year later thousands of American workers injured on the job are still waiting.

The administration has long promised a meaningful prescription drug benefit for the elderly. The people are still waiting.

Shunning the Kyoto Global Warming Protocol, the administration promised to develop a new plan to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The people are still waiting.

Despite promising to control energy costs, the administration dragged its feet in imposing Federal price caps on electricity, allowing Enron and others to gouge California consumers to the tune of \$6.8 billion. Californians waited 6 months for relief.

After bailing out the airline industry post-September 11, the majority in the House promised legislation to help thousands of furloughed airline employees. They are still waiting.

The people should not have to wait anymore for help, and I tell my colleagues, the richest 1 percent in this country, they can wait their turn.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of the previous speakers noted the Kennedy tax cuts as a measure of achievement, but what he failed to note was that part of the revenue, at least one-third of the revenue generated on that occasion, came from closing tax loopholes, which this Congress has been reluctant to address, but let me speak specifically to this issue.

The hot movie in 1981 was Smokey and the Bandit, the cool band was Blondie, and the prevailing fiscal theory was trickle down economics. While 1981 is a distant memory for most of us, we should learn from that experience and not repeat the mistakes of the past.

The meaningless resolution we are considering today would unfortunately do just that. The budget released this

week says that the way to climb out of this deficit is with more tax cuts, exploding tax cuts that we all know are going to be drawn from Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds, just when the baby boomers begin to retire.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford these tax cuts now, and everybody knows it, so why do we think we can afford them when the baby boom generation begins to retire? Apparently the taxpayers agree with us. The Los Angeles Times poll is clear that the American people dispute the priority that the majority in this House is about to undertake. These tax cuts are not only skewed toward the wealthy, but they disproportionately go to the superwealthy.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), in whose district the Twin Towers once stood and was the target of this vicious attack against the United States of America.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is a joke. I have been a Member of Congress for almost 10 years, and I cannot remember any resolution that simply supports current law. To not repeal or roll back tax cuts, we do not need this resolution. Nothing is coming to the floor. Nothing is threatened. We do not have to do anything.

The fact of the matter is that it was the Clinton budget's deficit reduction package, which the Republicans called the greatest tax increase in history in 1993, which they predicted, and I remember the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) on the floor saying this will lead to a depression, this will lead to hair-curling depression, instead led to the greatest economic boom in the history of this country, led to the lowest unemployment, lowest inflation, greatest job growth.

It led to reversing the \$5 trillion in debt that we incurred during the Reagan, Bush Senior, years. Instead, we got what we predicted a year ago after 8 years of the Clinton economics was going to be \$5.5 trillion of surplus, and 1 year with this tax cut and with the economic recession partially brought about by this tax cut, we now have \$4 trillion of that wiped out.

Now they say we should not have a tax increase in a recession. Of course we should not. No one is proposing that unless they think the recession is going to last another 4 or 5 years, but the real point here is that with a \$4 trillion in surplus wiped out, this country is going to face choices a couple of years down the road.

Do we want another tax cut for the richest people in our country, or do we want prescription drugs coverage for seniors on Medicare? How are we going to pay for that? There is not enough money in the Bush budget for it. There is not enough money that we see in the next 10 years for prescription drugs under Medicare, not if we give more tax cuts to the richest people in our society.

If we want to fully fund the education bill that we passed, we are not

going to be able carry on this current economics. So we have to leave ourselves some adjustment room so we can make decisions in the future when we see do we want prescription drugs for seniors or a little more help for the billionaires among us.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) has 3 minutes remaining.

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

I have been waiting for an answer from the other side as to how this tax policy provision could come out without ever coming before the Committee on Ways and Means. They refuse to answer. It did not come out of the Committee on the Budget. They refused to answer. It must have come out of the Republican campaign to reelect the Congress because it is a political issue and should not be on this floor.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I would like to provide an answer.

Mr. RANGEL. Well, it is too late now. My colleague sure had his chance, and he will get another chance to answer.

Mr. Speaker, the remaining time that I have I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY), an outstanding member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for yielding me the time, and I thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) for bringing this motion to the floor. I think it is very helpful.

When we passed the tax bill in May, we all agreed that Social Security and Medicare funds would be held inviolate. In fact, that was the terms of the consideration of the tax bill as put forward by the President. He said, to make sure the retirement savings of American seniors are not diverted to any other program, my budget protects all \$2.6 million.

This was elaborated on by members of the majority as they advanced the budget, including the tax plan. In fact, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) said we must understand that it is inviolate to intrude against either Social Security or Medicare, and if that means foregoing or, as it were, paying for the tax cuts, then we will do that.

Now we know, however, that the actual budget plan this year involves all future phase-ins of this tax cut coming out of Social Security funds. If we look at the green line on this chart, we will note that for each of the next 10 years, we are into Social Security funds to fund any future dimension of this tax cut. So it is a very different picture than we had when we passed the bill in May. It is not funded from general funds. This is a raid on Social Security. In fact, the President's budget reveals that up to \$2 trillion will be diverted from Social Security and Medicare in order to fund all future aspects of the tax cut.

□ 1300

So the question before us today is really a restatement of May's tax cut vote, but done in light of what we now know. In May, we voted saying it would not touch Social Security. Today, we know in light of the President's budget plan that it raids Social Security to the tune of \$2 trillion. Under those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this resolution.

I could support this resolution if there were a credible budget plan advanced by the majority that showed we were not touching Social Security and we were not touching Medicare. But to over the next 10 years, and not just in this period of war and recession, as the majority says, but over the next 10 years launch us on a plan that diverts \$2 trillion of funds coming in for Social Security and Medicare jeopardizes our Nation, jeopardizes a future commitment to our seniors, and jeopardizes those in the work force today paying for the retirement.

It is wrong to use Social Security monies in this way. They ought to put a plan forward that holds harmless Social Security. The vote today is whether we want to use Social Security on all future aspects of the tax cut.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The time of gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) has expired. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WELLER. The time of the gentleman from New York has fully expired, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

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

In conclusion, I would say to my colleagues that it is clear to me that we have an ideological divide. Our friends on the other side of the aisle are proposing a tax increase as their solution to our current situation. And if we look at the facts today, we are at war, a war against terrorism, we are rebuilding our homeland security, we are in an economic recession, and all those who are students of history know that whenever we are in a war, we have a deficit, and whenever we have an economic recession, we have a deficit. Of course, my hope is we can bring spending under control and eliminate that this year.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle propose a tax increase. They say we should repeal the tax cut that President Bush proposed last year, and that by doing so, raise tax revenue that they could spend here in Washington.

Well, let us look at what it is they propose repealing. First, I will mention the marriage tax penalty. Twenty-eight million married couples pay an average of \$1,400 more in higher taxes. We, of course, passed legislation to wipe out the marriage tax penalty. A married couple making \$60,000, a middle-class married couple in the district I represent, the south suburbs, pays on average \$1,400 taxes under the marriage

tax penalty. They are middle class. They would see higher taxes under the Democrat tax increase.

They also propose wiping out the elimination of the death tax, and they propose wiping out the doubling of the child's tax credit. Working moms and working families who have children will be able to get up to a \$1,000 tax credit. It is \$500 under the current law that is in place. They want to raise taxes on those parents with children.

We also provide an opportunity for families to put more tax-free contributions into their retirement accounts. If we go along with the Democrat proposal, we wipe out that opportunity and increase taxes on those who want to save for education and retirement.

If we care about economic growth, we have to remember that it is the small-business person, the entrepreneur who is in the top two tax brackets, the people they call rich. And 80 percent of those who pay taxes under the top two tax brackets are the small-business people, the entrepreneurs, the people who have shops and businesses on Liberty Street in my hometown, our main street, and main streets all across America. We know small businesses and the entrepreneurs are going to create jobs and get our economy moving again.

So, again, a world war, we are rebuilding our homeland security, and we are in a recession. And there is not one real world economist who has said that now is the time to increase taxes. In fact, economists tell us it is best to lower taxes in a recession so people have more money to invest and spend in the creation of jobs.

Yesterday, Secretary O'Neill, someone who is known for his frankness and independent thought, was asked the question: "Is a repeal of the Bush tax cut a tax increase?" And the Secretary said yes. And he noted that raising taxes would stifle the process of getting Americans back to work. This is a bad idea as our recovery is struggling to take hold.

My colleagues, this is a simple vote. We are in a recession, we are at war. Do we want to increase taxes? Those who want to increase taxes vote "no." Those who want to make sure the Bush tax cut is fully implemented and we get this economy moving again vote "aye."

I urge an "aye" vote and ask for bipartisan support for this sense of House resolution and preserve the President's tax cut.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer a few comments on the House's consideration of H. Con. Res. 312.

Today our nation is at war, both here and abroad. Congress is considering a budget plan that is likely to spend money out of the Social Security Trust Fund. Our economy is trying to find its footing in the wake of the ongoing recession. And many central New Jerseyans have questions about the security of their 401K retirement plans in the wake of the Enron bankruptcy. Looking at that list of issues, I imagine most Americans feel Congress has plenty of work to do.

But instead of coming together in a bipartisan way to deal with these important matters, the House is wasting time today debating a symbolic and politically slanted resolution that has one and only one purpose: To try to make it seem like some Members oppose tax cuts so that it can be used against them in political campaigns. That this is a purely political exercise is underscored by the fact that the Congressional Leadership rejected all attempts to modify this resolution to include the protection of Social Security.

I support tax cuts. My record on that is clear. I have consistently voted—sometimes even against my own party—to support responsible tax cuts for families, be it in the estate tax, the marriage penalty tax, or other tax cuts. Despite that, I will vote on this resolution. It is the type of silly political "gotcha" game that Americans hate about Washington. And it glosses over the real budget challenges we face.

Last year, the Congressional Budget Office projected over \$5.6 trillion in surpluses over the next ten years. Now, based on the President's budget presented this week, the surplus will be about \$600 billion—a difference of \$5 trillion lost in less than one year.

That budget will force the government to dip into Social Security and Medicare every year for the next ten years, and because it fails to pay off the debt, will cost the country an additional \$1 trillion. That is one trillion dollars that won't be available for families to meet their needs or for the government to help with schools, energy research, prescription medicine, or anything else. That's a one trillion debt that will rest on our children.

As many of us warned last year, Congress simply left no cushion in the budget resolution. Last year, no one predicted that we would enter a recession, and no one knew we would be at war. But many of us warned that unforeseen occurrences always arise and carry expenses with them. Set aside more of the budget, we said, and that will put us in a better position for the future—whatever comes.

There is no doubt that the recession and the war on terrorism have contributed to the disappearance of the surplus. But the single largest contributor to that disappearance over the next decade is the President's tax package. This resolution will be presented as a litmus test of who wants to raise taxes. I won't raise taxes. Americans can rest assured that no one here is proposing to raise taxes, certainly not at a time of economic weakness.

We'll see this resolution in only two places: On the House floor today and in campaign commercials this fall. We shouldn't be wasting time on finger pointing and political games. We should be working together to find solutions to the problems that are waiting out on the horizon.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, President Bush recently delivered his budget proposals for Fiscal Year 2003 to Congress. I was hopeful that all Americans would be a part of the American dream, but he has woefully put almost 60 percent of us in jeopardy. The most pressing question in Washington this year is will we support a budget that makes the wealthiest 15 percent of Americans wealthier, or will we pursue policies that will keep 60 percent of the people from becoming worse off.

I wholeheartedly support the President in his efforts to improve homeland security and to

further strengthen our military. We have finally adjusted to the post cold war world, and after the terrorist attacks of September 11, we now have an even better understanding of the world and those who threaten us. I fully support the President's efforts to strengthen our military forces through modern equipment and facilities and highly trained and compensated personnel.

I also applaud the President for his efforts to strengthen our security at home. The concept of "Homeland Security" holds special meaning to the people of our nation for the first time in more than 50 years. The images of that fateful day in September will haunt each of us for the rest of our lives. But we are a strong and proud people and we will not forsake our responsibilities to guard the privileges of freedom for which so many of our forefathers shed their own blood. We all support our President in his efforts to protect us and will go the extra mile to meet our security needs.

Yet, we must not neglect the other principles that have made our nation the strongest and most productive in the history of civilization. We are a nation of over-achievers who strive to reach the top and to win. But, we are also a nation of compassion, kindness and giving and we have always been willing to reach down and help those who need assistance.

I am fearful that the domestic side of President Bush's budget plan will neglect not only those who are least fortunate among us, but also a good many of us who are working to reach the top, but have yet to fulfill the dream.

The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) recently issued a report that said the single biggest factor in the elimination of the estimated \$5.6 trillion surplus was last year's Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act which cut taxes by \$1.35 trillion, most of which went to the wealthiest individuals and businesses. I strongly supported using this surplus to improve the lives of all Americans. I believed it best to divide the surplus into thirds, with one third for tax cuts, one third for additional funding on national priorities like education, Social Security, and infrastructure improvements, and one third toward eliminating the national debt. President Bush's tax cut was too much and, once hit by the recession and the attacks of September 11, it is clear that this huge tax cut has knocked our fiscal house into a heap of rubble.

For the first time since 1997, the budget of the United States Government will experience a deficit. We must pay for the war on terrorism and we must protect the Homeland. But, we should not put domestic programs at jeopardy, go into further debt, and raid the Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds in order to give the wealthiest Americans large tax cuts.

In fact, even though last year's tax cuts are scheduled to expire in 2010, the President's new budget has proposed making these tax cuts permanent. This is estimated to cost an additional \$675 billion over the next ten years. This means domestic programs will be cut by almost five percent below the levels necessary to maintain current services. This means that we will be using Social Security and Medicare funds to pay for these tax cuts. It means we will be forced to eliminate 28 elementary and secondary education programs. It means we will cut rural health care activities by 42 percent. It means we must freeze the Child Care and Development Fund. It means we must cut



funds for critical repairs to public housing. It means our federal highway program will be cut a drastic 29 percent.

In my view, the price we are being asked to pay for these huge tax cuts is too high. I do not believe it is in the best interest of our nation as a whole to return to deficit spending just so the wealthiest 15 percent of our people can become even wealthier.

I am opposing the domestic portions of the President's budget and call on decision makers to join me in a common sense approach to meeting the priorities of America. We should continue to fight the war on terrorism. We should continue to protect the Homeland against attack. But we must not continue the ill-fated principles that drive us further and further into economic insecurity and debt. Let's be sure all Americans are given an opportunity to strive for the American dream.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I oppose H. Con. Res. 312, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the scheduled tax relief provided for by H.R. 1836, the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001, should not be suspended or repealed.

I oppose the resolution before us today for the same reasons I opposed H.R. 1836 last summer. It's the wrong tax cut at the wrong time. The wealthiest ten percent of U.S. taxpayers reap the greatest benefit from the tax cut. The tax cut is so costly that the President is willing to imperil Social Security and Medicare by using revenue from the Trust Funds to pay for the tax cut.

I am not willing to weaken the foundations of retirement security in order to pay for a bloated tax cut that benefits the wealthy. Nor am I willing to compromise on a Medicare prescription drug benefit. The bottom line is, there is only a limited amount of revenue coming into the federal government. By passing last year's tax cut, the Republican Congress put a premium on tax cuts for the wealthy while making retirement security, seniors, education, and our children, a lower priority.

Last January, the 10-year surplus (2002–2011) estimate was \$5.6 trillion. In one year, that surplus decreased \$4 trillion. Certainly the events of September 11 and the fledgling economy contributed to some of this decrease. However, forty percent of that decrease can be attributed to the Republican income tax cut passed last summer. Last February, Treasury Secretary Paul O'Neill stated before the Ways and Means Committee:

"If we lock box Social Security, that the President said we should do, effectively use it to pay down the public debt and you all want to do Medicare too, that is fine. We still have got after implementation of the President's proposal \$1.5 trillion available, or more than 25 percent of the total projected surplus available as a cushion against the prospect of running ourselves back into a deficit ditch."

Secretary O'Neill was wrong. Using the "on-budget" or non-Social Security baseline budget from the Administration's own budget tables, there is now a \$298 billion deficit over 5 years from 2003–2007. This means that all of those Republican-promoted Congressional resolutions last year promising to put the Social Security and Medicare trust funds in a "lockbox" were nothing more than dog and pony shows for America's retirees. Sadly, the days of fiscal responsibility are over.

Although Democrats noted last year that the figures used to calculate the size of the tax cut

were unrealistic and too conservative, the Republicans ignored our warnings and proceeded full speed ahead. Then, to make the bloated tax cut fit into their rosy budget scenario, the Republicans used budget gimmicks to make their tax cut expire in 2011. Now, appallingly, the President has called to make these tax cuts permanent in the budget he released on Monday. Apparently the rich aren't rich enough. Meanwhile, seniors who cannot afford prescription drugs are reminded by this resolution, and the President's budget, that their concerns are not a priority.

The Congressional Budget Office just reported that making the Bush tax cut permanent would decrease revenues by \$569 billion resulting in debt service payment increases of \$58 billion. This leads to a total cost of \$627 billion in FY 2003–2012. To do a real Medicare prescription drug benefit will cost some \$600 billion over ten years. We should scrap the additional tax cuts called for in the President's budget and instead provide a Medicare prescription drug benefit to all beneficiaries.

This resolution is an insult to every American worker who expects to receive an adequate Social Security check at retirement. It is also an insult to every senior who has been anticipating a meaningful Medicare prescription drug benefit. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H. Con. Res. 312.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is not real legislation intended to meet a national need or resolve a national problem. Instead, it is a political game. Everyone in this Chamber knows that—and by bringing it forward under this extraordinary procedure, the Republican leadership is doing us the favor of making it clear to everyone in the country.

In simplest terms, the point of this resolution is to try to make the House again express support for last year's tax bill—a bill based on economic projections that were very doubtful then and that now have been shown to have been wildly over-optimistic.

When the bill was passed, the economic weather seemed bright—we did not yet know that we already were in recession—and sponsors of the bill claimed that we could rely on that to continue not just for a matter of months but for a full decade. And now, despite the dramatic change in economic conditions, despite the need for increased resources to fight terrorism and for homeland defense, the sponsors of this resolution are calling on us to say that nothing has changed.

With storm clouds looming and the wind shifting sharply, they are saying that instead of considering whether to shorten sail we should act as if the sun was still shining and the seas were calm—instead of considering adjustments, we should swear allegiance to stay the course—even if it was plotted in error. And that's not all. The resolution asks that the House insist that "suspending, repealing or delaying" any part of last year's bill "is a tax increase." I guess that they subscribe to the theory that if you say something often enough and loudly enough you can get people to believe it.

Of course, the problem is that saying something is so doesn't make it so. It simply is not true that changing something scheduled for the future is the same thing as doing something today—any more than revising next year's baseball schedule would be the same as adding an exhibition game tomorrow. I do

not think that makes sense, and I cannot support this resolution any more than I could support last year's tax bill.

I am not opposed to cutting taxes. I have supported—and still support—a substantial reduction in income taxes and the elimination of the "marriage penalty." I have supported—and still support—including the child credit and making it refundable so that it will benefit more lower-income families. And I have supported—and still support—reforming, but not repealing, the estate tax.

But the affordability of last year's tax bill depended on uncertain projections of continuing budget surpluses that now may inspire nostalgia but are otherwise meaningless. As I said last year, the tax bill was a riverboat gamble. It put at risk our economic stability, the future of Medicare and Social Security, and our ability to make needed investments in health and education. For me, the stakes were too high and the odds were too long, and I had to vote against it. This resolution does not correct those problems—merely insists that they don't exist. That may make its sponsors feel better, but it does not deserve the support of the House.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the tax relief law as Congress passed it and as the President signed it. Even in the middle of a recession, some lawmakers have chosen to resurrect a hatred of tax relief—this time giving speeches and making statements in support of delaying or repealing the promise we made to the American people last year. But a promise made should be a promise kept. Yanking cash out of the wallets and pocketbooks of hardworking taxpayers is not good policy. Their elected officials told them they would have more money to spend on their families and needs—and that's the commitment we ought to honor.

Creating jobs and letting people keep more of the money they earn is the recipe for getting our economy back on track. Raising taxes would send the wrong message, set the wrong precedent and take the wrong action during a national recession.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind my colleagues exactly what it is we are talking about: eliminating the death tax, reducing the marriage penalty, doubling the child credit and offering across-the-board income tax relief. This is not about "tax cuts for the rich." This is not about special breaks for only the wealthy. Under the tax relief law, anyone who pays taxes pay less. These are initiatives that should be permanent, not delayed or repealed.

Today's vote will put the House on record. Are we keeping our word or breaking our word? Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stand behind our promise to hardworking taxpayers around the country and vote for this resolution in support of economic growth and tax relief. Our constituents are counting on us.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, the resolution on the House floor is a sham. Rather than accept responsibility for their reckless budget policies, they try to hide behind a feel-good resolution that does nothing to balance the budget, and does nothing to protect our national obligations to senior citizens or veterans.

Yes, we are in a war, and we face new challenges that require a strong response. I support that effort 100 percent. But given that reality, we face a choice. One year ago, our new President told us that we need huge

across-the-board tax cuts because the surpluses were so large. Now he says we need them even though the surplus is gone and deficits are back. He promised us that we would meet our national priorities first, before cutting revenues in a way that overwhelmingly benefit the most well-off in our society. But his budget leaves key priorities unmet.

This week the administration sent us a budget that breaks the promise not to use Medicare and Social Security funds to fund government operations. Now we have a deficit with no end in sight. And we all know, we all know, that the deficit numbers will end up much worse once we work through all the budget gimmicks and tricks. This resolution champions fiscal irresponsibility. Let's do what the President said we would do: meet our national priorities first. That means we take care of Social Security and Medicare, that means we expand quality health care access for those who still find themselves outside the system, that means we fulfill our promises to veterans, not just next year, but five years from now, that means we invest in our national infrastructure and protect our environment so that we leave our children a world of clean, expanding commerce.

The tax cuts enacted last year—especially now—are simply unfair and unwarranted. They help the very few at the expense of the many. Americans loved the \$300 rebate they got last year; we could offer all Americans that rebate for years and years to come if we simply did not pursue the most irresponsible aspects of the majority's tax policies. Instead, we will likely face rising interest rates, the most unkind tax hike on American consumers and a true drag on our economy. We face a choice. Blindly adhere to a doctrine of tax cuts first and always, or adopt a balanced approach that offers tax cuts to all Americans while still meeting our national obligations. Let's make the right choice and put the interests of America's working families first.

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Con. Res. 312, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the scheduled tax relief provided for by the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 passed by a bipartisan majority in Congress should not be suspended or repealed.

Since January, 2001, we have seen a 10-year estimated \$5.6 trillion surplus completely dissolve. Today, Congressional Budget Office estimates show a meager \$600 billion surplus, and this is after every dollar has been raided from the Social Security and Medicare trust funds. Instead of insisting on more tax cuts that will drive us further into debt and raise our long term interest rates, let us consider other options.

Last year's tax cuts have already provided income tax relief to most working Americans, and the lowest individual income tax rate has fallen from 15 percent to 10 percent. By waiting to enact additional tax cuts until we can afford it, we can again work towards a balanced budget and ensure the solvency of Social Security and Medicare. In my 25 years of public service, I have worked under the constraints of a President who sought to spend outside of our means, and I had the pleasure of working with a President committed to paying down the debt and balancing the budget. It was this second strategy that allowed America to have the longest sustained period of economic

growth in the history of the world. We should follow the lessons we learned then and maintain fiscal responsibility and balanced budgets.

Our priority should be to retire the debt so we do not put America's economy at risk. I am for tax relief, but we need to do it the right way at the right time. It is a travesty that the Republican leadership did not allow us to vote on the Social Security lockbox bill that would have maintained continued support for fiscally responsible tax relief that does not take money away from Social Security. A similar bill passed the House last year by a margin of 407–2.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing H. Con. Res. 312, as it threatens Social Security and Medicare funds.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, this resolution before us today is a sham. This resolution is a political tool, not an economic tool.

If this resolution was really about improving our economy, it would proclaim the need to protect Social Security and Medicare and not ill conceived tax cuts that are plunging this country back into deficit spending.

If it was about improving the economy, it would seek to explain how a projected \$5.6 trillion in surpluses over 10 years have been reduced to \$661 billion in just eight months.

If it was about improving the economy, it would explain to the American people how we can afford \$2 trillion in tax cuts, while our budget is in deficit.

If it was truly about improving the economy, it would explain how three-quarters of that \$2 trillion will be borrowed from Social Security, and the other 25 percent (\$550 billion) will be borrowed from Medicare, which, by the way, is all of the projected surplus in Medicare.

I am one of the fiscally responsible members of this body that apparently caused the tax-cut-all-all-cost sponsors of this resolution to draft it. I called for a freeze of still-to-be-enacted tax cuts that would allow us to determine how much the war on terrorism, recession and the already enacted tax cuts will cost us. I have not called for a tax increase. I have not called for a rollback of taxes. I have called for a common sense breather to assess our situation. Anyone calling this tax freeze a tax increase is suffering from a brain freeze.

The President's budget, which includes many laudable items, includes about \$80 billion in tax cuts next year. Not coincidentally, about \$80 billion is expected to be borrowed from Social Security and Medicare next year, according to his budget. What good does it do for the federal government to give money to American taxpayers with one hand, and take it away with the other?

If corporate America treated pension funds like Congress treats Social Security, someone would be in jail. We can't steal from the future to pay for today's unwise fiscal policies.

I urge my colleagues who support this resolution to stop playing "gotcha", because the American people "get it". They understand that it is wrong to borrow from Social Security and Medicare. They understand that it is wrong to prolong deficit spending. They understand that every additional dollar we pay in interest on our national debt is a dollar that we don't use to pay down our debt.

And because they do understand, I wholeheartedly vote against this ill-conceived, petty resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 312.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. WELLER. 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 181, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 10]

YEAS—235

Aderholt	Ganske	Matheson
Akin	Gekas	McCarthy (NY)
Armey	Gibbons	McCreery
Bachus	Gilchrest	McHugh
Baker	Gillmor	McInnis
Ballenger	Gilman	McIntyre
Barcia	Goode	McKeon
Barr	Goodlatte	McKinney
Bartlett	Gordon	Mica
Barton	Goss	Miller, Dan
Bass	Graham	Miller, Gary
Bereuter	Granger	Miller, Jeff
Biggert	Graves	Moore
Bilirakis	Green (WI)	Moran (KS)
Bishop	Greenwood	Myrick
Blunt	Grucci	Nethercutt
Boehlert	Gutknecht	Ney
Boehner	Hall (OH)	Northup
Bonilla	Hall (TX)	Norwood
Boozman	Hansen	Nussle
Brady (TX)	Hart	Osborne
Brown (SC)	Hastings (WA)	Ose
Bryant	Hayes	Other
Burr	Hayworth	Paul
Burton	Hefley	Pence
Buyer	Hergert	Peterson (MN)
Callahan	Hilleary	Peterson (PA)
Calvert	Hobson	Petri
Camp	Hoekstra	Pickering
Cannon	Hoolley	Pitts
Cantor	Horn	Platts
Capito	Hostettler	Pombo
Capps	Houghton	Portman
Carson (OK)	Hulshof	Pryce (OH)
Castle	Hunter	Putnam
Chabot	Hyde	Quinn
Chambliss	Isakson	Radanovich
Coble	Israel	Ramstad
Collins	Issa	Regula
Combest	Istook	Rehberg
Condit	Jenkins	Reynolds
Cox	Johnson (CT)	Roemer
Cramer	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (KY)
Crane	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (MI)
Crenshaw	Jones (NC)	Rohrabacher
Culberson	Kaptur	Ros-Lehtinen
Cunningham	Keller	Ross
Davis, Jo Ann	Kelly	Royce
Davis, Tom	Kennedy (MN)	Ryun (KS)
Deal	Kerns	Sandlin
DeLay	King (NY)	Saxton
DeMint	Kingston	Schaffer
Diaz-Balart	Kirk	Schrock
Dooley	Knollenberg	Sensenbrenner
Doolittle	Kolbe	Sessions
Dreier	LaHood	Shadegg
Duncan	Largent	Shays
Dunn	Larsen (WA)	Sherwood
Ehlers	Latham	Shimkus
Ehrlich	LaTourrette	Shows
Emerson	Leach	Shuster
English	Lewis (CA)	Simmons
Everett	Lewis (KY)	Simpson
Ferguson	Linder	Skeen
Flake	LoBiondo	Smith (MI)
Fletcher	Lucas (KY)	Smith (NJ)
Foley	Lucas (OK)	Smith (TX)
Forbes	Maloney (CT)	Souder
Galleghy	Manzullo	Stearns

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

NAYS—181

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

NOT VOTING—19

Blagojevich	Luther	Shaw
Bono	McDermott	Slaughter
Cooksey	Napolitano	Sununu
Cubin	Oxley	Trafficant
Fossella	Riley	Young (AK)
Frelinghuysen	Roukema	
Hastert	Ryan (WI)	

□ 1327

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of H. Con. Res.

312, the concurrent resolution just considered.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1330

RECOGNIZING THE 91ST BIRTHDAY OF RONALD REAGAN

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 82) recognizing the 91st birthday of Ronald Reagan.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 82

Whereas February 6, 2002, is the 91st birthday of Ronald Wilson Reagan;

Whereas Ronald Reagan is the first former President ever to attain the age of 91;

Whereas both Ronald Reagan and his wife Nancy Reagan have distinguished records of public service to the United States, the American people, and the international community;

Whereas Ronald Reagan was twice elected by overwhelming margins as President of the United States;

Whereas Ronald Reagan fulfilled his pledge to help restore "the great, confident roar of American progress, growth, and optimism" and ensure renewed economic prosperity;

Whereas Ronald Reagan's leadership was instrumental in extending freedom and democracy around the globe and uniting a world divided by the Cold War;

Whereas Ronald Reagan is loved and admired by millions of Americans, and by countless others around the world;

Whereas Ronald Reagan's eloquence united Americans in times of triumph and tragedy;

Whereas Nancy Reagan not only served as a gracious First Lady but also led a national crusade against illegal drug use;

Whereas, together Ronald and Nancy Reagan dedicated their lives to promoting national pride and to bettering the quality of life in the United States and throughout the world; and

Whereas the thoughts and prayers of the Congress and the country are with Ronald Reagan in his courageous battle with Alzheimer's disease: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the Congress, on behalf of the American people, extends its birthday greetings and best wishes to Ronald Reagan on his 91st birthday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Joint Resolution 82.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 82, and I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) for introducing it. This resolution extends birthday greetings and the best wishes of a grateful Nation to Ronald Reagan on his 91st birthday.

Ronald Reagan is among the greatest of statesmen ever to serve in the Oval Office, or indeed to have served the American people in any capacity. He is loved and admired by millions of Americans and by countless others around the world. Twice elected by overwhelming margins as President of the United States, Ronald Reagan built a record of public service to our Nation and to the American people. He was an eloquent and forceful champion of all freedom-loving people, especially those enslaved by the former Soviet Union and its satellites.

Ronald Reagan pledged to restore "the great, confident roar of American progress, growth and optimism." And Ronald Reagan pledged to ensure economic prosperity. He kept that pledge. Ronald Reagan inherited a moribund economy mired in recession and wracked by rampant inflation. But his wisdom, his confidence in the American people, his sound economic policies and his courage in the face of fierce opposition led us out of that recession and defeated inflation. President Reagan's policies laid the groundwork for an unprecedented period of prosperity. He put us back to work and unleashed the genius of American entrepreneurs. He inherited a hollow military and a Nation unsure of itself. He rebuilt our Armed Forces into the finest fighting force in the world, and he lifted our spirits and strengthened our resolve. Ronald Reagan's leadership and courage paved the way for the ultimate demise of the Soviet Union and the extension of freedom and democracy around the globe.

Ronald Reagan's commitment to our men and women in uniform earned him a high accolade last spring when the USS *Ronald Reagan* was christened in Newport News, Virginia. His devoted wife Nancy stood in his behalf to christen and accept this evidence of America's esteem and gratitude for Ronald Reagan's unstinting service to our Nation. During the ceremony, President Bush noted that "when we send her off to sea, it is certain that the *Ronald Reagan* will meet with rough waters and smooth waters, with headwinds as well as fair, but she will sail tall and strong like the man we have known."

Mr. Speaker, we continue to benefit today from Ronald Reagan's foresight and courage. There can be no better or more dramatic example than our improving relations with the Russian Republic. Once the heart of our fiercest adversary, our relations with Russia are now marked far more by cooperation than confrontation. I do not discount for 1 minute the importance of the diplomatic skills and courage of President Bush in building that relationship, but it simply could not have