

(Rept. No. 107-682) on the resolution (H. Res. 545) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1646) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal years 2002 and 2003, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4691, ABORTION NON-DISCRIMINATION ACT OF 2002

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-683) on the resolution (H. Res. 546) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4691) to prohibit certain abortion-related discrimination in governmental activities, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. Res. 540, EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE THAT CONGRESS SHOULD COMPLETE ACTION ON H.R. 3762, THE PENSION SECURITY ACT OF 2002, AND H. RES. 544, EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON PERMANENCY OF PENSION REFORM PROVISIONS, AND H. RES. 543, EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE THAT CONGRESS SHOULD COMPLETE ACTION ON H.R. 4019, MAKING MARRIAGE TAX RELIEF PERMANENT

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-684) on the resolution (H. Res. 547) providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 540) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Congress should complete action on H.R. 3762, the Pension Security Act of 2002; for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 544) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives on permanency of pension reform provisions; and for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 543) expressing the sense of the House that Congress should complete action on H.R. 4019, making marriage tax relief permanent, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PLATTS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FILNER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. UNDERWOOD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HINCHEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE RAMIFICATIONS OF INCREASING THE PUBLIC DEBT

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we are in a predicament in Congress right now, and that is finishing the appropriations bills. The appropriations process goes from fiscal year to fiscal year, that is, October 1 to October 1. So in just another week we are hitting the new fiscal year. So tomorrow, what we are going to do is pass what is referred to as a CR; it stands for a "continuing resolution." We are now sort of arguing and trying to decide whether continuing spending for the next few weeks should be at the level it was this current fiscal year or whether it should be increased somewhat in terms of spending to accommodate inflation.

The problem is that there are a lot of people in Congress, in the House and in the Senate, that want to spend more money. So what has happened in this Congress, in this government, is spending has been going up faster than inflation. I brought this chart and made up this chart quickly, and we can see how the spending line tremendously has increased over the past 5 or 6 years in terms of spending.

Spending has some consequences in terms of its effect on the economy. The Republican Policy Committee met with Art Laffer, who I consider a very good economist in this country. We met last week. One of my questions to Art was, What is worse as far as its negative effect on economic growth, would it be increasing the debt or having tax increases? He said, in his opinion, they are both about the same kind of negative effect. Tax increases maybe have a greater economic effect in the short run; but in the long run, increasing the debt, that means we are going to take a lot of money out of circula-

tion which, eventually, has just a negative effect on the economy.

A lot of people are saying, well, look, we should be paying more attention to the economy. One way this Congress can pay more attention to allowing the economy to operate the way it should is be a little less overzealous in terms of regulation on business, in terms of our taxes on individuals and business, and when I say taxes on individuals, most of the businesses, the small businesses in the United States pay that individual income tax. So as we become more intrusive in that tax, it has a tendency of discouraging small economic growth, which is really the backbone, the mainstay of employment in the United States.

That brings to mind a question I think that this body must deal with and must consider, and that is how big should the government be in terms of a percentage maybe of gross domestic product. How fast should expenditures rise? Is it reasonable to have the budget of the Federal Government increase three and four times as fast as inflation increases?

And the conclusion is, as we are concerned about the economy, the answer is no, that we should hold the line on spending so we do not have to increase taxes and so we do not have to increase the Federal debt. Politicians have found out, however, that it ends up being to their advantage politically, it increases their chances of being re-elected, if they spend more money, so they go home with more pork barrel projects; and they get on television and in the newspaper cutting the ribbon for the new pork that they brought home to their district, or they come up with more social programs to help relieve some problem in the United States. No one can say there are not a lot of problems, no one can say that the spending in the Federal Government probably does not do some good for somebody, but the tendency has been to expand government spending.

Tonight I want to talk a little bit about the ramifications of increasing our public debt. What is the public debt? We have heard people brag that we have paid down part of the debt to the public in the last few years. The fact is that the total debt of the Federal Government has continued to increase every year. The debt can be divided into two portions. It is the Wall Street debt, the amount of money that we borrow from individuals that are at weekly Treasury auctions, and it is the money that we borrow from the trust funds, Social Security being the biggest one. So the money coming in from Social Security when we were pretty overzealous in the amount of increase in the Social Security taxes that we passed in 1983. We now are bringing in from that FICA tax, that 12.4 percent that we charge on everybody's wages for Social Security, we are bringing in \$515 billion a year. Out of that \$515 billion, this current year, in Social Security benefits, it is immediately sent