

the Blue Dogs put on the floor, would have recognized that change, but we lost.

Now let me say again, I hope that the wisdom of this House is not that we will attempt to hide increasing the debt ceiling in a budget resolution. If Members really believe the economic game plan is what they say it is, have the courage to come out with a clean bill; as Secretary Snow has asked us to do, on April 4, have a clean bill to say to the American people, we believe you ought to borrow the money in order to give us the tax cuts, all of them that we are talking about. There are good tax cuts, marriage tax penalty relief, child tax credit, estate tax relief, things that we can agree on, and we have agreed on in a bipartisan way, that can be paid for.

But I am getting a little bit tired of hearing everybody talk about these tax cuts we are now talking about and compare it back to what John F. Kennedy did in 1960. Sure, when you cut the marginal rate from 90 percent to 50 percent, we change economic behavior.

But I challenge Members, and we are unable to find a reputable economist who says cutting the marginal tax rate on today's corporate CEOs from 38 to 37 percent is going to change economic behavior and is going to create jobs and economic activity in the United States. And that is what we are arguing about. I do not understand it.

But if Members do believe it, let us have an honest debate, no more canned speeches from political campaigns. Let us talk about how we are going to borrow \$3 trillion in the next 5 years and we are going to owe \$11 trillion at the end of 10 years, following the economic game plan that some believe cannot be changed in this House. We are not doing a service to our grandchildren when we make that argument. We are darned sure not doing a favor to those who are out defending the freedom tonight as we speak. We are not doing them a favor when we are saying we must borrow money for an economic game plan that has already shown it cannot possibly work in the economic climate we are in.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me. A great political philosopher once said, if you do not change directions, you might end up where you are headed.

Let us look at where we were headed; as we look at the budget deficits over the course of the years, we see the Johnson, Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan, and Bush deficits. When President Clinton came in, we passed a budget in 1993 without any Republican support in the House or Senate. The Republicans took over the House and Senate after the 1994 election, but remember, when they passed massive tax cuts similar to the ones that they passed in 2001, President Clinton vetoed those bills.

They threatened to close down the government if he did not sign them. He

vetoed them again. They closed down the government. He vetoed them again, and it was essentially the Clinton plan that ran us up into surplus.

Within 1 year of the Bush administration, we are back down into deficits, and everything that we are spending on the war, since there is no way to pay for it, adds on to the bottom line, so this chart really might go off the chart.

What is the plan? In 2000, we had a surplus. By 2001, we have spent all of the Medicare surplus. September 11 is 3 weeks before the end of the fiscal year. The fiscal year ends September 30, so this was done before September 11, 2002, we are spending all of Medicare, all of Social Security, and \$160 billion in more debt. If we keep going at the rate we are going, it is going to be all of Medicare, all of Social Security, \$300 billion in additional debt as far as the eye can see.

Now this has consequences. We have heard of the debt tax. A family of four's proportion of interest on the national debt, when you run up all that debt, \$4,400. It was going to be down to zero if we had kept going in the direction we were going; but instead, since we were piling on new debt, by 2013, a family of four, over \$8,400.

□ 2045

We were told we had to run up all this debt and ruin the budget to create jobs. This is the number of jobs in millions for each administration: Carter, 9 million; Reagan, second administration, 9 million; Clinton, 10 million. We are losing more jobs than we are creating after that budget was created.

With no money, you have an effect on education. About a year and a half ago, the administration ran all over the country with a bipartisan group of leaders in the House Committee on Education and the Workforce and the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions because we had passed No Child Left Behind. We have a two-step process in Washington about spending money. The authorization, No Child Left Behind, and then the appropriation. Here is the authorization. In 2003 we spent \$23.8 billion; and this year's budget, we are going to spend less, about \$10 billion less than we promised in No Child Left Behind. At the same time, we are eliminating education programs like comprehensive school reform, dropout prevention, elementary school counseling, eliminating those programs, eliminating arts programs for disabled students. We are funding at less than inflation after-school programs, safe and drug-free school programs, bilingual education. Those are the kinds of cuts that are necessary because we do not have the money.

We are also cutting education generally. Over the last few years, we have been increasing education 12.3 percent. This budget that we are looking at now cuts education 2.7 percent, and what gets cut? Head Start, 28,000 if Head

Start takes its proportional share of the hit; 28,000 students will not get the ability to get a head start. That program has been proven to give those not born to privilege a fair chance in life, and now because we are giving tax breaks, they will not have that opportunity.

If the money comes out of school lunches proportional to the way the budget is cut, 500,000 students will not get school lunches. That is what happens when we cut the budget. We have to cut something. School lunches is what gets cut.

We are also cutting access to college. We know that college tuition, particularly State college, is going up. States are having fiscal problems, every State. I know my State is increasing student tuition. Of the last count, over 400,000 students every year qualify for college, take the right courses, take the college entrance exams, have good enough grades to get in, but cannot afford to go because they cannot afford it. And here we are in this budget cutting student loans, cutting Pell grants so that the maximum amount is less than it is this year. To add insult to injury, we are also cutting programs that encourage low-income and minority students to attend college, and we know that college is one's ticket to success in this country.

Also in special education, several decades ago we promised to spend 40 percent of the cost of educating students under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. At the rate we are going in this budget, we will never get to 40 percent.

This budget cuts important programs. We have heard about health care. We have heard about veterans. We have heard how deep in debt this budget goes, and we just have to wonder how bad it has to get before it is time to change directions again and go in a better direction.

I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his leadership in responsible budgeting.

Mr. SPRATT. I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY COMMITTEE ON RULES REGARDING H.R. 6, ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2003

Mr. DREIER (during the Special Order of Mr. SPRATT). Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that the Committee on Rules may meet this week to grant a rule which could limit the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 6, the Energy Policy Act of 2003.

Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies of the amendment, one written copy of a brief explanation of the amendment and one electronic copy of the same to the Committee on Rules in Room H-312 of the Capitol by 10 a.m. on Wednesday, April 9. Members should draft their amendments to the bill as introduced on April 7.

Members are advised that the text should be available for their review on the Web sites of the committees of jurisdiction and of the Committee on Rules by Monday, April 7, which I guess is today.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure their amendments are drafted in the most appropriate format. Members are also advised to talk with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain that their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURGESS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, good evening to my colleagues. I appreciate the opportunity to address our group this evening.

There are a number of different issues I want to talk about, but the issues I am going to talk about are going to focus on one thing, and that is America.

I come back from a weekend in Colorado, spending time with my constituents out there, constituents of all different types of backgrounds. I can tell my colleagues that the morale in America, the patriotism in America I do not think could be stronger. These people that are against this war, I have some appreciation of some of their thoughts; but I want the Members to know that the people that are making all these anti-U.S. statements within the borders of this country I am absolutely convinced are a very small part of our population.

I am very impressed, very impressed, with the amount of support, overwhelming support, for the troops of the United States of America. Thank God we are Americans. I feel so good about that. I want to tell my colleagues, on the back of my pickup I have a bumper sticker. My colleagues have all seen it before. A lot of my colleagues may have it on the back of their pick up or their car. It is pretty simple. It says: "America, love it or leave it." That is not a bumper sticker that defies anybody's right for their freedom of speech under the first amendment.

In fact, we know here on this House floor we have lots of debate on this House floor. We are very intense debate. It is one of the checks and balances in the government that we have of this country, but it at some point in time even on this House floor no matter how intense the debate is, with very few exceptions, at that point people on this floor I can say almost unanimously, almost unanimously, love this country, and I see no reason to be apologetic, no reason to be apologetic for saying to people if they do not love America, leave it. There are lots of choices in this world, but one does

not have to go very far from American borders to understand that this is the one Nation of the few nations in the world that do not have a problem with people leaving. Our big problem is so many people want to come into this country because they understand the fundamental principles that have made this country so great, that have made this country stand out in world history as the leading country for democracy, as the country greater than any other country in recorded history, the country that has done more for its neighbors, as one of the few countries in history, after it goes to war or moves into other people's territory, as Colin Powell, our Secretary of State, so justifiably said the other day, the only time that the United States of America has kept territory in a foreign country was under a request for someplace to bury our soldiers.

This country has got a lot to be proud of, and I carry that bumper stick with a great deal of pride, "America, love it or leave it." And I can tell my colleagues there are a lot of people in this country, by far the overwhelming majority, they love this country, and they love what this country stands for, and they support the troops of the United States of America.

I know we have got some people out there, and I am going to address some of their issues, some protesters out there that are not only not supporting the troops of the United States of America, but in California and in other places in this Nation, they are actually carrying signs that say: "We support our troops as long as they shoot their officers." "We support our troops as long as they shoot our officers." It is an absolute disgrace.

We have other people who, for self-interest, frankly, on the Democratic side, very limited but on that side who are seeking the office of President itself who stand out there and say we need a regime change in this country.

Let me tell my colleagues about the administration that we have, in my opinion, running this country. George W. Bush, I think he is doing an outstanding job. What President in history has had two wars, has had a September 11, has lost the Space Shuttle, was handed a bad economy and it is still going south? The strength of our President is second to none. The strength of our President is what will lead this country through this fog, and I can tell my colleagues that when the storm came in, when the conditions got nasty, we did not see our President anchor the boat at the dock where it was the safest. We saw our President turn that boat into the storm to guide people through the storm.

In my opinion and I want to tell my colleagues in the opinion of Democrat and Republican, in my travels, in my calls, in my contacts throughout this country, Democrat and Republican admire the President that we have. They think this President is up to the job. They think this President is leading

the country in the right direction. They think this President is doing the right thing in taking out of power the worst mass murderer in the history of the world and, by the way, the worst mass murderer of Muslims. Saddam Hussein has killed more Muslims than any other man known in recorded world history, and that effort to take him out is being led by our President.

By the way, I do not want to downplay the assistance we are getting from our allies. I have time after time after time read in newspapers or heard people say this is the United States picking a fight. As Worley says in his song "Have you Forgotten?" which is the number one song on the country hits, after September 11 maybe we are out there looking to resolve this situation, but the fact is it is not the United States standing alone. In fact, if we take a look at the coalition that our President and his cabinet has put together, it is very impressive. Our long-time solid allies, Tony Blair and the British, and Tony Blair, if my colleagues want to take a look at an example of a profile in courage, we have got it right there. The British, the United Kingdom, a country that has long understood freedom, a country that has very judiciously, very judiciously, used their military might for good and just causes.

And then we can go on to the European continent, and I hear people say this is a split between the United States and Europe. It is not a split between the United States and Europe. It is a split between the United States and the French, the United States and the German leadership, the United States and Belgium; but it is not a split between Europe. Jacques Chirac would like us to think that France is Europe. Jacques Chirac would tell the other countries in Europe that France is the ruling country of Europe and that when France speaks, it is as if it is the voice for Europe, and it is not. In fact, we have more countries in Europe that support the United States of America and our position than support the position of the French.

Take a look at it. We can start with the British. We can go to the Italians. We can go to the Spanish. We can go to the Polish. We can go to the Netherlands. We can go to Australia. Throughout the world nations throughout this world and their leadership recognize that the mission undertaken by the United States and that willing coalition is the mission that is correct. It is the mission for the right cause, and it is the right time to undertake that mission.

We have strong support, strong support amongst our allies. This is not the United States acting alone, although I will tell my colleagues that our country must always be prepared, must always be prepared because of our strength, because of our leadership, because of our history of democracy, we must always be prepared to act for the interests of humanity even if it means