done. I am proud of the Members of the Committee on Appropriations on both sides. While I may disagree with some of them, especially on that side, I am very proud of the fact that we have been able to produce 30 separate appropriations issues and passed all of them but one, and we are going to pass that one today.

I would also like to add that, up until today and all the votes that we have had on appropriations bills, we have received 8,702 aye votes to 3,514 no votes. That is almost three to one ayes. So the House, in my opinion, has shown great support for the work product of the Committee on Appropriations. I am very, very proud of that record. I hope that all of the members on the Committee on Appropriations on both sides share that pride, because we are getting our job done.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEREUTER). All time for debate has expired.

The joint resolution is considered as having been read for amendment.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, October 27, 1999, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. OBEY. 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 424, nays 2, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 546]

YEAS—424

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—2

DeFazio
Paul

NOT VOTING—7

Brady (PA)
Coburn
Hinojosa
Mascara
Rush
Scarborough
Waters

□ 1251

So the joint resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3064, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 345 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 345

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 3064) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read. The conference report shall be debatable for two hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEREUTER). The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST); pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 345 provides for the consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 3064, a bill to provide for fiscal year 2000 District of Columbia appropriations, and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, this rule waives all points of order against the conference report and its consideration, and provides that the conference report shall be considered as read. The rule provides for 2 hours of general debate divided equally between the chairman

and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. House rules provide for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions, as is the right of the minority of the House.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is intended to move the appropriations process forward and send the message that we are committed to sending all of the 13 appropriations bills to the President. I heard it stated on the House floor earlier this week that only three times in the last 2 decades has the Congress passed all 13 appropriations bills by the fiscal deadline. Like past Congresses, we did not meet the set deadline, but today we are sending the final appropriations bill to the President for his signature.

Keeping America's fiscal house in order does take a little longer than the freewheeling spending days of the past because we must ensure that all funding is spent efficiently and where it is needed most. Notwithstanding the fiscal constraints we now face after decades of fiscal irresponsibility, the bill before us today responsibly funds areas important to every American citizen and also protects the American people from waste, fraud and abuse in Federal agencies.

I want to discuss briefly the contents of the conference report that this rule makes in order. Mr. Speaker, this is a responsible bill that provides funding for important issues across the Nation. It includes funding for the District of Columbia, and substantial funding for education and health programs in the jurisdiction of the Departments of Education, Labor, and Health and Human Services. It also forces Federal workers to weed out waste in all of their agencies to find savings that will protect the Social Security program.

The President has stated clearly that they want to spend more money. Once again, Members on the other side of the aisle have refused to admit what the rest of America strongly believes, that Social Security funds should be spent on Social Security benefits and nothing else. I urge President Clinton to work with Congress to ensure that Social Security is not raided to spend more money on wasteful and inefficient Washington spending plans.

To achieve this, we are including in this bill a plan to direct every Federal agency to reduce spending by less than 1 percent, .97 of 1 percent, by rooting out waste, fraud and abuse. Surely the Federal Government can save one penny out of every dollar, and the American people know that. By cutting waste in the Federal Government, we can stop the raid on Social Security that this government has done for decades.

American citizens every month sit at the kitchen table and find ways to pay their bills and save money for their future. This Congress is simply asking the men and women who run Federal Government agencies to make the same kind of fiscally responsible budgeting with the money taxed out of our paychecks. This plan puts the power in the hands of each agency because each agency would have the opportunity to identify that percent of waste, fraud, and abuse and eliminate it.

It is up to the agency head to decide where to find the savings, and I am sure even the best government program wastes at least 1 cent on the dollar. For example, the Government Accounting Office audits have found that Federal agencies were unable to account for over $800 billion in government assets, that one out of every $18 spent in the Section 8 program is wasted, and that the government lost over $3.3 billion on students who never paid back their student loans. Another example of waste; approximately 26,000 deceased persons received $8.5 million in food stamps.

We all know that the agency directors and executives know where the waste is, and I am relatively certain they will be able to weed out at least that much in savings with this sensible plan.

□ 1300

The second component of this conference report includes the District of Columbia funding that was included in the first D.C. appropriations bill, appropriating a total of $429.1 million in Federal funding support for the District and sending $6.77 billion in District funds back to the people of Washington.

We maintain a number of important provisions that are designed to turn our Nation's Capital around, including ratification of the tax cut plan that was allotted by the city council and the Mayor of the District of Columbia to provide more opportunity for District residents to save their hard-earned money, reinvest it, to create jobs, and stimulate economic growth.

In addition, part of the city-wide effort to revitalize the District also depends upon efforts to reduce the scourge of drug use and related crime in the District of Columbia. Therefore, we have provided funding for universal drug screening and testing, additional probation and parole officers, and drug treatment services.

I am also very pleased that the bill retains the current law prohibition on Federal funds from being spent on any program to distribute needles for the purpose of illegal drug injection.

Finally, the third component of this conference report includes funding for the final appropriations bill allocating money for the Department of Labor, Education and Human Services. The Labor, Education, HHS allotment includes health and education funding, including funding increases for the Maternal and Child Health Block Grant, the Ryan White AIDS Health Services, and Head Start.

We have also included more funding than the President requested for education in the form of education block grants, safe and drug-free schools, State grants, and vocational education State grants.

We continue to seek to fund education initiatives in ways to infuse incentives, flexibility, and accountability into a system that has so often felt comfortable with the status quo, and this conference report moves us toward our goal of strengthening our schools and improving learning for all of our children.

In the Health and Human Services portion of the conference report, I am also personally pleased that the National Institutes of Health has received an increase in funding over the President's budget request.

I believe that medical research represents the single most effective weapon in our arsenal against the diseases that affect Americans. The advances our scientists and doctors have made over the course of the last century could not have been predicted by even the most farsighted observers. Our own lives might some day depend on the efforts of scientists and doctors currently laboring in our Nation's Federal laboratories, and I am pleased that this important account has been increased for fiscal year 2000 so that this research can continue and expand.

I urge the President to stop issuing veto threats to our fiscally responsible appropriations bills and join us in preserving Social Security and maintaining our balanced budget.

I hope that this conference report serves as a first step toward a cooperative budget process that will result in a balanced budget and secure a future for America's seniors.

This rule was favorably reported by the Committee on Rules last evening. I urge my colleagues to support the rule today on the floor so that we may proceed with a general debate and consideration of this important conference report.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this rule marks the end of a sad chapter in a year-long budgetary charade played out by the Republican majority.

This is the last of the 13 appropriations bills to be considered for fiscal year 2000. And what has the Republican majority done with the 2000 budget? Let us take a moment to examine this closely.

They have done nothing to strengthen Social Security. They have done nothing to strengthen Medicare. And they are following budgetary policies that hurt every American family. And to make matters worse, according to the Congressional Budget Office, their budget actually spent $17 billion of the Social Security surplus in spite of the fact that they troop out here every morning claiming they are not touching a penny of it.

Let us not forget for a moment what the Republican majority tried to do earlier this year with the surplus. The

Republicans passed a $780 billion tax cut that was wisely rejected by the President and by the American people because it squandered the surplus instead of using it to pay down the national debt and to strengthen Medicare and Social Security.

And so we move on to the latest chapter in this sad story of the budgetary games being played out by the Republican majority.

In this chapter, they are proposing a .97 percent across-the-board cut for all Federal programs in order to make up for the fact that they cannot get their job done. In essence, what they are saying is, stop me before I sin again. Stop me before I raid even more from the Social Security Trust Fund.

So what does this .97 percent mean? Let us listen to General Hugh Shelton, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in Congressional testimony earlier this week. ''This across-the-board cut would strip away the gains that we have made or what we've just done to start readiness moving back in the right direction. In other words, if applied to this program, it would be devastating. If it went into the personnel accounts, it would be disastrous.''

According to the Comptrollers Office at the Department of Defense, this mindless across-the-board cut would mean a reduction of anywhere between 27,800 and 50,000 active-duty personnel. At the low end, this would represent a reduction of 9,600 troops for the Army; 7,500 for the Navy; 3,400 for the Marines; and 7,300 for the Air Force.

This is the equivalent of three-fourths of an Army airborne division, one aircraft carrier, two attack submarines, two Burke-class destroyers, 1½ Marine Expeditionary Units, and two Air Force fighter wings. All this at a time when our armed forces are stretched thin across the globe. This, Mr. Speaker, is nonsense.

Last night during the Committee on Rules hearing, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) tried to tell me that these cuts would come from waste, fraud, and abuse and from the classic expensive Pentagon toilet seat. He tried to tell me that because the Pentagon budget signed by the President was $4.5 billion more than the President requested, the nearly $3 billion in cuts mandated by the across-the-board cut in this conference report would not really represent a cut in the Defense Department.

The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) said last night that these are not cuts, they are merely adjustments. I beg to differ with his analysis.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier this week, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said that these so-called adjustments would be devastating to military readiness. Readiness, in my book, does not represent waste, fraud, and abuse.

Let me tell my colleagues what these adjustments in readiness will represent. A cut in $720 million in military personnel, which leaves that account $600 million below the President's request, and the so-called adjustment will also represent a $1.1 billion cut in operations and maintenance, bringing that account down $1.1 billion below the President's request.

Last night the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) said that because of the obstinacy of the members of the Clinton cabinet, it would be hard to make any projections about what these adjustments might mean until they ''get out of denial.''

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is hard for General Shelton and the Joint Chiefs of Staff to be in denial about $2.7 billion worth of cuts in the Defense Department when the bill signed by the President and passed by the majority in the other side contains projects they did not ask for.

That includes $375 million as a down payment on a $1.5 million helicopter carrier to be built in Mississippi, the State of the Senate majority leader, or $320 million for a ship to be built in San Diego, or $15 million for a study of the aurora borealis, things that were added by the Members of the other side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, this is mindless budgeting and a clumsy attempt to appear to be living up to the Republican mantra of saving Social Security. The Republicans are not saving Social Security. They are not doing anything about ensuring its solvency, nor are they protecting Medicare. They are trying desperately to save their thin majority in this House. They are looking out for number one and letting the American people down in the process. They are cutting vital defense programs, ignoring Social Security, and denying senior Americans prescription drug coverage.

This is a shameful exercise, Mr. Speaker. I urge every Member of this House, every Member who cares about the honest budgeting and living up to our responsibility as elected representatives, to vote against this farce and to work in the next week to come up with real solutions for the American people.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEREUTER). The Chair would remind Members of something that is too often forgotten. Members should not make reference to individual Members of the other body.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to point out that my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), who spent nearly 2 decades in the majority, spending 100 percent of the Social Security surplus without batting an eye, is now concerned that we are trying to save it.

I further would like to point out that every family in America has learned how to cut 1 percent of their family budget. Surely, even the Pentagon can figure out how to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from southern California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I think it is the height for someone that spent time in the majority that consistently voted to take money out of Social Security to then come up and rail on Republicans on Social Security. The gentleman that just spoke did that very same thing time and time again.

Secondly, I was in the hearing where General Shelton testified to the President's budget on defense. He said that the President's budget was completely adequate on defense. We added $16 billion to that fact. And now the General says that 1 percent would be hurtful, after we added $16 billion and he testified that $16 billion would be less.

General Shelton is a war hero, but I think he has no political spine in the fact that he is supporting the President and the Democrats in trying to veto every single one of these bills so that they can spend more money.

In that defense bill that he said that the President signed this week, everybody knows that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the President, and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) did everything they could to have Democrats stand up and vote against the defense bill so that they could use it as leverage on all of these bills.

I mean, that is wrong, Mr. Speaker. My colleagues ought to be ashamed of themselves, absolutely ashamed.

And then the President signs it and says, well, it is because of the 1.8. The only reason he signed it is because Democrats stood before the President and said they gave their word, 100 percent of the Democrats on the committee in the Senate and the House said that they would support the defense bill. And then the President had to back out.

Do my colleagues know what he told one of those Democrats? And I will not mention their name because it was a personal conversation. He said, Oh, do not tell people that I was going to veto it anyway.

That is sick, Mr. Speaker, absolutely sick and what the Democrats are trying to do.

Secondly, we add education money. One of the gentlemen from the other body from Illinois, in the conference we add over $300 million above the President's request for education, and the gentleman from the other body said, oh, but you are making a cut, right? We said, no. We are increasing education spending from last year and we are adding $350 million above what the President requested. He said, oh, you are cutting. And the gentleman from Illinois kept on. And Senator STEVENS, or the chairman, I am not supposed to mention his name, sorry, the chairman of the committee said, no, that is not true. We are adding money from last year and we are adding money above the President's request. And the gentleman from Illinois

said, well, that is not what we originally wanted.

So we are still increasing, but the same old spin that we are cutting.

Now, I am sick and tired of the Democrats using demagoguery to try and veto every one of these bills so that they can spend more money. They sit there and support the President. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) just walked in. They support the President's budget.

Well, Mr. GEPHARDT, that story you told about Mars bars, where your mother wanted you to save the money, you should have listened to your mother. You still have not learned a lesson. You still want to spend and spend and spend and to tax to do that. Shame on you, Mr. GEPHARDT.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Shame on you, Mr. Speaker.

I apologize.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is not exactly what the Chair had in mind, but the gentleman understands his point.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I understand that.

But the point is that let us get out of this charade of trying to veto all of these bills so that the President has more leverage on all of these bills.

I think it is perfectly fair to say, Mr. President, we are going to give you 13 appropriations bills. Take out your red marker where your priorities are and identify under the balanced budget where those lines are, but do not dip into Social Security and Medicare.

The 1 percent across-the-board, including Members' pay, which I support, is a way to stay under that, but yet Members even reject that. I think that that is false, and I think it is wrong. Get a life.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members that they cannot characterize Members of the other body intentions or remarks unless they are factual recitals of the public record in the other body on this pending measure.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT).

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

□ 1315

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, this Republican budget is a bad deal for America's families, and it is really when you think about it the worst of all worlds. It does not extend the life of Social Security by one day. It does not provide one penny for a Medicare prescription drug benefit. And worst of all, it hurts every family in America in some important way.

Today's Congressional Budget Office letter to Speaker HASTERT repudiates the Republican false claim about safeguarding the Social Security surplus. The CBO clearly and directly says the Republican budget has already spent $17 billion of the Social Security surplus on the spending bills. This letter does not use Democratic or Republican numbers to come up with the $17 billion figure, it uses CBO's own nonpartisan numbers. It exposes once and for all the clear fact that the Republicans are the raiders of the Social Security surplus they claim to have safely stowed in the lockbox.

And, remember, the use of CBO numbers is something that Republicans felt so strongly about in 1995, they shut down the government over using CBO numbers consistently throughout the budget. They passed a resolution of the House in 1995 saying we would only use CBO numbers. Well, under the CBO numbers consistently applied across this budget, they say that we are spending $17 billion of Social Security surplus.

Democrats are fighting for the real needs of families while the only real priority of the Republican Congress has been to squander the surplus on tax cuts for the wealthy and special interests. Democrats want to strengthen and extend the life of Social Security, and we want to protect and modernize Medicare. Democrats support the President's plan to devote the entire Social Security surplus to debt reduction and extend its solvency to the year 2050, and we have a proposal to add a prescription drug plan for Medicare. Republicans come up empty on both counts. Their budget fails to address the issue of how we can extend the life of Social Security to ensure that current and future retirees can continue to depend on the foundation of retirement security. And they have no answer for seniors who are forced today to choose between health care and prescription drugs and what they can afford.

Some people say this debate is not real, that it is some kind of an inside-the-Beltway ritual, that somehow we enjoy gridlock and we do not want anything to happen. Well, people who say that are dead wrong. Go tell the senior who is going to be waiting for the meals on wheels and it does not come and it is not just the meal, it is the human contact that comes to that senior citizen to allow them to live in their home. This bill cuts thousands of meals on wheels.

Go tell the child who is going to wind up in an overcrowded classroom because this bill does not contain what it should to try to get more teachers and to try to get more classrooms. Go tell the parent who is worried about dealing with their children using drugs that we had to cut the safe and drug-free bill. And ask the cancer patient who benefits from NIH research. I have been there. You have heard me tell the story of my son and what it was like to have that resident come in the room after he was diagnosed with terminal cancer and say, ''We got on the computer last night and we found an NIH therapy that might save his life. Don't get your hopes up but we're going to try.''

Let me tell you something. When you need that research, you need it. This bill puts the NIH funding off to the last two days of the fiscal year, some kind of a cheap stunt in order to make the numbers come out. It makes no sense. Vote ''no'' on this budget. Let us sit down as adults with the President and the leaders of this Congress, the appropriators, let us come up with a budget that makes sense for the American people, that saves Social Security and Medicare and does right by America's families.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of injecting some sorely needed truth into this discussion, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK).

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I know we always hear some things that are long on emotion but short on facts or short on logic. One would think that what we were doing is cutting out or eliminating certain programs that the gentleman from Missouri referred to. That is not the case at all. What this bill says is for the discretionary spending of the Federal Government, let us reduce it 1 percent across the board. Not singling out any program for elimination, not singling out any department, not Meals on Wheels, not the military, not anyone but just saying overall in government, can we tighten our belt by 1 percent so that we do not jeopardize the Social Security trust fund any more. Because in the past, hundreds of billions of dollars from the Social Security trust fund were spent by Congress. And it happened even after the Republican majority took over because we were trying to make the change and now we are making it. Most of it, of course, in the prior years.

But the time to use Social Security money for all these other things has stopped, and all you have to do is say to the rest of government, spend 99 cents instead of $1. That is it. And we do not touch Social Security benefits, we do not touch veterans benefits, we do not touch Medicare benefits. It is only the discretionary programs that are touched. Is that asking too much? Is that the end of the world? Of course not. Except to the people who claim what they do not want to do is spend Social Security, but what is their answer? Do they want to spend the same amount but just differently? No. Do they want to spend less so that we do not touch Social Security? No. They want to spend more. The Democrats want to spend more. That is what this is about. We are saying no.

The CBO scoring documents, the Congressional Budget Office has given us in writing what they are not telling. They quote from the CBO and talk about the withdrawals from the government treasury, the withdrawals, the spending side, but they leave out what

CBO has said about the deposits. It is in writing and CBO has given it to us based upon the things and the bill upon which we are about to vote, it will not touch Social Security, there will still be a billion dollar surplus without even counting Social Security money. They want to count the withdrawals of the account, they do not want to count the deposits. CBO, when you count the deposits as well as the withdrawals, says you keep the budget balanced and you do it without spending Social Security money. And it is about time that we do that.

I am sick to hear these Cabinet officers stand up in front of the camera and say, oh, there is no way that we can trim back 1 percent. Tell that to the American families that have to do it constantly, adjustments a lot bigger than 1 percent, or businesses or anyone else. Do not tell me that Federal agencies cannot find the way to save one penny on the dollar.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule and to this bill. As a nurse, I have long advocated for Federal support of medical research. Over the past few years, we have substantially increased funding at NIH. This investment pays great dividends. Most importantly, it helps ease the suffering of millions.

My daughter Lisa is currently in a fight with cancer. She knows and I know the importance of the work of NIH, work that is in process right now. The bill before us supposedly provides $17 billion for NIH, an increase of 15 percent over last year. But in a slick accounting gimmick to make it look like they are balancing the budget, House leaders are holding back nearly half of the money until the closing days of this year. This will push $2 billion onto next year's books and allow them to claim they are saving Social Security.

I am amazed and appalled at such irresponsibility. It is no wonder this is being rushed through without adequate debate. This gimmick will actually have the effect of cutting NIH funding. Scientists today will have to slow their work while they wait for funding, seriously hampering saving research, research my daughter and so many others are waiting for, their lives on hold.

I urge my colleagues to vote down this rule and to fully fund the NIH starting today.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), my colleague on the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. GOSS. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Georgia for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, as we debate this very big bill we will necessarily be focused on big issues, as we have already heard, but I wanted to take a moment out to speak more to the human side, to commend the Committee on Appropriations for not overlooking an issue of very great importance but not of major press focus these days. I am referring to a line item that partially funds the Ricky Ray Hemophilia Relief Act found in this year's appropriations bill.

I think my colleagues will remember last year Congress enacted the Ricky Ray bill, which provides compassionate assistance from the Federal Government for victims of hemophilia associated AIDS. This law responds to that awful tragedy that has impacted the lives of thousands of Americans and continues to do that. This is the first year that we have sought funding for the Ricky Ray program, and I was grateful to see the Committee on Appropriations was receptive to beginning the funding process by allocating $50 million for fiscal year 2000. I certainly understand how difficult the appropriations process has been this year, I think we all do, so I am especially pleased that we are moving forward on this critically important program. I know the hemophilia community wishes we could allocate more money this year, the actual total funding would be $750 million, but I am hopeful that as the process continues the Committee on Appropriations will continue work to see that we set aside more funds.

I have a letter from the National Hemophilia Foundation expressing appreciation, which I would like to insert in the RECORD at the appropriate point. I know many Americans will join me in thanking our colleagues the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) for finding a way to start the funding for this program. I do not believe the sky is falling. I think good things are happening. I think this proves it. I urge support for the rule and for this bill.

The letter referred to is as follows:

NATIONAL HEMOPHILIA FOUNDATION,
New York, NY, October 5, 1999.

Hon. C.W. YOUNG,
Chairman,
Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN YOUNG: On behalf of the hemophilia community, I wish to express our deepest gratitude for your strong leadership and commitment to providing initial funding for the Ricky Ray Hemophilia Relief Trust Fund in the FY2000 Labor, Health and Human Services Appropriations Bill. Nearly 5,000 persons with hemophilia have died from the complications of HIV/AIDS since HIV contaminated the blood supply during the 1980s. Approximately 2,700 Individuals with hemophilia continue to live with HIV. For these individuals and for the families in the hemophilia community who lost their loved ones, the funding included in the FY2000 bill begins to fulfill the promise Congress made when it passed the Ricky Ray Hemophilia Relief Fund Act last year.

As you proceed to conference with the Senate, we ask that you continue to explore avenues to provide increased funding for the Ricky Ray Relief Act and ensure its full implementation as rapidly as possible. The time-limited nature of the Trust Fund and the pressing medical, financial, and personal costs borne by our community give urgency to this request.

Again, we thank you for your outstanding efforts and look forward to working with you to fully fund the Ricky Ray Trust Fund.

Sincerely,

EDWARD JONES,
President.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding time. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying bill. This rule provides for the consideration of the third version of the D.C. appropriations bill and the Labor-HHS bill which has never been voted on in the House, and just for good measure an across-the-board cut of 1 percent. This bill does not extend Social Security or Medicare solvency for even a single day. My friends on the other side know full well that the President will veto this bill and we will have to come back. And a veto is well deserved.

Mr. Speaker, if we pass this rule, we are endorsing a most unusual procedure. The annual Labor, Health and Human Services bill appropriates about one-third of the United States budget. It makes vitally important decisions about funding levels for everything from cancer research to teacher training. One would think that the Members of this House would consider it their responsibility to bring such a bill to the floor and to vigorously debate amendments which might make it better. But my friends in the majority are going to shirk that responsibility and opt instead for a single up-or-down vote on a whole grab bag of issues, some lacking even a passing acquaintance with the Labor-HHS bill.

In my district, Rochester, New York, experts at the University of Rochester are conducting internationally recognized research in biotechnology and medical investigation. But in a bill where out of the ordinary is considered routine, this measure will delay any grants from January until September 29, 2000. There will be no research grants for a year. People who are waiting for cures, praying for cures know that this bill will not help them. As a former scientist, I can tell you research cannot be conducted that way. A delay of a year could be a delay for a lifetime. Research delayed is results denied, results which might help save a life or improve the quality of life for our fellow Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I have tremendous admiration for the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), the subcommittee chairman. He has been a champion in so many ways and his intelligence, competence and compassion will be irreplaceable when he retires at the end of next year. I really believe that in another place and time he would have brought a much different bill to the floor. But in this time and place the Labor-HHS bill cannot pass on its own. And so the majority relies on procedural shenanigans to slip it through.

□ 1330

The other side will argue it is really just a cut in office supplies and travel budgets and maybe coffee money. Really? Well, how about a $184 million cut in veterans medical care, or $2.7 billion cut in defense, which would mean eliminating jobs for tens of thousands of men and women in uniform? The top military official in the United States has warned that this approach could seriously impair our military readiness, but the majority here will be arguing office supplies and travel budgets.

I do not blame the American people for finding this hard to believe. I find it hard to believe.

Earlier this year this same majority said it had $892 million for a tax cut using up the Social Security money. Now it says it has to cut back on Head Start and child nutrition.

A retroactive cut in bills which have already been signed by the President is a new wrinkle for us, and that has happened for several of the appropriations bills. It is very much like the contractor who builds a house, Mr. Speaker, and then comes back the next morning and breaks the windows.

The rule is objectionable because it condones the highly unconventional process under which we consider this underlying bill, and the bill is objectionable for reasons too numerous to fully address in the time allotted for any of us, but I solemnly urge defeat of both.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to put the debate on this final spending bill in context.

The President brought us what he called a balanced budget proposal. It was balanced, but it increased spending dramatically; and it funded it, and this is why it was balanced, it funded it by raising taxes $160 billion on the American people at a time when taxes are higher than they have ever been with the exception of 1 year during World War II.

Mr. Speaker, we put his budget on the floor, and we did not support it, and most of my colleagues did not support it on the other side of the aisle. Recently the President suggested that we close the gap between what we need to fund next year's services and the money available by raising taxes $20 billion. Well, we brought that proposal to the floor. The Republicans opposed that increase in taxes; and, as I recall, everyone of the Democrats did too.

So, do not just talk. Be part of the action. What we are doing here today is finding a way to adjust our expenditures so that we can do the things the American people need.

Any Secretary, any Cabinet member paid the salaries they are being paid can cut their expenses 1 percent over the year. The gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON), one of our colleagues, was made head of the agency in Arizona responsible for children's services halfway through the year, and she had to save 4 percent in half a year, and she did it without touching a single children's program.

Mr. Speaker, there is not anyone I represent who does not work in a factory or in a work place that over the last 2 years has not had to be more efficient and cut overhead in order to put their product out there on the market better quality, lower price. It is nothing in the private sector to have to find 1 percent.

Why is this an emergency? Why is it that the gentleman from Missouri could get up here and claim that we are going to cut programs like Meals On Wheels? As my colleagues know, it is really very distressing to see the level of fear they were willing to put out there over 1 percent. Frankly, if my colleagues cannot cut 1 percent out of their own expenditures, if any high-paid executive cannot cut 1 percent out without compromising programs, they are not a person who understands quality improvement, continuous improvement, or all of the other modern management techniques that allow them to reduce administrative costs and improve the delivery of services.

So I am astounded at these horror stories that my colleagues are putting out, but let me also say one other thing. I am proud of what we are doing because in this Congress we have quietly decided to move our own goalposts. A few years ago we balanced the budget with great fanfare. That is terrific. This year we found, because the economy was doing well, we have the opportunity to balance that budget without Social Security funds. First time ever. I mean talk about revolutions.

Balancing the budget was not nearly as hard as balancing it without Social Security funds, and we are going to do it without Social Security funds and without new taxes, and our colleagues should be helping us cut 1 percent, not scaring the American people.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I hear the nervous voices of my Republican colleagues, as they should be nervous, about what they propose today before this House and before the American people.

When I am back home in New Jersey, I spend a lot of my time meeting with working families who are just trying to make ends meet, parents who have to work long hours and need a place to have after-school programs for their kids, senior citizens who are scared that they may have to choose between food and the medicine they need to stay healthy. I have a group in Middlesex County that I am working with to try to serve all of our homebound, bedbound and disabled seniors hot meals. Right now a lot of these people live on cold food or one meal a day. These are real people suffering in my communities and communities across the country.

So when I look at this budget bill, the question I ask is: What does this do for these people? Well, for starters it guts the funding we made to them on hot meals, and it provides nothing to provide these seniors with a prescription drug benefit, but it does not stop there. It denies a million children the chance for a safe after-school program, it cuts funding for over 8,000 desperately needed new teachers, it cuts immunizations for 330,000 poor children, and it does nothing, Mr. Speaker, to extend the life of Social Security, not even by 1 day.

And why does this bill fail in all these respects? Because Republicans need the money to pay for their trillion-dollar tax giveaway, a proposal the American people rejected during the break.

It is all a matter of priorities. This bill does not extend the life of Social Security even by a single day. It fails to provide one penny for a Medicare prescription drug benefit, and the only thing it does, Mr. Speaker, is hurt some American families in some very real way.

To Republicans, the top priorities are tax breaks for their special-interest friends. For we Democrats the top priorities are America's seniors and families. Let us vote with them and against this rule.

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

At the risk of sounding remedial, I would like to point out to the gentleman from New Jersey that there is no tax cut in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

(Mrs. BIGGERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and of the conference report. The report not only includes funding for the District of Columbia, it also includes more money for education, Pell grants for college students, the NIH, Federal impact aid for local communities, the Ryan White AIDS program, and communities services block grants the administration requested.

But I am particularly pleased that the report includes a slightly less than 1 percent cut on new spending including a $1,400 cut to Members of Congress' own pay. Cutting Members' cost-of-living increase tells Federal agencies that they are not alone in holding down costs and says, ''If you have to take a cut, Congress will, too.'' The cut in salary will also bring Members to a level that is more comparable to the Social Security beneficiaries' COLA, further illustrating the Republicans' commitment to preserving Social Security.

I congratulate the Republican leadership for funding key programs in this bill and for keeping its word on protecting Social Security. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the conference report.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

I come to the floor this afternoon in the name of the people of the District of Columbia to protest being used by this rule.

Mr. Speaker, it is one thing to be abused. It is just as bad to be used. It is one thing to be treated like a dog. It is another thing to be treated like a mule. That is what is happening here.

The District of Columbia, the tiniest appropriation, is being used as a mule to carry across the largest appropriation, the Labor-HHS appropriation. This appropriation is the only one that involves a breathing, living city. We should have been the first out of this place. It is the simplest. It is our money, not my colleagues', virtually all of it. It does not belong here. It makes devolution a joke, for me to have to come before my colleagues who have virtually nothing to do with raising the money in this bill to ask for my own money.

Mr. Speaker, it is hung up here extraneous matters that are none of my colleagues' business. It makes the whole idea of devolution as it comes out of their mouths a joke because it involves them in tiny matters that in their jurisdictions would never go anywhere outside their borders.

It makes a lot of hard work go up in smoke. There is the work of the District of Columbia which presented a marvelously balanced budget with tax cuts and a surplus. There is the work of the Senate and House appropriators, and I appreciate that Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) have worked to get a bill that might be signed.

I wondered after the veto of this bill why would there be no negotiations. Talk about irregular order. Nobody sat down and tried to work out our disagreements. Now I know why, because my colleagues needed a bill number. That bill number, the first thing running, happened to be the District of Columbia appropriations containing the money of the people of the District of Columbia raised in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues did not have the nerve and the guts to take their HHS bill to full committee and then to this floor so that it could be debated openly. They tried something so underhanded that it needs to be exposed to the American people.

What has resulted is a double delay. We had to delay while our colleagues negotiated this jerry-built HHS bill. Then we had the delay, of course, while we negotiated our differences in the D.C. bill.

What we have is a potentially signable bill, one not to my liking, and I do not know if it would be signed, that is going over with a bill my colleagues know will not be signed to further delay the people of the District of Columbia getting their own money.

This rule is unworthy of any serious legislative body. It is an unconscionable way to treat the people of the District of Columbia.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT), a member of the committee.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, once again we are stressed between a debate over spending the Social Security surplus. This bill that is the result of this rule will protect the Social Security surplus, but one would not know it from the rhetoric. According to the other side we are actually dipping into the Social Security surplus by $17 billion. But once again we see that the sky is falling and Chicken Little is running about the House of Representatives. They say children will be sitting in crowded schools because of this, seniors will not eat, parents will be helpless to stop their children from doing drugs, medical research will be frozen for a year, and 50,000 troops will be laid off or reduced in force.

Well, none of that is true. Let us just look at defense, for an example. General Shelton came to the House of Representatives, came to the Senate and he said, ''Here's the President's budget. We think it's sufficient to provide for our Department of Defense.'' Then we increased that amount of money in budget authority by $4.5 billion. Now a 1 percent cut would reduce that, but it's still $2 billion over the request that was completely sufficient, $2 billion more, and now, Mr. Speaker, all of a sudden we are going to be laying off 50,000 troops.

How can that be? How can it switch when we are still increasing by $2 billion? Well, I have the letter that says that we are dipping into Social Security surplus by $17 billion that has been referred to by the opponents of this, and it puts some really bogus groundrules to do that. But even if it were true, it says that in order to keep from spending the Social Security surplus, one would have to have a 4.8 percent across-the-board reduction, 4.8 percent. Well, where is their offer to cut the budget by 4.8 percent so we can protect Social Security?

□ 1345

Now, you say this will not extend Social Security even one day. Well, if you do not follow your own rhetoric and arguments, if you do not cut another 4.8 percent, you will shorten the life of Social Security. You will reduce the amount of time that is available for us to pay our seniors the benefits that they have so adeptly earned by working and paying into the system. The charges are not true, so why do they make the charges? To increase spending.

I ask my colleagues to vote for the rule and vote for the bill that follows.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I want to remind myself of the old adage, select your words carefully today, for tomorrow you may eat them. I rise in strong opposition to this rule for a fundamental reason why all of us should be opposing this rule: It brings a $95 billion spending bill to the floor without allowing the House to debate it and to decide where to cut it. That in itself is unprecedented, bringing a bill to the floor as a conference report that has not had committee action, that has not had floor action. That should be sufficient reason for anyone who cares about the process of this House to oppose this rule.

Now, I, too, am sick and tired of demagoguery. I heard an excellent speech from my friend from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) this morning in which he openly and honestly said a lot of things.

My reason for being here today is my opposition to the leadership of this side of the aisle, a leadership that has the gall to stand on this floor and to have a message from their party taking full credit for the balanced budget and the fact that we almost got by without spending Social Security last year, when that same leadership did not vote for the budget of 1990 that laid the foundation, the budget of 1993 that put the walls up on the economy, and only provided 187 votes for the balanced budget agreement in 1997 that has become the mantra of political demagoguery on this floor. How do you have the gall to stand here and to blame anybody? There is enough credit and blame to go around.

I happen to be one of the 46 Democrats that stood and voted with you in 1995 when you said a balanced budget should be required and to use scoring by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office based on the most current economic and technical assumptions of the Congressional Budget Office. I agreed with you then, I agree with you today. That is why the Blue Dogs sent a letter to this same CBO asking them to score it, and when they responded to our question of CBO assumptions and methodology and excluding directed scorekeeping, they tell us we are spending $17.1 billion of Social Security, we, the Congress, both sides. But how can people blame the minority when the minority can pass nothing? That is CBO.

All I am saying is it is time for a little honesty. You know, that tax bill that you begged and pleaded with us to support, according to CBO honest scoring, would have spent $120 billion of the same Social Security trust fund we here today are debating.

Come on, it is time to be honest with our rhetoric. ''Across the board spending.'' I heard the gentleman from Oklahoma a moment ago make this talking claim. The measure does not specify the accounts.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves at this moment in the middle of a very highly structured and organized disinformation campaign by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and yet some of the criticisms that have been leveled I want to admit to.

The gentleman from Texas and earlier the gentlewoman from New York said that it is not right that a bill like the Labor-HHS bill, or any other appropriation bill, comes to the floor without the chance of the House to shape that legislation on the floor. I agree with that. I regret that this bill has not been taken up on the floor. I think it is a failure of process, and I accept the criticism that has been leveled in that regard.

I would say to the gentleman from Texas that the bill was shaped in the subcommittee and in the full Committee of Appropriations and that my colleague from Wisconsin was invited to an informal conference which we had to have in the absence of passing the bill on the floor. He refused to participate and his voice was not heard. But the criticism is a valid one.

Yet there is so much today that is not valid, so much that is disinformation. This bill in total is the same as the President's budget. It is equal to the President's budget in education, it is higher than the President's budget in health and human services, and it is somewhat below the President in labor. But it is equal to the President's budget, overall.

Yes, we differ on how that money ought to be spent, and it is up to the Congress, not the President, to shape legislative policy, and we are doing that.

The minority leader followed by the gentlewoman from California said in effect we are cutting NIH. Let me remind my colleagues from the other side of the aisle that in the last 5 years we have increased NIH 5.7 percent, 6.9 percent, 7.1 percent, and, last year, 15 percent, and in this bill 14 percent. And, very frankly, the President of the United States in his budget this year proposed just a 1.4 percent increase for NIH. Are we supporting biomedical research? Yes, we are. Is anything saying that we are not? The truth is, ''no''; it is a lie.

I would end by saying this: Nobody for the last 15 years has attempted to get control over the budget in a way that protects the Social Security reserve, and your side of the aisle has presided over hundreds of billions of dollars of raid on that reserve. Thank God we are trying to correct that right now.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely correct that I refused to participate in the conference on the Labor-HHS bill, because it was not a conference. The conference is supposed to come after the House passes a bill.

We were never given an opportunity to debate this bill on the floor and help shape it. Then we went into a conference controlled by the Republican leadership with a specific instruction about what ought to be provided in that bill, and so I simply said to the gentleman, ''Look, my friend, when the Republicans have determined what they want in that bill, I will be happy to sit down with you and give you an honest assessment of what else you need to do to get a bill that can be supported on a bipartisan basis.'' But I will not participate in a sham. And I do not apologize for that. I am proud of it.

Secondly, with respect to NIH, the gentleman from Illinois is a great friend of NIH. There are few better friends in this House than the gentleman from Illinois. But the product today, not through his desire, but because of this silly, phony debate on Social Security, what is happening to NIH is that all but a few hundred million of the $4 billion that we are providing to NIH for new grants will be frozen for an entire year. That will kill people, and that is wrong.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

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

Mr. Speaker, let me first say to the respected chairman of the subcommittee just for a point of reference, in 1995, my first year in the House, it was the Republican budget, the fiscal 1996 budget, that the President would not adopt that cut the NIH by 5 percent. You all have forgotten about that, but you all did propose that, and thank God you did.

Now, the bill before us today perpetuates a fraud on the Federal budget process and the American people. The Republicans have produced a Federal budget which in reality exceeds the spending caps set in 1997 by more than $30 billion and, according to our own Congressional Budget Office in this letter, spends at least $17 billion against the Social Security surplus, even with the across-the-board cuts, advance funding and gimmicks such as delaying medical research funding and paying the government's bills to private contractors late.

Today we read that the Speaker of the House and the Republican leadership, in their effort to pursue this budgetary fraud for political goals, has cut a deal with the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, promising him that they will make him whole later on. He will get his highways, but medical research, trying to find cure for cancer and AIDS in Houston, Texas, will get the shaft.

No matter how much my Republican friends say it, no matter how much they wish it, the fact remains that, as scored by CBO, their budget exceeds the '97 budget spending caps by $30 billion, and spends $17 billion of the Social Security surplus. This is before the House takes up bills to rewrite the 1997 Balanced Budget Agreement, before the tax credit extensions and the minimum wage tax cuts, which we know will cost billions more.

It is not really whether you cut across the board, it is the fact that you have destroyed the budget process.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER).

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

Mr. Speaker, here we are, 29 days into the new fiscal year, dealing with the largest discretionary budget, other than defense, under most unusual circumstances.

This is the bill that deals with every family in America on education and health and working issues and training and job safety and such, and we are operating under and asked to vote for a rule which completely bypasses regular order.

This is my ninth budget. In not one of those previous 8 years have we dealt with the labor, health and education budget in less than at least one whole day of debate, where it was possible to amend this legislation along the way, either by the minority or the majority, to offer amendments and have them debated and considered along the way.

Not a single amendment can be offered here, not a single one debated. It is totally unamendable under these circumstances. But we are here under that set of rulings, and we should reject the rule for that reason.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands, Mrs. CHRISTIANSEN.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule and to this combined DC/Labor-HHS-Education conference report, which in reality is a misnomer, because the majority did not even bother to bring a freestanding Labor-HHS-Education bill to the floor.

While they are continuing to invent new budgetary gimmicks to mask the fact they have already raided the Social Security surplus, our friends in the majority have brought a Labor-HHS bill to the floor which cuts many of the President's priority requests to a completely unacceptable level. In fact, even if the President's request was approved, it would not have been adequate to sustain and meet the current capacity building needs of minority

communities. Of the CDC's minority HIV and Health Disparities request, it cuts the administration's request by $39 million, making it less than last year's level. This is unconscionable and must not be allowed to stand. We cannot afford to take a step back, just as we are finally beginning to make a difference.

My colleagues, we must not allow disparate treatment in health care of minorities to continue. I urge my colleagues to vote against this unfair rule and this mean-spirited bill which cuts much needed funding in health care, education and social services to our families and our children.

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

□ 1400

Mr. Speaker, the speakers on the other side, several of them have engaged in what I have referred to as triple-speak, not double-speak but triple-speak. They said, oh, well, the President only requested X for defense, and Congress voted more than the President requested for defense. Now they are cutting back across-the-board 1 percent, and the figure is still more than the President requested for defense. Therefore, defense is just hunky-dory.

What the gentlemen on the other side really did was to appropriate more than the President requested for weapons systems, for pet weapons systems for particular Members of Congress, money that was not even requested by the President. Now they want to cut below what the President requested for operations and maintenance and for personnel.

This is not double-speak, this is triple-speak. In fact, the Defense Department, under their 1 percent cut, will now get less than what the President asked for to be able to deploy people around the world, less for operations and maintenance, and will in fact have to reduce the size of the armed forces.

They should not be permitted to get away with this kind of charade. The American people deserve to be spoken to honestly and directly when we are talking about what we are doing with their money.

Mr. Speaker, this is a charade. We will vote ''no'' against the rule. If the rule is passed, we will vote no against the conference report. If the conference report should be passed, the President will veto it. They do not have the votes to override the veto, they know that, and we will then, finally, be in negotiations with all the parties at the table, unless the other side stubbornly refuses to negotiate with the President.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I gratefully bring an end to this discourse by yielding the balance of my time to my friend, the gentleman from Southern California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEREUTER). The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 4½ minutes.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule. I would like to commend this House, because when we move from this rule to the debate on the conference report and then vote it out, we will have, for the first time in a heck of a long time, passed all 13 appropriations bills without touching social security, and we will have sent them down to the President.

There has been a great deal of rhetoric that we have heard during this debate, but I have to say that we are going to be making history when we proceed with this.

We are trying to make some tough decisions. It is very easy to simply advocate a tax increase when we are advocating more spending. What we are saying is that we are not going to increase the tax burden on working families, we are not going to touch social security, and at the same time, we are going to make sure that we do not increase spending.

It is tough to do that. We are the ones who proposed doing it responsibly. That is why so many of my colleagues on this side have argued eloquently on behalf of a very responsible 1 percent cut.

My friend, the gentleman from Dallas, Texas, has justifiably talked about the fact that we are going to see problems within the Department of Defense. That does not have to happen. It does not have to happen. We will, with this 1 percent cut, have, as has been pointed out, $1.8 billion more than the President's request for national defense, and those priorities can clearly be established within the Pentagon and by the President.

We all acknowledge that there has to be waste, fraud, and abuse in every level of government. We are going to be doing it right here in the United States Congress, as well.

We know that when it comes to education, $34.7 billion was requested by the President. What is it that we had? We had $35.03 for education, and with this 1 percent cut we end up with $88 million more than the President's request for education. So if we look at what it is we are trying to do, we are doing it very, very responsibly. I hope very much that my colleagues will join in helping us make history by giving us a bipartisan vote on both the rule and on the conference report.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to strongly oppose this rule. Although the rule waives all points of order against the conference report, the rule also denies any amendments to this very flawed bill.

This bill cuts $1.2 billion out of the President's education agenda. It guts last year's bipartisan commitment to hire 100,000 teachers to reduce class size in the early grades, block grants the program, and cuts out the additional $200 million requested by the President to hire 8,000 teachers next year, in addition to 29,000 teachers hired this year.

This measure funds 3,400 fewer after school centers serving 950,000 fewer children than requested by the President.

The appropriations bill also cuts $189 million in Title 1 funds below the President's request which help schools hire an additional 5,400 Title 1 teachers to serve 290,000 disadvantaged children.

This legislation also cuts $44 million in requested CDC funding to immunize over 333,000 children against childhood diseases.

This bill denies $94 million requested for educational technology initiatives, including funds to establish computer learning centers in 260 low-income communities, to implement technology plans in 220 school districts; and impose technology instruction in 4,700 middle schools.

When our multi-cultural society is our Nation's strength, this bill wrongfully denies $169 million for Bilingual Education, HEP/CAMP, and Adult Education, denying bilingual education training for 1,800 teachers; high school equivalency and college assistance for 2,400 migrant students; and ESL education for 600,000 adult learners when one-third of recent immigrants do not have a high school diploma or its equivalent.

And this bill also injures our hardworking students by denying $60 million of the $240 million requested for GEAR UP, preventing an estimated 131,000 low-income middle and high school students from receiving the mentoring, counseling, tutoring, outreach, support services, and encouragement they need to raise their expectations and successfully pursue college; cuts out $50 million for new initiatives to educate disadvantaged youth and their families about college opportunities.

This bill cuts $35 million in requested funding to improve pre-service training for 2,500 new teachers and denies funds to recruit 500 new teachers under the Teacher Quality Enhancement Program; and rejects $18 million for Troops to Teachers aimed at meeting the need for 2.2 million additional teachers over the next 10 years.

The Department of Education is a vital entity that provides a great many services to our Nation's education, yet, the bill cuts $16 million out of the Department's administrative budget—forcing a furlough of employees for 10+ days—in a back door attempt to dismantle the Education Department piece by piece. As written, the bills denies $125 million requested by the President to support family care for over 5 million Americans with long-term care needs, cuts $28 million requested by the President to ensure that 1.6 million elderly and disabled receive quality nursing care, and cuts funding available for social services for the elderly and low-income Americans in FY 2000 by $1.1 billion or 46% below the mandatory level.

This bill also strikes a blow to our workforce and eliminates assistance for 241,000 unemployed individuals. It also shortchanges efforts to improve the safety and health of workers and the safety of their benefits, but cutting $69 million out of requested increases for workplace safety enforcement, initiatives to promote equal pay, to address problems of coal dust in mines, and help other countries improve working standards. Worse yet, the measure eliminates $25 million new initiative to provide health coverage for uninsured workers, cuts the Minority AIDS initiative by $15 million below the 1999 level.

This legislation also injures the American farmer and drops $508 million in emergency

aid to farmers devastated by Hurricane Floyd in North Carolina and states on the Eastern seaboard with no guarantee that this needed assistance will be provided later.

The 1.4% cut across the board will decidedly hurt key programs. This bill cuts $403 million out of the Department of Education, reducing the conference level to $81 million below the President's program request, cuts $550 million out of the Department of Health and Human Services, and cuts $122 million out of the Department of Labor. An additional $109 million would be cut out of Title 1, eliminating reading and math assistance for approximately 168,000 disadvantaged children, $108 million would be cut out of Pell Grants, underfunding the maximum Pell award, $54 million would be cut from Head Start, and over 10,000 fewer kids would be served, $2 million would be cut from Meals on Wheels, and 1.5 million fewer meals would be served to 11,000 fewer seniors.

By combining the Labor HHS bill with the DC Appropriations Conference Report, we send the message to America's children, workers, and elderly that we do not care about them—that we are willing to cut their services because we were too lazy to amend this bill.

I oppose this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. FROST. 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 221, nays 206, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 547]

YEAS—221

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—206

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

NOT VOTING—7

Gilman
Hinojosa
Mascara
Rodriguez
Rush
Scarborough
Waters

□ 1424

Ms. BERKLEY and Mr. BISHOP changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay''.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall No. 547 I was unavoidably detained and missed the vote. If I had been present I would have voted ''aye.''

Stated against:

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 547, I was delayed. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 345, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 3064) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEREUTER). Pursuant to House Resolution 345, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Wednesday, October 27, 1999, at page H10933.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 3064, and that I and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I believe all of the Members understand now that this conference report includes, not only the District of Columbia appropriations bill, that was rewritten and passed after the President vetoed the first one, but it also includes the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education bill, which is the 13th appropriations bill to be sent to the President's desk. The submission of these 13 bills plus the two supplementals will end this phase of the appropriations process.

The next phase of the process, then, is to receive the vetoes from the President on those bills which the President determines that he does not like, and to work with the White House Office of Management and Budget and the President himself, if he is available, on whatever differences we can to try to get subsequent legislation signed, because all of these appropriations bills must become law.

Much of the debate will be related probably, not to the District of Columbia portion of the bill, but the Labor, HHS portion and to the offset section.

□ 1430

One of the issues that we will hear about, I know, because we heard a lot about it during consideration of the CR and also the rule on this bill, is the across-the-board cut, which is less than 1 percent. I am not a great proponent of across-the-board cuts, but we are doing everything that we possibly can to make sure that we do not spend any of the Social Security money. To do this we made this less than 1 percent across-the-board cut part of our offset package.

Now, there has been and there will be a lot of criticism of this across-the-board cut, but everyone that I know who lives outside the Beltway is convinced that the Government wastes a lot of money, a lot of their money. And I know that the folks back in my district would laugh at me, and anyone else who would try to convince them that our government could not find 1 penny out of every tax dollar from the discretionary accounts; that we could not save one penny out of every dollar. I think we would be laughed out of town if we tried to convince our constituents that this government, that has considerable waste, and we try to weed out the waste the best that we can, but it continues to pop up, we would be laughed out of town if we tried to convince our constituents that this government could not save 1 penny out of every dollar that we appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished chairman for yielding me this time.

Before we begin the more partisan portion of this debate, I want to join with my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), for a tribute to a retiring member of our staff, and I want to congratulate Bob Knisely, who is sitting directly on my right, on his retirement and wish him well.

Bob has served the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for 28 years. That is an absolutely remarkable achievement, Mr. Speaker. There are only 10 Members of this House who were here when Bob Knisely began his career with the subcommittee. He has served under Chairman Mahon, Chairman Whitten, Chairman Natcher, Chairman OBEY, Chairman Livingston, and now Chairman YOUNG. On the Subcommittee on Labor-HHS and Education, he has served under Chairman Flood, Chairman Natcher, Chairman Smith and now during my tenure.

In the world of appropriations, two words encompass the strongest values of the committee and, when used, Mr. Speaker, represent the highest compliment that one can pay to a staffer at any level. One is ''technician''. It contains none of the bureaucratic connotations usually associated with the word. Bob Knisely is an outstanding technician, Mr. Speaker. He assures that the legislative and other products of the subcommittee meet his high standards for quality and that they will assure the implementation of our policies. His expertise in the rules of the committee and the House, as well as the technical aspects of putting the bill and report together, is absolutely irreplaceable. His knowledge of the programs under our subcommittee's jurisdiction is, of course, unparalleled, as is his understanding of the history of the subcommittee for more than half of its existence.

The second word, Mr. Speaker, is ''professional''. There are those who continue in the mistaken belief that a professional staff cannot exist on the Hill; that we must surround ourselves only with individuals who share our political views. This is rubbish, and Bob's career demonstrates the true concept of professionalism. He has served chairmen and members of our subcommittee of both parties equally, providing them with his best advice and technical support.

Bob, our subcommittee and its chairmen have been better and more effective because of your service here. This institution, which we all love, is a better place because of your service. And, hopefully, your career will serve as a model to continue to strengthen it even after you have left. Your shoes will be very, very hard to fill.

I know that I speak for the entire subcommittee and for this entire House in wishing you well in your retirement, and I hope we can call on you occasionally for help. Your work of 28 years and your professionalism are a credit to our subcommittee, to the Congress, and to our country.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, when I first went on the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education as a rookie, Bob Knisely was one of the persons who taught me both about the programs with which we dealt, and about the way the committee worked and how I could be most effective in pursuing the goals that I was concerned about.

To this day, I have no idea whether Bob is a Republican or a Democrat. I do know he is a consummate professional. I do know he is a first-rate human being. I do know he is a spectacular public servant. He is one of those people about whom the public will never hear, but he is one of those people, nonetheless, who has helped every day to make things better for working people, who are supposed to be the primary interest of the Department of Labor.

He has always given us straight, honest information. He is part of a terrific staff that acts as reality checks on all of us practicing politicians. We like to fit the facts into our rhetoric, but Bob Knisely has been one of those people who has always helped us to fit our rhetoric into the facts. We may not have always been comfortable with that, but that, in the end, is what a professional staffer is supposed to do.

I am profoundly grateful for the service that you have provided, Bob, and I am profoundly grateful to the assistance you have given me, and all of us, through the years, and I wish you well in your retirement. Thank you again very much.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), who wishes to wish Mr. Knisely well, and to discuss the District of Columbia appropriations conference report.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the reason why I rise to speak with regard to Mr. Knisely is that I worked with Mr. Knisely a quarter of a century ago.

Over the last 25 years, I have become older and fatter and grayer and uglier, but Mr. Knisely looks the same. He is just as sharp and keen of mind and quick of wit, and he is just as slim and good looking as he was then.

But putting aside all the superficial things, the substantive thing is, as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) said, he is a consummate professional. I was on the Senate Committee on Appropriations staff during some very difficult times. And I know that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) remembers, and by the way, even then the personality and intellect of the gentleman from Wisconsin made him a larger-than-life presence on the Committee on Appropriations 25 years ago, but if it were not for Bob Knisely, a great many of the issues that we could not find our way out of never would have been resolved in a spirit of bipartisanship.

He is a very professional staffer and a good person and this country owes him a deep debt of gratitude.

Now with regard to the D.C. Appropriations Bill, Mr. Speaker, here we go again. I am not sure if we can remember how many times we have been on the House floor or in conference on just the D.C. appropriations bill. This little bill is about $6 billion, $429 million is all of the Federal funds involved, but certainly this should be the last time that we would have to bring the D.C. appropriations bill to the House floor because we have made great progress since the President's veto of the first D.C. appropriations conference report.

Maybe it took a White House no to get all the parties into a room and discuss it seriously, earnestly. It certainly worked, if that is what it took. The chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK), and the chairwoman, Senator HUTCHISON finally kept an open enough mind to find out what needed to be done, and so we reached an acceptable compromise.

It took very few changes, as we had been saying all along, to reach that acceptable compromise. The compromise includes increasing the cap on special education attorney fees, eliminating the restriction on a private organization to be able to use private funds to carry out needle exchange programs, and allowing the District's Corporation Council to review and comment on its voting rights lawsuit without the use of Federal funds.

I have to say if they had accepted these modest changes several months ago, showing proper respect and deference to the District's home rule, we would not be here today. If it had not been for a lot of politicizing and posturing, we could have and should have had this appropriations bill signed into law last July.

For such a small appropriation of Federal funds, we had to have so much political rhetoric, $429 million is all the Federal money involved, and yet we are holding up $6.8 billion of the District's money. Because we changed things with the D.C. Revitalization Act, we treat the District as we would other States. We give them grants and contracts. We do not oversee them any more, or certainly we should not be, yet we are holding the District's budget hostage. They have a tax cut in it. They have a balanced budget and fiscal accountability in it.

They have a terrific Mayor, better management now in so many key areas. They are doing everything that we had hoped that they might do; more importantly, that their citizens demanded that they do. They have a little surplus. They are all in agreement on their own budget, and yet we are holding up their $6.8 billion budget using as leverage this little $425 million of Federal funds, holding it hostage.

It has been held hostage to a series of controversial social riders and restrictions on how the District can spend its own local property tax money and private money that is not even local public money. Those restrictions have not and would not be imposed on the constituents of any other Member of Congress, yet we impose them on the District of Columbia.

But this compromise, as I say, removes several of the most objectionable riders, at least with regard to the needle exchange program, which is always a controversial issue. But free needle exchange operates as a gateway so that the Whitman-Walker private organization could get access to addicts who were in desperate need of drug treatment and counseling. By offering free needles, they got them into the program so that they could identify them and heal them. The District has the worst AIDS epidemic of any other urban areas. They desperately need to be able to do whatever it takes to address effectively that problem.

□ 1445

But since we have taken so much time to do our most important job passing appropriations bills, this little D.C. bill, important really only to the residents of the District of Columbia because it holds hostage over $6 billion of their own money, is now held hostage to a grander political scheme. The Labor, Health, and Human Services Appropriations bill, a bill with $93 billion of Federal money, compared to $429 million in the D.C. bill is attached as an amendment along with a 1% across the board cut and thus ensures its veto.

As a free-standing measure, we would support, in fact the entire subcommittee, Democrats and Republicans alike, would support this D.C. appropriations bill. We have always hailed it from an appropriations standpoint. It has always been a good appropriations bill. It is just these politicized, idealogical riders that sunk it.

Now it is going to be crushed by the Labor-HHS bill and by the 1 percent across-the-board cut. That is not right. It is wrong. It should not have happened. And I urge a no vote because it did happen.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK), the very distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) for the opportunity to present this bill today and for the leadership that he has provided in the appropriations process, and also to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, on which I also serve and which has been combined in this bill with the D.C. appropriation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there were a number of people who, frankly, have been proposing, and basically these are people on the other side of the aisle, they have been proposing that we get all the appropriations bills and put them in one big package. Well, we have not done that. But we have a smaller package with two sets of issues, those for the District of Columbia and Labor, Health and Human Services. I guess they do not like that either, but this is just the best way we believe to proceed.

Now, why is that? Now, Mr. Speaker, we have had the D.C. bill on the floor before. We know the Nation's capital has a special relationship with the Federal Government. We have in this bill the funding, the assistance from the Federal Government to help the District of Columbia get some problems squared away, attacking the link between crime and drugs, incentives for the adoption of young people that currently are stuck for years in foster homes, incentives for the downsizing of the government in the District of Columbia. Because the city officials recognize it is bloated, it is too large, it needs to come down to size.

We have the environmental cleanup. We have the incentives for college attendance. We have the approval of the budget of the District of Columbia. And get this, Mr. Speaker, the District of Columbia has a Democrat mayor and a majority Democrat city council, and a key part of their budget is reducing taxes and reducing the size of government, and the Republican members of the city council were major contributors to this effort.

I have not heard anybody in the District of Columbia say, there is just no way they could handle a 1 percent cut in the size of their government. Instead, the Democrats in the District of Columbia and the District of Columbia city government are aggressively trying to reduce the size of their government and at the same time reduce taxes. And, yes, we heard within D.C. some people saying, oh, the tax breaks go to people with the wrong economic status.

But D.C. recognized they needed to have the tax incentives to create jobs and to help their economy and they did not fall into this demagogic trap of trying to say they are giving it to the wrong group of people. No, the Democrats of the District of Columbia did not do that. And so, we have the approval of their tax cuts and their budget. We did not change anything about their proposed budget and their proposed tax cut. We endorse it. But now it is part of this proposal for the Federal Government programs.

We hear people saying, now, when it comes to the Federal Government, though, there is no way we could reduce things by just one penny out of each dollar, not even one penny. I saw the Cabinet officers on TV the other day, Mr. Speaker, and they were saying, oh, there is no way we could do a 1 percent cut. They want to make it sound as drastic as possible instead of finding the administrative savings that businesses have to do when they do cuts, that families have to do when they do cuts.

I remember former Democratic President Jimmy Carter who went on national TV to tell people to adjust their

thermostats, wear sweaters if necessary, turn out some of the lights, but let us reduce some costs. But today we are hearing people on the other side of the aisle say, because this has a 1 percent reduction, not in Social Security benefits, not in veterans' benefits, not in Medicare, only in so-called discretionary spending, we cannot handle it. Even though spending will actually be up for so many of those agencies from what it was before, they do not want to take a hard look at the size of government. They do not want to tell these Cabinet officers maybe they should lead by example.

The pay of Members of Congress is being adjusted one percent less under this bill than otherwise. I do not see the President or Cabinet officers trying to lead by example. This is important.

First we have to agree on how much we have to spend. The sad thing, Mr. Speaker, is that my friends on the other side of the aisle when they say, oh, we want to balance the budget and we want to do it without spending Social Security money, but instead of saying that means we might have to make more adjustments, they do not want to make any at all. They want to spend more. They want to get more into Social Security, as happened for decades around here. And it should not have happened, and it is time to fix it. This bill fixes it.

I want to commend the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG). I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman PORTER). I want to commend the people that have worked so hard, the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman KASICH), who will speak in a moment, working on overall things.

I do not think the American people believe that Cabinet officers will not find the way to make their adjustments, as they have the right to do, program transfers, adjustments, reprogramming of funds. They have those tools at their disposal to make sure there are no difficulties caused by simply saying they have got to save one penny out of each dollar.

I urge adoption of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present to the House today the conference agreement on H.R. 3064, the District of Columbia, and the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2000. The conferees met yesterday morning and resolved the remaining matters in disagreement between the House and Senate bills and filed the conference report, House Report 106–419, last evening.

Mr. Speaker, this conference agreement includes the FY 2000 DC Appropriations Act; technical changes to the FY 2000 VA–HUD Appropriations Act; the FY 2000 Labor, Health and Human Services and Education Appropriations Act; and an offset package that protects social security.

Regarding the Labor-HHS Appropriations Act, the chairman of that subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, Mr. PORTER, will be yielded time to explain that part of the conference report. The offset package was developed by the Budget Committee and the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, Mr. KASICH, is here to explain the offsets.

Mr. Speaker, regarding the DC Appropriations Act, the conference agreement reflects the vetoed bill, H.R. 2587, with a few adjustments. The needles language has been adjusted to retain the prohibition on using Federal or local funds, but without the restriction on privately-funded programs. There is also a new provision, section 173 that allows the D.C. Corporation Counsel to review and comment on briefs in private lawsuits and to consult with officials of the District government regarding such lawsuits. All of the other social riders—marijuana, abortion, domestic partners—are the same as they were in the House-passed version of H.R. 3064.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement endorses the budget and tax cuts approved by the District's Democrat mayor and majority Democrat city council, whose Republican members were important contributors to this effort. The conference agreement helps the District in its efforts to reorganize, cut costs, reduce overhead, and improve services. This conference agreement retains the initiatives that were in the initial House bill, such as Federal funding for the largest-ever effort to crack down on the link between drugs and crime, so the DC's streets and neighborhoods will be far safer. The conference agreement includes incentives to move children from foster care to adoption in a safe, loving, and permanent home, and $2.5 million in Federal funds to complete a community pediatric health initiative for high risk children in medically underserved areas of the District. We also retained the $17 million in Federal funds for tuition assistance so that D.C. high school graduates will have the same opportunities that exist for students in the 50 States who attend State-supported institutions of higher education. In addition, language in the initial House bill strengthening the popular charter school movement in the District has been retained. The conference agreement also includes Federal funding to clean up pollution in the Anacostia River and to complete all design and other requirements for the construction of expanded lane capacity for the 14th Street Bridge across the Potomac River.

This conference agreement, as did the first one (House Report 106–299), totals $429 million in Federal funds which is $24 million below the house bill, $18 million above the Senate bill, and $255 million below last year's bill. The reduction of $255 million below last year's bill is due to several non-recurring items funded last year. The total conference amount of $429 million is $24 million below our 302(b) allocations in budget authority and outlays. In District funds, the conference agreement provides $6.8 billion of which $5.4 billion for operating expenses is $7 million below the House level, $29 million above the Senate bill, and $284 million above last year; however, included in this $284 million increase is a ''rainy day'' reserve fund of $150 million.

The conferees have included language under Defender Services that will allow the use of $1.2 million to pay attorneys for their services to indigents in FY 1999. Because the D.C. Courts underestimated the amount required for this program, language has been included in the conference report allowing FY 2000 funds for court operations and defender services to be used to pay for FY 1999 and FY 2999 attorney services for indigents in the event the regular appropriation is insufficient. This language will allow the appointments and payments to continue without disruption.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to make clear that language in the conference report permitting the courts to use FY 2000 funds to pay excess FY 1999 obligations does not in any way waive any possible applications of the Anti-Deficiency Act to the courts on the grounds that the obligation to make payments to these attorneys exceeded the obligational authority available for making those payments. The courts are not absolved of their responsibility and accountability under the Anti-Deficiency Act.

Title II of the conference agreement commends the District for reducing taxes and ratifies the city's action in that regard. One of the initiatives taken by local officials in agreeing to a consensus budget for fiscal year 2000 is to reduce income and property taxes by $300 million over the next 5 years, including $59 million in fiscal 2000. I want to acknowledge that Republican members of the District's city council, although outnumbered, contributed significantly to the tax reduction enacted by the District government. In fact, one of the two council members who spearheaded the tax cut was a Republican member.

I will include a table showing the amounts recommended in the conference agreement compared with last year's enacted amount, the budget request, and the House and Senate recommendations.

In closing, I want to thank all of our Members for their hard work and their contributions to this bill, especially the Chairman of the Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Florida, BILL YOUNG. He has displayed an amazing degree of patience, good judgment, and resolve in getting us to this point.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for an ''aye'' vote on the adoption of this conference report.

I reserve the balance of my time.

H.R. 3064 - DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
FEDERAL FUNDS						
District of Columbia Resident Tuition Support			17,000	17,000	17,000	+17,000
Incentives for Adoption of Foster Children			5,000	5,000	5,000	+5,000
Citizens Complaint Review Board			500	500	500	+500
Federal Payment for Human Services			250	250	250	+250
Metrorail improvements and expansion	25,000					-25,000
Federal payment for management reform	25,000					-25,000
Federal payment for Boys Town U.S.A	7,100					-7,100
Nation's Capital Infrastructure Fund	18,778					-18,778
Environmental Study and Related Activities at Lorton Correctional Complex	7,000					-7,000
Federal payment to the District of Columbia corrections trustee operations	184,800	176,000	176,000	176,000	176,000	-8,800
Federal payment to the District of Columbia Courts	128,000	137,440	99,714	99,714	99,714	-28,286
Defender Services in D.C. Courts			33,336	33,336	33,336	+33,336
Federal payment to the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency of the District of Columbia	59,400	80,300	93,800	93,800	93,800	+34,400
Federal payment for Metropolitan Police Department	1,200		1,000	1,000	1,000	-200
Federal payment for Fire Department	3,240					-3,240
Federal payment for Georgetown Waterfront	1,000					-1,000
Federal payment to Historical Society for City Museum	2,000					-2,000
Federal payment for a National Museum of American Music and Downtown Revitalization	700					-700
United States Park Police	8,500					-8,500
Federal payment for waterfront improvements	3,000					-3,000
Federal payment for mentoring services	200					-200
Federal payment for hotline services	50					-50
Federal payment for public charter schools	15,622					-15,622
Medicare Coordinated Care Demonstration Project	3,000					-3,000
Federal payment for Children's National Medical Center	1,000		2,500	2,500	2,500	+1,500
National Revitalization Financing:						
Economic Development	25,000					-25,000
Special Education	30,000					-30,000
Year 2000 Information Technology	20,000					-20,000
Infrastructure and Economic Development	50,000					-50,000
Y2K conversion emergency funding (courts)	2,249					-2,249
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	61,800					-61,800
Total, Federal funds to the District of Columbia	683,639	393,740	429,100	429,100	429,100	-254,539
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS						
Operating Expenses						
Governmental direction and support	(164,144)	(174,667)	(167,356)	(167,356)	(167,356)	(+3,212)
Economic development and regulation	(159,039)	(190,335)	(190,335)	(190,335)	(190,335)	(+31,296)
Public safety and justice	(755,786)	(778,670)	(778,770)	(778,770)	(778,770)	(+22,984)
Public education system	(788,956)	(850,411)	(867,411)	(867,411)	(867,411)	(+78,455)
Human support services	(1,514,751)	(1,525,996)	(1,526,361)	(1,526,361)	(1,526,361)	(+11,610)
Public works	(266,912)	(271,395)	(271,395)	(271,395)	(271,395)	(+4,483)
Receivership Programs	(318,979)	(337,077)	(342,077)	(342,077)	(342,077)	(+23,098)
Workforce Investments		(8,500)	(8,500)	(8,500)	(8,500)	(+8,500)
Buyouts and Management Reforms			(18,000)	(18,000)	(18,000)	(+18,000)
Reserve		(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)	(+150,000)
District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority	(7,840)	(3,140)	(3,140)	(3,140)	(3,140)	(-4,700)
Financing and other		(384,948)				
Washington Convention Center Transfer Payment	(5,400)					(-5,400)
Repayment of Loans and Interest	(382,170)		(328,417)	(328,417)	(328,417)	(-53,753)
Repayment of General Fund Recovery Debt	(38,453)		(38,286)	(38,286)	(38,286)	(-167)
Payment of Interest on Short-Term Borrowing	(11,000)		(9,000)	(9,000)	(9,000)	(-2,000)
Certificates of Participation	(7,926)		(7,950)	(7,950)	(7,950)	(+24)
Human development	(6,674)					(-6,674)
Optical and Dental Insurance payments			(1,295)	(1,295)	(1,295)	(+1,295)
Productivity Bank			(18,000)	(18,000)	(18,000)	(+18,000)
Productivity Savings			(-18,000)	(-18,000)	(-18,000)	(-18,000)
Procurement and Management Savings	(-10,000)	(-21,457)	(-21,457)	(-21,457)	(-21,457)	(-11,457)
Total, operating expenses, general fund	(4,418,030)	(4,653,682)	(4,686,836)	(4,686,836)	(4,686,836)	(+268,806)
Enterprise Funds						
Water and Sewer Authority and the Washington Aqueduct	(273,314)	(279,608)	(279,608)	(279,608)	(279,608)	(+6,294)
Lottery and Charitable Games Control Board	(225,200)	(234,400)	(234,400)	(234,400)	(234,400)	(+9,200)
Office of Cable Television	(2,108)					(-2,108)
Public Service Commission	(5,026)					(-5,026)
Office of People's Counsel	(2,501)					(-2,501)
Office of Insurance and Securities Regulation	(7,001)					(-7,001)
Office of Banking and Financial Institutions	(640)					(-640)
Sports and Entertainment Commission	(8,751)	(10,846)	(10,846)	(10,846)	(10,846)	(+2,095)
Public Benefit Corporation	(66,764)	(89,008)	(89,008)	(89,008)	(89,008)	(+22,244)
D.C. Retirement Board	(18,202)	(9,892)	(9,892)	(9,892)	(9,892)	(-8,310)

H.R. 3064 - DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
Correctional Industries Fund	(3,332)	(1,810)	(1,810)	(1,810)	(1,810)	(-1,522)
Washington Convention Center	(48,139)	(50,226)	(50,226)	(50,226)	(50,226)	(+2,087)
Total, Enterprise Funds	(660,978)	(675,790)	(675,790)	(675,790)	(675,790)	(+14,812)
Total, operating expenses	(5,079,008)	(5,329,472)	(5,362,626)	(5,362,626)	(5,362,626)	(+283,618)
Capital Outlay						
General fund	(1,711,161)	(1,218,638)	(1,218,638)	(1,218,638)	(1,218,638)	(-492,523)
Water and Sewer Fund	.....	(197,169)	(197,169)	(197,169)	(197,169)	(+197,169)
Total, Capital Outlay	(1,711,161)	(1,415,807)	(1,415,807)	(1,415,807)	(1,415,807)	(-295,354)
Total, District of Columbia funds	(6,790,169)	(6,745,279)	(6,778,433)	(6,778,433)	(6,778,433)	(-11,736)
Total:						
Federal Funds to the District of Columbia	683,639	393,740	429,100	429,100	429,100	-254,539
District of Columbia funds	(6,790,169)	(6,745,279)	(6,778,433)	(6,778,433)	(6,778,433)	(-11,736)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to transportation cuts in this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

(Mr. GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the latest Republican majority appropriations scheme.

For weeks they tried to craft a Labor/HHS/Education spending bill that would be acceptable to the American people, and for weeks they failed.

Everyone on Capitol Hill spends a lot of time talking about priorities. And to be honest, we all have the same goal—which is to convince the American people that we are really fighting for their priorities.

But the old adage ''actions speak louder than words'' has never been truer.

While the majority Republicans like to say improving education is one of their top priorities, how are we supposed to react when they use the money that was designated for education funding to offset the spending for their real priorities.

For weeks Democrats have been asking the Republicans to show us their budget plan, and for weeks the Republicans have refused. Today, we finally see why.

Under this bill, every education program will be cut by almost 1 percent. This may not sound like a big deal, and the Republicans will tell us all day that such a small percentage will not have a negative impact. Well what this bill will do is: Blocks nearly 300,000 students from receiving needed math and reading tutoring services under Title I; cuts $200 million from the class-size reduction initiative; and cuts after school care and programs for nearly 1,000,000 children.

The Republicans claim this 1 percent cut will only impact government waste—is that what they think of our Nation's children?

For weeks the Republican leadership has been delaying bringing this bill to the floor.

Today, we learned why.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, 3 minutes does not give me an opportunity, obviously, to discuss this bill or the fiscal shenanigans that are going on in this bill. But I do want to focus on one facet of this bill, the National Institutes of Health.

We have all heard the phrase ''women and children first.'' That, essentially, means that we want to give to women and children priority. This phase has been women, children, and the sick and workers last. This bill has been held hostage to the last. Why? Because the President places a priority on women, children, workers, and the sick.

My distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), cares a lot about NIH. I want to tell the chairman, and I am sure he knows this, I am surprised that he would support this bill. Because under this bill, Mr. Speaker, they are proposing to spend this fiscal year that we are in now 1.5 billion less than President Clinton suggested. Hear me, $1.5 billion less.

I will tell my colleagues that people are concerned about this because it will delay such a large part. NIH budget will be a massive managerial challenge but much more importantly will force the delay of research grants and delay of clinical trials.

My friends, the chairman of our committee so critically involved in bone marrow transplants knows how timely action is. We are delaying clinical trials for cancer patients. We are delaying clinical trials for victims of heart disease. We are delaying clinical trials for victims of AIDS. We are delaying clinical trials for children with serious, life-threatening diseases. We are delaying them until September 29 and 30. That is 11 months away.

Who of my colleagues would stand and say to a critically ill child, wait 11 months while we underfund by $1.5 billion what the President asked for NIH funding? We pretend that we are giving NIH $17.9 billion. But we are saying, hey, guess what. Forty-two percent of it they cannot spend. Women, children, sick and workers last.

Why have we done this? To save Social Security? The majority leader of their party says that Social Security ought to be done away with. Let us reject this bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am now happy to yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to get off my stride. But let me say that the Republicans, recognizing that the National Institutes of Health really are one of the crown jewels of the Federal Government, have had historic increases in NIH, something that has never been seen before, a 15 percent increase last year, a 14 percent increase this year.

But on to the other subject at hand. And that is, as I have been passing by this floor and past the television sets, listening to the debate, I have begun to observe that it is seemingly impossible for this House not to denigrate just about anything we do. It is remarkable to me as I stop and I watch this debate.

For the first time since man walked on the Moon, we have balanced the budget, when we include all the spending that the Federal Government makes versus all the revenue that has come in. Since the first time we have walked on the Moon, we are in balance. And now, to my own surprise, we are actually going to balance the operating part of the Federal budget without stealing from Social Security.

And do my colleagues know what? As Members of this House, we feel compelled to wipe that off the slate, to ignore an accomplishment that a couple years ago was beyond our imagination, when we have got budgets from downtown that puts spending in the red as far as the eye could see, and now we find ourselves not only balancing the unified budget, but we no longer have to take from Social Security.

Should we not, just for a second, shake one another's hands across the aisle and maybe even send some kudos down Pennsylvania Avenue that, for the first time, we have demonstrated something people thought was impossible in this town and it has resulted in a stronger economy, a major contributing factor?

Now, some of the critics of our approach today say that we are spending into Social Security; and then out of the other side of their mouths they say we are not spending enough.

Well, which is it? We cannot be spending too little and at the same time be spending too much. Pick an argument, choose one of them, and stay with it. They are going to give politics a bad name.

Now, this Republican majority has started a firewall. Is it the greatest firewall? I do not know if it is the best one, but it is a pretty good one.

What we are saying is we are not going to reach into that Social Security surplus and we are going to use the Office of Management and Budget as the traffic cop to add up the numbers, not as the economic estimates, but the traffic cop.

The President shut down the Government over the issue of OMB being the traffic cop. And we have decided to go along. We have decided to say that the President's Office of Management and Budget, as provided under the law and provided for by the United States courts, will be the referee and the arbiter of whether we are into Social Security.

And now we as Republicans, joined by I hope some of my colleagues on the Democratic side, have used the extraordinary tactic of an across-the-board cut to make sure that that traffic cop does not give us a ticket for a violation.

In my tenure in the House of Representatives, in 17 years, we have never, as on a voluntary measure by elected Members of Congress, cut across the board in order to achieve this objective.

☐ 1500

Will we stay out of Social Security? I am not sure. It is likely we will stay out of Social Security. But we are fighting on the margins, are we not, on this issue, because we have never achieved this much in any of our tenure.

Now, why do we want to stay out of Social Security? Because we do not want to commit the money to any other program. We want to use it to

pay down some debt, which is good for this economy, and we want to preserve those dollars as a leverage to transform Social Security, not just for the seniors but for us and our children, so we can regenerate this system and we do not want to blow this opportunity and reduce our leverage. The Committee on the Budget 5 years ago and working with my friends in the Committee on Appropriations who from time to time we get into fights in the hallway with, we sat down 5 years ago and we plotted a road map. We have made some real progress. Have we made all the progress on that road map that I would like? You have just got to ask the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and he will tell you, ''Of course not. The gentleman from Ohio is never happy with any of the level of spending we have. He is always complaining it is too much.'' But we are moving forward on this road map.

Today rather than spending our time debating about the crumbs, debating about the margins and about obscuring a message to the American people who have become cynical because of the failed promises of politicians, let us for once keep our eye on the ball, hold our heads high, congratulate one another of different philosophies and different parties and different branches of government. And while we can continue to fight on the margin and while we can continue to advance on this road map, let us just celebrate how far we have come and how far we have come in contributing to the benefit of our great country. I hope we will support this bill and today will be a day of celebration, not just a day of argument.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, despite the fiction we have just heard, we have a letter from the head of the Congressional Budget Office which spells out that the Republican budget so far has eaten into $17 billion of the Social Security surplus. So much for the fiction we just heard.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the public has every right to be cynical about a Republican House leadership whose majority leader said several weeks ago that Social Security was a bad retirement and a rotten trick on the American people. This is from the party who today claims that in fact they want to save and preserve Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this irresponsible budget, one that does nothing to extend the life of Social Security, does nothing to add a prescription drug benefit for Medicare, but does a lot of harm and hurt to real families in this country. I oppose this bill because it is chock full of accounting tricks. But the cruelest trick of all is the delay in funding to the National Institutes of Health. This bill would delay $7.5 billion in funding for the National Institutes of Health, amounting to 42 percent of their budget, 60 percent of its research grants.

Let me just say, what is the National Institutes of Health for those who may not know? What is it but our Nation's leading biomedical research effort, to investigate cures and treatments for every disease, for cancer, for diabetes, for arthritis. The list is endless. Why the delay? In order to keep up this budget charade, their absurd claim that they are not spending Social Security, even though the Congressional Budget Office says that they have already dipped into the Social Security surplus to the tune of $17 billion. So to keep up the budget charade, this bill says that no funding could go to the National Institutes of Health, to their researchers, the people who work on these cures and treatments until the last final days of the fiscal year of next year.

What does this mean for medical research? It means delay. It would mean delay in research, delay in hiring, delay in salaries for a year. It is outrageous.

Mr. Speaker, as a cancer survivor, I am offended with a bill that plays games with biomedical research. We make strides every day in cancer research. That is why this is so cruel. Cancer knows no fiscal year. A family struggling with this life-and-death disease cannot wait a year. They need hope now. As a survivor, I know something about the power of hope. I know what it is like to pray for a cure. I know what it is like to put your life in the hands of doctors and of researchers. I would not be alive today if it were not for the advances in medical research. Advances in cancer research saved my life and every day in laboratories around this country men and women are making those life-saving discoveries that will change the lives of people that they have never met, families huddled in a hospital room, praying for a loved one to have the chance at life. Research cures cancer. Research gives hope. Delays in medical research funding plays games with people's lives.

We were sent here to do well by the people that put their trust in us, not to do harm. This bill does harm. Oppose it.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I thank the chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, a valued member of my subcommittee as well, for allowing us to attach our bill to his bill and bring it through the process.

Let me say that earlier in the debate on the CR and in the debate on the rule, the charge was correctly made that this bill was not heard fully on the floor of the House of Representatives, was not shaped by the Members of the House as it should have been, and that we did not carry out our constitutional responsibility, particularly in view of the fact that spending bills must originate in the House. While the bill was shaped as it should have been in the subcommittee and in the full committee, I accept that criticism, it is fair and right, and I regret that the normal process was not able to be followed.

But let me say that beyond that criticism, much of the rest of what I have heard is not fair criticism, it is simply political talk.

Members that vote on this conference report are going to be voting to protect the Social Security trust fund. To achieve this end has not been easy given the competing spending demands and the small size of the non-trust fund surplus. And this conference report does rely on advance appropriations, delayed obligations and additional offsets provided in the leadership package, primarily a .97 percent across-the-board reduction.

But let me say, Mr. Speaker, that this is the first time that we have attempted to do this and that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for 17 years did nothing to protect the Social Security trust fund and raided it to the tune of $850 billion in IOUs . . . They never even tried. We are trying to save the trust fund, and all they give us is political criticism. We should get credit for trying to do something that the minority never even attempted when they controlled the House.

This bill, the Labor, Health and Human Services and Education portion of it, is funded at a slightly higher level than the President suggested in his budget. There are cuts in it, yes, because we do not agree on policy matters with the President. There are also increases where the President did not provide adequate funding for programs that we think are higher priorities. Education is level-funded; HHS, we spend more; Labor, we spend slightly less. Overall, the funding is slightly more than the President's. We plus-up the Job Corps more than the President. We think it is a higher priority. We plus-up consolidated health centers higher than the President. We think it is a very important priority. Despite all the rhetoric, we plus-up NIH by the second largest increase in its entire history, 14 percent, and last year it was 15 percent. And yes, all of that money will eventually be paid out, even under our plan. It will be paid out for the research for which it is appropriated. We put more money in for Ryan White AIDS than the President.

We are $320 million above the President total in education funding. Impact Aid is higher than the President. The maximum Pell grant is set at $3,300, which is higher than the President's request. TRIO, higher than the President. Special education, $679 million for disabled children, higher than the President.

Now, do we make some cuts? Do we fail to fund some programs that the

President has suggested? Yes. But, ladies and gentlemen of the House, it is our responsibility as the legislative branch to fashion a bill that we think is proper for this country and the President's only role in the legislative process is to veto it if he disagrees. It is our prerogative to write the priorities, not his, and that is exactly what we do.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good conference report. It assures that the Social Security trust fund remains secure. It is the first time it has been attempted ever. The other side never attempted it once. Give us some credit, ladies and gentlemen. We are doing our best to do the work for the American people to protect Social Security, to fund vital programs that work for people, that get positive result in their lives. I think this is a bill every Member of this Chamber ought to support.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, this is a very unfortunate day, because this bill that comes before this body today has been traditionally a bill that brings us together. It says that the strength of our country is measured not only in our military might but in the health, education and well-being of the American people. Mr. Natcher always called it the people's bill.

So it is unfortunate that this bill today has become a mockery. It has become a mockery because it is being used by the Republican majority to say that a vote for this bill today is a vote to protect Social Security. Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, the Republicans are spending tens of billions of dollars of Social Security funds in this whole budget process while misrepresenting that to the American people.

In this bill, we fund the National Institutes of Health. This funding gives hope to the American people. It is a place where we say the NIH has the biblical power to cure. And while everyone's hopes were raised while there was talk of the increased funding in the bill for the NIH, those hopes were quickly dashed when the budget gimmickry of the Republican Party was demonstrated, that $7 billion, 40 percent of the NIH budget, would be delayed, the spending would be delayed until the end of the fiscal year, the last day or two of the fiscal year. That means 40 percent of the funding, 60 percent of the grants.

Every one of us knows people who have written to us about health problems in their families, be it breast cancer, prostate cancer. I have in my own community a woman Meg who has suffered from a disease, a little known one, called EDS. She and thousands of her friends suffer from this disease and the only hope they have is the National Institutes of Health. This is a disorder of the connective system that can lead to premature death, crippling and disfigurement, mostly to women. So they were very hopeful when this bill urged the National Institutes of Health to look into this issue. Biomedical research is the best hope for people with diseases, especially some of these diseases that no one has ever heard of. Our former Speaker Mr. Tip O'Neill, Speaker O'Neill, said all politics is local. But in this bill, all politics is personal. It is as personal as the woman with breast cancer, or the man with prostate cancer, my friend Meg with EDS, or people with AIDS who look to us for hope. And what do they get? Budget gimmickry. It is a very, very sad testimony.

Another area in education, this bill cuts 1 million students from after-school programs. In one place after another from the cradle to the rocking chair, this bill is a disservice to the American people. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

□ 1515

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA), another member of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

(Mr. BONILLA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

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

The rhetoric I hear from our friends on the other side of the political aisle today reminds me of Chicken Little, and if we look at their faces, they are telling us over and over again that the sky is falling and we are facing tremendous disaster if we vote for this bill, and I think that the American people are smarter than that by now, to listen to the same message over and over and over again.

Mr. Speaker, I think I heard one of my colleagues say this morning that this bill hurts every family in America. I think that their arguments have to start changing to include a little more substance and reality about what we are doing here today. The truth of the matter is, and these are real numbers, that this bill is the People's bill, and we do so much in spite of the budget restraints we now live under that were not only voted upon by this Congress, but signed into law by the President.

Mr. Speaker, let us not forget that the President signed the law that we, after we gave him the bill that says we have limits now on what we can spend, because it is no different than any family, than any business out there that has to face fiscal constraints year after year for the benefit of the greater good of the organization, the family or the corporation; and we are having to make some tough decisions, but nonetheless have kept as the highest priority funding for health care, like the Community and Migrant Health Care Centers that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) pointed out earlier for the Trio education program that we have increased funding for that that has held so many people in low-income neighborhoods like myself, frankly, when I was a teenager, a program that helped give me that lift to go to college and to graduate from college, and other programs like health professions, nurses and dental hygienists and assistants out there looking for that first break to provide a service for the community.

We give more money to these programs, more money than the President has asked for in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, if we visit with people out in the heartland who are running these medical programs, for example, they are all recognizing the truth in what we are trying to accomplish. I just met about an hour ago with representatives from the March of Dimes from my hometown in San Antonio, and I told them what we tried to do with programs that provide for folic acid for mothers, expectant mothers, so that we can cut back on birth defects in our country and in our State; and they understand what we are trying to do, and they know that we are trying to help families out there in the heartland.

And I am just hoping that as people watch this debate, they will listen to the sincerity of what we are trying to portray here today of our efforts to try to help America in every neighborhood out there whether it involves an education program or a health care program, because I think that if we watch the faces of those who will step up right after me that we will see the face of Chicken Little, and we all remember the story on how misinformed Chicken Little was.

Mr. Speaker, I think that in our colleagues' hearts they know that this misinformation that is being put out there over and over again is no longer selling with the American people.

Stand with us, stand with the President to understand that we have got to cut spending yet provide for these important services for the American people.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding this time to me.

This debate opened with the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), indicating that we would not hear much about the District of Columbia during this debate on the District of Columbia bill. That is what is wrong with this bill. But I am not going to let my colleagues forget what they are doing to the people of the District of Columbia. It is hard to regard what we have before us as a bill at all.

The District of Columbia, of course, had a bill number before us, but that is what we have been degraded to because we are serving other purposes, we are serving other masters. The Labor-HHS

appropriation has been slopped together, bypassed committee, bypassing debate on this floor, thrown over the transom on to the backs of the people of the District of Columbia. Makes the D.C. appropriation, our smallest, a beast of burden for the largest appropriation.

What kind of way is this to treat a city pulling itself up by its bootstraps in the full throes of recovery with a new mayor, a reformed City Council meeting the expectations of its own residents, meeting the expectations of the Congress?

Early meetings with the Mayor, a promise to try to get out our appropriation first out? We are the last out, Mr. Speaker. At early hearings, our subcommittee chair worked with us on problems that we ironed out throughout; and yet, Mr. Speaker, the ultimate response was more riders on the D.C. appropriation than in 25 years of home rule.

Today, we see further delay on our bill even after Senate and House appropriations have worked mightily to try to deal with our differences.

This is a minimally signable bill. I can only accept it if I have to.

The worst part of this process today is that it is all for naught, that a veto is assured. It is cynical; it is irregular. If at least the bill would be signed, something might be said for it. Instead the District of Columbia is caught in the middle. We are being stepped on, then walked over.

This body often gets up on the other side of the aisle to rant about its constitutional claim to work in the best interests of the Nation's Capital. By this process today, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues have forfeited any claim by throwing the people of the Nation's Capital to the winds.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this measure.

If my colleagues vote for this bill, they are voting to cut the Department of Defense budget by 2.6 billion.

Now, a lot has been said that it is 1 percent. That is 2.6 billion. That is the equivalent of three destroyers or two amphibious assault ships. Mr. Speaker, that is enough money to get the 12,000 soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines that we know are on food stamps off of food stamps and buy 175 Black Hawk helicopters, replacing 30 year old Hueys that they are flying around in today.

Almost all of the cuts come at the expense of the Department of Defense, and we are not talking about something that would have been. It is the law right now. Our colleagues are cutting the budget that went into effect this week when the President signed it.

So if my colleagues admit that we have to save some money, then let us set priorities, but do not cut from the one thing that the Nation has to do. The States can do almost everything else, but we have to defend the Nation.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, let me give my colleagues some facts.

The gentlewoman from Connecticut said that we were cutting NIH because we delayed 40 percent. My colleagues support the President's budget which only increased NIH 2 percent, so even if we delay 40 percent, remaining 60 percent, we fund more than they do under the budget now; and then the remaining 40 percent will also be spent, which is 12 percent more than the President, that his entire plan supports.

So what I would say to my colleagues: listen to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH).

I am also a cancer survivor, and I am glad the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) was a cancer survivor, and one of our priorities is to double medical research. The gentleman knows that, and we fight for it, and I believe in it.

It is also our priority to keep our word not to touch Social Security and Medicare, and I will do everything I can to make sure that that happens.

But we increased health care medical research by 15 percent last time, 14 percent this time; and we are going to continue to do that because I feel that is one of the gifts that we can give to this great country.

As far as defense, General Shelton is one of my heroes. I mean he could break me in half with his training and his experience in combat. But I am disappointed in General Shelton. He testified before our committee on defense and said that the President's budget was adequate for defense. That was before we added $16 billion to defense. And then he comes out and says, well, this 1 percent will hurt defense. I do not like reducing defense myself, but at the expense of Social Security and Medicare and our other priorities to save and stay under the balanced budget?

The gentlewoman said from D.C. said this is all for naught. I think it is important for us to lay down a marker and say: What do we really stand for? For health care? For education?

The other day, yesterday in the conference, one of the members from the other body said, Oh, you're cutting education.

Chairman said, No. We are adding $350 million above what the President asked, and we're adding more than we spent next year.

And the gentleman says, Oh, you're cutting education because that's not what we originally wanted to put in there.

That argument is wrong. Join with us and say we are adding money to education and health care.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON).

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Will the gentleman from Illinois remove the ribbon-badge from his lapel?

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I apologize for being out of dress code, Mr. Speaker.

(Mr. JACKSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report.

Members on the other side of the aisle falsely claim that this conference report saves Social Security while increasing spending over the President's request for education and certain health care programs. When did Members from the other side of the aisle start to care about Social Security? Just 3 months ago Members from the other side of the aisle were peddling an almost $800 billion tax cut that did not help save Social Security, and today the Congressional Budget Office stated the Congress has already spent $17 billion of the Social Security surplus.

This report, like many of the spending bills before it, does not extend the life of Social Security by even 1 day. It fails to include a prescription drug benefit for Medicare, and it hurts every American family in some way. The Labor-HHS and Education bill should help families in this country get through today and prepare for tomorrow. Unfortunately, this bill is loaded with reckless gimmicks and outrageous offsets. Here are just a few examples of some of them.

This report contains $10 billion in advanced appropriations creating a $19 billion hole for next year requiring a further raid of the Social Security surplus.

This report contains $11 billion in delayed obligations for the Departments of Health and Human Services. These delayed obligations will force the National Institutes for Health to not spend 60 percent of the NIH research grant budget until the last 2 days of Fiscal Year 2000. And the Centers For Disease Control and Prevention, this delayed obligation represents 60 percent of the total amount that the CBC awards for grants and cooperative agreements. This delay will interrupt programs that address infectious diseases, immunizations including children's vaccines, HIV/AIDS surveillance, and prevention activities and chronic diseases.

In the Health Resources and Services Administration this delayed obligation represents 25 percent of its budget, which will interrupt the provision of vital health services for 3 million underserved men, women, and children.

One of the most egregious offsets in this bill is the .97 percent government-wide across-the-board reduction.

□ 1530

This reduction is not about cutting waste, fraud and abuse, as the distinguished Budget chairman came a few

moments ago and talked about, in Federal agencies, as Members on the other side of the aisle continue to claim. In fact, there is very little discretion for agency heads to make decisions about these cuts. In the Meals on Wheels program, for example, this reduction will result in 1.1 million fewer meals and 8,400 fewer seniors being served. In the Head Start Program, this reduction will deny Head Start services to approximately 7,000 needy children. In Youth Training programs, this reduction will deny job training, summer employment and education opportunities to almost 6,000 disadvantaged youth.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, I hoped my colleagues and I would have been able to come up with a real bill that would have provided real differences for American families.

I am disappointed in the product we have before us and the process that has gotten us to this point, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this ill-conceived conference report.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, what I would like to do now is to yield several minutes successively so that Members of the North Carolina delegation can discuss their flood problems.

Mr. Speaker, I yield first 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this conference report. There are many grounds for objecting to the accounting gimmicks and the delayed payments in this bill, but the main objection hits very close to home: This bill has eliminated $508 million in emergency assistance for agricultural damage caused by Hurricane Floyd in North Carolina and other states. This assistance was approved unanimously by the Committee on Appropriations as a down payment on the crop and livestock losses that our farmers have suffered. It was accepted by our committee leadership very graciously. It is supported by the administration. Now it has been dropped.

The bill contains lots of emergency spending for other purposes. Why, then, was the $508 million in flood relief stripped from the bill, while another $2 billion was added in emergency funding, including $400 million in refugee assistance?

Assistance for refugees is admirable. I support it. But we have refugees from this storm, thousands of families who have lost their homes and possessions and may lose their farms. We have to help them get on their feet again.

This bill is deceptive in its accounting and uncaring in its elimination of assistance to hurricane and flood victims. I urge my colleagues to vote no.

Mr. Speaker I rise in opposition to this conference report. Despite laudable funding levels for many programs in the Labor/HHS/Education bill, it is fundamentally flawed in ways that require me to vote against it.

This bill pushes $14 billion for ongoing programs into FY 2001, and delays $11 billion in obligations until the end of FY 2000 for the National Institutes of Health, the Head Start program, and other priorities. But cancer doesn't wait; diabetes and Parkinson's Disease don't wait. This is not just an accounting gimmick, although it certainly is that; it also will delay critical research on which thousands of desperately sick people are depending.

The proposed 1 percent across-the-board cut in all discretionary accounts will also have real consequences for real people. According to the Office of Management and Budget, these cuts will deny childhood immunizations for up to 2,900 children, deny food and nutrition services to 71,000 women, infants, and children, and prevent 4,800 children and their families form receiving Head Start services. It is an irresponsible approach to reducing spending, since it does not distinguish between programs which might merit reductions and those which do not.

The most egregious flaw for me is a personal one, since it primarily affects my home state. My colleagues know that North Carolina experienced its worst natural disaster in recorded history when Hurricanes Dennis, Floyd, and Irene pounded the eastern part of our state between late August and mid-October. Thousands of North Carolinians are still suffering from the aftermath of the floodwaters, which are only now receding below flood stage in many areas. Entire towns have been destroyed in some cases. Over 15,000 homes were damaged to the point of being unlivable, and the infrastructure in many areas was severely damaged.

Eastern North Carolina is rural, and depends on a farm economy for sustenance. And unlike homeowners or small business owners, who are eligible for at least some direct assistance through FEMA or low-interest loans through the Small Business Administration, there is no authorized direct assistance program for losses suffered by farmers. The North Carolina delegation never had an opportunity to plead our case for emergency agriculture assistance through the Agriculture Appropriations conference, which would normally have been the proper place for such assistance. And while some of the $1.2 billion in agricultural assistance contained in that bill will benefit farmers in North Carolina and other affected states, substantial unmet needs still remain for our farmers.

As a consequence, I offered an amendment to the Labor/HHS appropriations bill during Appropriations Committee consideration in late September to provide $508 million in emergency assistance for agricultural damages caused by Hurricanes Dennis and Floyd. Since damage estimates at that time were incomplete but clearly substantial, I argued that this funding should be provided as a down payment on the needs that farmers in North Carolina and other affected states would be shown to have. Chairmen YOUNG and PORTER graciously accepted the amendment, and it was approved unanimously by the committee on a voice vote. Likewise, the administration signaled its support for this funding.

It seems highly unlikely that there will be a separate emergency supplemental bill this year to address the needs of states affected by the hurricanes and associated flooding. Our best and likely our only opportunity to provide timely assistance to the victims of this natural disaster is through pending FY 2000 appropriations bills—and Title X of the Labor-HHS bill, which contained this $508 million, was the obvious place to get the job done. The sensible thing would have been to use an updated estimate of emergency needs from North Carolina and the other states to refine the existing emergency provisions in the bill for agriculture and other areas of emergency need.

The omission is made all the more conspicuous and indefensible by the other emergency spending the bill contains. Why was the $508 million in flood relief stripped from the bill while $2 billion in other emergency designations remains, including $1.1 billion for the standard Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program and $427 million for assistance to refugees? Both of these are important programs, but hardly appropriate for emergency funding. Assistance for refugees from other countries is admirable, and I support it—but we have refugees in North Carolina, too—thousands of families who have lost their homes and their possessions. We must help them get on their feet again. How can they interpret the elimination of this emergency assistance as anything but a sign that Congress holds their suffering in contempt and does not care about their real and immediate need?

This bill is dishonest in its accounting and uncaring in its elimination of assistance to Hurricane victims. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

(Mr. WATT of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the bill and in support of my colleagues from North Carolina and their statements about the devastation and lack of attention that this bill pays to North Carolina's flood situation.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

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

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I associate my remarks with the previous speaker, my friend from North Carolina, and I join him in saying there are some good things, but this bill is a sham. It is a disgrace to our children and families in North Carolina who have lost everything in the flood of Hurricane Floyd. The Republican leadership found $2 billion for emergency relief in this bill, but cut out the $508 million for our folks who badly need it.

Mr. Speaker, there is an emergency in our State today. I have looked into the faces of the farmers and the families. I was with a family this weekend who had three children who lost everything they own, everything. I have met with farmers who have lost their crops, the widow who lost her husband, and 15,000 families who lost their homes.

The Republican leadership should be ashamed of themselves for playing politics with the lives of these people. In

North Carolina, normally the cold winds of winter come from the West. Today they are coming from the North, from Washington. I urge you to do better by our people.

This bill is a sham to our seniors, a sham to our children and a sham to thousands of families in North Carolina who have lost everything in the floods from Hurricane Floyd. The Republican leaders found $2 billion in emergency spending for this bill, but cut $508 million in emergency funds the committee had approved unanimously for Hurricane Floyd relief. Folks, we have an emergency in my state. I've seen the suffering and despair first hand. The farmer who has lost his crops, the widow who has lost her husband, and the fifteen thousand families that lost their homes and every possession they ever owned, can't wait any longer for the help they need to survive.

The Republican Leadership should be ashamed of themselves for playing politics with the lives of these people. Playing pay raise politics on this bill is an act of cowardice not worthy of the U.S. Congress. Winter is coming. In Northern Carolina, the cold air usually comes in from the West. But today, the cold air is coming from the North, a chill pouring in from Washington brought about by the cold-hearted politics being played with the lives of the people of my state. I urge every member, including my Republican colleagues from North Carolina, to cast a vote of conscience against this bill and not to vote for another spending bill until we take care of our own. We must help the people of eastern North Carolina get back on their feet, and we must help them now.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE).

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

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, let us talk about this one penny for every dollar. There was an amendment to this bill that would have given $508 million to help farmers who have lost everything. These are hours of desperation, not a time of celebration. This is a time of shame, shame on those who claim this helps American families.

Let us talk about substance and reality, when in fact it takes $423 million of our money to give to foreign refugees, and you will not give one penny to our farmers who have lost their homes, their equipment? They do not have a future.

This is the People's House. We are elected to serve our people first, and may God help us honor that commitment to the American people with every penny of every dollar.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

(Mrs. CLAYTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, normally the Labor bill we call the people's bill, a compassionate bill, a bill that cares about people's health, their welfare.

Well, you had an opportunity to do that, to really do that. $508 million would make a difference of humanity for farmers in my district. I tell you, more than 68,000 Americans who live in eastern North Carolina are affected. You are saying no to them when you refuse to take this opportunity. I say that this conference bill had a unique opportunity to live up to its humanity. This is inhumane. It is inhumane to assume that you would turn your back on farmers and those who are destitute at this time.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I have to rise regarding this issue. The three or four Members from North Carolina who just spoke sent me letters as chairman of my subcommittee thanking me, thanking me for providing for $2.5 billion in disaster assistance to FEMA for North Carolina, while my part of the country, the Northeast, was terribly underfunded for disaster relief because of drought, and they have the temerity to stand here and accuse us of disrespecting the needs of the lives and well-being of the people of North Carolina.

That is an outrage. It is an outrage for them on the one hand to demand that we help them, and I met with them, the entire delegation with their Governor, heard their pleas, heard their concerns, identified and empathized with them, and provided $2.5 billion in our bill on that request alone. For them to stand here and make these allegations against my party, I think it is just wrong, and I had to stand and state the truth.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would like for the gentleman to tell us how much agricultural aid was in that VA–HUD bill? He is talking about FEMA aid. We are very grateful for that. Of course, we are grateful for that.

But in the bill before us, we are talking about emergency aid to farmers who have no other way of getting direct payments for crop and livestock losses.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, we are talking about $2.5 billion in American taxpayer money going to Eastern North Carolina to help people solve their problems. That is our response.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, my question is, how much of that would be available for direct aid to farmers for crop loss?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, it is direct aid to people.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I think what the gentleman is talking about is apples and oranges. I think the gentleman from North Carolina is correct. He is talking about aid that farmers need that they are not getting.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) was on the floor a minute ago, and he said that we should really be celebrating our success. I agree. We have come a long way from 1992 when the deficit, even with a large surplus in Social Security, was $290 billion and headed up.

We passed three budgets to reverse that course, a budget summit in 1990, the Clinton Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act in '93, and the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, and my side put the votes on the board to pass those bills and we are proud of the accomplishment.

But one of the disciplines we implemented when we passed those bills was to put a ceiling, a cap, on discretionary spending, the stuff that runs the government. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) said we should not be denigrating this accomplishment, but how can you help but denigrate what this budget before us represents? Because what it does is make a mockery of the discretionary spending ceiling.

The discretionary spending ceiling for this year, according to CBO, is $580 billion in July, $579.8. We are $30 billion over that particular limit, $30 billion over that limit. We have exceeded the discretionary spending limits to that extent.

You can do that if is a genuine emergency, but the Census, an emergency? $4.4 billion? Spare parts, POL for the Army, an emergency? Give me a break. We are trashing the rules, the disciplines, that have gotten us to where we are in doing this.

The result was given to us this morning by CBO as soon as they saw what this bill, the Labor-HHS bill, appropriated. They scored the entire 13 bills that make up the discretionary spending budget, and here it is: The cap for this year is $580 billion. If we can attain that cap, CBO told us in July that we would have a surplus of $14 billion, without including Social Security. That gives us a target of $594 billion. As long as we keep the spending within that level, we do not have to dip into Social Security.

But what is the total according to CBO of outlays, total spending under all 13 appropriation bills passed by this House, controlled by the Republicans? $611 billion. The arithmetic is simple. We are $17 billion into Social Security.

Now, if you look at the letter CBO sent me this morning, and we have copies over here we will gladly share with you, that is Table 1. Look at Table 2.

Dr. Crippen goes on to say in Table 2 you do not have a 1 percent problem. If you want to cut across the board to put this budget back in balance and out of Social Security, you have got a 4.8 percent across-the-board problem. And if, because that would be disastrous for defense and veterans, you want to leave out veterans and defense, you have got a 10.8 percent problem.

So all of this talk about 1 percent across the board is just a minimum cut is poppycock. As soon as we recognize that, read CBO's letter, they are our neutral, nonpartisan budget shop. They have served us well. They have scored outlays over the last 6 years from 1993 to 1998 with an error factor of 0.4 percent. As soon as we take their advice and get this back in proper condition, then we can get out of this sham budgeting and into real budgeting and finally close this process. But it is not a 1 percent problem, it is a much bigger problem.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to get into this give and take on the political argument, but I listened to this rhetoric about the farm emergencies, and let me tell you what the truth is, and here is the paperwork, the documentation that proves it.

Last year this Congress added as an emergency amount of money for the farm emergencies $6 billion, $5.916 billion, to be exact. Then, when the next supplemental request came from the administration, we added to that request for the Hurricane Mitch supplemental $700 million. Most of it was not requested, we added it. Then in the regular fiscal year 2000 agriculture bill, which we passed and the President has signed, we added $8.7 billion to deal with farm emergencies. The President did not request any of this $8.7 billion. We still do not have a request from the President for agricultural losses this hurricane season.

Now, for someone over there to stand and say this Congress has neglected the farmer and the emergencies in the agriculture community is just not right. It is not accurate. It is not truthful. It is purely political rhetoric. The facts are here, and you are welcome to look at them.

□ 1545

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Kentucky (Mrs. NORTHUP), a member of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a real thrill to be here today and to be part of this debate.

When I ran for Congress in 1995, what I told my constituents was that there was a new day in this country, a day of talking about restraint, a day of talking about balancing the budget, a day of talking about Social Security and saving Social Security, and that it was going to require a lot of courage, it was going to require us to look at things differently, but that I felt that I could be part of that debate and part of that solution.

Since I arrived in 1996, the first thing we tackled was balancing the budget. It was a thrill to me when we passed the balanced budget amendments and set ourselves on a course that we were going to restrain spending and balance the budget.

But even then, we did not imagine that we would be able to, as quickly as now, also restrain ourselves from spending Social Security surpluses. Let us give the economy credit, certainly that has been part of it, but we could have gone right on and spent. In fact, what we have heard today is one speaker after the other from the minority side talking about spend more, spend more, spend more, spend it faster, spend it faster, spend it faster.

If we had stepped up every single budget bill we have had before us, every single appropriations bill we have had this year, and spent what they asked us to, we would have gotten way back into the past type of thinking. But because of the restraint of the leadership, the discipline of the subcommittee chairs and the chairmen, we have held to the idea that we have to restrain ourselves, and for the sake of social security.

I am tired of hearing people say social security is safe, that we have put a note in there saying it is an IOU and we are going to owe it, because our children in 2010 are going to have to start paying that back.

We do not have things that we can sell, assets that we can sell to cash it in. It is not in stocks. It is not in things that we can cash in. It would be like me spending my six kids' college funds on new clothes and saying, I am going to put an IOU in there. That is great. When they start to college, what do I have to sell to give them their money back? We are not going to sell our airports, we are not going to still our schools, we are not going to sell our locks and dams.

We have no assets to sell, no assets to sell. The only assets we have are my six children, who are going to go to work and have to start paying for this spending that we did not restrain ourselves from in the past.

So out of great love and admiration for my 77-year-old parents, who are not going to make anymore money than they have in the bank, we are securing Social Security. For those grandchildren and my six children who are going to carry the burden forever, we are restraining our spending so they might have it in their day.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding time to me.

Because 950,000 children will have no place to go after school when this bill passes, Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this legislation, and ask us to get back to work for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to strongly oppose this appropriations bill.

The majority has made a mockery of the appropriations process by attaching the Labor HHS appropriations bill to the DC appropriations bill. Because the bill has been presented in this manner, we cannot amend this bill that is flawed in almost every way. This political maneuvering simply breeds more partisanship, and it only sharply divides the House when we should be working together for the American people.

On a program level comparison, the House Labor HHS appropriations bill is almost $4 billion or 4% below the President's Budget request. It is about $5 billion or 6% below the funding level contained in the bill currently under consideration in the Republican-controlled U.S. Senate. Excluding the National Institutes of Health, which received a $1.3 billion increase in the bill, the remaining programs in the bill are in the aggregate cut close to $1 billion below current year levels. There are 45 major programs cut below 1999 or eliminated entirely in the bill that total almost $2 billion in cuts.

This situation is untenable, and the bill in its current form is a sham. It is our responsibility to draft an appropriations bill that works.

This bill denies 42,000 children a ''Head Start'' in life. Research has shown consistently that Head Start helps low-income children get ready and stay ready for school, improves parenting, and helps parents get on the road to economic and social self sufficiency. There are over 2 million low-income children under the age of 5 who are eligible for Head Start, but the program currently provides services to only 835,000 children, 40% of those who are eligible. The President's request of $5.3 billion would provide a Head Start experience to an additional 42,000 children (including 7,000 children ages 0 to 3) and their families as part of the Administration's commitment to enrolling 1 million children in Head Start by 2002.

The Appropriations recommendation, however, is a full $507 million below the President's request. This cut would have drastic implications in my home State of Texas. The recommendation would result in a $43 million cut for Head Start funding in Texas. This substantial reduction in funding would have severe consequences on the Texas children and would diminish the positive impact that Head Start has had in my State.

The bill repeals last year's bipartisan agreement to dedicate funding solely for Class Size Reduction, jeopardizing the President's goal of helping schools to hire 100,000 new teachers. The Committee bill eliminates a total of $2.2 billion in funding requested for Class Size Reduction, Goals 2000 and the Eisenhower Teacher Training Program. In the State of Texas, this cut would result in a $26 million cut to the Eisenhower Teacher Training Program, a $37 million cut to the Goals 2000 Program, and an almost $114 million cut to the Class Size Reduction Program. Texas cannot sustain such a loss in Federal funding, and I greatly fear for the continued success of these programs.

Not only does the bill cut the President's combined request for the Class Size Reduction, Goals 2000 (state grants) and Eisenhower Teacher Training programs by $396 million, it also cuts the funding level proposed by the House Committee on Education and Workforce for the teacher training/class size block grant program by $200 million or 10%. The Teacher Empowerment Act is a new teacher training/class size block grant program that has passed the House, but not the Senate, and has not been enacted into law. Should the Teacher Empowerment Act fail to become law, assistance to schools would be cut not by $200 million, but by $2.0 billion below the 1999 level for the programs combined into the block grant.

This bill also cuts back on funding for GEAR UP. In 1994, only 49 percent of low-income students attended a postsecondary institution within two years of high school. Of these students, only 19 percent attended a 4-year college, in contrast with 70 percent of high-income students. The GEAR UP program is designed to help these students. By starting disadvantaged middle school students on an academic path, it raises their educational expectations through early college preparation and awareness activities, and gives them the skills and encouragement they need to successfully pursue a college education. In my hometown of Houston, Texas, The University of Houston has forged an alliance with HISD through GEAR UP, and this university has done much to ensure that low-income students have the opportunity to attend a four-year college.

The bill eliminates the GEAR UP program which was funded at $120 million in FY 1999, and for which the President requested $240 million for FY 2000. The bill would deny 572,000 low-income middle and high school students sustained, comprehensive support services including: counseling, tutoring, mentoring, parental involvement, after-school and summer activities, access to rigorous core courses needed for college, information about financial aid, and campus visits.

This appropriations bill also drastically underfunds America's Historically Black Colleges and Universities. Yet, one of our pressing national priorities is to increase the number of underrepresented minority and disadvantaged students who enter and successfully complete higher education. In 1995–1996 black, non-Hispanic students earned less than 8 pecent of the Bachelor's degrees conferred. To increase the success rate of African-American and other minority students, HBCUs need additional support to provide stronger academic programs and more comprehensive services to the growing number of African-American and other minority students. In Houston, Texas Southern University has been an exemplary institution and has provide innumerable opportunities for minority students. This bill effectively would undermine the work of this school.

In addition, the lack of diversity at the graduate level is becoming an important national concern. In 1995–1996 black, non-Hispanic students received only 6.4 percent of the Master's and 3.7 percent of the Doctor's degree conferred. As we work to increase the number of minority students who pursue graduate education, we have to provide sufficient support to ensure that HBGIs (graduate institutions) are prepared to serve these students adequately.

This bill provides level funding for both of these programs, which is a cut of $14.8 million below the request for Strengthening HBCUs and HBGIs. The Department would therefore be unable to increase support for the 98 HBCUs and the 18 HBGIs beyond the FY 1999 level, not even for inflation. The result would be a decrease in minority participation at these schools—especially at the graduate school level.

With a booming economy offering job opportunities to people who have never before been in the labor force and with welfare rolls shrinking and with employers scouring the labor market for qualified workers, this bill is cutting job training funds by $700 million dollars below last year. In Texas, this would result in an almost $8 million cut in adult training and a $8.5 million cut in youth training. According to a survey of the U.S. Conference of Mayors, 86% of cities suffer shortages of technology workers, 73% suffer shortages of health workers, and 72% lack enough construction workers to fill available jobs. Yet, this bill would do nothing to provide solutions to these grave problems.

The bill provides an appropriation of $4,572 million for Training and Employment Services for FY 2000. This is a reduction of $928 million, or 17% below the request, and a reduction of $709 million, or 13%, below 1999. Overall, the House mark reduces program participants nearly 432,300, or 20%, below the request, and about 175,000, or 9%, below 1999.

This bill also undermines the bipartisan Workforce Investment Act enacted last year that is intended to provide access to information and services that all Americans need to find and keep a job to meet the workforce challenges of the global economy.

The House bill cuts the dislocated worker program by $140 million below 1999, and $335 million below the request. In Texas, the State would need to cut its funding by almost $18 million. The House mark means that 176,600 fewer dislocated workers will be served compared to the President—and 46,500 fewer than in FY 1999, reversing increases the Congress has provided over the past three years. This means that from the universe of 3.3 million dislocated workers per year, even fewer will not benefit from services that could shorten the time that they are unemployed and hundreds of employers will also be hindered in their capacity to find the skilled workers they need. The bill rejects the President's goal of providing reemployment services and training to dislocated worker who needs and wants them by 2004.

The bill provides a program level of $38.4 billion for the Department of Health and Human Services, which is $686 million (–2%) below the President's 2000 request.

In particular, the bill slashes $212 million from the Administration's request for the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. This will drastically affect the Center for Mental Health Services which supports state prevention, treatment and rehabilitation efforts. These cuts will potentially deny 20,000 individuals access to essential stabilizing medication. The Committee also cuts $3 million from the President's request for PATH, a program which aids homeless individuals with mental illness. Every night, approximately 200,000 Americans with major mental illness have nowhere to sleep. By denying the President's request, the Committee is denying the opportunity to reach out to an additional 7,800 homeless individuals and provide them with essential mental health services.

Furthermore, our children suffer from mental illnesses. The tragedy in Littleton, Colorado is a somber example of this fact. It is estimated that eleven million American children and adolescents have a diagnosable mental, emotional or behavioral disorder. One in 20 American children will have a severe disorder by the age of 18.

Five to nine percent of our children and youths ages 9 to 17 have a serious emotional disturbance of a magnitude that limits their capacity to function appropriately at home, at school, or in their communities.

Yet, as this bill stands, we cannot help America's children. The Appropriations Committee simply fails to acknowledge that our children are suffering.

The Committee bill is $19 million below the FY 1999 funding level for the Center for Substance Abuse and Prevention. This cut severely threatens the program to provide integrated substance abuse and HIV/AIDS prevention services to African American and Hispanic/Latino youth as well as women and their children. According to the Surgeon General, nearly one half of all new HIV infections are caused either directly (through sharing of injection equipment) or indirectly (sexual transmission from an individual infected through injection equipment, birth, etc.) through substance abuse. Racial and ethnic minorities are disproportionately effected by substance abuse related HIV infection. Sine 1981, roughly 61% of all AIDS cases among women have been attributed to injection drug use, or sex with partners who inject drugs. Further, among the highest health care expenditures associated with substance abuse are those associated with HIV/AIDS.

Yet, this bill eliminates $50 million in emergency funds for HIV/AIDs in Minority Communities. Representing an estimated 12% of the total U.S. population, African Americans make up almost 37% of all AIDS cases reported in this country. In 1998, Hispanic represented 13% of the U.S. population (including residents of Puerto Rico), but accounted for 20% of the total number of new U.S. AIDS cases reported that year (9,650 of 48,269 cases). The AIDS incidence rate among Hispanics in 1998 was 28.1 per 100,000 population, almost 4 times the rate for whites (8.2 per 100,000) but lower than the rate for African Americans (66.4 per 100,000).

And it isn't just children, young adults seeking job training or average workers who are ignored by this bill. It is our senior citizens as well. This bill cuts funds requested for the meals on wheels program targeted at the growing number of elderly shut-ins that currently are not getting that assistance. It eliminates a new initiative aimed at protecting our disabled elderly from abuse in nursing homes. It eliminates the family caregiver support program that would help seniors remain in their own homes and out of nursing homes as long as possible.

The bill includes $6.48 billion for the administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration, which is $225 million below the level requested by the President. Funding SSA at this level will result in a deterioration in public services. SSA would be forced to impose immediate and complete hiring freeze, leaving 3,000 positions vacant by the end of the year. This would result in disability applicants waiting almost 5 months, almost twice as long the current processing time, for a decision on their initial claims, and longer waiting

times for the millions of individuals who visit district offices. Mr. Speaker, send this bill back to committee so that American families can get a fair deal for their tax dollars, not an insult.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this bill, with the greatest respect for the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman PORTER) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). They both care deeply about the health, education, and opportunities available to Americans.

I especially want to mention my high regard for the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman PORTER), who has said he will retire at the end of this Congress. The gentleman from Illinois has served his constituents, this committee, and the people of this great country with such honor, commitment, and decency, I am proud to call the gentleman my friend.

I have hoped and will continue to hope that we can come together and work on a budget that truly addresses the needs of Americans. Unfortunately, in too many instances, I do not believe this budget does so. We are spending billions in this budget and, unfortunately, in my judgment, many times we are spending it in the wrong places.

In some cases, we delay so long it is almost like not spending the money at all. The delayed obligation to the NIH and CDC troubles me, particularly.

I have a personal reason for caring about this part of the budget. I lost my mother to breast cancer, and not a day goes by when I do not think about her and of the years we missed together. I often wonder how many women like my mother might still be alive today if our country had invested more in cancer research and treatment a generation ago.

I am determined that my daughters and granddaughters will not suffer with cancer as my mom did, and as so many Americans do today. I believe that while government cannot cure cancer, it can put the resources in the hands of those who will. Therefore, I have made funding of biomedical research at the National Institutes of Health and the Public Health Mission of the CDC my top priority on the subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education of the Committee on Appropriations.

I am proud that medical research, particularly with regard to women, has finally become a national priority. Again, I am proud to serve on this subcommittee. This is a bill that is meant to give Americans a hand in the hard work of raising families and caring for loved ones.

We are charged with protecting America's health, education, and employment, and because of that, I must say that it is irresponsible, in my judgment, to bring a bill to the floor with $10 billion in money borrowed from next year, in effect, taking care of this year's political problems at the expense of next year's needs.

It is irresponsible to say that we support education and health care, but delay $11 billion in obligations to Head Start, the NIH, and other agencies until September 29, 2000, and it strains whatever trust Americans still have in us to load this budget with trickery and accounting gimmicks and call it a success.

Mr. Speaker, frankly, when we read the bill, it is easy to see why Americans are cynical about Congress. The budget does nothing to secure the strength of social security, it does not reform Medicare, it hurts millions of hard-working Americans. Assisting those families should be where we start our budget work, not where we scramble to end it.

I believe we can do better, we should do better. Let us vote no, and then let us work together and give this budget the worthy and sincere effort that the American people deserve.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the majority leader of the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am excited, I am pleased, I am happy, and in fact, Mr. Speaker, I am elated. Can Members imagine what we are doing today? Stop and think about what we are able to do today. This is the most wonderful opportunity for public service any of us could ever have hoped to have had in any time of service here.

Today we stop the raid on social security. We started the year saying we could do that. We started the year saying we should do that. We have those who said it could not be done. They did not think we would be capable of doing it. I have to tell the Members, Mr. Speaker, we have worked hard. Some of our Members have worked themselves into near exhaustion. We have worked hard, and yes, we have had some good fortune, some good news along the way.

We have brought ourselves today to that day that they said we just could not get to. Today we are proving that we can fund the government without raiding social security and without raising taxes.

The President knows this. The President saw it a week ago. The President said, they can do it. I can see they can do it. Because they can do it, we must do it. I want to join them in doing it. He has done so. He has his folks up here working. Let us complete the job. It is within our reach. Let us do it.

Today CBO has certified, and now, I would ask Members to please read the whole CBO letter and get to the bottom line. The bottom line of the CBO letter, not the one he sent the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) but the one he sent to the appropriators and to the leadership of this Congress, CBO has certified that we have done it. Right now we have done the job of passing the budget without spending social security. It is certified, indeed, to a $1 billion on-budget surplus.

The President knows we can do it and has said, let us get the job done as quickly as possible. We know we can do it. CBO has certified we have done it. Now, what do we hear today from our friends across the aisle? They are no longer saying it could not be done, they are no longer saying it cannot be done. Now they are saying it should not be done. Why should it not be done? Because if we stop the raid, if we fund the government without spending social security, they can no longer do what it is they have been doing, funding the government with social security.

Today we have funded the government without social security. Let us vote yes. Let us be proud, let us be happy, and let us be thankful that we have been able to have this opportunity for service to our parents and our children.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, to return us from the land of fiction to the land of reality, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker is precisely why I rise again today. It is not a letter to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), it is a letter to me from the Congressional Budget Office which we requested on behalf of the Blue Dogs that clearly states when we use CBO scoring as they wish, not as the House leadership instructs them to ask the question, we are spending $17.1 billion of social security trust fund.

That is a fact. That is in my letter. That is a simple thing that we have asked, just to be honest in what you ask and stop this political gobbledegook that we are going through as to who is spending social security trust funds.

I say that my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), a moment ago expressed a spirit of conciliation which I appreciate in acknowledging the process today. In the same spirit, I acknowledge that some of the rhetoric coming from my side of the aisle is not exactly right, either. I will acknowledge that, and I hope I am not part of it.

But the reason why I oppose this across-the-board cut today is because by CBO's estimates, we will be spending social security trust funds after we have made an across-the-board cut of $3.452 billion in outlays. I do not wish to go into operations and maintenance of the Defense Department, of which we have heard witness after witness, statement after statement, on both sides of the aisle of people who are concerned about defense, saying that we cannot afford a one dollar cut out of $100, or a 1 percent cut.

Everyone that knows something about this knows that it is not that simple. But yet today, for somebody's reasons, so somebody can continue to

buy advertisements on television attacking some of my Democratic colleagues saying we in the minority are spending social security trust funds, the CBO, when asked honest questions, and I have no quarrel with the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG), I commend him for the job that he is doing, and the statements that have been made by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), a moment ago, all of this.

But if we really wanted to deal with social security, why did not the leadership, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), why did he not insist that the gentleman from Texas (Chairman ARCHER) come from the Committee on Ways and Means and bring a social security bill to the floor of the House this year, instead of spending the first 8 months talking about a tax cut of $1 trillion that would have spent, by CBO's honest accounting, $120 billion of the same social security trust funds that we are here today to preserve and protect?

Please let us get honest. There has been a spirit of conciliation. The gentleman from Ohio (Chairman KASICH) a moment ago acknowledged that even after this, we may still not serve it. I ask those Members to listen to their chairman and be careful of their rhetoric, particularly when they go out and make political statements, because they are going to have to live by these words next year.

Remember, the budget of 2001 begins about February. All of this rhetoric about back-end loading and all of the things, and the little cute games we are getting in order to make sure we say today we are not spending social security, will actually be factual in about 3 months. I ask Members to be careful what they say.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 20 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard people try to present a partial look, only a partial look at what CBO has said.

A request was sent to them saying, if you do not count the adjustments, is there money coming out of social security? They said, if you do not count it. But if you count the adjustments, then it is in surplus. That is like asking your banker, Mr. Speaker, to send you a bank statement that tells you about your withdrawals but leaves out reference to the deposits. Of course it would show a negative.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. DICKEY).

□ 1600

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish that my constituents were here today. When we went home during the break and said we wanted to have tax reductions, we had wanted taxes to come back here, and they said we want to pay off the debt, and my response was time and time and time again we cannot do that up in Washington, because we are going to spend, and we are going to spend, and we are going to spend, and we are going to spend.

They said, no, no, we hear it from the liberals and we hear it from the conservatives that we are going to pay this debt down. Now, we are watching today. I just wish they could be here. We are watching today the people who are the most skilled at learning and talking about spending.

I have heard every excuse there is. We are trying to isolate this and that, and we are trying to bring compassion in, and we are trying to say there is no compassion on the other side. Remember this, compassion is saving the money so that we can spend it later. It is not compassionate to go spend money and spend money and spend money so we can get recognition, so we can get reelected and leaving the poor people out there to live off of borrowed funds and particularly borrowed funds from Social Security.

So we need to be honest. We must be honest. We are not being honest now. We took this bill and said that we were not covering the farm aid. The gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) said what he said, and then the gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH) got up and said $2.5 billion specifically is going to North Carolina directly.

Now, this is how it still is. This is why you all are so good, you liberals are so good at doing what you have done for years. You are protecting your territory, and you are doing it quite well, but it is not right.

We have to be responsible. We need to take our compassion and convert it to discipline and to stopping this spending. We are doing it here. We should be joining together to protect the people of America.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), former chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

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

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, before my planned comments, a couple statements of fact. Nothing this Congress will do will add one dime to the Social Security Trust Fund. Nothing that this Congress is doing will change how dime one of the Social Security Trust Fund is invested. Regardless of which assumptions one uses, whether they be CBO, Congressional Budget Office, or those at the Office of Management and Budget, in either case, based on current projections, this Congress will be borrowing money from the Social Security Trust Fund based on today's assumptions.

But, Mr. Speaker, I was going to make just one little observation about how one program works. I am for highway funding. I am for transit funding. I serve on the committee that funds those programs. But I think they should be treated like other programs.

In this bill, those programs receive the 1 percent cut like other programs for the year 2000. But then lo and behold, this same bill gives all the money back as additional funding in the year 2001, saying that all those funds for those programs, which I like, some I have local interest in, is higher priority than anything else in the transportation area, such as operations for the FAA.

If there is any area within our bill that all of us were apprehensive about, it was FAA operations. We had already reduced the President's request. That will be cut by 59 million additional dollars, will not automatically be restored next year.

Programs, whether they be in education, research, housing, farmers, veterans, none of those are automatically restored next year. But because one powerful individual threatens to vote no, those funds get preference. What a way to operate.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER), another member of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today is a day we should feel good, feel positive, feel happy, because there are some great accomplishments that we should be proud that have been announced this week and that we are going to pass on the floor here today.

We are hearing all this sky is falling rhetoric from the other side and this fear and scare tactics, oh, my gosh, what is happening next.

Well, first of all, the Treasury Department announced this week that we had $124 billion surplus in this past fiscal year that just ended a few weeks ago, $124 billion surplus. Now, $1 billion was taken out of Social Security, so we have not quite met our goal. But the fact is we had a huge accomplishment. That is real numbers. That is not OMB numbers. That is not CBO numbers. That is real dollars.

In the past 2 years, according to the Treasury Department, actual debt reduction is $138 billion. Real reduction. We have finally accomplished that.

Now, a lot of our colleagues on the other side think it was the tax increases in 1990 and 1993. In 1995, when President Clinton submitted his budget, he projected $200 billion deficits as far as the eye could see. We said, no, that is not good enough. We want to have at least a balanced budget by 2002. Thank God we made it sooner than that. So we should be glad that we have accomplished this already with real dollars.

The other great accomplishment is going to happen later this afternoon, and that is passing this bill and for the continuation of the fact we are really going to have a real surplus again.

Now, we have the Labor-HHS bill before us now. As a member of that committee, I wish we had a full day to debate it and discuss it. The one disappointment that I have about the bill

is that the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman PORTER) is going to be serving his last term as chairman of that subcommittee, because he has been a great chairman. I think both sides of the aisle would agree.

But let us look at some of the real numbers. NIH, we have a $2.3 billion increase. President Clinton asked for a $300 million increase. From 2.3 billion, and the President only asked for $300 million. Now, all right, we are going to take a 1 percent cut out of it. But a $2.3 billion increase. The President said, oh, cancer research is important. We agree. Special Ed has got a $1 billion increase. This is a good bill. Pass it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) may not have been here. This budget spends, in fiscal year 2000, $1.5 billion less than the President of the United States asked for in NIH. That is what their budget does.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), the distinguished ranking member on the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I tell my colleagues what worries me about the way we are doing this. I would doubt that the leadership asked the chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense where to cut this bill.

Now, during the entire time that I have been on this committee, we have cut substantial amounts from defense, but we never did an across-the-board cut without knowing what the implications were.

Some people said, well, General Shelton testified this way, General Shelton testified that way. Well, I have said, the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) has said, the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) has said, the Defense Department has been short money for the last several years. We have said it over and over again.

When I go to a base, I find 20 percent short across the line. I find them short on real property maintenance. I find them short on O&M. Anybody that goes to any of our military bases will find the same thing.

Secretary Cohen called me the other day. He said, ''I want to tell you how much I appreciate what the Members of Congress did to raise the pay and change the whole thing for retirement.'' He appreciated it. He said the enthusiasm and morale is marvelous.

Now, I do not want to say what I went through in order to make sure this bill was not vetoed. I mean, I have had a few amiable discussions with a lot of people. There was a tremendous pressure to veto this bill. I decided that we could not veto it. We had a good bill. Everybody said this is a good bill. This is a bill that funds the Defense Department with the allocation we got from leadership, whatever leadership gives us.

If the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) gives us less money, we will make the appropriate cuts. If the leadership decides there should be less money, we will make those cuts.

During the Reagan administration, we cut billions of dollars, item by item from his budget. As we went into the gulf war, one of our finest victories, we had apportioned that money so carefully that we were able to win a tremendous victory. But we did not do an across-the-board cut. We did a cut item by item.

According to the figures that I have, the Defense Department, because it cannot cut pay, would have to cut personnel. When I go overseas, I find the members of the Armed Forces saying, I have been overseas four or five times. I went to one Marine unit, and they had been overseas four Christmases in a row because we have cut back so dramatically in the number of people that are available in the armed services.

Now, we can argue whether they should be deployed so often or not, but this way of cutting the budget is absolutely against everything that we have been taught. What we should do is go back to committee and make the decisions based on the amount of money we have available.

When we started this process, we had a bipartisan agreement in all the subcommittees, then the leadership said, Okay, you have got to cut a couple hundred million dollars more. Well, they did not do that with defense. With defense, they took the bill, they gave us a good allotment, and we came up with a bill which everybody is praising, and, yet, it is not enough money.

Any way one cuts it, it is not enough money. They used to come over there and bring all those charts over when we were before the committee. I wonder where they got the money for the charts. But I will tell my colleagues this, cutting out a few charts is not going to make up for the amount of money, the $2.7 billion, we are going to cut out of this. This actually takes us below the O&M that the President requested. So this is not the way to do it.

You take this bill back, and you give it to the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) and myself, and we will come up with a bill. We will come up with a legitimate cut. But the way we are doing it is absolutely wrong.

I would ask the Members to think about the devastating impact that we would have when we just passed a pay raise, we just revised their pension, the morale is high. The Defense Department knows it needs more. There is no question about that. All of us agree with that on the Subcommittee on Defense. Yet, we are sending a signal that we are just cutting across the board.

Even though my colleagues say, well, it is going to be vetoed, well, I could have said the same thing when I argued that our bill was going to be sent right back to them. I think it behooves us to give us the figure and let us work our will on where the bill should be cut.

So I would urge the Members of this body to take this bill back to committee and let us work our will. Tell us how much money that our allocation is, and we will pass that bill out, and it will be a much better bill than an across-the-board cut.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the comments of my colleague and helpmate on the Subcommittee on Defense. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) is a great American, and I appreciate his help and his work.

I would like to spend just a moment addressing a couple other areas relative to this debate before going back to defense. For, as I listened to other people earlier, Mr. Speaker, I could not help but think of that old line that there are darn liars and statisticians. That line very much applies to a lot of the debate that has taken place here today.

Let me speak a moment about the whole ruckus swirling around the Social Security Trust Fund. That is very, very disconcerting to me. But I start by saying that one of the great things that have happened in this year is that the majority in Congress, and I know the Republicans as well as Democrats, are concerned about that trust fund.

But to hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), my ranking member, talking about a set of statistics that suggest that one way or the other the bills that are passing here will be signed into law perhaps have already gone into the trust fund by $17 billion, and then another set of statisticians who reflect the administration's view of the way dollars worked, suggest we have not really gone into the trust fund yet.

The point is really not that. It is that there is a new call to set aside the Social Security Trust Fund and to protect it. That, in view of the history of the Congress, the old majority, the business as usual majority, using it constantly to build more and more spending programs around the Federal Government, that is the point that needs to be made and remembered.

One of the items that was discussed earlier today related to education funding within this bill, Labor-HHS, that portion of it, suggesting that one way or another we are of great disservice to Federal education efforts. Indeed, the proposal of the committee was $375 million above the President's request.

□ 1615

A 1 percent across-the-board would bring it down to the President's request. That is $30 billion in total; more

money at a Federal level than throughout history for Federal money for education. We all know that most education dollars are raised and spent at the local level and the responsibility of the States and local school districts.

My last point takes me to the comments of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA). I could not agree with him more. We produced an excellent bill this year. An across-the-board cut is not the way to deal with our bill, in my view. And, indeed, to reduce that effort is not helpful to our national defense purposes.

But having said that, the Congress has exercised itself by way of across-the-board cuts before. I remember a discussion with my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), talking about his favorite programs around here in the Labor-HHS bill, this very bill. And I asked him how he could possibly stand aside for an across-the-board cut in Labor-HHS. Really, our discussion came to the point that at the crunch time, when there are Democrats and Republicans, and there are these two bodies, as well as the administration, sometimes that is the only way to get to the final straw.

Well, my colleagues, we are at the final straw at this moment. It is time for us to come together and support this measure and get our work done.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER).

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I have only time to focus on one of the reasons for voting against this bill.

My distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the honorable chairman and good friend, has a couple of times, several times, pointed out that the NIH budget, the National Institutes of Health budget, is up from $15.6 billion by 14 percent, up to $17.9 billion. What he does not point out, and that he has never mentioned, is that $7.5 billion of that, more than 40 percent, is shifted so that it may not be obligated until the 29th or 30th day of September next year.

For him to speak about that would probably cause him to throw up. The number of dollars that are available because of that feature, the number of dollars for medical research in the fiscal year is, in reality, cut by about 15 percent in the year 2000. And that means that medical research on cancer research, on Alzheimer's, on AIDS, as well as genetic causes of disease and biotechnology, all of that has to be slowed down or stopped or put on the back burner.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

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

There have been many honorable men and women who have approached the microphone today to express their concerns about this bill, the two bills, and the 1 percent across-the-board savings. And although the message of the other side is very well organized, it is somewhat crippled by the well-publicized strategy that the minority has been directed to employ by its own leadership, and that strategy is identified in The Washington Post on Monday, January 12, and I quote the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK). He said, ''It took us a little while to figure out how to be the minority. But DICK has it just right,'' meaning the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the minority leader, ''it is not our responsibility to legislate any more, it does not make sense for us to compromise.''

That is the direction and that is the strategy. I do not know which to believe. Is it a true concern about education, about defense and the rest, or is it just a need to obstruct, to impede, to delay, to encumber, to foil? Which one should we believe?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does not extend the life of Social Security by one single day. This bill that we have before us fails to provide one penny for Medicare prescription drug benefits. The only thing it does is hurt American families.

Compromise, the gentleman from Colorado said? We would be delighted to sit down to compromise. We cannot get them to the table.

I want to talk about some folks that I represent. A lovely lady in my district, retired, widowed, with children, $600 a month she has coming in. She makes a few dollars baby-sitting. Her prescription drug costs per year are over $2,000. This bill does nothing to help her or millions of other American families who are in a similar situation.

I have another wonderful woman who I know who called the district office complaining about these prescription drug costs the other day because she has cancer and her monthly cancer prescription drug costs are up to the ceiling. And all she wants is a few years to be able to spend with her grandchildren.

What does this bill do? As the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER) just mentioned, it stretches and it hurts the whole question of digging into cancer research and other medical research for Alzheimer's and Parkinson's disease. This bill does nothing for that lady. It denies her the hope that she would hope to have to spend those extra years with her grandchildren.

And, of course, what does the majority do in this bill and in the budget that we have that could alleviate some of these problems? There is $500 million for a Mississippi shipyard boat that the Navy does not even want. For a boat in Mississippi, $500 million that the Navy does not want. Talk about waste, fraud and abuse, Mr. Speaker. This budget puts pork before people, and it puts special interests before saving Social Security.

And let me also say that what this has been about, this battle here on the floor with respect to Social Security, is that they put together this incredible trillion dollar tax cut bill that they could not sell to the American people, because the American people did not want it. They saw the other needs we had. They did not want to bust the budget. And as a result of putting it together and advocating it, they scared the daylights out of senior citizens all over this country.

Well, their poll numbers went into the toilet, excuse me, with seniors. The seniors saw that that trillion dollar tax cut going to the very wealthiest people in this country was going to stifle any prescription drug care and was going to cut out any benefits to extend Social Security and Medicare. Now they are in a panic. So they come here and they say to us, unbelievably, that we are the culprits here. After their own leaders, year after year after year have advocated phasing out Social Security, letting Medicaid wither on the vine, they have the gall to come here and suggest that they are the saviors.

They have no credibility. They are as bankrupt on this as they are on this bill. And so I say, Mr. Speaker, the American people see through what is going on here. And what we need to do is vote ''no'' on this bill, and sit down, I say to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), and deal with a compromise where the principals are sitting at the table, not coming here and playing these games with the American people that the Republicans are the saviors of Social Security, the party who wants to phase it out, the party that never provided a vote for Social Security when it was adopted in 1935.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority whip of the House of Representatives.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, it is almost Halloween, and the Democrats are up to their usual tricks in search of the big government treats. Like all our appropriations bills, this conference report funds many very significant programs sufficiently while maintaining a balanced budget. But despite all the good qualities of this legislation, it is being opposed.

Now, I hear a lot of rhetoric about getting down to business from the other side of the aisle. One Member after the other walks up to the podium and accuses the Republicans of partisanship. Well, I have a message for the Democrats. Stopping the raid on the Social Security Trust Fund is not a partisan issue. The Republicans want to ensure that every penny of the Social Security Trust Fund goes to those who paid into the fund.

Today, with this vote, the Democrats will have the opportunity to join us in

this battle. But it seems very clear that many Democrats are going to turn their backs on this historic opportunity in voting ''no'' on this bill. When these individuals vote ''no'' in the coming minutes, they are telling their constituents in no uncertain terms that they are willing to raid the Social Security Trust Fund to pay for big government programs.

Why will the Democrats vote to raid the Social Security Trust Fund? The answer is very simple. Because above all else Democrats want to increase Federal spending. They have continually said that the taxes that Americans pay to the Federal Government are not enough to fund their programs. Now they are saying that they need to take those tax dollars and the Social Security money to pay for these programs.

Today, the Republicans are saying in one very clear voice that we will keep our hands off the Social Security Trust Fund. The Republicans know how important it is to secure the trust fund, and we have a plan to do it.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), the chairman of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chair of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia for yielding me this time.

I want to address one point. While this bill may not extend the life of Social Security, and it was not intended to, what it is intended to do for millions is to extend the hope that their retirement promise will be kept. And this is the day that begins.

My subcommittee bill includes the veterans budget, and I would like to respond to that issue directly. First of all, the President proposed no increase in veterans' medical care this year. Flat line. No increase. We propose a $1.7 billion increase in veterans' medical care. So even if this 1 percent across-the-board reduction were embraced by the Congress and the President, we are still $1.5 billion above the President's request, the largest increase ever given to veterans' benefits for medical care.

We have done much more for the veteran on our watch than the opposition has, and I think it is important that we make note of that, a $1.5 billion increase over what the President requested, even with this shaving across the top of all the budgets.

I want to address one other item that was discussed today, this idea of budget gimmicks. When I received the President's request for our VA-HUD bill, I looked and I found in that bill a $4.5 billion advanced appropriation for Section 8 housing.

Now, the President proposes to be concerned about people getting public housing, and I think there is no question that he does. We all do. We are all very concerned. I said to staff, what is this advanced appropriation all about? I have been on the Committee on Appropriations for 5 years, and I had never seen anything like this before. They said, Mr. Chairman, that is a gimmick. The President has proposed to spend this money not this year but next year in order to fund Section 8 housing.

We rejected that budget gimmick. Ultimately, it was accepted by the Senate and the President, and the House joined in. And as one of the President's secretaries explained to me, if everyone embraces the gimmick, then it is an offset.

So the facts are here that the President introduced this advanced appropriation, this so-called gimmick, into our bill. We rejected it initially. Ultimately, working together in the spirit of compromise with the White House, we accepted it.

□ 1630

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEREUTER). The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) has 10½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that we look at the heart of this matter and how we got here. The real issue is are there limits, are there boundaries on this spending of the Federal Government, or do we go back to the old days of the former majority where they just kept spending and borrowing as much as they wanted to?

We have achieved a balanced budget. No matter who wants to take the credit, the fact is it has been done. And there is plenty of credit to share. We have set the standard. It ought to be balanced without spending out the Social Security Trust Fund. Many people agree with that in principle, but when it comes to practice, they do not want to accept the boundaries that it places on spending.

So we had the President's budget that proposes tons of new spending. And he said, well, we will spend it by having more taxes, more fees, and taking a third of this year's Social Security surplus, spending a third of it.

We said to the President, the proper standard is do not spend any of it and do not raise taxes, either. That means there is a limit on spending. And frankly, Mr. Speaker, we have an across-the-board cut to balance out spending, to make it fit within the available money because our friends on the other side of the aisle are not willing to accept limits.

They are still asking for more money. I have heard them identify a lot of new programs they want to put in. They do not want to reduce things. We cannot get specific agreements on reductions rather than across the board because they will not agree that this is all the money that there is available. This is the only method left. We could do it different ways, but this is the only method left if we want to keep the budget balanced and not raise taxes and not raid Social Security. That is why we are in this circumstance.

But the American people understand that, Mr. Speaker. They have dealt with family budgets. They have dealt with business budgets. They know that a 1 percent shave is not the end of the world.

Now, for some people, of course, it is never enough. And I am really appalled hearing some people say, well, this will not extend the life of Social Security. What they want to do will shorten the life of Social Security. They want to raid the Social Security Trust Fund so that when old Mother Hubbard gets to the cupboard it is bare; the money is already spent out.

We want to preserve as much as we can by controlling spending. That is the whole issue. Keep the budget balanced, do not raid Social Security, and accept the fact that there is a finite amount that this Congress can and should spend.

If they would stop their new spending programs, it would be a lot easier. But, in the meantime, nobody is going to be hurt by doing a 1 percent across-the-board. If the American people have to do it, Uncle Sam should do it, too.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) so he might explain the motion to recommit that will be coming shortly.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I will be offering a motion to recommit at the conclusion of the consideration of this bill. The motion to recommit is not debatable, so I am explaining it at this time to all Members.

The majority has included in this bill a provision which will strike the comparability adjustment for Members of Congress by 3.4 percent. The fact of the matter is that that provision will have no impact on Social Security and no impact on the deficit and, I point out to all the Members, no impact on Members.

The reason it will have no impact on Members is because the Constitution precludes reducing a Member's compensation during the term of his or her office.

Therefore, we are reliably informed that this provision will not take effect until January 1, 2001. It is, therefore, simply self-flagellation which will not adversely affect us. But we will pretend to the public that it will; and we will, therefore, add to the cynicism of the public as we rhetorically say we are beating our chest and not taking a pay raise, when in fact it will occur on January 1, 2000.

So I would say to my friends on both sides of the aisle, we adopted an adjustment of pay. Why did we do it? Because for 5 out of the 6 years we had not

taken an adjustment, which means that the 2.3 percent that we received in 1998, if divided by six, was a four-tenths of a percent adjustment per year.

Certainly, I would hope that none of my constituents, nor any of my colleagues', would think that was an unreasonable adjustment in salaries for the service given.

My colleagues, the 3.4 percent, as all of us know, is 1.4 percent, or about 35 percent, less than Federal employees will receive and less than the military will receive. That is appropriate. We want to take less to ensure that the public knows we are not here for money's sake. But it is fair to keep us even.

I would hope my colleagues realize that the inclusion of this language will have a pretense to the public that we are doing something adverse to ourselves and trying to tighten our own belts. But because it is a pretense and when they find that it does not happen, they will be cynical.

Very frankly, I do not think anybody thinks this is going to happen anyway, which is also adding to the cynicism of the public.

I urge all Members to vote for the motion to recommit.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying that I want to commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of our committee, for the absolutely marvelous job that he has done in shepherding all 13 appropriations bills through this process. We could not have a better chairman, a man who keeps his cool under fire, who works with all of the Members to try to accommodate greatly different interests often. We thank him for the marvelous job he does in leading all of us.

Let me thank the committee staff Tony McCann, Bob Knisely, Carol Murphy, Susan Firth, Francine Salvador, Nicole Wheeler; and on the minority side, Mark Mioduski and Cheryl Smith. They do a terrific job for all of us.

My personal staff: my AA, Rob Bradner; my LA, Spencer Perlman, who has worked on the bill, and Christina Hamilton on the staff of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) have all done absolutely wonderful work. And Bettylou Taylor for the Senate majority staff, and Ellen Murry for the Senate minority staff and their coworkers have done an absolutely marvelous job.

Let me also thank the members of my subcommittee. They do yeoman's work in hearing months and months of hearings before the subcommittee and it is a very, very tough job for them.

Mr. Speaker, let me close by saying that the other side said to us earlier that they believe we are $17 billion off. This Federal budget is $1,800 billion. We are talking about less than one percent. Even if we take their figures, and they cite a CBO letter that is based upon CBO revenue estimates, we cannot estimate within 1 percent. We cannot even estimate within 3 percent of what the Federal revenues are going to be for the next year.

Let us celebrate. As the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) said earlier, we have done a terrific job in getting this process under control and protecting the Social Security Trust Fund.

Let me say something else. We have learned in the last 5 years to focus on the bottom line. We are doing it on a bipartisan basis. We have learned to protect Social Security. We did not do it before. We are doing it now.

We demand from every Federal spending program results for individuals, the betterment of their lives. The money has to be spent well. We have to see that it gets something positive done in the lives of every single American that it affects.

We have brought the budget into balance. We have brought an end to the raiding of Social Security. I believe that all of us ought to go back home and celebrate the tremendous job that has been done, celebrate the tremendous economy that our constituents have brought to all of us. We have done the people's work in the right way.

Support the conference report.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that before this debate is done the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) will point out that in all the years, going back to the Mesozoic Era, that the Congress borrowed Social Security money. I will stipulate that is true. I will also stipulate that, in every year but one, Congress did less of that than we were asked to do by Republican Presidents.

The problem with this bill today is that it is a giant fudge ball of gimmicks to enable the Republican party to pretend that they are helping Social Security.

What are the gimmicks? First of all, the bill provides $12 billion in aid to schools. That money is supposed to go out this July to the school districts. Instead, it delays it until October 1 so it slips just over the line and is not counted in this fiscal year.

That does not help Social Security. In fact, it does spend next year's Social Security money.

The bill also contains $18 billion for NIH for medical research. Sixty percent of the dollars for those research grants are delayed for a year. New research grants will be cut by 90 percent for a full year under those recommendations. Again, that helps the Republicans pretend that they are not spending Social Security money. But it again spends that same Social Security money next year. That does not do Social Security any good. Just a political gimmick.

The 13-month gimmick that they provide, it is not only a gimmick, it is a public fib. Taxpayers pay $50 million a year in order to staff the Congressional Budget Office that is supposed to tell us how much everything we do is going to cost. And they have told us today, despite denials to the contrary, that the Republican budget right now, even with all these gimmicks, still spends $17 billion out of Social Security money.

So what does the Republican leadership do to try to avoid it? They simply set up a device that says, ''Ignore it.'' They order the scorekeeping agency to simply ignore $13 billion worth of spending in the defense bill. In this bill today, they tell them to ignore $1.6 billion, just ignore it.

They then have another gimmick. They declare $25 billion of so-called emergencies, because if we call it emergencies, that also does not count.

Example: the fuel assistance program. That provide help to low-income elderly so they can pay their heating bills in the wintertime. Last year, the Republican leadership tried to eliminate that program. This year they call it an emergency. I have a little trouble following that one. That is a double reverse even the Green Bay Packers could not duplicate.

Another problem: when we provide all of these phony emergency designations, it really removes all restraints on spending. When we take the Department of Defense bill, which the chairman has already indicated is $16 billion above the President—and he said that, I did not—when we add up all other increases, we have bills that add $30 billion to the President's budget.

So then how do they deal with it? They totally disrupt the NIH funding stream for research grants and they say, ''Oh, we are going to give them this harmless little 1 percent across-the-board cut.'' The problem is they rig it so that we cannot really attack the waste and fraud that they are talking about.

I have a list here from Senator MCCAIN of all of the congressional pork put into the Department of Defense bill. It is 11 feet long. They have got it rigged so that none of these projects can be eliminated, even though the Defense Department did not ask for them. One of them alone is $1.5 billion. Do my colleagues call that responsible to say, no, we are not going to cut this but, oh, yes, we are going to cut cancer research, we are going to cut education? We do not think that is the right way to do it.

□ 1645

And then as was also mentioned, one powerful chairman has gotten all of his programs effectively exempted. They get cut this year but, oh, the money gets put back this year. I love highways, but I do not love them more than I love cancer research, or providing health care to people who do not have it. If you are an American family and you have to cut back in your budget and you had a trip to Bermuda and you

bought a new car and you bought milk and you bought groceries and you paid the rent, if you go to cut back in your budget, you do not cut all of that back evenly 1 percent. You say, ''Well, probably the trip to Bermuda isn't necessary.'' You will cut that out. You pick and choose. You make intelligent choices, not the kind of choices in this bill.

This is not a bill at all. This is a magic show, designed to put on a phony debate on Social Security. If you really care about Social Security, if you really care about Medicare, recognize this turkey of a bill does nothing to strengthen Social Security or Medicare. What you ought to do is extend the solvency of Social Security, put a prescription drug benefit into Medicare. I held 16 hearings around my district to listen to seniors who needed help to pay for their drugs. I ran into one woman who paid $600 a day, yes, a day, for prescription drugs. This bill does nothing for her. I ran into another couple, they spent $28,000 a year on prescription drugs.

Your leadership, the same leadership that has said on other occasions that Medicare should not even be here and that Social Security ought to be phased out, you now give this cock and bull story that somehow you become the last-minute defenders of Social Security. Give me a break. Let us play it real. Drop the debates, sit down in a room, figure out what is practical, end this debate. I know the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) would like to do that. He knows I want to do it. And I know the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) wants to do that, too. We are not able to do it because of a dispute above our pay grade, but this Congress is not going to get out of session until that dispute stops, we play this real for a change and give the American people what they deserve, an honest budget.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, before closing comments on the bill itself, I wanted to add to the comments that were made about our friend Bob Knisely at the beginning of the debate and say that I certainly agree with those comments. I would also like to say that the Committee on Appropriations staff, we have a tremendous staff, and they work long, hard hours and long days and after we have finished our 12- and 14-hour days as Members, they add another 5 or 6 hours to put on paper or put into the computer decisions that we made during that day. I want to thank Jim Dyer, who is the clerk of the full Committee on Appropriations and Chuck Parkinson and Dale Oak and John Mikel and all the staff of the Committee on Appropriations. They all do a tremendous job, and I think they deserve that recognition.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I envy the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). The gentleman from Wisconsin had the privilege to chair this committee for a year and during that time the gentleman had 81 more Democrats than we had Republicans. As Chairman in this year I only have 10 more Republicans than Democrats. That makes it a lot different. In addition, the gentleman from Wisconsin was able to spend $60 billion out of the Social Security trust fund that year. Chairman YOUNG cannot spend anything out of the Social Security trust fund and does not want to.

Despite the fact that we have this small majority, which we hope will increase the next time we organize the next Congress, there are some things that we promised to do. A lot of people do not realize that politicians keep their promises. We promised to do everything we could to balance the budget. We kept that promise. The report yesterday said that we not only have a budget surplus this year but we had one last year. This is record-setting. This is the first time since Eisenhower's administration that we had two back-to-back surpluses. We promised to increase national defense. And if I misspoke and said that we were $16 billion over the President's budget, that was not correct. This budget is $16 billion over last year, the fiscal year 1999 defense budget. So we have increased our investment in national defense, a promise that we made.

We have increased medical research, a promise that we made. Despite the rhetoric today to the contrary, we have increased medical research. We have increased education, over and above the President's request. The only argument that we have with the Democrats and the administration on education is who makes the decision on how it is spent. Does some bureaucrat in Washington make that decision or do our local school boards make the decision? The needs in one district may be different than the needs in another district and those needs should be determined by the people who control and are elected in those school districts to make those decisions.

We stopped spending the Social Security money. The gentleman from Wisconsin's party controlled this Congress for 40 years. What did they do about Social Security? They spent it. The gentleman from Wisconsin just said that this bill does nothing to deal with Medicare or prescription drugs. That is true. Why? This committee does not have jurisdiction over that issue. That is a Ways and Means issue. But I would say again, the gentleman from Wisconsin's party controlled this House for 40 years. What did they do in 40 years to provide for prescription drugs and Medicare? Nothing.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we adopted Medicare.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. The gentleman has had his hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEREUTER). The gentleman from Florida controls the time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it has not been easy because of a small majority. And the 1997 budget accord which the gentleman from Wisconsin did not have to deal with, either, because he was Chairman before the 1997 budget agreement has not made it easy. But we made promises, and we have kept those promises, and this bill today will complete the promise of having 13 bills on the President's desk. Then we will go to the final phase of our appropriations process for this year, and then we can all go home and be with our constituents, where we should spend considerable time.

After this bill gets to the White House, then the final phase will be to deal with the President's vetoes, on whichever bill he determines to veto. At that point the gentleman from Wisconsin and I will once again become major players to try to settle those differences and get signable bills. But now let us vote against the motion to recommit and vote for this conference report.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this conference report.

Let's look at how we got to this shameful place in the budget process.

First, the Republicans tried to cut taxes for the wealthiest Americans by billions of dollars.

When that didn't sell, they decided on across-the-board cuts to programs that affect all families.

I hope my colleagues look at what this bill doesn't do and the consequences it will have on families and children.

First, this bill does not extend the life of Social Security by a single day.

It also fails to provide one penny for a Medicare prescription drug benefit.

Most importantly, this bill fails to take care of our children.

It will leave children unable to participate in the Head Start; title I; before and after-school programs that families need.

What does this bill do? Well, it does take $17 billion from the Social Security surplus.

Robbing the Social Security surplus and not investing in our children—that's not a responsible and fiscally prudent way to run a government.

I urge my colleague to oppose this conference report.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the combined D.C. and Labor, Health and Human Services appropriations conference report.

First Mr. Speaker, linking a Labor HHS conference report to another rider laden conference report is wrong. But even more egregious, is the fact that this House did not consider a Labor HHS bill. Instead, the Republican leadership sent it straight to conference, leaving Democrats with no opportunity to amend the bill.

This is tantamount to denying my constituents representation in Congress! I strongly believe each member should have the opportunity to debate and amend this extremely important appropriations measure.

Instead, we have a Labor HHS bill, which has:

1. A 21 percent across the board spending cut;

2. Guts the class size reduction initiative this Congress funded last year;

3. Denies funding to after-school centers—centers that keep our children off the streets;

4. Cuts title I funds which help disadvantaged students;

5. And, dramatically underfunds bilingual and immigrant education.

What is the impact of an across the board budget cut? It means that Head Start programs will service almost 5,000 fewer children and their families. It means that more than 70,000 fewer women, infants and children will benefit from food assistance and nutrition services. It means that over 117,000 disadvantaged children will have their reading and math assistance programs eliminated! I don't know about my Republican colleagues, but the thought of allowing over 70,000 women, defenseless infants, and children be malnourished so we can give tax cuts to the rich makes me sick.

Mr. Speaker, the real truth is that a Democratic-led Congress created the Social Security Program, and it was signed into law by a Democratic President, despite fierce opposition from Republicans. Now we are expected to believe that Republicans are protecting Social Security? Something they never wanted in the first place.

The Republicans are clearly playing games with the budget—games with the lives of the American people.

Does this Republican leadership care? No. They tout the ''tax relief'' packages, which only help the top one percent of wage earners in the country. Does the Republican leadership care about Social Security? If so, it is not evident in this bill, which does not extend social security by one day. Instead, this budget would still exceed the discretionary caps set by this leadership, thereby dipping into the social security surplus. The Congressional Budget Office reports that $17 billion in excesses in this year's budget will be taken from the social security surplus. How does this indicate a Republican Party who purports to care about saving social security?

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, this bill provide one penny for prescription drug benefits to our financially strapped seniors. In fact, this bill takes food out of their mouths and services from them. This Labor HHS bill cuts the Meals-On-Wheels Program, resulting in over 1.3 million fewer meals being delivered to the elderly.

What about other cuts in this bill? Schools in my district are bursting at the seams. I now have to go home and tell these schools that the little relief they have received from the class size reduction initiative will be reduced. Schools that are already operating at 119 percent over capacity will lose funds. School districts that are seeing a growth of 30,000 students every five years are losing funds for class size reduction, after-school programs, and title I assistance. Furthermore, this bill does not even address the national crisis that our school infrastructure is in. With walls and ceilings sagging, paint peeling, and antiquated heating systems—in my district they still have coal burners for heat—our Nation's schools need help. But do we have any school modernization fund assistance here? No. Did we have it in the Republican tax package? No.

This bill is a travesty Mr. Speaker, and I urge all Members to vote against it. Don't take food from the mouths of infants, seats from our students, or services to our elderly. Vote against this Labor-HHS conference ''agreement.''

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Mr. OBEY and the Democratic members of the Labor-HHS Subcommittee. They worked hard to defend critical health programs from short-sighted Republican proposals like slash-and-burn, across-the-board cuts.

But I am deeply troubled by the inclusion of a rider delaying vital reforms of our national organ allocation system. A 1-year moratorium on the Department's final rule expired last week. A revised final rule has been published. We are ready to reform organ allocations for the better.

So why is there a new rider? How much longer are we going to play political games with transplant patients and their families? Every day of delay hurts patients across the country.

This rider flies in the face of sound science and equity.

First, we have hard data from UNOS itself documenting dramatic 200 to 300 percent transplant and survival disparities between centers across the country. These are precisely the inequities which the final rule would address. But the rider would delay the final rule.

Second, we have the Institute of Medicine recommending ''that the final rule be implemented'' because broader sharing ''will result in more opportunities to transplant sicker patients without adversely affecting less sick patients.'' But the rider would delay the final rule.

Finally, we have the Institute of Medicine correcting the mistaken objections that local donations and small transplant centers would do poorly under the final rule. IOM says the evidence is that neither would happen. But again, contrary to the evidence, the rider would delay the final rule.

I know the opponents to organ reform will say, ''What's the harm of getting more public comment?''

The answer is simple. ''Been there, done that.''

There is no excuse for delaying the final rule any longer. The Secretary has already bent over backward to achieve a consensus. She has revised the final rule to reflect the concerns of patients, surgeons and transplant centers.

The final rule already embodies years of deliberation, three separate public comment periods and input from public meetings held across the country. It embodies the consensus that organs should be shared more broadly to end unjust racial and geographical disparities in organ allocation.

A delay in the final rule is a vote for the status quo: a status quo of gross racial injustice; a status quo of parochial self-interest which flies in the face of equity and the evidence; a status quo that is slowly killing patients who deserve to live, but are deprived of that right by a system that stacks the odds against them.

If you want to help them, let the final rule go into effect. It's that simple.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, the Labor-HHS appropriations bill is yet another example of the Republican party's inability to govern. I will vote against this bill because it fails the American people. It is a failure with regard to Medicare and education and other important Democratic priorities. It fails to fund a Medicare prescription drug benefit for seniors, and it fails to provide funds to reduce class size and hire 100,000 new teachers.

Adding insult to injury, Republicans have added a 1-percent across-the-board budget cut to the Labor-HHS bill. This cut will have disastrous effects on programs that are critical to children, seniors, veterans, farmers, and national security. In lieu of an egregious across-the-board cut, I have proposed that the Republican leaders eliminate the Members' pay raise, as well as all Member earmarks. However, the Republican leadership would rather put money in their pockets and pet projects than use it to fund the priorities of the people.

Republicans have also proven, through this across-the-board cut, that they will take care of their own priorities at any cost, even if it means losing up to 48,000 military personnel and cutting much-needed assistance to our farmers by $86 million. Putting money in their pockets must also be more important than fighting the war on drugs and maintaining strong law enforcement. Their budget cut would cut 90 agents from the Drug Enforcement Administration and 247 FBI agents.

Moreover, Democrats are not alone in their concerns about the inevitable cuts in defense. Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Henry Shelton has confirmed the disastrous effects of the Republican-proposed budget cut on our military. In testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, he stated that the across-the-board budget cut would be ''devastating'' to the military.

In addition, the Congressional Budget Office, the Republican-appointed budget scorekeepers, announced today that Republicans have already spent $17 billion of the Social Security trust fund. This announcement comes as Republicans take to the floor one after another to praise the importance of Social Security, vowing not to dip into the trust fund. These are crocodile tears from the party that has consistently raided Social Security. They have opposed this program since its inception and have consistently tried to kill it.

The sad truth is that the Republicans' newfound concern for Social Security is merely a political ploy. They weren't concerned last year when they spent one billion dollars of the trust fund, and they weren't concerned during the Reagan administration or the Bush administration, when Republicans consistently proposed spending billions of dollars of the Social Security trust fund.

I urge my colleagues to cast their vote against the Labor-HHS bill. A vote against this product of poor Republican governance, budget gimmicks, and cynical political maneuvering, is a vote for bolstering our national security, educating our children, caring for our seniors, respecting our veterans, and helping our farmers.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to let my colleagues know what the proposed 1-percent across-the-board cuts will mean for hungry and poor people in the United States.

One percent may not sound like very much, and I might agree with our colleagues who argue that there is one percent of fat in the overall federal budget that can be cut. But those cuts should be made with care—not with this meat-cleaver approach.

Many federal programs—and virtually every one that benefits low-income Americans—already have faced cuts year after year. For example, the food stamp program—which was slashed in order to pay for welfare reform—would be cut by $210 million. The fund that helps churches and charities operate their

soup kitchens and food banks is another example. This fund already is running on empty because of the growing need working poor families have for help with their grocery bills. All around the nations, food banks and soup kitchens are turning people away—and yet this bill would cut their funding by nearly $1 million a year.

Nor do one percent of the people who receive meals-on-wheels, WIC assistance, food stamps, or help from soup kitchens and food banks deserve to be dropped from these programs. If this bill becomes law, here is what will happen: 1.3 million fewer meals would be delivered through the nation's Meals on Wheels programs; 71,000 fewer women and their young children would get assistance from the WIC nutrition program; 4,800 fewer poor children would be enrolled in Head Start—a program that enjoys bi-partisan support and has proven to be an effective way to ensure children succeed; and 2,900 fewer poor children would receive childhood immunizations.

Mr. Speaker, while our nation is enjoying the best of times a generation of Americans has known, too many Americans still face the worst of times. This country should not ever balance its budget on the backs of the poor—and especially not at the time when there are responsible ways to meet our commitment to all American citizens.

Cutting spending across-the-board is the wrong way to meet our responsibilities. It will hurt people who are doing all they can to be self-sufficient. It will hurt children who swell the ranks of impoverished Americans. I urge my colleagues to reject this proposal.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, we are here today in a spirit of compromise. My compliments to Chairman ISTOOK for his patience and the statesmanlike approach he has taken in bringing this conference committee Report to the floor.

The last D.C. budget was vetoed by the President on September 28. The city, and I emphasize that this is a city we are talking about—not an agency or department—is operating under a continuing resolution. This is not acceptable.

The Nation's Capital is caught in the middle, and many urban needs here are being adversely affected. It is my sincere hope that the flexible approach taken by the House conferees will encourage the administration to sign the bill containing the D.C. budget. This may be the city's last clear chance to get the resources and reforms it needs.

While much progress has been made in the District, there are still enormous problems which must be addressed. A substantial number of functions remain in receivership, including foster care and offender supervision. The enhanced resources for foster care in this budget, to take just one example, are desperately needed by many children.

Our local courts are funded in this budget. They too very much need the added resources this bill provides.

Very soon I expect the House will pass the legislation I sponsored to enhance college access opportunities for D.C. students. The money to fund that program is in this budget.

There is additional money in this budget for public education. There are 146 public schools in this city, and now 29 charter schools. The money to help the children in those schools is in this budget.

This budget contains the largest tax cut in the city's history, which is central to our goal of retaining and attracting economic development.

There is money in this budget to clean up the Anacostia River, open more drug treatment programs, and study widening of the 14th Street Bridge.

What the city needs is a stronger tax base and more taxpayers. This bill takes us another step in that direction.

This D.C. budget is the one the President's strongest supporters in Congress have always insisted he would sign. Let's hope so.

In the 5 years I've had the honor to serve as chairman of the District's authorizing subcommittee, it's been my philosophy that you cannot have a healthy region without a healthy city. Working in a bipartisan manner, building consensus, I'm proud of the way we have helped to turn this city around. I urge this House and then the White House to let us continue.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the conference report on fiscal year 2000 appropriations bill for the District of Columbia and the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education. The conference report before us is a sham budget which I cannot support.

The bill before us today perpetuates a fraud on the federal budget process and the American people. The Republican leadership has produced a budget that exceeds the budget caps we established in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 by $30 billion, according to the Congressional Budget Office. This Republican-majority budget would also spend at least $17 billion of the Social Security Trust fund, something the Republicans are claiming they do not want to do. This bill includes many budget gimmicks, such as advance funding, delaying medical research funding until September 29, 2000, and delaying paying private contractors who provide services to the Federal Government. Today, we also learned that the Republican leadership has cut a deal with the House Transportation Committee chairman by promising to restore any transportation funds lost from the across-the-board cuts included in this bill. He will get his highways, but medical researchers trying to find a cure for cancer or AIDS in Houston, Texas will get the shaft.

I am especially concerned that this bill includes a budget gimmick that will backload $7.5 billion or 40 percent of the National Institutes of Health's (NIH's) medical research Fiscal Year 2000 budget until September 29, 2000. What this means is that new and renewing research grants to universities and teaching hospitals will be delayed by nine months to a year. This $7.5 billion delay for NIH's funding would affect up to 60 percent or 40,000 research grants. For researchers at Texas Medical Center in my district which receives about $300 million in NIH grants annually, the spigot will be turned off for nine months and people will be laid off. This delay is unworkable and would adversely impact the cutting-edge medical research done at those teaching hospitals. With this budget gimmick, those projects like the Human Genome Project, and the recently announced ovarian cancer research project at Baylor College of Medicine could be put on hold until their annual funding is paid on the last day of the next fiscal year. All this in the name of politics.

I am also concerned about some of the funding levels included in this bill. For instance, this conference report would cut title I funding for 5,400 teachers who provide reading and math assistance for 290,000 disadvantaged children and would cut $1.1 billion or 46 percent from the title XX social services block grant programs. The title XX program provides federal funding for a variety of social services, including family planning, adoption services, and foster care. Without this funding, states will be forced to reduce the number of families which they serve. Finally, this conference report also eliminates $508 million in emergency aid to farmers related to Hurricane Floyd.

I am also troubled by the process which brought this bill before us. The fiscal year 2000 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education appropriations bill has never been considered by the House of Representatives. Yet, today we are considering a conference report on this bill. This highly unusual procedure has bypassed the House of Representatives and not provided sufficient time for the Members to participate in this process.

No matter how much my Republican friends say it, no matter how much they wish it, the fact remains, as scored by the CBO, that their own budget exceeds the 1997 spending caps by $30 billion, and spends $17 billion of the Social Security surplus. And this is before the House takes up the bills to rewrite the 1997 Balanced Budget Act, tax credit extensions and minimum wage tax cuts which will cost billions more. It's not really about whether you can cut 1 percent across-the-board, or pound your chest about how we are cutting our pay, it's about the fact that you have already busted the budget and do not have guts or the integrity to stand before the American people and tell them so and why.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations funding plan. The fact that the Republican leadership has sought to avoid a separate vote on the measure reveals a fundamental weakness in this legislation. Proponents will talk about increases in funding for Pell grants, for special education, and for the National Institutes of Health. Of course we can all agree that these are important programs. However, there are several other programs which are being under funded or completely cut out. This bill is like a pea and shall game, but without the pea. The GOP leadership has been shuffling dollars and shifting funds from the Labor-HHS-Education allotment to other appropriations bills to make them passable. Now that there is so little money left that passage of the Labor-HHS-Education bill is impossible, they declare billions of dollars for regular programs as emergency spending. They have even shifted spending irresponsibility into next year, inventing a 13-month year for 2000 and compounding problems, creating an impossible equation for fiscal year 2001. No matter how slick the GOP leadership is, we can not be fooled into thinking that there will be a winner in this game of gimmicks and phony arithmetic.

The American public time and again has rated education as a top priority . . . above tax cuts, above foreign affairs, above Pentagon spending, even above gun control and protecting social security. While I am not discrediting the need for Congress to address all of those issues, it is important that we listen to what constituents are saying. Republican

rhetoric makes a strong commitment to education. However, this is a classic case of robbing Peter to pay Paul. In order to showcase the funding increase for Pell grants and special education, this budget severely short-changes other essential education programs. To site just a few: GEAR UP, technology training for teachers, bilingual education, adult education, and Head Start. To add insult to injury, this legislation would gut last year's bipartisan commitment to hire 100,000 new teachers and reduce class sizes, abandoning the program and substituting an under-funded, undefined block grant. Education is a continuous journey, and the GOP scheme of hitting a few highlights along the way is short-changing and short-sighted; a shallow and insincere approach to ensuring that all students have the support they need to succeed.

Congress must do more to restore and increase funding for important human needs programs. This bill is emblematic of how budget distortions and faulty priorities often have grave consequences for some of our most vulnerable citizens. The most glaring example of this is static funding for social service block grants (SSBG). Over the last 20 years, SSBG has been one of the primary sources of social service funding for states, providing the flexibility to afford vital services for children, youth, seniors, families, and persons with disabilities. Now, in a healthy productive, economic time, Congress should not intensify social-economic disparities, but rather maintain commitments to ensure that all Americans have an opportunity to contribute to and share in America's prosperity.

As a great man, fellow Minnesotan, and congressional mentor Hubert H. Humphrey said, ''The moral test of government is how it treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children; those in the twilight of life, the aged; and those who are in the shadows of life, the sick, the needy and the handicapped''. It is apparent to me that this legislation reflects, through distorted priorities, political posturing and questionable accounting methods, serious shortcomings on the part of the majority leadership who are failing this moral test. I urge all of my colleagues to vote no on this GOP appropriations fiasco which plays games with funding for vital and necessary programs.

Mr. McGOVERN. I rise today in strong opposition to the District of Columbia/Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education conference report. This bill is bad policy and I am appalled that the Republican majority is bringing this bill to the floor today. As a strong supporter of education, health and public welfare programs, I cannot support this report and I will vote against it.

The Republican leadership once again is bringing the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education appropriations bill to a vote without giving Members of Congress the opportunity to improve the underlying bill. Last year, the ineptitude of the Republican leadership resulted in an omnibus appropriations bill. The Republican leadership, under the fear of opening this bill up to amendments, attached the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education appropriations bill to the D.C. appropriations bill. The majority's job is to pass spending bills to keep this country running. The Republican majority is failing by sending bills like this to the floor and I am distressed and saddened that the Republican leadership is resorting to these gimmicks to pass such important legislation.

First let me address the underlying bill. While the latest version of the D.C. appropriations bill is slightly improved from the bill sent to the President—a bill I voted against—it is still far from perfect. The bill still maintains the language that prohibits the District from using any funds for abortions or to implement the District's Domestic Partners Act. I would have voted against this conference report even if the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education bill had not been attached to the report.

This bill is a perfect example of how far out of touch the Republicans are with the people in Massachusetts and around the country. While we are working to improve the programs Americans want and need, the Republicans are playing games with the health and education of America's families. Instead of working to improve the quality of life for Americans, the Republican leadership is sacrificing sound policy for partisan politics.

The spending priorities in this bill are not consistent with what Americans want or need. For example, this bill cuts $1.1 billion in social services for elderly and low-income Americans, ignores our children by refusing to fund $44 million to immunize over 333,000 children against childhood diseases, and punishes our farmers for natural disasters outside of their control by striking $508 million in emergency aid to farmers devastated by Hurricane Floyd.

As my colleagues are well aware, I am a strong supporter of federal funding for public education and families and students finance a college education. That's why I support continuing the bipartisan-initiated Class Size Reduction Program to put more qualified teachers in our schools. This bill guts that program and uses the deception of block grants to hide that fact.

I support programs to help our elementary and secondary teachers strengthen their professional and subject matter skills, but this bill freezes funding for these programs. This bill underfunds technology training for our teachers and schools. It eliminates funding for education reform and the establishment of high standards for our children in reading, math, and science.

At the same time, this bill perpetuates another deception on the American people. It proposes increases in Pell grants, special education, TRIO programs, and modest increases or funding freezes for most other programs, while at the same time requiring a .97 percent across-the-board-cut in all federal programs. This cut will wipe out most of the modest increases in K-through-12 education programs. For example, the Bilingual and Immigrant Education Program is designated to receive $387 million, or $7 million more than fiscal year 1999. But after the across-the-board cut, this program will be reduced by $3.75 million, for an annual increase of only $3.2 million.

Even more deceptive is the fact that for many of our critical education programs, the funds noted in the bill are not available for fiscal year 2000. Instead, they are forward funded for fiscal year 2001. This translates into deep reductions in public education programs for next year and increases the budget problems the Congress will confront in fiscal year 2001.

For example, for special education programs, a program the Republican leadership praise themselves for providing more funding than the President's request, the current fiscal year 1999 level of funding is $5.08 billion. The Republicans say they are providing $6.0 billion for special education, or $587 million more than the administration's request. The reality, however, is quite harsh. Only $2.3 billion is available for special education in fiscal year 2000, which means an actual decrease of $2.78 billion from fiscal year 1999 funding. The remaining $3.7 billion is advanced funding for fiscal year 2001, and cannot be used in the coming year.

And after a year that has seen the safety and security of our schools rise to such public prominence, the Republican appropriators perpetrate a horrible deception on our families and school children. The conference report purports to provide $460 million is targeted for state grants for the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program, in theory $19 million more than the President's request. Of this total, however, only $115 million of these funds will be available in fiscal year 2000—the remaining $345 million only becomes available one year later in fiscal year 2001. This will require deep, deep cuts in this program at the local school district level. The administration, in its balanced budget proposal, had proposed $441 million for state grants, all of it available in fiscal year 2000 funds.

As we can see, the programs are both underfunded and funded in backhanded ways. The Republicans are doing this in the false pretense that the Social Security fund will not be raided. Unfortunately, the Republican majority is playing games by using advanced appropriations, delayed funding and emergency declarations for non-emergency programs. They are playing partisan games because they know that they are raiding the Social Security trust fund. We are witnessing the deception of the American public instead of working in a bipartisan way to improve the health, education and public welfare of America's families. Let's look at the ways the Republicans are playing games in this budget process today.

First, the Republican leadership concocted the bright idea of changing the payment structure for the earned income tax credit (EITC). The EITC is a tax credit for low-income working families with children. This credit helps reduce the regressive burden of the payroll tax on wages and it prevents minimum-wage workers with children from sinking far below the poverty level. However, the Republican leadership decided to change the payment structure, causing an $8.7 billion tax increase on low-income working families. By examining this cut, it's evident that the Republican leadership is out of touch with America. For example, the 1.9 million low-income working families in Texas, the home of both the majority leader and the majority whip, would have lost almost $1 billion in tax credits. Fortunately, this provision was dropped somewhere along the way.

Now the Republican leadership has unveiled its new spending bill, which includes a 97 percent across-the-board spending cut as well as other misguided funding priorities. This provision would cut all programs funded by the Federal Government except for Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and the cost-of-living increase and salaries of Federal workers. Here is a list, compiled by the Office of Management and Budget, of what this cut would mean for various programs:

Head Start—A 0.97-percent cut would cause Head Start to provide services to approximately 4,800 fewer children and their families than otherwise would be served.

WIC—Approximately 71,000 fewer women, infants, and children would benefit from the food assistance and nutrition services offered by the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC).

Meals on Wheels—A 0.97-percent cut would result in over 1.3 million fewer Meals on Wheels being delivered to the elderly than would otherwise be provided.

Title I, Education for the Disadvantaged—$76 million would be cut from title I, eliminating reading and math assistance for 117,000 disadvantaged children.

Reading Excellence—$2.5 million would be cut out of the Reading Excellence Program, eliminating literacy services to approximately 9,700 children.

Childhood Immunizations—$4.7 million would be cut from childhood immunizations, preventing roughly 2,900 additional children from receiving the full complement of child immunizations.

Superfund—$13 million would be cut from Superfund, eliminating funding for an additional two new, federally-led Superfund cleanups, jeopardizing public health for those living near affected sites.

FBI—Staff would be cut by approximately 247 full-time employees, including 106 FBI agents and 141 analysts, computer specialists, engineers, and other support staff.

INS—Staff would be cut by approximately 116 Border Patrol agents and 154 support staff (if taken from the enforcement account).

Defense Department—A 0.97-percent across-the-board cut would equate to a $2.7 billion cut to Defense—with $2.6 billion coming from the Defense appropriations bill and $0.1 billion coming from the military construction appropriations bill. The indiscriminate nature of the cut would mean certain accounts that fund military pay and readiness, appropriated at or below the Administration's request, would suffer. For example, the cut would require the military services to make cuts in recruiting and engage in a loss of up to about 48,000 military personnel.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is bad policy drafted on politics and not policy. I reject this bill, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this bill and I welcome President Clinton's impending veto.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 3064, the combination District of Columbia appropriations and the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education appropriations bill. This bill makes a mockery of the legislative process and is paid for with numerous budgetary gimmicks.

The majority is bypassing the normal legislative process and is asking us to vote on the final version of the Labor/HHS bill. What happened to the amendment process? For every other appropriations bill Members of Congress had the opportunity to present amendments to the Rules Committee and have the amendments debated on the House floor. Why are we skipping this step on one of the most important bills to be discussed each year?

The Labor/HHS bill funds crucial domestic programs including: Title 1, for disadvantaged students; Meals on Wheels; National Institutes of Health; Pell grants; and workers health and safety programs. The American people deserve a full debate on this bill.

Not only are we denied a full debate, but also we are asked to accept a bill that is paid for with numerous budget tricks. For example, there are some strange emergency designations. The 25-year-old Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) is now considered emergency spending. Did the Republicans forget that winter is coming? My constituents in western Wisconsin know that winter is coming. We saw our first snow fall back on October 1.

In addition, this bill delays $11 billion in obligations to NIH, Head Start, and other agencies until September 29, 2000. We are giving these important programs desperately needed money, but telling them they cannot spend it until the end of the fiscal year. Further, there is $10 billion in new fiscal year 2001 appropriations, avoiding the problem for this year but creating a deeper hole for next year's budget.

Finally, I want to talk about the 1-percent across-the-board cut in discretionary spending. This is a fiscally irresponsible way to budget. By advocating an across-the-board cut, the majority is abdicating its responsibility to make the tough choices. Though a 1-percent cut may sound fair, it penalizes efficient government and wasteful government equally. What is fair about cutting nutrition programs for seniors, health care for veterans, and education programs for children, just because Members of Congress cannot help themselves when it comes to parochial projects? We should be cutting wasteful pork-barrel spending such as a $1.5 billion ship to be built in Senator TRENT LOTT's home state that the Department of Defense did not ask for and does not even want. Let's cut the true waste and pork first before we cut crucial services to people in need.

Some Members today have said that surely we can cut one cent of every dollar out of the budget, just as many families do every day across the country. But, would a family cut spending on a medical operation for their child the same as they would cut spending on a new pair of roller skates? Of course not. Would a senior cut prescription drug purchases and the expense of buying a new T.V. equally? Of course not. The point is, as with family budget decisions, federal budget decisions should be a question of priorities. This 1-percent cut abdicates our responsibility to allocate our limited resources to our most important priorities as a nation.

The American people deserve a full and open debate on this important legislation. They deserve more than smoke and mirrors; they deserve a responsible budget. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the District of Columbia/Labor-HHS-Education conference report. This is a terrible way to approve the federal government's budget and for that reason alone I would urge my colleagues to vote against it.

However, there are other reasons to oppose this legislation. The District of Columbia conference report, while still including provisions I support, does not include the kind of reform and oversight I believe is necessary to provide accountability for taxpayer-funded programs in the nation's capital.

In addition, the Labor-HHS legislation include a 1-percent across-the-board cut of all 13 appropriations bills, indiscriminately cutting defense, veterans, education, and other programs. If this effort were to achieve the goal of not touching the Social Security Trust Fund while balancing our federal budget, it would be worth consideration. However, the Congressional Budget Office—which for years the majority in this House has used as the agency with the most accurate budget numbers—estimates it will still result in dipping into the Social Security Trust Fund. The Republican majority is deluding itself by using the administration's more optimistic estimates in spending, something that would have been unthinkable in past years. By CBO's standard, this bill will cut into the Social Security Trust Fund, something I cannot support.

I urge those on the appropriations committee to keep working on a solution that will balance our federal budget, fund our nation's priorities while not dipping into the Social Security Trust Fund. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this bill in its current form.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, today we will vote for 1-percent across-the-board savings in the budget by targeting waste, fraud, and abuse in the federal bureaucracy—not from critical services like Social Security, Medicare, or Medicaid. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this sensible proposal.

This proposal does not compromise vital programs. Even with a 1-percent across-the-board saving, our defense spending level remains at $265.1 billion, $1.8 billion more than the President's request. For education, our funding level is $34.8 billion contrasted to the President's proposal of $34.7 billion. This budget also contains $3.25 billion to continue our fight against crime versus the President's proposal of $2.85 billion.

Mr. Speaker, this 1-percent across-the-board saving proposal makes sense. It forces federal agencies to closely examine their spending and make wise decisions on where tax dollars are most needed. Congress remains committed to holding the line on protecting the Social Security Trust Fund despite pressure by President Clinton to raid the fund to pay for more government spending. Again, I urge my colleagues to support the 1-percent across-the-board saving proposal.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this appropriations bill. It fails to live up to our commitments on some of the most vital federal programs and plays budgetary games with others.

Last week, this House debated two education bills. Throughout the debate, one of the most common things heard, by Members on both sides of the aisle, is how terribly important education is. How improving education in this country is one of the most important issues today. And now we stand here with a bill in front of us that makes unsustainable cuts in some of the most vital educational programs there are. This is unthinkable.

Hidden in this bill is a provision that would delay critical medical research for a year. Under the spending plan for the National Institutes of Health, $7.5 billion in funding is essentially locked up until next September 29th, the end of fiscal year 2000. This Republican Congress is prioritizing its budgetary gimmicks—gimmicks that don't even save Social Security—over research that could result in lifesaving breakthroughs for millions of Americans suffering from hundreds of diseases.

We cannot ask seven year old Mackenzie Mahr, who testified in front of the Commerce Committee just 2 weeks ago about her diabetes, to wait that much longer for a cure for her

disease. Nor can we ask her father, a lieutenant with the Capitol Police, to watch his daughter give herself over 700 shots next year, so that this budget fits arbitrary boundaries.

The NIH has said the result of this ploy could postpone all new grant awards for a year. We cannot ask the 16 million diabetics who are waiting for a cure, to risk kidney failure, amputations, and blindness because these research grants cannot be released until the very end of the fiscal year for these budgetary gimmicks.

We are at a critical point in diabetes research. 271 Members of Congress joined Congressman NETHERCUTT and me to urge the NIH to fully fund the $827 million by the Diabetes Research Working Group Report, a comprehensive research plan to help us attack diabetes head on. They understand that diabetes is the sixth leading cause of death due to disease in the United States, the third leading cause in some minority groups. They also understand that the extraordinary research opportunities identified in this report are the critical first steps towards a cure for diabetes.

The DRWG recommendations are encouraging and will profoundly impact people with diabetes. A primary goal of the report is to understand the causes of diabetes and how we can prevent or delay the onset of the disease. Additionally, the plan sets forth efforts to effectively manage diabetes to delay, or hopefully avoid altogether the complications of the disease. The DRWG applies recent discoveries in areas like genetics and immunology to diabetes research. If the plan is carried out, a cure is within reach.

Do not allow these research opportunities to be delayed, or worse, not funded at all, in the interest of a budgetary shell game.

It is the job of Congress to make tough choices and prioritize what is truly important. Numbers should never be placed above research that will save lives.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, the circumstances under which we are considering this bill are rotten: Because other appropriators have raided Labor/HHS for money to pad their proposals, this D.C./Labor HHS bill contains a variety of budget gimmicks that shift billions in spending into fiscal year 2001. Such gimmicks will negatively impact many worthy programs, including delays in critical biomedical research projects funded by the National Institutes of Health.

But these forward funding gimmicks are not even the bill's biggest flaw. The Labor/HHS proposal deserves to fail because it harms programs that are critical to the well-being of Americans across the country. Simply stated, it's a rotten bill.

Look at what we're being asked to approve: A 1-percent across-the-board cut in every program in the federal budget. Such crude, desperate budgetary tactics will result in decreasing vital federal funding for new community police officers, after-school services to children, worker protection programs funded by the Department of Labor, and childhood immunization programs. All of these and many more programs will be damaged.

For seniors, the impact will be particularly severe. This bill cuts funding for nursing home survey and certification programs—reversing the increases of last year. It proposes to cut the operating budget for the Health Care Financing Administration, which needs far more then it is slated to receive to do an effective job in administering Medicare and Medicaid.

If we continue to slash HCFA's administrative budget—which today stands at only 2 percent of the entire agency's budget—then we will have only ourselves to blame when HHS comes back next year to report that they are months behind in implementing initiatives that we directed them to accomplish.

It is particularly sad and ironic that House appropriators are proposing to reduce spending for nursing home surveys. Have they not heard about the many General Accounting Office reports that detail appalling conditions in our long-term care facilities? In California, which I represent, GAO found that one in three nursing homes between 1995 and 1998 were cited by state surveyors for having serious or potentially life threatening care problems.

The year-old federal/state initiative spearheaded by the HCFA to stem nursing home abuse has just begun to yield important findings. These findings didn't appear magically. They came about because last year, we voted to approve increased funding for additional state inspectors, who are now visiting more facilities more often—and on an unscheduled basis. This stepped-up scrutiny is showing where the worst quality flaws are in nursing homes generally, and which individual homes are actually harming people.

The bill before us proposes to reverse these gains—and to put frail nursing home residents at serious risk again. As one frustrated HCFA official said to me: 'You can't possibly give states money one year to hire more inspectors, and then take it away the next year and expect to make any progress.'

It is equally wrongheaded to bleed funds from the government's primary health care fraud-fighting initiative, the Medicare Integrity Program. Congress crafted this program in 1996 so that it would be funded from mandatory spending accounts, precisely so that it would not be subject to the appropriations process. The whole notion was to try to create a secure, stable source of funding. This bill effectively proposes to unravel the Medicare Integrity Program, which the Congressional Budget Office has credited with producing an actual drop in Medicare spending of 2.5 percent last year.

There is another huge problem with this bill—and that is that it delays HHS regulations that would reform our current organ allocation system to better serve the neediest—regardless of where they live. At present, our locally based systems mean that patients with terminal diseases in some parts of the country have a good chance of getting an organ transplant, while equally—and sometimes more—needy and deserving people in other states, where allocation systems are poorly developed, have no chance at all.

The Institute of Medicine has issued a report that criticizes our current unfair system of organ allocation, and which recommends policy that is very similar to what the Secretary's regulations would do. I urge my colleagues to listen to these medical experts, to patients and to transplant advocates, and to support reform of our current skewed system.

For all of these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the Labor/HHS bill.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to object strenuously to this appropriations conference report.

We have had almost one year to craft these appropriations bills. Yet now the Republicans are talking about across-the-board cuts that would decimate those who we deeply care about—our families, our children, our senior citizens. It does not protect Social Security or Medicare. This bill does not extend Social Security by a single day. It does not provide for our senior citizens' need for a minimum Medicare prescription drug benefit. It does not support effort to strengthen community policing.

This bill attacks our national cry to improve our educational program and hurts our children by reducing efforts for immunizations, reading instruction, math and reading teachers and after school centers, and small class sizes.

In a time when the Republicans wanted a $790 billion tax cut, which of course the American people said no to, we see now an effort to wreak havoc in the daily lives of those we care about.

I urge my colleagues to reject this bill.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, a 1-percent across-the-board cut is one of the most half-baked wacky ways to balance a budget this country has ever seen.

One leg of the federal government that needs no budget trimming is the Decennial Census. And I thought the House leadership knew that—because just a few weeks ago, we were told that the Census budget is so crucial that it is ''an emergency.'' And now, we're being told that the Census budget should be cut. Well, is the Census an emergency or should it be cut?

This cut to the Census Bureau's budget will lead to a less accurate census.

Can the Republican leadership tell me where there is waste, fraud or abuse in the Census Bureau? Because, the GAO cannot. The GAO released a report only last month that said there was no waste in the budget for the 2000 Census!

Mr. Speaker, the Census, has had its budget called an emergency one week and had its budget cut the next. This is wacky.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, Democrats will continue to fight for critical priorities in the Labor, HHS, and Education appropriations bill so that the bill will address the education and health needs of all America's children.

The bill as currently drafted fails in this regard:

For example, it cuts $60 million of the President's request for the GEAR UP Program, leaving over 100,000 disadvantaged high school students without mentoring, counseling, and tutoring services critical to helping them reach their fullest potential.

It cuts $50 million from the President's proposal to educate disadvantaged youth and their families about college opportunities.

And at a time when we need to increase resources to attack the HIV/AIDS crisis particularly in our communities of color, where African-Americans represent 43 percent and Latinos 20 percent of new HIV/AIDS cases—the bill cuts $39 million from this critical program.

This is a sad commentary on the Republican vision for our country's future, and it is the wrong choice for America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. HOYER

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. HOYER. Yes, the gentleman is.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOYER moves to recommit the conference report on the bill H.R. 3064 to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to disagree to section 1001(e) of Division C (relating to pay for Members of Congress) in the conference substitute.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. 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 11, nays 417, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 548]

YEAS—11

Doolittle
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
King (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Meeks (NY)
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Rahall
Watt (NC)

NAYS—417

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Engel

NOT VOTING—5

Hinojosa
Mascara
Rush
Scarborough
Waters

□ 1713

Messrs. CAPUANO, NADLER, TANCREDO, SIMPSON, Ms. McCARTHY of Missouri, Mrs. BONO, and Messrs. WHITFIELD, SMITH of New Jersey, BARR of Georgia, HINCHEY, OWENS and TOWNS changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. KING changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEREUTER). The question is on the conference report.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 211, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 549]

YEAS—218

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Saxton
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw

Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—211

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pickett
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shows
Sisisky
Skelton
Slaughter
Snyder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—5

Hinojosa
Mascara
Rush
Scarborough
Waters

□ 1731

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, October 21, 1999, because of a family matter that I had to attend to in Houston, I was unable to cast my votes.

Mr. Speaker, if I had been here, I would have cast my vote in favor of roll call vote No. 522. I would have voted in favor of roll call vote No. 523. I would have voted against roll call vote No. 524. I would have voted in favor of roll call vote No. 525. I would have voted in favor of roll call vote 526. I would have voted against roll call vote 527. I would have voted against roll call vote 528. I would have voted against roll call vote 529. I would have voted in favor of roll call vote 530. I would have voted in favor of roll call vote 531. I would have voted against roll call vote 532.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on October 26, I was in my District on official business.

I would have voted in favor of roll call vote 539, House Concurrent Resolution 102. I would have voted in favor of roll call vote 540, House Concurrent Resolution 188. I would have voted in favor of roll call vote 541, H.R. 1175.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. BONIOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader or the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO) regarding the schedule for the rest of the day, the balance of the week, and next week.

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

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

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

I would like to announce, Mr. Speaker, that the House has completed its business for the week. There will be no legislative business in the House tomorrow.

I want to express on behalf of the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), his appreciation to the Committee on Appropriations, which has been doing an outstanding job.

I would also like to announce that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), has allowed the committee Members to have tomorrow off, so we are very appreciative of that.

The House will meet next on Monday, November 1, at 12:30 p.m., for morning hour debates, and at 2 p.m., for legislative business.

We will consider a number of bills under suspension of the rules, a list of which will be distributed to Members' offices tomorrow.

On Monday we do not expect recorded votes until 6 p.m.

On Tuesday, November 2, and the balance of the week, the House will take up the following measures, all of which will be subject to rules: S. 900, the Financial Services Modernization Act conference report; H.R. 3081, the Wage and Employment Growth Act, and H.R. 2389, the County Schools Funding Revitalization Act of 1999.

Mr. Speaker, we also expect a conference report on the Satellite Home Viewer Act to be ready by next week.

Mr. BONIOR. If my colleague would indulge me for a second, what day do we expect to have the minimum wage bill up on the floor?

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would say to the gentleman that we are trying to get through some other work, and that we continue to try and reach a bipartisan accord on the minimum wage bill. I do not expect that we will have it up in the early part of next week, but probably in the latter part of next week.

Mr. BONIOR. Would the gentleman repeat that, please?

Mr. LAZIO. I would say to the gentleman from Michigan, we are trying hard to reach a bipartisan accord on the minimum wage and tax package. I expect that there will be other legislation that will be on the floor early in the week, probably suspensions on Monday and Tuesday. After that, there will be other bills that are subject to rules. We will have those votes later in the week.

It is more likely than not that we will have the minimum wage bill up later in the week, next week.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman know what kind of rule we can anticipate on the wage bill?

Mr. LAZIO. I would say to the gentleman that I think that the Committee on Rules is going to be considering that. I am sure they will come up with a fair rule in order for us to consider that, but there has been no decision yet on the substance of the rule.

Mr. BONIOR. Can the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) enlighten us perhaps on what he might have in mind in terms of the rule on the wage bill?

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

Mr. LAZIO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding to me.

We are going to have an extraordinarily fair and balanced rule that will allow this House to, as has always been the case under this majority, work its will. We will look forward to the debate. We will welcome the gentleman's input on any recommendations to the rule.