United States of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 23, 2000 No. 34

# House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEASE).

□

## DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
*March 23, 2000.*

I hereby appoint the Honorable EDWARD A. PEASE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

□

## PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We are grateful, O merciful God, that You are with us wherever we are and whatever we do. We know that Your spirit gives us forgiveness for the ways of our past, direction for the path ahead, and the comforting assurance that we are never alone.

We gain strength from the words of the Psalmist:

''Be still, and know that I am God,
I am exalted among the nations,
I am exalted in the Earth.
The Lord of hosts is with us;
The God of Jacob is our refuge.''

May Your good word, O God, be with all Your people, and give them the peace and confidence that You alone can give. In Your name we pray. Amen.

□

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. MCNULTY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. MCNULTY. 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. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

□

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HUTCHINSON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

□

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the earnings test for individuals who have attained retirement age.

□

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain ten 1-minute speeches per side.

## PASS THE COLOMBIAN AID PACKAGE

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, each week that we delay the passage of the Colombia aid package costs America the lives of 1,000 of its children. That means every day we sit here and do nothing about the drug trade from Colombia, 143 of our young people will die from drug-related causes. In the time it takes us to debate and vote on the aid package, 12 children will succumb to drug addiction.

In 1998, 5 million young people in this country required treatment for drug addiction, and nearly 600,000 required an emergency room visit. In the United States, there are 1.6 million drug-related arrests annually, and over half of our prison population has committed drug related crimes. Even more disturbing, while the average age of marijuana users is increasing, heroin abusers are getting younger.

Seventy-five percent of all the heroin entering this country comes from Colombia. Delaying this aid package will only bring in more.

Mr. Speaker, we have worked hard to stop the genocide in other countries. We now have the duty to stop the senseless slaughter of a generation of young Americans. If we love our children as much as we claim, then we must pass the Colombia aid package, and soon.

□

## PACT: PARENTS OF ABDUCTED CHILDREN TOGETHER

(Mr. LAMPSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to talk about Lady Catherine Meyer, wife of the British Ambassador



Printed on recycled paper.

to the United States and mother of Constantin and Alexander, and the organization she has formed called PACT, Parents of Abducted Children Together.

Constantin and Alexander left for a summer holiday with their father in Germany in 1994, and their father has kept them in Germany ever since. In the last 6 years, Lady Meyer has only seen her sons for a total of about 24 hours. Lady Meyer formed PACT to help American parents gain at least basic access rights to their children.

Today I will join my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), in introducing a concurrent resolution urging signatories to uphold the Hague Convention on the civil aspects of international child abduction. This resolution was introduced today with over 90 original cosponsors, a powerful statement on the importance of this issue. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and I may be the legs and the feet to move this legislation through the House, but Lady Meyer is truly its heart and soul.

Mr. Speaker, children should be a nonpartisan issue, and I urge the House to pass this resolution and bring our children home.

□

## UPHOLDING THE CONSTITUTION

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week the United States Supreme Court ruled that the President had illegally exceeded the power granted to him under the Constitution. In his quest to regulate every aspect of American life and society, the President issued an executive order in 1996 granting the Food and Drug Administration the power to regulate tobacco marketing. However, Congress never gave the President, this administration nor his agency the authority to issue these regulations.

Mr. Speaker, I am relieved that the United States Supreme Court has upheld the Constitution and the basic tenets of our democracy. But, Mr. Speaker, I am also worried, worried that what the Clinton administration will continue to do is usurp the powers granted to this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we need to ensure that the balance of power as envisioned by our Founding Fathers is maintained.

I yield back the monocratic attempts of this current administration to govern by edict and executive order, rather than by democratic principles.

□

## REFORM OF JUSTICE DEPARTMENT NEEDED NOW

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, after 80 Americans were killed at Waco, the Justice Department investigated the Justice Department. When half of the Weaver family was shot down and killed, the Justice Department investigated the Justice Department. When serious charges concerning top government officials accused of doing business with Chinese nationals to influence our election was brought to the Justice Department, they looked the other way and did not investigate.

Unbelievable. The hen house fox in America investigates the hen house fox.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we reformed welfare, the IRS, and I am submitting a bill to reform the Justice Department. I am asking Rush Limbaugh to read it carefully, Michael Reagan, Tom Pope, Blanquita Cullum, Ron Verb, Tom Joyner, and help me from the outside like you did with the IRS.

I yield back the lack of oversight on the Justice Department of the United States.

□

## AMERICANS FACING LOSS OF PERSONAL PRIVACY

(Mr. HUTCHINSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, each day in the newspaper we read or hear of the news of yet another account of how Americans have a growing concern about invasions of their own personal privacy.

Today in the USA Today, the headline reads, ''Filesafe, health records may not be confidential.'' It says, ''Most patients assume that what they tell their doctor is confidential, but it might not be. Blame the loss of privacy on the Internet or on the growing use of computer records.''

Mr. Speaker, more and more Americans are voicing their concern about the loss of their own personal privacy. They are alarmed at the accessibility of medical records, their financial information, how it is being used. They want to know how they can get on the Internet without strangers downloading personal information about them. In today's information society, all of these issues are hopelessly interwoven.

This Congress should adopt privacy legislation. The best approach is the bipartisan Privacy Protection Commission, which I introduced along with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN). A Supreme Court Justice said the most cherished right of civilized man is the right to be left alone. In this Congress, we need to address that, and I urge my colleagues to consider that legislation.

□

## PROPOSED BUDGET NEGLECTS CHILDREN AND SENIORS

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, every policy decision we make here in the House affects our children, and today we are going to consider a Republican budget resolution that does not consider the needs of our children.

Their budget resolution increases the national defense budget by over $17 billion in the year 2001, while increasing education spending by only $2 billion. That is $15 billion less. What a disgrace.

We spend billions of dollars each year on nuclear weapons, but we have to scrape together money for new schools, we have to scrape together money for critical school breakfast programs. It is wrong. It is wrong for our children, it is wrong for our Nation.

Our children need us to invest in their future. They need us to invest in education, they need Social Security and Medicare protected for their future, and they need the national debt paid down. By the way, this works to help our seniors also.

The Republican budget resolution takes care of millionaires and their risky tax breaks, but it does not take care of our seniors and our children.

□

## PORNOGRAPHY: A CANCER EATING AWAY AT THE AMERICAN FAMILY

(Mr. LARGENT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, I stand this morning appalled at a cancer that is eating away at the American family. That cancer is illegal pornography.

Federal law prohibits interstate transportation and distribution of this material. Through the Internet, the family rooms and home offices of our Nation have turned into the worst porn shop you can imagine. The fact is that America's children and families have been assaulted by more obscene, lewd, and disgusting material than imaginable just 8 years ago. For instance, when a child doing research types in whitehouse.com, what do they see? Illegal pornography.

The revenues that illegal pornography rakes in are more than all the money generated by rock and country music combined. And how has the Department of Justice responded? We have seen a drop in the rate of prosecutions of illegal pornography of nearly 75 percent since 1992.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to call on the Department of Justice to begin aggressively prosecuting illegal pornography for the long-term health of our children and the soul of our country.

□

## AMERICA DESERVES A RESPONSIBLE BUDGET

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, once again the Republican leadership has designed a budget that is completely out

of touch with the needs and the values of middle class families. Even conservative members of their own party claim that the GOP budget is too spendthrift.

The Republican budget is a reckless plan that fails to extend the life of Social Security and Medicare by even one day. Instead of strengthening these pillars of retirement security, the Republican budget spends the surplus on $250 billion in tax cuts for the wealthiest people in this country. It is irresponsible, and it is wrong.

The Democrats have provided an alternative which strengthens and preserves Social Security and Medicare, provides targeted tax cuts to working middle class families who need it the most, provides a prescription drug benefit for all seniors, focuses on education and lowering class size and increasing discipline and accountability and standards. We can do this and still lower the national debt, lower the interest rates, and provide that targeted tax cut relief to the middle class.

The American people deserve a budget that is responsible and that is fair, not what has been concocted by the Republican leadership.

□

## ENFORCEMENT OF OBSCENITY LAWS NEEDED

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, pornographers in this country make more money than rock and country music combined. Pornographers bring in more dollars in a year than all Broadway productions, all theater shows, all ballet, jazz and classical music combined. And this administration is doing almost nothing about it.

The Supreme Court has ruled that obscenity is not protected by the First Amendment. Federal law prohibits interstate transportation and distribution of obscenity. But since 1992, prosecutions for interstate distribution and sale of illegal pornography are down 75 percent. In all of 1997, there were only six prosecutions by all 93 U.S. Attorneys.

The cause and effect between pornography and crime, violence against women and children, rape and child abuse, is clearly established. The President and the Department of Justice should enforce the law, not ignore it.

□

## AN IRRESPONSIBLE BUDGET

(Mr. BACA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the budget. The Republican budget contains tax breaks for the wealthy while ignoring working Americans, which I think is irresponsible. It is not a fiscally oriented budget that looks toward the future.

It contains deep cuts in domestic spending. The Republican budget would cut FBI agents and Drug Enforcement agents, college scholarships, air traffic controllers, and programs for women and children.

By contrast, the Democratic plan invests in education, our future in preparing our working force for the 21st Century. It reduces class sizes, protects our senior citizens, builds schools, provides college scholarships, provides affordable drug prescriptions, preserves Social Security and Medicare and pays down the deficit in a responsible manner before spending and emptying the bank account.

□ 1015

The Democratic plan looks toward the future and a sensible, balanced tax relief. It is an investment in support and strength of our Social Security and Medicare, and it pays off the debt. It provides everyone with an opportunity to succeed and work hard. It provides our children, our senior citizens who are less fortunate.

□

## PORKER OF THE WEEK AWARD

(Mr. HEFLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week the world watched as five cloned piglets were introduced before an international news core. Scientists cheered the achievement as a scientific and medical breakthrough. Maybe the American people should have cheered as well since we paid for a good bit of that research with $2 million of our tax dollars.

The Advanced Technology Program, a corporate welfare program managed by the Department of Commerce, gave a grant to the company responsible for cloning the piglets. The company, PPL Therapeutics, claims it needs taxpayer assistance because it cannot find private backing for cloning research. It will certainly be interesting to see if that company shares its profits with the American taxpayers now that they have found success.

In this modern-day nursery rhyme, five little piggies got cloned, and the American public got taken to market. The ATP gets my ''Porker of the Week'' Award.

□

## BUDGET AND DEBT REDUCTION

(Mr. SHOWS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the upcoming budget debate and the opportunity we have to pay off our debt.

Did my colleagues know that reducing our national debt would provide a tax cut in itself to millions of Americans because it will restrain and lower interest rates? Did my colleagues know that more than 25 percent of our individual income taxes go to paying off interest on our national debt? We can greatly restructure our budget and get our real tax savings to America if we pay off the debt now.

Did my colleagues know that more than $1.2 trillion is held by foreign investors? In 1998, the U.S. Government paid $91 billion in interest payments to these foreign investors.

We must reduce this drain and create a stronger global economy for American business and agriculture.

This is the right thing to do. Let us give our children a strong America. Let us pay off the national debt. I urge everyone to take an honest look at the Blue Dog Coalition's proposal. I believe it would put us on the right track.

□

## SOUND ENERGY POLICY NEEDED FOR ECONOMY, NATIONAL SECURITY, AND LOWER GAS PRICES

(Ms. DUNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, working Americans across the country are paying the highest prices at the pump at any time since World War II. More and more of their hard-earned dollars are spent on gasoline, leaving far less dollars to be spent on their loved ones.

But the lack of any energy policy by the Clinton-Gore administration has put not only our economic security at risk but our national security as well. The United States relies on foreign imports at this point for 56 percent of its crude oil needs today. That compares to 35 percent during the Arab oil embargo in 1973. Think what that would mean to the United States if that supply were suddenly cut off.

The Clinton-Gore energy policy will just make things worse before they get better. The Department of Energy estimates that in 20 years the United States will be dependent on foreign imports for 65 percent of our crude oil needs.

We must have a sound energy policy to provide for America's economic and national security interests and lower prices at the pumps.

□

## SUPPORT THE STAMP OUT CANCER REAUTHORIZATION ACT

(Mr. BASS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Stamp Out Cancer Reauthorization Act. Now, this bill would extend for an additional 2 years the breast cancer research stamp program enacted by us in the last Congress.

Now, this is a 40-cent stamp used normally for 33-cent postage. The excess revenue raised is used to provide funding for breast cancer research at NIH.

As of last month, almost 160 million stamps had been sold, raising $11.3 million for breast cancer research. 182,800 new cases of breast cancer are estimated for the year 2000; and, sadly

enough, there will be 41,200 deaths expected.

Breast cancer remains the most common form of cancer among women. We need every dime we can to promote research in this important field. Please join me in cosponsoring this bill, which I plan to introduce today.

□

## TIME TO MOVE FORWARD ON GUN LEGISLATION IS NOW

(Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, next month, very soon, we will unfortunately mark the 1-year anniversary of the tragedy at Columbine High School. Unfortunately, sensible gun control or legislation still languishes here in the Congress.

Forty-three percent of households in America with children have guns. Nothing is wrong with that. It would seem to me, though, that those of us in this Congress, in the face of horrors and tragedies around the Nation, would feel compelled to act.

In my home State of Tennessee, 95 percent of background checks for those who wish to purchase guns take place within 2 hours. Only 5 percent require additional information from law enforcement authorities.

Is it that much of an inconvenience, I say to those Members of the other side and even on my side, those in the National Rifle Association, and those in the gun lobby community? Is it that much to wait to ensure that we are able to cut down on human loss? Is it that much to wait to ensure that children, indeed, would be safer?

The conferees in the House and Senate have not met since August. I applaud the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) for bringing a motion to instruct the conferees to meet. Let the leadership in the House and Senate call the meeting of the Senate conferees. Let us do right by our children.

□

## FISCAL YEAR 2000 BUDGET RESOLUTION

(Mr. GUTKNECHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, later today we are going to have a heated debate about the next Federal budget. We have already heard that some of our friends on the left are saying there are tax cuts for the rich. I guess if one is married, one is considered rich because we do make room to eliminate the marriage penalty tax. I guess if one owns a small business or if one is a farmer, I guess they consider one rich because we do make it easier in terms of estate taxes.

But the really good news about this Federal budget, and I hope Members are paying attention, is that this year, in this fiscal year, we will spend in the Federal budget $1,780 billion. Under the budget we are proposing, we are talking about spending $1,820 billion. That is a 2.2 percent increase. That is the smallest increase in my adult life.

More importantly, Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of Labor Statistics tells us that this year the average family budget will grow at 4.9 percent. Now, when is the last time we have had a Federal budget that grew at half the rate of the average family budget? This is a good budget. It is fair. It has been evenly crafted. I hope Members will join me in supporting it.

□

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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 345, nays 58, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 66]

YEAS—345

Abercrombie
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clayton
Clement
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
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
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tierney
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Upton
Vento
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NAYS—58

Aderholt
Baird
Bilbray
Bonior
Borski
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Clay
Clyburn
Condit
Costello
Crowley
DeFazio
English
Filner
Gillmor
Gutknecht
Hefley
Hill (MT)
Hilliard
Hooley
Hulshof
Kucinich
LaFalce
Larson
Latham
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Metcalf
Miller, George
Moore
Oberstar
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Ramstad
Rogan
Sabo
Schaffer
Scott
Slaughter
Snyder
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Towns
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Weller
Wicker

NOT VOTING—31

Ackerman
Armey
Barton
Bliley
Bono
Crane
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Engel
Greenwood
Herger
Hill (IN)
Jackson-Lee (TX)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Jefferson | McCollum | Sessions |
| Klink | McDermott | Tiahrt |
| Kuykendall | Pallone | Toomey |
| Linder | Pomeroy | Wise |
| Lowey | Royce | Young (AK) |
| Martinez | Schakowsky | |

□ 1047

Mr. OWENS changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□

## ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR H.R. 2418, ORGAN PROCUREMENT AND TRANSPLANTATION NETWORK AMENDMENTS OF 1999

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon a ''Dear Colleague'' letter will be sent to all Members informing them that the Committee on Rules is planning to meet the week of March 27 to grant a rule which may limit the amendment process on H.R. 2418, the Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network Amendments of 1999.

Any Member who wishes to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies and a brief explanation of the amendment by 12 noon on Tuesday, March 28, to the Committee on Rules in Room H–312 in the Capitol. Amendments should be drafted to the text of the bill as reported by the Committee on Commerce.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Council to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House. Again, this is the Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network Amendments of 1999.

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

Mr. GOSS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, we are talking about the organ transplant bill?

Mr. GOSS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Is this the bill that we will eventually work on, unlike the budget that we are voting on today that was constructed at 3 o'clock this morning without anybody testifying on it?

Mr. GOSS. Reclaiming my time from the distinguished gentleman, the ranking member of the Committee on Rules, who I am delighted to see this morning again, I will assure the gentleman, to the best of my knowledge, this will proceed in the normal way of the Committee on Rules business and should be discovered on your desk at the Committee on Rules meeting time as we normally do at the daylight hour.

We will hopefully proceed through a hearing process and hopefully proceed through the rulemaking process in a timely fashion with the cooperation of the gentleman's minority party.

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

Mr. GOSS. Of course, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MOAKLEY. I appreciate my friend yielding. I have not seen him since 3 o'clock this morning, and also the wonderful chairman we have here, I have not seen him since 3 o'clock this morning.

Mr. DREIER. Why did the gentleman leave so early?

Mr. MOAKLEY. I had to catch a bus, but the only thing I want to be sure is that all the efforts that we go to in getting ready for this piece, if this is going to be the bill that we are ultimately going to vote on, unlike the budget bill that was put before us at 2:30 this morning, after being constructed in the dark of night in some den by I do not know who, but that bill never saw a committee, and it was never voted on by a committee. I want to make sure that is the way it is going to go.

Mr. GOSS. Reclaiming my time, I can assure the gentleman that is my understanding. We are fortunate to have the chairman of the Committee on Rules here who can give the gentleman further assurance. I shall yield to him.

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

Mr. GOSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let us not have a vote on his assessment.

Mr. MOAKLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding. Let me assure my colleague, who was in his office I know last night at 8:29 last evening, the gentleman received 99.9 percent of this budget package that we had. And I know that the gentleman spent the following several hours carefully scrutinizing this legislation. I think that he will find when we have this vote today it is a very responsible, appropriate way to move ahead with this.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GOSS. Reclaiming my time from the chairman, I yield further to the distinguished ranking member.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, there was an additional $5 billion added that was not in the bill when we heard it.

Mr. DREIER. I do not know about $5 billion that was added.

Mr. MOAKLEY. The gentleman does not know that. Maybe we should take more time to look at it.

Mr. DREIER. We looked closely at it.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I reclaim my time and assure the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) that the next piece of business we hope to see on the floor which I am about to call up will give us the opportunity to discuss further matters of interest that he has raised.

□

## CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 446 ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 446

*Resolved,* That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 290) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2005. The first reading of the concurrent resolution shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution for failure to comply with clause 4(a) of rule XIII are waived. General debate shall not exceed three hours, with two hours of general debate confined to the congressional budget equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, and one hour of general debate on the subject of economic goals and policies equally divided and controlled by Representative Saxton of New Jersey and Representative Stark of California or their designees. After general debate the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original concurrent resolution for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. All points of order against the amendment printed in part B of the report are waived except that the adoption of an amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute the conclusion of consideration of amendments to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. After the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment and a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendment as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the concurrent resolution or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to final adoption without intervening motion except amendments offered by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to achieve mathematical consistency. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

SEC. 2. Rule XXIII shall not apply with respect to the adoption by the Congress of a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), my friend, 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 on this issue only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 446 is a structured rule, which is fairly typical for bringing forward the annual congressional budget resolution. For a number of years, we have gotten into the very good habit of managing debate on the budget by asking that all amendments be drafted in the form of substitutes so that Members could consider the whole picture as we debate and weigh our spending priorities. This rule continues that tradition and wisely so.

We have gone to great lengths with this rule to juggle the competing needs of having a full debate on a range of issues and perspectives without allowing the process to become so unwieldy that it breaks down of its own weight.

In that regard, I think the rule is fair in making in order five substitute amendments reflecting an array of points of view.

Specifically, the rule provides for 3 hours of general debate, with 1 hour specifically designated for discussion of economic goals and policies as described by the Humphrey-Hawkins provisions of the current law.

Two hours of the debate time shall be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, and 1 hour shall be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK).

The rule waives clause 4(a) of rule XIII, requiring a 3-day layover of the Committee report, against consideration of the resolution. The rule makes in order an amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in Part A of the Committee on Rules report as an original concurrent resolution for the purpose of amendment.

This new base text makes a number of technical and substantive changes to the underlying resolution, changes that were discussed and negotiated throughout the day yesterday. This text is available to Members in the Committee on Rules report, which was filed last night.

The rule waives all points of order against this amendment. The rule further makes in order only those amendments printed in Part B of the Committee on Rules report. I would note that, of those five substitutes I mentioned, four are sponsored by Members of the minority.

Those amendments may be offered only in the order specified in the report, only by a Member designated in the report, and they shall be considered as read, they shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and they shall not be subject to amendment.

The rule waives all points of order against the amendments except that, if an amendment in the nature of a substitute is adopted, it is not in order to consider further substitutes.

The rule provides for a final period of general debate not to exceed 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the Budget to occur upon conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment.

The rule permits the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to offer amendments in the House necessary to achieve mathematical consistency.

Finally, the rule suspends the application of House Rule XXIII relating to the establishment of the statutory limit on the public debt with respect to the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001.

Mr. Speaker, thanks to the effort of our congressional majority, we have emerged from decades of deficits; and we are now operating in a brave new world of surplus. But that does not mean we can or should now abandon our commitment to fiscal discipline. In fact, it is when the sky looks most blue that we should be thinking about how best to shovel out from the mountain of debt we have incurred and prepare for the next rainy day, which inevitably we know will come.

So I am delighted to be bringing forward to the House, House Concurrent Resolution 290, the fiscal year 2001 fiscal budget blueprint. This document, although not binding as a law, sets forth the guideposts that will dictate the path we take for the rest of this session of Congress as we complete our budgeting work.

The budget reflects conservative principles and lays the groundwork for continued success in our mission of paying down the debt, protecting Social Security, shoring up Medicare, strengthening the national defense and education, and offering meaningful tax relief to our seniors, our families, and our small businesses.

□ 1100

This budget outlines $1 trillion in deficit reduction while taking the Social Security trust fund completely off the table and while opening the door for Congress to provide realistic prescription drug coverage for Medicare beneficiaries. At the same time, we have gone further than the President in the area of defense, something that is so critical in this changing world and at a time when we are asking so much of our men and women in uniform and those in our intelligence activities.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) and his committee for the work they have done. I particularly share their interest from a process standpoint in seeking ways to enforce the fiscal discipline this budget document outlines. I am delighted that we have been able to work out an arrangement that meets the concerns of some Members about setting aside surplus moneys up front for further debt reduction even while we make sure that we have provided the resources necessary so the appropriators can bring forward legislation that brings to life our commitments in key areas.

This rule brings that negotiation to fruition, and we have now put in place a process so that the issue of debt reduction will continue to be addressed as we move through this year's spending process. That is good news all around for all Americans. This is a fair rule. I urge Members to support it.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me the customary 30 minutes and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule. This resolution has never seen the light of day. This is not the resolution that the Committee on the Budget worked over for a few months. It is certainly not the resolution that the Committee on Rules held hearings on for several hours yesterday. In fact, I have talked to Members who have been here much longer than I, and they can recall no time in which a bill has come to the floor under those circumstances.

It arrived at 2 in the morning, hours after the final vote when the majority of the Members of this House had left the Hill. The ink will barely be dry when the leadership makes Members vote on this document. How many Members will see this new substitute before they have to vote? I would note that these are not technical changes. The majority has added $3 billion for science, still below what the President requested. The new resolution calls for $5 billion in unspecified cuts all to be announced later, and this is a travesty. The measure changes reconciliation numbers and includes two new points of order. It even changes the public debt limit though the rules of the House prohibit changing that number from what is reported by the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, we have been down this road with this budget process time and time again. The leadership in this body reminds me of the bridal contestants in the television show ''Who wants to marry a millionaire.'' They know it is a charade, but they are going through the motions anyway. This budget is as unrealistic as the failed budgets from

1998 and 1999. This proposed budget by the majority maintains a single-minded obsession with large tax cuts. It does nothing to extend the solvency of Social Security and Medicare for a single day and cuts funding for critical education, housing, and environmental protection programs.

In 1998, the majority party in the House and Senate failed to pass a budget resolution for the first time since the creation of the congressional budget process. In 1999, the budget adopted by the majority called for draconian cuts in appropriations to finance a huge $792 billion tax cut for the wealthy. This budget was disregarded by the majority almost as soon as they began the appropriations process.

When the final appropriations bill passed Congress in November, 2 months into the fiscal year, appropriated spending overran the budget resolution by $43.8 billion. In both 1998 and 1999, the American people rejected these same unrealistic cuts in essential Federal spending and excessive tax cuts for the very rich. Why on earth does the majority party believe the American people will suddenly change their minds and reject essential government services like Social Security and Medicare in favor of benefits for the wealthiest among us?

The definition of folly is to repeat what has failed and expect it to succeed, and that is just what this resolution does. It assumes that Congress will cut nondefense spending by $7 billion below this year's level and by $20 billion below the level needed to make up for inflation. Congress must then keep its foot on the brake for 4 more years, eventually taking nondefense spending $114 billion below the level of current purchasing power.

Compounding the problem of calling for implausible program cuts is the fact that the resolution already spends some of the Social Security surplus. The resolution's $200 billion tax cuts overwhelm the $114 billion reduction in the purchasing power of domestic appropriations. As a result under the resolution, the non-Social Security surplus is virtually gone by the year 2003. By 2004, the Government begins spending the Social Security surplus. And by 2010, the measure spends $68 billion of the Social Security money.

We have a choice. We can substitute this budget for one that extends the solvency of Social Security and Medicare, repays the national debt by the year 2013, provides targeted tax cuts to working families, invests in domestic priorities such as school modernization and improved access to health insurance for families.

I would like my colleagues to reflect for a moment. The surpluses on our horizon offer an extraordinary opportunity to pay down our large public debt which would be the ultimate tax cut. They allow us to make Social Security and Medicare sound and solvent for future generations. They mean that we can close the gaping hole in Medicare coverage and they make it possible for us to do more for education at all levels.

Unfortunately, this proposed budget resolution squanders this opportunity and jeopardizes the progress that we have made in eliminating the annual deficits and paying down the public debt. This measure also passes up the opportunity to put Social Security, Medicare, and the Nation as a whole on sound fiscal footing.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds. I would urge Members to pay very close attention to debate on the five substitutes we have made in order, four of them being from the other side of the aisle. Members need to know that under the process of this rule as I stated, once a substitution passes, we are not going to continue any others. In the vernacular, that means there are no free votes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. DREIER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule. I think it is important for us to note that this rule in fact puts into place what has been the case under both Democratic control of this institution and Republican control. What we have done is we have made four Democratic substitutes in order, one Republican substitute in order. We have been able to provide an opportunity for a wide range of proposals, to be very fairly debated. We listened up in the Committee on Rules to authors of those substitutes. They have indicated their willingness to be supportive of what it is we are trying to do here by moving ahead with a very fair and open debate, and I believe that it is in fact that.

99.9999 percent of this package was provided by the Committee on the Budget. We had the package placed in the hands of the minority and other Members of the Committee on Rules by 8:30 last night, and we did in fact make a modification. It deals with increasing spending for science. I happen to think that is a very high priority. For me as a Californian it is very important for us to do that. So let me just say that the rule is fair. The rule provides the minority with four opportunities to offer substitutes; the majority with one opportunity. So I think it should continue to enjoy very strong bipartisan support.

Let me move beyond the debate that we have going on right here to talk for just a few moments about the issue of the budget itself. I have found, maybe this is just my perspective as a Californian, that the American people very much want to see an end to the extraordinary partisanship that goes on, the partisan bickering which we have seen back and forth, just listening to some of the speeches that have been made and criticism of this very fair rule. They do not like those sorts of partisan attacks, and I hope very much that we can bring an end to that kind of harsh partisanship, and I think we have evidence of it coming to an end by simply looking at this budget.

Frankly, just take the example of education. Republicans and Democrats alike want to improve our public schools. This budget actually increases by almost 10 percent over last year the level of funding for schools. That is a $20 billion increase over 5 years. As we develop policies to go with those resources, we need to make sure that every American child has a chance to learn the skills and knowledge to succeed in our new 21st century economy.

Now, let us take another issue on which we have bipartisan agreement, national defense. Most Democrats, I am happy to say, now agree with what we Republicans have been saying for years, that we must bolster our national security spending so that we can get every soldier, sailor, and airman and their families and their children off of food stamps and into quality housing.

Let us look at a third issue, Social Security. This budget shows how Republicans and Democrats now stand together to ensure that the Social Security surplus is never again spent on other government programs. I am very happy to say that it is under this Republican leadership, under the strong leadership of Speaker Hastert, we have successfully protected every dollar of the Social Security surplus for the past 2 years, and this plan now does that for an additional 5 years. This is clearly the basis for long-term bipartisan retirement security reform.

Republicans and Democrats stand together to increase medical research. This budget dedicates $1 billion more than last year to find cures that will ease the pain of millions of American families. Republicans and Democrats stand together on key science initiatives, as I was saying. When we pass this rule, we will ensure that the science and space programs funded in this budget are supported at a level needed to continue the cutting-edge science and space work that go on in places like the Jet Propulsion Laboratory in Southern California and other fine facilities throughout the region that I am privileged to represent.

Now, Republicans and Democrats do agree on a wide range of very important priorities. But of course, there is still quite a bit of politics left. There is a difference between the basic philosophy of the competing budgets with the five substitutes that we will have today. Republicans believe that the Government has an important role in helping to address many problems, but we never lose sight of the fundamental fact that America is great because of

the American people, families, entrepreneurs, neighborhoods, businesses and farmers, not the Federal Government.

What does this mean in a budget? It means that while we work hard to address education, medical research, national defense, retirement security, and health care, we also set something aside for families. The Republican budget helps families by paying down $1 trillion in public debt by 2005 and retiring the entire debt by 2013. This will provide a tremendous boost to ensuring a strong, stable, vibrant economy for our children and grandchildren.

The Republican budget also provides some tax relief for American families, senior citizens, small businesses and farmers. Make no mistake, this budget spends a lot of money. As I said, we increase spending on education, health care, medical research, defense and science. But we believe that families should be in that priority list as well so that they have a little more of their own money to spend on school clothes for the kids, college tuition, or a new home computer. With half of American households participating in financial markets today, our Nation has what we like to call an emerging investor class. More than ever before, the American people recognize that they have a direct stake in policies focused on expanding economic prosperity, including smart tax relief.

Mr. Speaker, the investor class supports pro-growth, pro-investment tax reductions because they know that America's strength, our prosperity, is driven more by the emerging Internet economy and the NASDAQ, the wonder of NASDAQ and the companies involved there, than the Federal bureaucracy that exists here in Washington, DC.

This is a very, very good budget that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) is going to be moving forward here. I think that this rule deserves again strong bipartisan support by providing all these alternatives to our colleagues, and we can move ahead focusing on the areas of agreement and we can have what the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) describes as a full, vigorous, tough debate on these areas of disagreement.

I urge support of the rule and our budget package.

□ 1115

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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.)

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, judging from comments by the campaign of Governor Bush, this Republican budget abandons conservatives. If we take a close look at the details of this budget, it is clear that this budget also abandons middle-class families. In their haste to embrace massive fiscally irresponsible tax cuts, Republicans are abandoning Social Security, Medicare, and fiscal responsibility.

Despite their talk about how much they care about seniors, the Republican budget does nothing to strengthen the retirement security for current and future retirees.

This Republican budget does nothing to extend the life of Social Security and Medicare. It does not provide one dime to strengthen the Social Security or Medicare trust funds. They ignore the looming shortfall that threatens the future retirement security of all Americans.

The Republican budget fails to propose a Medicare prescription drug benefit to cover all seniors. The cost of prescription drugs is hurting all seniors. This is not a problem which is just limited to low-income retirees.

The Republican budget does not help middle-class seniors. Their budget says that they need to be spending themselves into poverty with prescription drug costs before they get Medicare coverage of prescription drugs.

To make matters worse, I understand at 3:00 a.m. in the morning, the funding that was in their budget to support a Patients' Bill of Rights was taken out. So I suppose that priority will also be lost.

The Republican budget abandons the fiscal responsibility that we worked so hard to achieve and tries to turn back the clock to the early 1990s. They threaten the balanced budget and efforts to pay off the debt by the year 2013.

The analysis by the Democratic staff of the House Committee on the Budget found that the Republicans would spend some of the Social Security surplus by 2004 and as a result we would be revisited by on-budget deficits if we enact this budget once again.

The Republican budget proposes deep cuts in investments in education, health, and veterans affairs, putting our children and others even further behind.

One may ask, why this abandonment? The Republican budget sacrifices fiscal responsibility on the altar of massive tax cuts. The Republican budget proposes $150 billion in tax cuts now, $50 billion after the smoke clears, and then possibly another $50 billion in tax cuts for the wealthy and special interests if revenues increase.

The American people rejected these massive tax cuts that threaten our economic progress and retirement security last year, in last year's budget debate. Clearly, Republicans still have not gotten the message. The American people want a budget plan that pays off the debt, extends the life of Social Security and Medicare, provides a prescription drug plan for all seniors, and addresses our pressing health and educational priorities.

So this is not the right budget. We need to vote against the rule and vote against this budget. Let us reject this budget and protect the surplus for the priorities of working families.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this budget and for our alternative that puts families first and keeps our fiscal house in order.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I am frankly kind of astounded by what I have just heard because I thought that was a speech laying in the bottom of the desk drawer from 6 years ago. It is so far from representing reality, I am really stunned.

I want to say what the budget does. I think the people will be very surprised when they hear about what we have in this budget.

First of all, this will be the second year, I think in my lifetime, that the politicians in Washington kept their mitts off of Social Security. That never happened before. In 1995, we were running $175 billion deficits; and they were projected to be as far as the eye could see, and here we are for the second year in a row, because of the leadership of people in this House, we are not going to touch the Social Security surplus. We are locking it up. We are saying to senior citizens, we are not going to take one dime of it and use it for any other spending like my colleagues on the other side of the aisle did for all of my lifetime.

We are saying we are not going to touch it. We are going to lock it up. We are going to put an electric fence around it, and it will only be used to pay for Social Security benefits or to pay down debt. We are the first group of leaders in this town to keep our mitts off of Social Security in decades. It is amazing.

Secondly, in terms of Medicare, not only are we going to have a reform agenda on Medicare to try to strengthen Medicare, but we have money set aside so that our poorest senior citizens can have access to prescription drugs; $40 billion worth of potential resources to both reform Medicare, strengthen Medicare and to provide a prescription drug benefit to our poorest seniors who cannot afford to go to the pharmacy because they do not have any money. That is in this budget.

Thirdly, we are going to pay down a trillion dollars in the publicly held debt. Did my colleagues hear what I said? We are going to pay down $1 trillion of the debt that is owed to the public in this country.

Now, if Regis was here and he was flashing this up on the wall about being a millionaire, everybody in the gallery would be standing up and cheering; but the fact is I think they will be cheering when they realize that by paying down a trillion dollars in the publicly held debt we are lifting a huge burden off the backs of our children.

When we came to this body in 1995 and took our majority, the guiding star was the future of our children. We are beginning to carry through with our promises, which is unusual for politicians.

Fourthly, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) just said that we do not have any tax relief for the middle class. I have to send him our budget because the first thing we passed around this House was to ease the marriage penalty so that when people get married they do not get punished for getting married. Now that is not something that does not apply to the middle class. Most of the people who are going to benefit are middle-class couples who got married, who are not going to be punished anymore because they got married. This budget will accommodate that.

In addition to that, if one is a senior citizen and they have decided to work, in this town we have a formula: if they work, we punish them.

Well, we just passed a bill through this House that I think received total support from everybody in this House that said if seniors work we are not going to take away their Social Security benefits.

Who does that apply most to? People at the lower end of the economic spectrum.

Now, say someone is a little family farmer. We just had a thousand farmers show up in this town. We are saying that when they die, they are not going to have to visit the undertaker and the IRS on the same day. They can take their family farm, and they can give it to their kids.

Is that not what we want in America? I think so.

Someone owns this little pharmacy, they are struggling every day to make it, they make their dollars, they get old, they want to pass it on to their kids, that is the American dream. To say that that does not reflect a middle-class value, I mean, come on, shame. We know better than that.

There are going to be more programs for tax relief for all Americans. If someone is self-employed and they want to get health insurance, we are going to make that available to them. If one is a mother and father that has their kid in a school where their kid is not safe and not learning, we are going to give them incentives so they will be able to save so their kid can go to the school of their choice.

It is going to be in this budget. It is all provided for.

We strengthen defense, and we also strengthen education. We also continue our historic increases in investments at the National Institutes of Health to help people fight the diseases that afflict them with heart, with cancer, and with lung.

I am astounded. I believe in a good old-fashioned, fair fight, but let us just fight on the facts. Let us not make stuff up. Let us not scare people.

The question today is whether we are going to advance the reform agenda in Washington or whether we are going to continue to be obstacles in this town to the need to reform and pare down government and prioritize government and clean up waste, fraud and abuse and protect Social Security and provide tax relief.

If one is for the reform agenda, they will support this budget. I know that for the period of the next, I do not know, 6 or 7 hours, we are going to hear a lot of code words: risky, dangerous, irresponsible. Those are code words for more bureaucracy. They are code words for more standing in line. They are code words for more frustration. They are code words for higher taxes.

That is fine, but let us not just make stuff up out of the thin air.

Mr. Speaker, I hope some of my colleagues will have the good sense to fight this fair. If they want more spending, great; say it. If they want higher taxes, fine; say it. That is what the fight ought to be on.

This is a budget we should all support.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, last week things were looking pretty good around here. Last week the Republican members of the Committee on the Budget showed the world their proposed budget. They gave people plenty of time to read it, and they were not ashamed of it.

Last night, all that changed. Last night, or this morning, at 2:00 a.m. this morning, the real Republican budget came out. But unless one is a member of the Committee on Rules, they did not see the Republican budget until 2:00 this morning, just hours before its coming up for a vote.

Mr. Speaker, these days the only creatures that stir in the middle of the night, long after the sun goes down, are vampires and members of the Committee on Rules. Eighty percent of the members' meetings on the Committee on Rules do not start until the lights have to be turned on, and from the looks of some of these bills, Mr. Speaker, I could see why. They read a lot better in the dark.

This budget does nothing to save Social Security or Medicare or help seniors with the Medicare prescription drug plan. The chairman of the committee said that 99.9 percent of this was the same budget. Let me say some of the other parts of that budget.

Some of the changes are pretty big, Mr. Speaker. This was all done after the hearing concluded. They went back into this room somewhere, and they changed the public debt limit, which is a violation of the Budget Act. They promised to cut $5 billion, but they did not say where they were going to cut it from. They added $3 billion for science, which still is far less than the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) would have added if his amendment was made in order.

They still did not do much more middle-class families.

They added two brand-new points of order. They changed the reconciliation directives. They changed the provision dealing with health care and Patients' Bill of Rights. They changed the reserve fund for thrift savings plans and benefits. These were all done, Mr. Speaker, after the hearing had been concluded for hours.

This bill that we are voting on today never appeared before the Committee on the Budget.

So I urge my colleagues to reject this budget and send it back and let the Committee on the Budget who have expertise in this field really have a chance to look at it and do something about Social Security and Medicare, and preferably earlier in the day.

□ 1130

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the time available on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) has 11 minutes remaining and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) has 19 minutes remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, last year, for the first time in 40 years, we balanced the budget without including the surplus and Social Security. We balanced it to the tune of $704 million. Having reached this milestone, we made a vow on both sides of the aisle when we brought our budget resolution to the floor last year that we would not get back into an on-budget deficit again, we would not slip back into borrowing from the Social Security trust fund. We would use the surplus, we said, in the Social Security trust fund instead to buy up existing Treasury bonds and notes, reduce debt rather than create new Federal debt.

To accomplish that purpose we both trotted out something we called ''lockboxes,'' a portentous name. When you got through all the boilerplate, both of them came down to this. You have a point of order. If somebody brought to the House floor a resolution, like this resolution, a budget resolution, and it dipped into Social Security again, went into deficit, you could raise a point of order.

Now, to the American people, that suggests summary dismissal. It disposes of the question. But in truth, the Committee on Rules in the House is the task master at waiving points of order.

We have before us today a rule that ought to be subject to a point of order if we take the lockbox seriously, because this rule waives all points of order. This rule permits a budget resolution to come to the floor that, in our

opinion, would wipe out the surplus in 3 years and, in the 4th and 5th years, 2004, 2005, and subsequent years, it would put us back into deficit again, put us back into borrowing from Social Security.

This simple chart, this simple arithmetic on this chart shows you why. The Republicans claim that they have $110 billion surplus over the next 5 years. But the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) just showed that they intend to use $40 billion for a prescription drug benefit, and we welcome them to the fold on this issue, because we think it needs to be done. So they have matched us. They have $40 billion for a Medicare benefit.

In addition, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) has said on repeated occasions in committee markup, yesterday in the Committee on Rules, last night on the floor, that they will have a tax cut of $150 billion, plus $50 billion more, and if CBO says there are more revenues, they will go up still more. When you factor in that additional $50 billion, the $40 billion for Medicare prescription drugs, guess what? The surplus disappears in 3 years and we are back in deficit, back into borrowing from Social Security.

So this in simple arithmetic is the argument why this rule should be voted down. Vote it down. Make the Republicans bring back to the floor a budget resolution that safely is in surplus, and not this one, which clearly puts us in danger of backsliding into deficit and borrowing again from Social Security.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding me time to speak in opposition to this rule.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is restrictive. Although there are claims that it is allowing all debate on all points of view, it, in fact, does not do that.

I spent a considerable amount of time with my staff putting together a substitute amendment that certainly would have allowed this debate to be expanded out to talk about tax fairness and the kind of investments we need to keep our economic growth and to keep families secure in this country. I think it was a point of view that deserved to be debated, deliberated and voted upon.

We ought not to have just a debate about whether we are going to have incredibly huge tax cuts that favor only a small segment of already wealthy individuals and corporations, or a situation where people talk about taxing some more.

We have within this trillions of dollars of budget a huge amount of unnecessary and unwarranted advantages that are given to special interests. If we were to recapture those, we can do the two things that we need to do in this country, invest in our economic growth, in education and job training, in health care and retirement security, and research and development, in infrastructure, and, at the same time, have the kind of fairness we need.

Mr. Speaker, we need to have this process go back to the drawing board and come out again.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

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

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have a problem with the rule, but I do have a problem with the budget resolution offered by the Republican Party today. Yogi Berra should be with us here today, because it is ''deja vu all over again.'' Last year it was a $800 billion risky tax cut scheme, this year it is a $1 trillion 10-year risky tax cut scheme.

You would think that the Republican leadership would get it eventually and start listening to the American people about where our priorities should lie. But the problem is not that they do not get it, the problem is that they cannot sell it. They could not sell it last year when it was a $800 billion tax cut, they are not going to be able to sell it this year with a $1 trillion tax cut.

They can't sell it because the American people won't buy it. The American people understand if these projected budget surpluses do in fact materialize, although there is no guarantee they will, now is the time to take care of existing obligations, to shore up Social Security, Medicare, and pay down the $5.7 trillion national debt. That is the fiscally responsible and fiscally disciplined approach.

It is sad that when the Republican leadership and members on the committee had an opportunity to vote for their presidential nominee's fiscal plan, a $1.5 trillion tax cut scheme, they were all ducking for cover, hiding under their desks and trying to flee the budget room in order to avoid having to vote on that issue.

But the saddest commentary of all is that a contemporary American comic strip is more reflective of the values of the American people today than the governing majority party in the House of Representatives. I do not know how many of my colleagues had the opportunity to see the Doonesbury article that appeared about a week ago, but I think it tells the story very, very well.

It opens up with a scene of men with one guy saying, ''Heads up, he is coming this way.''

Another gentleman, ''Try not to make eye contact.''

And an empty hat, which I suppose depicts Governor Bush. Then Governor Bush saying, ''Hi, fellows, I'm George Bush and I'm asking for your support. If you vote for me I will give a huge tax cut. How is that for a straight deal, huh?''

''Well, I'm not sure. I mean, I can see how the wealthy might get excited. They'd be averaging $50,000. But it wouldn't mean much to a guy in my bracket.''

Another gentleman says, ''Besides, I care a lot more about shoring up Social Security and Medicare and paying down the national debt.''

''Yeah, didn't fiscal responsibility used to be a Republican issue?''

Then Governor Bush: ''But, but, you do not understand. I am offering you something for nothing. Free money. Don't you want free money?''

Then another gentleman: ''Sure, but not until we pay our bills.''

''Right.''

Governor Bush: ''What is the matter with this country?''

The last gentleman: ''I guess we have grown up a lot as a people. I know I have.''

Now, I am not saying the Doonesbury comic strip should set fiscal policy in this Nation, but I do believe, sadly, this comic strip better reflects the values of the American people and why we should support the Democratic alternative today.

I certainly didn't come to this Congress in order to leave a legacy of debt for my two little boys or for future generations.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, today we enjoy the fruits of fiscal responsibility and an expanding economy. This budget resolution, thrown together at 3 in the morning in the dark of night in a secret room, this budget resolution puts all that at risk. Why? To support huge tax cuts that threaten to bust budget and endanger Social Security and Medicare.

The only good thing that can be said about this resolution is that it is slightly less fiscally irresponsible than the plan put forward by Governor George Bush, to which Senator MCCAIN responded that it represented fiscal irresponsibility.

What kind of tax cuts are we asked to risk Social Security and Medicare for? We saw earlier this month, when the Republican tax bill provided three-quarters of the benefits to 1 percent of the richest Americans.

Mr. Speaker, in his earlier speech, the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman KASICH) invoked the sacred name of Regis Philbin. What game are we playing here?

The Republicans are not playing the game who wants to be a millionaire or who wants to marry a multimillionaire. They have a new game, who wants to risk Social Security to give huge tax breaks to multi-multi-multimillionaires.

Let us not play that game. Let us reject this rule and reject the Republican budget resolution and return to fiscal responsibility.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH)

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me time.

I love listening to these budget debates every year. It is like back to the future. It is like deja vu all over again. Unfortunately for the Democrats, they seem to be what Paul Simon called a one trick pony. It is the same thing over and over and over again.

Except this year they have got three trick ponies. They have MediScare. They talk about how Republicans are going to destroy Medicare and Social Security. They have class warfare, talking about massive tax cuts for the rich, and Americans are not going to buy it. Well, heck, Democrats are buying it. One hundred Republican and Democrat Senators last night supported stopping penalizing senior citizens for earning money. They supported the marriage tax penalty reduction, bought and sold for by Democrats. God bless America. Everybody is doing it.

They also spend without care. Every one of their substitutes spends more and taxes more than the Republican budget.

Now they are reading cartoons. That is how sad it has gotten. I understand, because you know, in 1995, when we got here, they were doing the same class warfare argument, saying that we were going to destroy the economy. You cannot balance the budget in 7 years without destroying the economy and killing the middle class.

Yet Alan Greenspan came to the Committee on the Budget and testified if you all would pass this Balanced Budget Act, I predict Americans will see unprecedented growth over the next 5 to 7 years. Greenspan said it in 1995. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) had the courage and vision to follow through with it, as did the Republican Congress. We did it, and you know what? It was not 7 years later. Five years later we balanced the budget. We gave the middle class Americans the strongest economic boom in over a generation. And we did something else. For the first time in a generation, this Congress did not steal from Social Security in their budget.

Yet these same Democrats that come to the floor today, that have the nerve to call themselves protectors of Social Security, were the very ones while in power for 40 years, stole from Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, I remember when some of us in 1995 said we could balance the budget and not steal from Social Security's trust fund, we were called radical extremists. Five years later, the budget is balanced; and we are keeping Social Security solvent by keeping our hands off of it.

I will tell you what, this year continues what we have done for the past 5 years. The gentlewoman from New York defined folly as repeating what has failed and expecting it to succeed. They have repeated the same class warfare arguments. They have repeated the same arguments of fear. They have repeated the same arguments of risky schemes. And their arguments have failed.

It is time to look at what has happened because of the vision of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the Committee on the Budget's vision, and this Congress' vision. We have balanced the budget. We have saved Social Security. And we have given tax cuts to middle class Americans.

□ 1145

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA).

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the budget rule. I am totally against the budget debate and the budget rule. I think it is wrong for America. We just heard the debate right now, and we talked about keeping the budget balanced. It is not just about keeping the budget balanced today. We are talking about a solvent budget, a budget that will be there for the future as well, protecting our children for today, investing in our future, protecting Social Security, taking down the debt, taking care of drug prescriptions, taking care of what we need to do.

It is easy to get up here and talk about a balanced budget. Yes, we can talk about it today, but what is the impact it will have on the future? That is what is so important right now. It is being fiscally responsible, taking that budget and doing what needs to be done. We are not doing that.

The Democrats have a budget proposal right now that deals with taking care of the American people, working families; taking care of investing in our future, protecting as well what we need to do, and that is to make sure that we have good education, quality education, scholarships that will be available. It is investing in the future.

I ask my colleagues to vote against this rule.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask again where we stand on the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) has 8 minutes remaining; the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) has 9½ minutes remaining.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Again, I did not have time before, but I think I should call to the attention of the House, in light of what the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) said earlier, that this resolution offered by the Republicans does not provide for the abolition of the Social Security earnings test. If it did, on page 33 of the concurrent resolution of the budget under function 650, Social Security over the next 5 years would have to be adjusted by $20 billion. They do not adjust it. They do not provide for this waiver, repeal of the earnings test, despite what the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) just said.

Now, this is an example of doing something hurriedly, doing something slipshod and not attending to important detail. They are not doing what they are purporting to say that it does.

We had the same problem last year. We had a military pay raise on the floor, retiree increases; and the budget resolution did not reflect those, did not account for those.

Mr. Speaker, I call it to the attention of the House. Function 650 is unadjusted, does not reflect the cost that over the next 5 years if we are going to repeal the earnings test, we have to add $20 billion in outlay expenditures by the Social Security Trust Fund. Everybody should know that when voting on this rule.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), a distinguished member of the Committee on the Budget.

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

The minority leader's speech today was a speech taken out from something he said 5 or 6 years ago, and the speech I just heard from the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on the Budget reminds me of straining out gnats and swallowing camels. We set aside $200 billion for tax cuts. Now, we are told it is irresponsible. We are told it is outrageous. We are told it is something we cannot afford.

The fact is, in the next 5 years we are going to raise $10 trillion in revenues, and we are going to return to the American people $200 billion. The tax cut ends the marriage penalty. A good number of Democrats voted for that. The tax cut repeals Social Security earnings limit. All Democrats voted for that. The next tax cut, which a good number of Democrats voted for, reduces the death penalty. We are expanding educational savings accounts. We are increasing health care deductibility. We are providing tax breaks for poor communities, and we are strengthening private pension plans. Mr. Speaker, $200 billion out of $10 trillion, a 2 percent tax cut. But our colleagues on the other side of the aisle do not even want to return 2 percent.

Mr. Speaker, we protect Social Security. Last year was the first year since 1960 that a Congress did not spend Social Security reserves. We protect it in this budget we are in, and we protect it in the budget we are now voting on. We are strengthening Medicare. We are setting aside $40 billion for prescription drugs, $40 billion. That is what we are setting aside, and yet the minority leader said we were cutting Medicare.

We retire the public debt. Mr. Speaker, $1 trillion of public debt in the next 5 years, $1 trillion. It never happened under Democrat rule. We are doing it now, and it is in this bill. We are providing that tax fairness for families. It is not just returning revenue to the American people, but dealing with fairness. Couples should not have to pay taxes when they get married; seniors

should not have to lose Social Security when they work. And we are restoring Americans defense; we are putting more money in education, science, and health. We are doing exactly what we should do.

Now, we are going to have 5 amendments come up and we are going to oppose 4 of them. We are going to oppose them because they do not meet these tests. We are going to protect Social Security; and if it does not do that, we will oppose that. We want Medicare prescriptions, $40 billion. If it is not there, we are going to oppose it. We want to retire debt. We have already retired $302 billion of debt. We are going to promote tax fairness, which on the other side of the aisle they seem to be opposed to. We are going to restore America's defense, and we are going to strengthen and support education and science. That is what we are going to do in our budget, and we are determined to succeed.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was so struck by what the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) said just a moment ago, that this budget fails to take into account the repeal of the earnings test, and I want to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) the rest of my time, save 1 minute, to sum up.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I would inquire of anyone on this side who wants to explain why the $20 billion is not provided in function 650, spending by Social Security, to effect this policy that the chairman of the Committee on the Budget just claimed that he is accommodating. Where is it?

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

Mr. SPRATT. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, Social Security is off-budget, is it not?

Mr. SPRATT. It is indeed.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, function 650 is a discretionary account, is it not?

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, function 650 is a discretionary account, but it also has an off-budget account.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, it does not include mandatories. We passed that bill unanimously in the House; it passed unanimously in the Senate. It will be signed by the President into law. It was initiated by the Speaker of this House, and it does not need to be included in function 650, because it is a mandatory outlay and not a discretionary fund.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would advise the gentleman simply to look at page 33 and the gentleman will see there is an on-budget provision and an off-budget provision, and the off-budget provision is the Social Security benefit spending provision. It is $20 billion short. I mean this is government work, but $20 billion is still real money. It is a big mistake.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I think the point is clear, is eminently clear. All of Social Security spending is off-budget. Function 650 is a discretionary account. What we are voting on here today includes the incorporation of the Social Security earnings test to the extent that it needs to be included in this budget document. I think it is misleading to suggest that it was put together in a slipshod way when the gentleman knows that the legislation has already passed the House and the Senate and will be signed into law and that it will not have a material impact on discretionary outlays.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his explanation, although I think it falls short.

The fact of the matter is there is provision for off-budget spending. It is on page 33, function 654 and your report; and that function understates spending over the next 5 years by Social Security to the tune of $20 billion. Because my colleagues understate spending here in calculating how much debt reduction they will achieve in the purchase of our debt held by the public, they owe the State the accomplishment of debt reduction. That is a significant mistake, unless they want to say this is a waivable mistake; it is not. It is bad work. It is a good reason to vote against the rule and to take this thing back and clean up.

Let me go back to my chart. I did not have enough time to talk about it. This chart is simple arithmetic. In simple arithmetic, it shows my good friend, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), whom I have enormous respect for and who was just on the floor saying they are going to have a $200 billion tax cut. That is what the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) said in the Committee on Rules yesterday, and that is what he said repeatedly in our markup.

If they have a $200 billion tax cut, then they have to add $50 billion to the amount of tax reduction over the next 5 years. In addition, if they have a pharmaceutical benefit, a drug benefit in Medicare, they have to add $40 billion. And when they add those two things that they both claim are included, $50 billion and $40 billion, guess what? The surplus disappears.

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

Mr. SPRATT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. This bill does not, in fact, reflect what the Committee on Budget did. Until the Committee on Rules stops rewriting budgets, we are going to be in a situation where neither the Committee on the Budget on the Democratic or Republican side or any House Members have had any real role in its construction. That is just plain wrong. This is the most important document which we produce.

Moreover, let me tell my colleagues that in the Committee on Budget they blocked our ability to put the Bush tax cut up as an amendment. They do not want to vote on it. It was not a pretty sight in the Committee on Budget; it was not a pretty sight in the Committee on Rules. Neither one of them put the Bush tax cut in order for us to be able to take a vote upon it. And there is a good reason why, because two-thirds of the Bush tax cut goes to the richest 10 percent of taxpayers. The richest 1 percent of taxpayers get an average of $50,000 tax cut. It does not leave enough money to shore up Social Security, Medicare, education, all the way down the line.

So I urge a vote against the rule so that we can debate this issue fairly, openly and freely; let us have an open vote on the Bush tax cut. It is the centerpiece of the economic claim which is being proposed by the other party. All of us should be allowed to vote upon it.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Let me go back just in conclusion to this chart so that everybody understands it. This is simple arithmetic. This is not smoke and mirrors. This takes their numbers, their assumption, their claims about what their budget resolution does and adds them up correctly. They claim that they are providing for a tax cut over 5 years of $200 billion, so we adjust their tax cut of $150 billion by $50 billion to show and allow for a tax cut of $200 billion, which is what they claim on the floor and in committee.

In addition, they claim on the chart that they just showed and through comments that they have just made that they too will have a pharmaceutical drug benefit for Medicare beneficiaries. They assume costs of that, they have it in a reserve fund, it is $40 billion. If they are going to claim it, they have to count it. They claim it, but do not count it. We count it. Add the $50 billion, add the $40 billion, adjust for debt service, and in 2003, the surplus of which we are all so proud which we want to protect, we do not want to backslide into Social Security, the surplus virtually vanishes. In 2004, there is a $6 billion deficit. We are $6 billion into Social Security again if this resolution is adopted. In 2005, it is down to $2 billion, and the subsequent years are just as bad. That is the consequence.

Now, we have tax cuts in our budget resolution, the Spratt substitute, the Democratic budget resolution. We provide for $50 billion net tax cuts over 5 years and $201 billion net tax cuts over 10 years. We think those are reasonable; and we believe that if our colleagues do the tax cuts that they are talking about that they are claiming, they are back in deficit, and that is why this rule should be voted down. Because it waives what we tried to establish as a major point of order last year in the lockbox when we said, we cannot bring a resolution, we cannot bring an appropriations bill.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, just to be sure both sides understand, could we

have a statement of the times again, please?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) has 5 minutes remaining; the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell my colleagues what is amazing about the chart we just saw. It is all made up. In fact, the numbers do not even add up. Talk about slipshod.

Let me tell my colleagues how they put these numbers together, and I give them credit for actually explaining how they come up with this chart. In their document, they say figures 2002 to 2005 are interpolated by the Democratic staff. That means made up, interpolated. Extrapolations for the second 5 years made by the Democratic staff. In addition to that, my good friend, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), on November 2 of last year, said that we will be $17 billion into the Social Security account, which, of course, never happened.

□ 1200

So he was wrong last year about arguing we were going to be into Social Security. His staff made up the numbers with extrapolations and interpolations. I am going to start including that language in my vocabulary.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to engage the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, in a colloquy with respect to the points of order contained in the budget resolution.

The first point of order prohibits the inclusion of directed scorekeeping language, and the second prohibits the consideration of advanced appropriations above $23 billion in the fiscal year 2001.

My question is: Does either point of order preclude the consideration of H.R. 2563, a bill that provides advanced contract authority for the Woodrow Wilson Bridge?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would say no, there is absolutely no point of order that precludes consideration of H.R. 2563.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would further engage the gentleman from California. Does either point of order preclude the inclusion of H.R. 2563 with directed scorekeeping language in an appropriations bill?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that, while the new directed scorekeeping point of order would affect the timely consideration of H.R. 2563 with directed scorekeeping language, there are several other points of order that would currently apply. I would make a commitment to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) that we will work together to craft a rule that would remove all obstacles to consideration of this important bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's assurance.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. KASICH.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to complete the thought that the Republican budget does not use extrapolations and interpolations to cook numbers and make things up and make claims that never come true.

We will have an ending of the Social Security earnings limit. It will be paid for through this bill. It passed the House. It passed the Senate. It will be signed into law.

The fact is that, by the time we are at the end of this summer, we are going to have in the vicinity of $250 billion worth of tax relief for every American who pays taxes without any extrapolations, interpolations or any other hyperbolations that the Democrats may want to lay on this floor today. But they are my friends, and I appreciate their ingenuity. They are just wrong.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am going to be calling a ''no'' vote on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule to allow an up-or-down vote on Governor Bush's proposed tax cut. There has been a good bit of discussion about where the House stands on those tax cuts. I think the House should have the opportunity to go on record and end the speculation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment I would offer be printed immediately before the vote on the previous question. The vote on the previous question may be the only opportunity the House has to vote on Governor Bush's proposal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSS

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOSS: Page 2, line 10, after ''comply with'' insert ''clause 3(b) or''.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, this amendment waives clause 3(b) of House Rule 13, which requires each committee report to include specific vote information from that committee's markup session. All Members are familiar with that.

This amendment is necessary to address an inadvertent technical error in the report of the Committee on Budget to accompany H. Con. Res. 290. Specifically, on page 88 of the report, the roll-call vote on the motion to report the concurrent resolution fails to indicate how the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) voted, although her vote is reflected in the total vote.

Again, this is an inadvertent technical error in the report that is not intended to be captured by clause 3(b) of House Rule XIII.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I include the amendment that I previously referred to, as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 446

On page 3, line 5, after ''Rules'' strike the period and add the following:

''or the amendment printed in section 3 of this resolution which shall be treated as if it were the last amendment printed in part B of said report.'' and

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

Section 3. Amendment to be offered by Representative Markey of Massachusetts.

Amend section 4 to read as follows:

**SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.**

Not later than May 26, 2000, the House Committee on Ways and Means shall report to the House a reconciliation bill that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to accommodate tax relief of $10,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, $483,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2002 through 2006, and $1,269,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2010.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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 Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of agreeing to the amendment and to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 203, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 67]

YEAS—220

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aderholt | Barton | Boehlert |
| Archer | Bass | Boehner |
| Armey | Bateman | Bonilla |
| Bachus | Bereuter | Bono |
| Baker | Biggert | Brady (TX) |
| Ballenger | Bilbray | Bryant |
| Barr | Bilirakis | Burr |
| Barrett (NE) | Bliley | Burton |
| Bartlett | Blunt | Buyer |

Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
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
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hansen
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
Martinez
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
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
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—203

Abercrombie
Allen
Andrews
Baca
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
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
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
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
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
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
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
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pickett
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
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
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—11

Ackerman
Crane
Dixon
Greenwood
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Lowey
McCollum
McDermott
Pallone
Royce
Schakowsky

□ 1237

Mr. CUNNINGHAM and Mr. KNOLLENBERG changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS).

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 194, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 68]

YEAS—228

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

NAYS—194

Abercrombie
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Coburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McGovern
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Mollohan | Rivers | Strickland |
| Moore | Rodriguez | Stupak |
| Moran (VA) | Roemer | Tauscher |
| Murtha | Rothman | Thompson (CA) |
| Nadler | Roybal-Allard | Thurman |
| Napolitano | Rush | Tierney |
| Neal | Sabo | Towns |
| Oberstar | Sanchez | Udall (CO) |
| Obey | Sanders | Udall (NM) |
| Olver | Sandlin | Velazquez |
| Ortiz | Sawyer | Vento |
| Owens | Scott | Visclosky |
| Pascrell | Serrano | Waters |
| Pastor | Shadegg | Watt (NC) |
| Payne | Sherman | Waxman |
| Pelosi | Skelton | Weiner |
| Phelps | Slaughter | Wexler |
| Pickett | Smith (WA) | Weygand |
| Pomeroy | Snyder | Wise |
| Price (NC) | Spratt | Woolsey |
| Rahall | Stabenow | Wu |
| Reyes | Stark | Wynn |

NOT VOTING—12

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Ackerman | Jackson-Lee (TX) | Pallone |
| Crane | Lowey | Rangel |
| Dixon | McCollum | Royce |
| Greenwood | McDermott | Schakowsky |

□ 1253

Mr. PORTER changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Pursuant to House Resolution 446 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 290.

□ 1256

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution (House Concurrent Resolution 290) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2005, with Mr. BOEHNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the concurrent resolution is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the general debate shall not exceed 3 hours with 2 hours confined to the Congressional Budget equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, and 1 hour on the subject of economic goals and policies equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK).

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) each will control 1 hour of debate on the Congressional Budget.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH).

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, one more time, it is probably going to be about five more times, I want to go through what we are presenting in this budget today. If I can just take us back a few years. I mean, it is pretty astounding that a Congress that was increasing spending through the roof, having deficits in the neighborhood of several hundred billion dollars, could reverse itself today under a policy that we believe as majority Republicans that, if we could just restrain the growth of the Federal Government, we could contribute mightily to the growth of this economy. That, in fact, has happened.

Starting in 1995, we made a commitment that we would relieve the burden that has been placed upon our children's backs. We do not believe that at the end of our lives our children should show up for the reading of the will to find out that what mom and dad left them was a big bagful of bills totalling into the trillions of dollars.

So we made a commitment that, frankly, was pretty amazing. As for me, I have held public office now for approaching 25 years. For those that gasp at that number, do not worry, I am leaving at the end of this year. I am going to retire. As you can see, I am, you know, tenderly young, even though I have been here so long. But what I can tell you, I can tell my colleagues that in politics, in the 25 years that I have been involved with it, it is very seldom that I have been able to see public officials put aside their own self-interests and instead adopt the community interest, the interest of the country.

We did that starting in 1995. And we had a rough road. We were outwitted at times. We were outspoken at times. We were out-PR'd at times, but that is soft stuff. That is not about results, and that is not about policy, and that is not about programs.

We kept our eye on the ball. And the eye on the ball was to balance the Federal budget. And starting in 1995, with our rollercoaster ride of emotions to try to get to a balanced budget, we demonstrated our commitment. I believe the chairman of the Federal Reserve, who sets the interest rates policies for this country, noted our commitment and gained confidence in what result we would produce here on Capitol Hill; and as a result, he lowered interest rates, which, of course, has allowed this economy to grow in a spectacular fashion with the wealth generated from this economy being shared by all Americans.

We get to 1997, and we make a budget agreement with the administration; and what we find in 1998 is the first balanced budget in a generation. In 1999, we wrote a budget that for the first time in my lifetime kept our mitts off the Social Security surplus.

The leadership of many members of the Committee on the Budget, most notably the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER), with assistance of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN), and the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU), there was an effort being made to say that we should not any longer grab the Social Security surplus and use it for anything other than protecting Social Security; that we should not take that Social Security surplus and use it on running any other department agency and bureau, because it is the people's money.

In 1999, we were able to achieve something that was even more significant than the balanced budget, it was not just balance the budget, but also put ourselves in a position where we would safeguard Social Security, keep our hands off it, put an electric fence around it, and say that the Social Security money should only be used to pay the benefits of Social Security recipients and kept in surplus to pay down the public debt until we solved long term the Social Security problems for both our baby boomers and their children.

□ 1300

For the second year, we will protect Social Security in that fashion. With the efforts of my good friend, the gentleman from the State of Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), we will bring to this floor a bill that will provide that the politicians in this town cannot grab Social Security for any other purpose than paying down debt or paying benefits. That is a significant accomplishment, Mr. Chairman.

We are also very aware of the fact that the American people are saying, in an era of surpluses, we not only want Social Security to be protected but we would like Medicare to be strengthened.

I must say that Medicare is a program that is in trouble. I must say that the next President, elected next January, whether it is a Republican or a Democrat, must work with the Congress of the United States, leave the demagoguery, the name calling, and the political hyperbole behind, and begin to deal with the two giant issues of Social Security and Medicare so that we do not end up in generational warfare.

We are setting the stage for that to be able to happen, to solve that problem long term. We are strengthening Medicare; we are going to reform Medicare. We are going to improve Medicare, and with those reforms and improvements we will also provide for our neediest senior citizens a prescription drug benefit.

Now, we know that there are many seniors, and think about it for a second, they need the prescription drugs; they need to go to the pharmacy and

many times it is a choice between the utilities, the trip down the street, the meal or a drug that their doctor has prescribed for them.

We believe, as Republicans, and I think are joined by our friends on the other side of the aisle, that our poorest senior citizens must have access to prescription drugs. This budget will provide it, while at the same time encouraging the preservation, strengthening, and reforming of Medicare; two significant accomplishments.

Thirdly, we also do something for our children. We will reduce the total publicly held debt over the next 5 years by $1 trillion. In 1995, our guiding star were the children, to lift that burden from their backs, to not ring up more debt, to begin to reduce the national debt. We already have a headstart on paying down that publicly held debt. Last year, we paid it down in the vicinity of $100 billion, but over the next 5 years we are going to have more momentum, and we achieve it by restraining the growth of spending in this town.

We do it and we take those savings and we use a large chunk of it, $1 trillion, to begin to pay down the publicly held debt.

I say today that we achieve it in large part by restraining the growth of government. Now people might call us names and say we are heartless. I have to say that when the Agriculture Department, the Justice Department, the Education Department, the Pentagon, and the Agency for International Development cannot even have their books audited to figure out how they are spending their money, is it not time we get back on the reform agenda and send money back home to people and to pay down some of the debt?

My great friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), told me that in the bowels of the Department of Education there are 48 VCRs operating day and night to record television shows, and yet they cannot even add up their books.

Think the days of thousand-dollar hammers and screwdrivers and bolts are gone? Wrong. The Pentagon loses ships; they do not know where they are. Yet, they say we cannot restrain spending in this town? They are wrong, because they have gotten too addicted to the Potomac fever. They need the antidote, and the antidote are our children and our seniors.

So we restrain the growth in public spending, and we pay down a trillion in the public debt; and that then leaves us room for tax relief. Who does the tax relief go to? It goes to our senior citizens who are punished because they decide to go to work and earn more money so they can have more for themselves and more for their grandchildren.

We eliminate the penalty that they are now exposed to that says if they earn money they lose Social Security benefits. We also say to our farmers, our small businesspeople, that at the end of the day when they leave this earth they should not have to visit the undertaker and the IRS on the same day; that we are trying to ease the tax on inheritance, which is double and triple taxed. We are trying to say that if someone works a lifetime to build something, something I would like to build for my children Emma and Reese, that at the end of my life I would like to give them the fruit of my bounty, the fruit of my toil. Whatever burdens my wife and I experience, we want to pass on the good results to my children, and the Government should not take 55 percent of everything I have earned to spend it on what? More VCRs in the bowels of the Department of Education? I think not.

We want tax fairness for families. When people get married, they should not be punished for having a union. Today, if one pays their taxes individually, in too many cases they will have a lower tax burden to the Federal Government different than if they get married. We believe that that tax burden ought to be ended. We ought to ease the marriage penalty, and this House has already voted for it.

In addition to that, we believe that if one is self-employed they should be able to get the same insurance opportunities and the same tax provisions that are available to large companies so they can afford health insurance for themselves. So the fact is that we are going to have a variety of tax-cut measures that will pass this House, but these tax-cut measures come, once we have secured Social Security and Medicare and paid down some of the national debt, we want to send money back; we want to get it out of town because I want us all to understand one thing. If people get bigger, government gets smaller. If government gets smaller, people get bigger.

I believe in the 21st century, in the Information Age, on the edge of an incredible revolution, that it is the individual that we prize; that it is the individual who is paramount in our society, not bureaucracy and bureaucrats and standing in line. It is about speed. It is about innovation. It is about excitement.

The more power we have in our pockets, the more we can do for ourselves and our communities and our schools and our children; and that is why we are committed to cutting taxes, not at the expense of our seniors, not at the expense of our children; but we believe every day that we should reduce the size and scope of this Federal Government. Let it do the things that people cannot do or business cannot do for itself and use government in a limited fashion.

We believe we need to restore America's defense. Now, we do have a very strange time where we have a department whose books cannot be audited, yet we are giving them more money. Why? Because we do not want our people in uniform to pay the price for sloppy management inside the Pentagon. But I must say there is a crusade building in this House, on this side of the aisle, that we want that building changed; we want to force the services to work together; we want accountability and we intend to make every effort to secure that.

We will also strengthen support for education, trying to send more Federal dollars to meet the Federal mandate of special education. School districts are handicapped because the Federal Government ordered them to carry out a task but never provided the money. Because of the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS), the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU), and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), we are going to provide more money for special education; and because of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) we are going to make sure that the remaining dollars are sent to the classroom so that flexibility is provided to our educators.

In addition, we are going to improve the National Institutes of Health and basic science research, because we think it is a priority of the Federal Government. It is a proper role for the Federal Government, and we are committed to the efforts to eliminate cancer, to improve the treatment for heart disease, to be able to deal with the pain that families experience in Alzheimer's. Yes, we are going to spend more money on the National Institutes of Health, and we are going to spend more money on basic science, because it was through basic science programs in the Pentagon that we got the Internet. It was not invented by any politician. It was developed through a basic science initiative so that computers could talk together through the Pentagon. Basic science is a proper role of this Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, we are going to hear this budget called a lot of things: risky, reckless, irresponsible. They are code words, for me. They are code words for more bureaucracy, more standing in line. Is there anything you hate more than standing in line? More frustration, higher taxes. The fact is that there will be charges that we are somehow affecting these programs for the elderly. It is false.

The proof is in the pudding. We have secured them, like no one has in a generation.

The fact is, we believe that this budget that invests in limited priorities in the Federal Government, reduces the public debt, transfers wealth that we have given to government back to people and secures the programs not just for our seniors but for baby boomers and their children. We believe this is a budget that is consistent with the economic development that is going on in America today. There really is no reason for Members not to come and in a unanimous fashion support this budget.

I would ask my colleagues to think carefully about it. I think it is an outstanding blueprint, and I think it is consistent with those that believe in

limited government, in strong economic growth in the private sector. So I would urge support of the Republican budget proposal.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we have come a long way in 8 years. We have come from a deficit in 1992, a record deficit of $290 billion and deficits projected as far as the eye can see, to a surplus computed the same way of $175 billion and that has underlaid this phenomenal economy.

We are now at a fiscal fork in the road. We have wiped out the traditional deficit, the deficit in our annual budget. We have created surpluses in place of those deficits as far as the eye can see, but those surpluses only exist because of the way we keep books. We keep a cash set of books. If we had accrual accounting instead of cash accounting and if we recognized our liability to the Social Security program and the benefits promised to those working today and to the Medicare program and the benefits that it entails, we would be booking substantial costs to both of those programs; and I do not think we would be in surplus. We would be in deficit again.

There are many differences between our budget, the Democratic substitute, and their budget, the Republican budget. The resolution is on the floor today, but the main difference is this: we recognize our liability to Social Security and Medicare. They do not, and I will say why.

Our budget generates savings, too. We have a cumulative surplus over the next 5 years of $48 billion; over the next 10 years of $365 billion. We take the $365 billion surplus, a substantial share of it over the next 10 years, and we direct the Committee on Ways and Means to provide legislation so that $300 billion of that surplus will be taken out of the general fund and contributed to the Medicare Trust Fund so that it will be more solvent than ever; we think more solvent to the tune of at least 10 additional years.

□ 1315

We further direct the Committee on Ways and Means to reconcile legislation so that in 2011, 10 years from now, the total amount of debt savings that we are able to achieve because we have accumulated these surpluses over 10 years, the total amount of debt service, the reduction in interest on the national debt, will be computed, and that amount will then be transferred from the general fund to the Social Security trust fund for a period of years such that we can extend its life by 15 years. Those proposals have been made by the President. We put them in reconciliation language in our budget.

They simply do not have anything. They are saying they are going to leave the Social Security surplus alone, and we are too. Good policy, and we agree. They are saying they will pay down $1 trillion of debt. So will we, using the Social Security trust fund. But we are going further. We are extending the life of both programs, and that is the main difference between us and them.

We have shown in this budget resolution that we are presenting that we can cut taxes, by less, but significantly. We can pay down debt, $48 billion over the next 5 years, $365 billion over the 10-year period in time. We can do all of these things and still provide for the reasonable needs of our country. $20.5 billion more for education, for example, in our budget than their budget. More for community development. In fact, they cut community development by nearly $2.5 billion between this year and next year. The Community Development Block Grant, the Economic Development Administration that means so much to many of our districts, they slice it, $2.5 billion. We plus it up. More money for law enforcement in ours.

There is also an account that is vitally important, because this is not spending, this is an investment, more money for science, more money specifically for the National Science Foundation.

You know, Mr. Chairman, when we had our markup in the Committee on the Budget, one of our Members from Princeton, from New Jersey, who is a professor of physics at Princeton and knows something about science, offered an amendment to the budget markup which would have added $2.8 billion over 5 years. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) made that amendment, $2.8 billion over 5 years, $675 million a year to Function 250, which provides for the National Science Foundation.

The Holt amendment was rejected. There was a compromise reached such that the committee did give him $100 million plus-up in the mark. But, you know, the arguments of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) began to resonate apparently with the majority. Over the last week, something happened.

Last night, haunted by the persuasive arguments that the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) made in our committee last week, a majority had some kind of an epiphany, because they came around, and after rejecting his requested increase in NSF, they put $3 billion, exactly what he wanted, even more, in the National Science Foundation function.

Mr. Chairman, in light of that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), to explain what we have also put in our budget resolution to accommodate an increase in scientific research and exploration.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend, the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to see that the budget does not amount to a fiction. What we want is to see that we can maintain the kind of robust economy that stands behind our projections. We want to have an economy with real productivity growth. And what is behind that? New ideas and smart workers. It is necessary ingredients.

I thank the ranking member for the kind remarks, and I would like to extend my thanks to the chairman and to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) for helping to prevail on our colleagues to see the benefit of my amendment.

The strong economy that we enjoy today is due in large part to previous investments in research and education, and the increase that we now see in the budget at the 11th hour, or actually it was the 2 a.m. hour last night, in research, is most welcome. But that is only part of what we need.

We should approve the Democratic substitute budget which will provide for increased funding in education as well.

The Republicans' budget cuts the purchasing power of education by $8.5 billion over 5 years, it freezes funding at the 2000 level for 5 years, it would reduce funding for 316,000 low-income students to receive Pell Grants to attend college. Head Start would have to cut services to more than 40,000 students.

The Democratic alternative budget, on the other hand, rejects this Republican freeze for educational funding. It provides $4.8 billion more for education for 2001 than the Republican budget. Over 5 years, the Democratic budget provides $21 billion more than the Republicans.

So we have made a partial fix in research, but we need to do more in education, so that we can have the new ideas, the well-trained workforce, necessary for the kind of productivity growth that we have been enjoying.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) for a colloquy about prescription drugs.

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

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into a colloquy with the distinguished ranking member.

Somewhere in this budget there is supposedly a reserve of $40 billion that is supposed to take care of Medicare and the pharmaceutical benefit and whatever, but I cannot seem to find it. Could the gentleman explain to me where that is?

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARK. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, this budget resolution, the Republican resolution, sets up a so-called reserve fund. It basically says if and when the Committee on Ways and Means reports a prescription drug benefit for Medicare, along with, coupled to, Medicare reform, whatever that means, then $40 billion is provided for that purpose.

Unlike their resolution, our resolution has reconciliation language. That is the whole purpose of having the reconciliation power vested in the Committee on the Budget. We can use this resolution to tell committees they should change basic law to provide for things like drug benefits. We have directed it and we have put up $40 billion also.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, if I could further inquire of the distinguished ranking member the chances, I would like to ask the gentleman's opinion of the chances of the Committee on Ways and Means passing a prescription drug benefit, when just recently the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN) offered an amendment to provide a discount on prescription drugs to seniors at no cost to the Federal Government and every Republican voted no, and every Democrat, of course, voted yes. So the Republicans voted, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH), the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER), right down the line, they voted to deny seniors a discount on prescription drugs when it would have had no budget impact at all.

Now, given that kind of compassion, and this is a word that comes out of Texas, given that kind of compassion, what do you think the chances are that the Republican-led Committee on Ways and Means would vote out a prescription drug benefit that would help anybody?

Mr. SPRATT. I take it the gentleman's question is rhetorical.

Mr. STARK. Oh, no, it is a question that I hope the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) will answer to the seniors in Florida, and that the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) will answer to the seniors in Arizona, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH) will answer to the seniors in Pennsylvania, and that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) will answer to the seniors in Illinois, because they have denied their own constituents the chance to buy these prescription drugs which they so vitally need at no cost to the Federal Government.

What kind of assistance is that to your constituents, I ask the gentleman rhetorically? And the answer is they do not want any prescription drug benefit. They do not want to save Medicare as we know it. I think that should be pointed out in this debate today.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. WEYGAND).

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

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Chairman, I just would like to follow up on the great comments made by the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) and our ranking member, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

In 1965, this Congress took a bold move in policy. It set forth a program called Medicare, because the highest costs that were encountered by our seniors was the hospital stays. They deliberately went out and determined that, indeed, we as a budget, we as a Congress, should in fact develop that kind of a program.

Today, 35 years later, the highest costs that are being encountered and incurred by our seniors is the cost of prescription drugs. Yet when we put forward a program, a real program of reform, on how to pay for and provide for prescription drugs for our seniors, the Republicans on the Committee on the Budget turned it down.

As a matter of fact, what they did was they put together a double count kind of system of providing $40 billion for Medicare reform and prescription drugs, but they counted it in another fashion as a surplus. So they have double-counted it.

We indeed then put forward a program of providing $40 billion strictly for prescription drugs so that the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) and the Committee on Ways and Means and all the members of the Committee on Ways and Means could truly vote on and pass legislation that would reduce prescription drugs costs for our seniors.

We have been denied that. But, more importantly, our seniors have been denied that. This budget that is before you today does not provide one penny for prescription drugs. As a matter of fact, since they already made a mistake of $20 billion on the Social Security earnings limit portion of this budget, you know where that reserve fund will go to? $20 billion of it will go to making up for that mistake. Then we have even less for any kind of Medicare reform or prescription drugs.

Each one of us in our district knows the anecdotes, knows the stories, of seniors who have gone without paying their rent or paying for food to buy prescription drugs or the reverse. It is time to change that kind of situation for our seniors and make a bold move in leadership to truly give prescription drugs an opportunity to be lowered and to benefit our seniors.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. PRICE.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, recent calls for biennial budgeting have claimed that the budget process around here is broken and needs fixing. Well, I would like to suggest that the problem is less one of process, and more one of a failure on the part of the majority to produce realistic budget resolutions. What we need is not endless tinkering with the budget process. What we need is to use the existing process responsibly.

The Republican budget resolution before us today repeats patterns that are all too familiar to us from fiscal 1999 and fiscal 2000. It makes highly unrealistic domestic spending assumptions, like those that led to last year's budgetary train wreck. It relies on false assumptions about the level of cuts which can be absorbed by critical domestic accounts.

The only way the Republican plan can make room for its exorbitant $200 billion in tax cuts over 5 years—and that goes up to $1 trillion over 10 years—is to drastically undercut domestic programs that are critical for working families and for the most vulnerable among us.

In 2001 the Republican plan would cut non-defense domestic spending by $7 billion, compared to a freeze at the 2000 level. When you account for inflation, this represents $19.7 billion, or a 6.4 percent cut in purchasing power, from our current level of activity. By 2005, the Republican plan would cut non-defense domestic spending by $39.4 billion or 11.5 percent relative to the funding necessary to keep pace with inflation.

Mr. Chairman, we need to remember that since 1962, non-defense appropriations have grown by 2.8 percent annually above the rate of inflation. From 1996 to 2000, the Republican Congress has increased non-defense spending at an average rate of 2.5 percent above inflation. So how can we realistically expect to suddenly reduce non-defense spending, not only below the level needed to maintain constant purchasing power, but below even the current year's nominal spending level? The answer is we cannot expect to do that, we should not, and we are not being honest with ourselves if we suggest that we can.

I am not talking here merely about cuts to domestic programs in a generic sense. It is easy to talk about belt tightening, and we indeed do need to press the war against waste and fraud and abuse. But what is at stake here are large cuts to programs that serve as essential safety nets which help struggling families help themselves. We are talking about cutting 310,000 people out of the Women, Infants and Children nutrition program. We are talking about making Pell grants to 316,000 fewer students by 2005. We are talking about eliminating more than 40,000 children from Head Start.

By contrast, Mr. Chairman, the Democratic resolution is realistic and it is responsible. Under the Democratic alternative, we would pass our appropriations bills on budget, on time. Unlike the Republican resolution, we would extend the solvency of both Social Security and Medicare, and we would mandate the addition of a prescription benefit to Medicare. We would buy back publicly-held debt, not only with the entire Social Security surplus, but, unlike the Republican plan, with $365 billion of the non-Social Security surplus. And we would create room for a reasonable and well-targeted tax cut.

□ 1330

The Democratic plan is well-balanced, by reducing debt, protecting and

strengthening Social Security and Medicare, providing targeted tax relief, and maintaining our investments in public education, research, transportation and affordable housing.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to adopt the Democratic alternative.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ).

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of my distinguished colleague's budget proposal which will provide prescription drug coverage and better access to the Department of Defense health system for Medicare-eligible military retirees.

This legislation upholds the obligation; and yes, we do have an obligation to those who have served. In Orange County alone, we have over 100,000 military retirees, and we need to provide these Americans the access to health care they deserve. It is time to do it, and this bill does it.

Fortunately, our society has been blessed with many leaders who imparted the values of leadership, responsibility, and loyalty while wearing the uniform of this country. For without their dedication to duty, we would not enjoy the many freedoms that America has to offer. Congress should keep the promises made to these brave men and women. We should vote yes on the Spratt substitute.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Connecticut for yielding me this time.

I would just like to bring us back down to earth and talk about what this budget achieves. This budget that we are talking about here protects 100 percent of the Social Security surplus; it strengthens Medicare with a prescription drug plan by setting aside $40 billion; it retires the public debt by the year 2013; it promotes tax fairness for families, farmers and seniors; it restores America's defense systems; and it strengthens our support for education and science.

But what I would like to focus on today is Social Security. I think it is important to note where we have been on Social Security. Well, over the last 30 years, the Federal Government has been taking money out of the Social Security Trust Fund and spending it on other government programs. In fact, just last year alone, the President of the United States gave us a budget last year where he said, I want to take 62 percent of the Social Security Trust Fund and dedicate that to Social Security, but take 38 percent of the Social Security Trust Fund out of Social Security to spend on other government programs.

Well, last year we said enough is enough. Mr. Chairman, 100 percent of Social Security should go to Social Security.

So last year the President basically said, let us take $52 billion out of the Social Security Trust Fund, spend it on the creation of 120 other Federal Government programs.

Well, if we take this year's budget and take last year's rhetoric, we can see the difference between the two parties. Last year's rhetoric was this: a number of Members from the Democratic side of the aisle said on the same day, the Republican budget already dips in to the Social Security Trust Fund by more than $18 billion. The Republican budget has already spent $13 billion of the Social Security Trust Fund. The Republican budget raids Social Security by $24 billion. Another Member on the next day said the Republican budget takes $17 billion out of the Social Security Trust Fund. All remarks last year by Members of the other side.

Well, let us take a look at actually what happened. Last year, in 1999, guess what happens? We took zero money out of the Social Security Trust Fund. We locked away every penny of the Social Security Trust Fund. We are doing it again this year, and we are going to bring budget language to the floor that says never again will Congress go back to the days of raiding the Social Security Trust Fund.

Mr. Chairman, if we look at the President's budget, if we take out his Medicare cuts, if we take out his tax increases, the President is sending us another budget that takes $60 billion out of the Social Security Trust Fund.

Let us look at the facts. Let us not believe the hype. We have already stopped the raid on the Social Security Trust Fund, and we are going to continue to stop the raid on the Social Security Trust Fund.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I believe we are at a crossroads in our Nation's history. In front of us is every opportunity for a future so bright, so filled with promise that our children and grandchildren have a chance to live in a Nation where every person truly has the opportunity to reach their fullest potential, a Nation where every child is educated in a modern school, in smaller classes with an excellent teacher; a Nation where people who have worked a lifetime can retire with security and without worries; a safe Nation with guns off of our streets and away from our schools. We can achieve these things if we make the right choices today.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues, this Republican budget makes all the wrong choices. Its main goal is a $1 trillion tax cut that snuffs out the aspirations of all but the wealthiest among us. It cuts 310,000 low-income babies and mothers off the nutritional assistance they use to buy things like milk and baby food. It takes away home heating assistance from 164,000 poor families. It cuts financial aid from hundreds of thousands of students. It ends Head Start for 40,000 preschoolers. It does not extend Social Security and Medicare, not even for a single day. That is no way to lift people up, to give them a chance to make a brighter future.

Great nations recognize that families in trouble are families with untapped potential, not problems to be swept under the rug.

Mr. Chairman, we can pay off our debt, save Social Security and Medicare, give our children the education they deserve, and our seniors the retirement they have earned, and lift people up to join in the prosperity and opportunities of this country. But we cannot lift people up if they are buried under the mountain of debt the Republican plan would pass along to our children.

Mr. Chairman, let us reject the shortsighted choices of the Republican budget and pass a Democratic budget that will help us get to that even brighter future that is now well within our reach.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), a member of the Committee on the Budget as well as the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Protect 100 percent of the Social Security surplus, strengthen Medicare with prescription drugs, retire the public debt by 2013, promote tax fairness, restore America's defense, and lets us strengthen and support education and science.

Let us talk Medicare. Here come the me-too Democrats. That is not what they were saying a month ago. The me-too Democrats a month ago were rushing in and saying the President has a fantastic prescription drug benefit. Well, let us look at that. Let us see what the prescription drug benefit did.

Well, the President in the first year cut Medicare. No money left for prescription drugs. Second year, $2 billion, but the President's plan did not start yet. The third year, a $100 million increase for Medicare according to the President's budget; no room for prescription drugs.

What does the Republican plan do? Mr. Chairman, $40 billion set aside for Medicare, and what do the Democrats do? Last night, rush in with a substitute, saying oh, me too, me too, me too. I want to give a prescription drug benefit that is real, not the President's that is not real, that cuts Medicare; and let us look at some of those cuts.

In order for the President to fund his Medicare benefit, it increases beneficiary costs, it cuts kidney dialysis, cutting prescription drug payments, cutting hospitals.

Let me tell my colleagues something. Out in rural America, out in Iowa, you close my hospital, you do not have health care, let alone the President's fake prescription drug benefit that did not even go into effect until 2004. So do

not come in here and ''me-too,'' 2 months after the President stood right up here and promised America a drug benefit that was not even real. Do not come here 2 months later and claim credit for a prescription drug benefit that is a ''me-too'' with our Republican budget.

We welcome our colleagues in a bipartisan way to solve this problem, but do not tell us that this is where you have been, because you have been cutting benefits under Medicare. The President's plan did that. It is not real. Vote for the Republican plan for Medicare.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to answer the gentleman and say, if the gentleman's proposal is real, why did he not put reconciliation directly to the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on the Budget? If your proposal is real, why did you not say here is $40 billion, not here is a reserve fund, if you can reform Medicare and if you can report a bill?

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, last year the Republicans in the House of Representatives beat their chests mightily to talk about a $792 billion tax cut over 10 years. That tax cut was so fiscally irresponsible that it was rejected throughout the country. We are back this year with the same situation, except now we will not even talk about it.

In our Committee on the Budget hearing I asked our chairman, what was the price tag over 10 years for this tax cut? I could not get a straight answer. But today, I understand that number has been put out here before the body. It is $200 billion over 5 years.

Now, the question that the public deserves to have the answer to here, and we ought to answer it for ourselves, is what is the 10-year cost of this tax cut?

Well, last year the $792 billion tax cut was $156 billion over 5 years. We are talking about $200 billion over 5 years. So the math is pretty simple. We are looking at a $1 trillion tax cut over 10 years.

Now, there are those up here that think we ought to use the projected surplus for massive tax cuts and some that want to go on a spending spree, and I reject both positions. We should take the lion's share of the projected surplus and use it to pay down this massive Federal debt. Why should we focus on paying down a $3.47 trillion Federal debt?

Consider these facts: in 1999, we spent $230 billion in interested payments, 13 percent of our discretionary spending. That is $3,644 per every family in America with four people. That is more than we spend on Medicare; it is slightly less than what we spent on national defense. Think of the things that we could do by paying down the debt and not having that interest payment. We can do a responsible tax cut. We spent $60 billion last year on education. We spent $230 billion in interest payments.

Paying down the debt has also been an offense to our wallets at home. Several economists, including the chairman of the Federal Reserve, Alan Greenspan, have said, that as we pay down the debt it has a positive impact on interest rates, as much as 2 points. Take a homeowner in my home State of Florida with a $115,000 mortgage. If his or her interest rate goes down by 2 points, that is a reduction of $155 a month in their mortgage payment. That is a better benefit than most of the tax cuts that are being proposed up here.

Mr. Chairman, let us stop playing games with the future of America.

This budget is not a responsible step towards paying down the debt and extending the solvency of Social Security and Medicare. In fact, under this plan, the Social Security surplus will be spent as early as 2004. The public does not want gargantuan tax cuts at the expense of paying down the debt and preserving Social Security and Medicare, and we should reject the resolution for that reason.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU), a distinguished member of the House Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, we have a Republican budget on the floor here today, and it cannot be emphasized enough. It sets the right priorities; it protects ever penny of the Social Security surplus. It sets aside $40 billion for Medicare and makes sure that there is enough for prescription drug coverage for those that need it. It retires public debt. It promotes tax fairness by eliminating the marriage penalty, by making the Tax Code more fair for those seeking to purchase health insurance or send their children to school. It restores the strength of our defense system, and it invests in education and science as well.

The previous speaker spoke a little bit about the importance of retiring public debt, and I think he spoke the truth. It is important. It does help lower interest rates, and it does make a difference in our economy. But I think it is also important to remember where we started.

The President was not setting aside ever penny of the Social Security surplus a year ago; he was not making the commitment to pay down the debt that we have in this budget. Just 1 year ago, the President suggested that we spend 40 percent of the Social Security surplus. We have come a long way, and what a difference just a year makes.

□ 1345

In 1998, we paid down $50 billion in public debt. In 1999, over $80 billion in public debt retired. Last year, when the critics on the other side of the aisle said, no, you are not going to set aside every penny of the Social Security surplus, we proved them wrong. We not only did it, we paid down over $160 billion in debt.

With this Republican budget, we will bring the 4-year total of debt retirement to over $450 billion. Paying down debt to protect our future, to lower interest rates, to keep the economy growing, it does make a difference on every home mortgage someone has. It does make a difference in lowering the cost of college loans and lowering the cost of an automobile loan. It helps keep interest rates low, and it helps protect America's savings.

When one's interest rates are lower, those are funds that one never even has to send to Washington. We are paying down debt, over $450 billion in the most recent 4 years. But over the next 5 years, we will pay down over a trillion dollars in debt, paying down that debt to protect the public.

Now, the critics say, well, maybe we could pay down more debt if we did not cut taxes. We could pay down more debt if we did not eliminate the marriage penalty and kept penalizing married couples. We could, but that would be wrong. We could pay down more debt if we did not get rid of the Social Security earnings limit. We could, but that would be wrong. We could pay down more debt if we did not give individuals health insurance deductibility. We could, but it would be wrong.

We set aside over a trillion dollars over the next 5 years, and we can criticize and harangue and suggest that maybe we should keep raising taxes so that we can spend more.

My colleagues have heard the code words, risky scheme. My colleagues have heard the code words, it is a dangerous plan. Taxes are not high enough. The fact of the matter is those are code words for spending more and for keeping more of the money that the public sends here.

We are paying down over a trillion dollars in 5 years, and that is why my colleagues should support the Republican budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL).

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, the budget resolution in front of us today has a misguided focus. It double counts. It cooks the books. It does not have enough debt reduction. It has unrealistic assumptions in terms of cuts and domestic programs. It has risky tax cuts, risky indeed. Because they are simply too big, and they risk the future of Social Security.

If the Republican budget resolution is fully implemented, it would use up all of the surplus funds and threaten the future of Social Security. But if it is not fully implemented, if they cannot make the domestic spending cuts of 10 percent over 5 years that they include in this document, then they are directly going to raid Social Security.

That is an important subject for us to focus on.

All of us know how important debt reduction is. There is bipartisan agreement on that fact. The question is who accomplishes it. Debt reduction is important. This year, 12 percent of our budget is going to pay interest debt service on our debt, $224 billion. That money crowds out private sector investment. It keeps interest rates artificially high.

If we can reduce that debt, we can free up money for tax cuts or other spending needs. If we can reduce government borrowing, then the private sector interest rates will be kept lower, and we will strengthen our economy. But we have got to have a realistic budget.

The Republican budget resolution in front of us calls for 10 percent reductions in domestic discretionary programs. That is across the board. But they pick on some particularly important programs such as the community in regional development function that would have a reduction in purchasing power over 5 years of one-third.

I do not believe there are enough votes on that side of the aisle to do that. I hope there are not enough votes on that side of the aisle to do that because of the pain that would cause.

Two years ago, I was a county commissioner, and I was dealing with community development block grants in a wealthy county, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, which this year will get $7.5 million in CDBG grants. It gets about $20 million in requests from the townships, the bureaus, and the housing groups, the nonprofits in Montgomery County.

So the county commissioners can fund one-third of those requests presently. If this budget goes through and across-the-board cuts are made as envisioned by the Republicans, that money is going to drop 20 percent. Over 5 years, it will drop by one-third. We are not meeting the needs of the public. This budget does not work. We have got to vote ''no'' on it.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, our budget protects 100 percent of the Social Security surplus, 100 percent. It does it in the next year's budget just as it is doing in this year's budget just as we did not spend any Social Security money last year. It strengthens Medicare with prescription drugs. We set aside $40 billion in the next 5 years. It retires debt, $1 trillion in the next 5 years. We have already retired $302 billion. It promotes tax fairness for families, farmers, and seniors.

The GOP tax plan ends the marriage penalty, repeals Social Security earnings limit, reduces the death tax, expands educational savings accounts, increases health care deductibility, promotes tax breaks for poor communities, and strengthens private pension plans. We set aside $200 billion in the next 5 years, just 2 percent of the budget in the next 5 years.

The Clinton plan came in with $96 billion of gross increases in taxes. The Republicans had zero. We do not have any taxes.

The Clinton plan increases taxes $10 billion in the next year. We provide tax relief of $10 billion in the year.

The Republican tax relief plan, over the next 5 years, $200 billion for the marriage penalty, the death tax, the educational savings account, health care deductibility, the community renewal, and pension reform. We set aside $50 billion in potential update. We want to make sure it is locked up for paying down debt or tax relief. We do not want it spent by the Democrats on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, the Republican majority's fiscal year 2001 budget resolution before us today tests the bounds of fiscal reality while failing the tests of fiscal responsibility.

The Republican budget resolution is premised upon an unsustainable tax cut of $250 billion over 5 years and $1 trillion over 10 years, which absorbs the entire on-budget surplus and then some, while requiring untenable, unreasonable cuts in nondefense discretionary programs. These cuts amount to 11 percent in real terms in the funding of such things as community and regional development, health care, and the environment.

Further, the Republican budget does nothing to address the need for a prescription drug benefit and Medicare, does nothing to extend the solvency of Social Security and Medicare. If fully implemented, it fails to adequately reduce the debt.

In short, Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget is designed solely to provide huge tax cuts at the expense of proper investment and human resources and prudent debt reduction.

The Republican budget assumes that nondefense discretionary spending will be cut by $363 billion over 10 years, cuts such as 1,000 FBI agents, 800 Drug Enforcement Agents, and hundreds of Border Patrol Agents.

It means a retreat from our bipartisan efforts to double the funding for the National Institutes of Health. It means cutting Pell Grants for kids to go to college and Head Start for kids to begin to learn.

In reality, we know the Republicans will never achieve these cuts for two reasons. First, the American people oppose them; and, second, the Republicans themselves oppose them.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, between 1995 and 2000, Republican Congresses have increased discretionary spending faster than the rate of inflation. The majority knows that these cuts will never occur, but they provide cover for their huge tax cut which will ultimately eat through the on-budget surplus and into the Social Security surplus at the expense of Social Security solvency.

On Medicare, the Republicans offer lip service to the public's desire to a new prescription drug benefit with the so-called $40 billion reserve. During the Committee on Budget markup, that reserve was spent several times on prescriptions, Medicare reform, and debt reduction. But the fact is we can only spend it once.

Finally, the Republican budget fails in debt reduction. If fully implemented, the Republicans will use none of the on-budget surplus to pay down debt and spend a portion of the Social Security surplus for their tax cut. If history is any judge and the Republican majority fails to make huge discretionary spending cuts they propose, it will spend even more of the Social Security surplus.

So, Mr. Chairman, the budget before us will ultimately lead the Nation back to debt finance spending, doing nothing to extend the life of Social Security and Medicare, failing on prescription drugs for seniors, and failing on paying down the national debt adequately.

The Democratic substitute offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) is a far better fiscal plan for the Nation. It provides for tax relief, debt reduction far more than the Republicans offer, and investment in the Nation's priorities of education, health care, the environment, and economic development.

The Democratic substitute does so in a way which is fiscally prudent and solvent, dedicating 100 percent of the Social Security surplus and 40 percent of the on-budget surplus to paying down the national debt, $400 billion more than our Republican friends.

I encourage my colleagues to oppose the Republican budget resolution and adopt the resolution of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 32½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) has 34 minutes remaining.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the vice chairman of the Committee on Budget.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, we are here today to discuss a budget which Republicans have put forward that, number one, is going to protect Social Security, 100 percent of the Social Security surplus. We are going to strengthen Medicare, and we are going to provide our Medicare beneficiaries with a real meaningful prescription drug plan.

We are going to retire over the next 5 years, under this budget, $1 trillion. By the year 2013, we are going to pay down all of the public debt that this country now owes.

We are going to promote tax fairness for families, for farmers, for small

business people, and for seniors. We are going to restore America's defense. We are going to strengthen support for education and science.

I want to concentrate just a minute on the area of national defense. Let us look at where we were when this new majority came in in 1995. When the current administration and the Democratic Congress took over back in 1993, the budget for defense that year was $282 billion. Over the next 2 years, this administration and the Democratic-controlled Congress reduced spending for defense by $20 billion, down to $262 billion.

Well, what was the effect of that reduction in spending? Well, let me show my colleagues what happened. We have reduced the number of Army divisions from 18 to 10. We have reduced the number of fighter wings in the United States Air Force from 24 to 13. We have reduced the number of ships in the United States Navy from 546 down to 333.

Well, since this majority has been in control, we have been about the business of providing more money for the national security of this country. We have taken the Clinton budget since 1996 alone, and have increased it by almost $40 billion. This year, again, in the current budget that we are debating today, we are going to add $1 billion over the President's request for defense.

What are we doing with that money? Let us look at what we are going to do with that money. We today are competing in our military services with every Fortune 500 company in the country. We have got to provide our folks with the quality of life in the military services that is second to none, and we are going to do that.

We are going to provide them with pay raises. We are going to provide them with better housing. We are going to provide them with better recreational opportunities to be able to continue to attract the finest men and women that America has to offer.

We are going to make sure that, from a readiness standpoint, that those folks are the best trained forces in the world today; that our folk in the depots have the parts to repair the equipment; and that our forces are equipped with the latest technologically advanced weapons systems that the world has to offer.

We are the world's greatest country in large part because we are the world's strongest military power. This Republican budget maintains that commitment to the national security of this country.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would say in response to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), by my reading of their budget, it pluses up the President's budget $1 billion this year and no more than $300 million in the out year. It basically tracks the Clinton budget.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. CLEMENT).

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Democratic alternative to the budget resolution offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT). As a veteran, I urge my colleagues to support this alternative which keeps the promises to our veterans.

We have debated on a lot of different issues in the Committee on Budget, which I am a member of: education, national defense, social security, Medicare, health care, and a plan to retire the national debt.

□ 1400

But the fact is the Democratic alternative offers us more hope and more opportunity to accomplish our goals and objectives for the 21st century.

For 2001, the Democratic alternative provides $22 billion in appropriations for veterans' programs, $100 million more than the Republican plan. Over 5 years, the Democratic alternative provides $1 billion more than the Republicans.

In addition, the Democratic budget provides for an expansion of the Montgomery GI Bill education benefits, a key recruiting retention tool for the Armed Services. The value of these benefits has failed to keep up with the rising cost of higher education. Our budget increases the basic monthly GI bill benefit to nearly $700 for 2001, a 25 percent increase for the benefit level in current law.

Our veterans are growing sicker and older each year. As a result, their health care needs only will grow in the years to come. It is imperative that we fund the various mandates included in the Millennium Health Care and Benefits Act, which the overwhelming majority of my colleagues supported last year.

In addition to increasing funding for health care benefits, our alternative also provides for an increase in the benefits available to veterans under the Montgomery GI Bill. The erosion of purchasing power severely hampers the effectiveness of these education benefits in recruiting and retention at a time when all branches of the military are falling short of their recruiting goals.

America and our veterans need a Montgomery GI Bill for the new millennium. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this alternative budget resolution.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), a member of the Committee on the Budget and a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

What does a Republican budget mean for our families? Very simply, it means that we start moving towards a debt-free Nation for our children. Now that we have balanced the budget, we will eliminate the $3.6 trillion public debt over the next 13 years.

It means a more secure retirement for our seniors. We stop the raid on Social Security, and we protect the Social Security surpluses into the future; a stronger effort to find cures for cancer and other life-threatening diseases, and a safer world while we fulfill our promise and our pledge to those who made it that way.

It also means more education dollars for our classrooms. It means more money for our kids; more money for learning, instead of bureaucracy and red tape.

We are committed to funding special education. We are committed to funding Title VI. What does that mean? It means that we are going to fund innovative education program strategies, the area that gives local school districts the most flexibility in educating their kids and spending their dollars to meet their needs.

We are going to make sure that we keep our commitment to those areas that have Federal facilities, military facilities, by increasing impact aid. These are areas that we are committed to because when we fund them, it gives flexibility to local school districts to meet the needs of their children and their schools.

It is a sharp contrast to the President's direction. The President's direction builds on the failed Washington approach which has given us 760 education programs spread over 39 different agencies, an education department that for 4 years will fail its audits. They have already failed two audits; they are going to fail the next two.

We give the Department of Education $35 billion per year to help educate our kids, and the thanks that we get is a department that does not even commit to the basics of balancing its books and providing us with a clean audit. They have failed two, and they are going to fail the next two.

They have a theft ring operating within the Department of Education requiring a vigorous investigation identifying where their computers and their electronic equipment is going.

They recently printed 3.5 million forms for financial aid. Only one problem, they printed the wrong ones. They recently notified 39 students that they got a great scholarship. The only problem is these 39 students did not qualify.

This is an agency that is out of control. We need to move away from the failed bureaucracy here in Washington and move these dollars to people who know the names of our children and empower them to make the decision for learning environments that will enable them to learn and succeed.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. RIVERS).

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Republican budget

proposal as it is presented here today and in support of the Democratic proposal.

I am particularly concerned that the Republicans are not near as generous with American students as they claim to be. In fact, the Democratic proposal offers $20.25 billion more in spending for America's students than the Republican proposal on the floor at this time.

I am also concerned that the Republicans will actually do damage to many of the programs we support in this country. For example, much of the Republicans' claimed increase for special education exists on paper only. Although they claim to provide a $2.2 billion increase for 2001, only $200 million in real spending increases will be available to America's schools.

And this sleight of hand grows dramatically over the next 5 years. Despite claiming that they will add $20.3 billion in budget authority, this hollow $11 billion promise, they will have only $9.3 billion available in real dollars; this hollow proposal will not buy one book; it will not hire one teacher; it will not pay for $1 toward spending for special education.

But more importantly, as the Republicans put together this package, they are going to hurt other educational programs. If we follow their proposal and say that any additional monies are going to go to special education, what we find is that the other elementary and secondary education programs must be frozen at 2000 levels. What does that mean? It represents a real cut in purchasing power of almost 9 percent by the year 2005.

This represents a real loss of 316,000 fewer low-income students who could get Pell Grants, and Head Start would have to cut services to more than 40,000 children and their families. They are not raising educational spending. They are hurting educational programs.

Instead, I would urge Members to support the Democratic proposal which increases education funding. As an individual who served for the better part of a decade on a local school board, I am pleased to support the Democratic proposal. I believe the programs we are advancing will offer support to the activities of local school boards. We will, in fact, supplement, rather than supplant, the hard work that is going on in communities all across the country.

The Democratic proposal provides real spending increases, unlike the Republican proposal. The Democrats will provide dollars to move forward on the President's promise to hire 100,000 new teachers. The Democratic increase is enough to continue that 7-year initiative, and we can expect we will be able to support about 49,000 teachers in the third year of funding. Research has proven that adding new teachers and reducing class size produces real improvement in student achievement.

Democrats also provide dollars to renovate schools. The Democratic budget provides tax credits and funding to help low-income school districts to make needed repairs to crumbling schools, something we know is a problem all across this country. It provides for loans and grants to leverage nearly $8 billion for about 8,300 renovation projects.

We increase Pell Grants, Head Start, employment and training, and funding for all elementary and secondary education. Please support the Democratic plan.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN), a member of the Committee on the Budget, the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Republican budget.

I want to direct my focus to defense and to education in particular, because the Republican budget does support our military families, those that have been suffering from low morale. The quality of life in the military has been allowed to fall to historic lows over the last 8 years while deployments have risen to historic highs.

The Republicans began to reverse this trend last year by following through with the first real dollar increases in defense in the last 15 years, and this year we will do it again. We are going to make those changes.

I want to talk specifically about an issue that not only affects our Nation's defense but our education as well, and that is impact aid. Impact Aid provides funding to educate children of our military personnel. Impact Aid gives parents that are serving in uniforms the assurance that their children are being educated while they are deployed throughout the world. The fine men and women of our Armed Services deserve the assurance that while they are away doing their job their children are being taken care of.

The Clinton-Gore budget wants to cut the funding by 16 percent this next year while providing for an overall increase in education spending. That cut is a slap in the face to the parents who are serving in the uniforms that serve our country.

The Clinton-Gore budget wants to cut education programs like Impact Aid that provide flexibility in and local control of education. Instead, it wants to increase the number of Federal mandates that are often left unfunded. Republicans want to invest in education by prioritizing their funding in a way that directly benefits children and allows local educators to make those decisions as to how that money is spent; whether it is in a classroom, whether it is for teachers, or perhaps new computers.

The Republican budget rejects new Federal mandates and prioritizes the best needs for our children. I urge adoption of the Republican budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume in response to the last speaker, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN).

Every President while I have served here has sought to reduce Impact Aid, and I agree with him that we should increase it. I would say to him that its chances of being increased are far greater under our budget, with $20.5 billion over 5 years more for education, than their budget.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, this budget is based on a false assumption; and no better than Senator JOHN MCCAIN makes the observation that, indeed, this great surplus we think we have to give a big tax is problematic. Indeed, if we do that, we may indeed affect Social Security.

Mr. Chairman, this budget resolution before us promises much to farmers but delivers little. In this budget, programs for agriculture are weakened at a time when they should be strengthened. Discretionary spending for agriculture is cut. Resources needed to process claims and make timely loans are cut. Funds for programs to provide vital information to farmers are cut.

Over a 5-year period, this budget resolution cuts the purchasing power of agriculture by $1.6 billion. At a time when the Department of Agriculture field offices face staff shortages and funding squeezes, at a time when farmers face long lines at the service counters and delays in getting needed assistance, this budget cuts agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, American farmers as we know them are in peril. Commodity prices are down. The cost of farming is up. Foreign competition is unfair. The farm safety net is virtually nonexistent, and many farmers have borrowed to the brim. Yet the very offices that can help them are understaffed and overwhelmed.

While this budget resolution offers larger farm payments, it withholds the resources to administer those same programs. This budget resolution, with its wizardry and magical acts, gives something; but guess what, at the same time it takes it away.

Mr. Chairman, there is an answer. The Democratic alternative provides $4.7 billion more to agriculture in the fiscal year 2001. The Democratic alternative budget provides some $213 million more for agriculture than this resolution does for this year. Over a 5-year period, the Democratic alternative budget provides $1.8 billion more for agriculture than this provides.

This budget resolution gives farmers rights without any relief. It is a promise without any substance. It is an illusion. The Democratic alternative extends the solvency of Social Security and Medicare, repays the entire debt by the fiscal year 2013, and gives targeted tax cuts to working families.

□ 1415

The Democrat alternative is fiscally responsible. Mr. Speaker, reject this budget. Support the Democrat alternative. Our farmers and our citizens deserve better.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), a member of the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on the Budget, so that he can respond to what was just said.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) that ag and farmers deserve better. But I think it should be very clear that in our budget, unlike the budget of the President, we immediately put in $6 billion for use and then we add another $6 billion over the next 5 years for crop insurance to beef up that program. So, for the first time ever, we put in ahead of time $6 billion right away.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER).

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, as this first point shows, this Republican Congress has ended the 30-year, $655 billion raid on Social Security.

As the next chart shows, regrettably, Congresses of the past raided Social Security to pay for unrelated Washington programs. This was wrong, and this Republican Congress has done something about it. Seniors deserve to have their Social Security protected.

First, Congress adopted the Contract with America that led to the first balanced budget in more than 30 years. We moved from $200-plus billion deficits to surpluses by 1998. But we knew and the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman KASICH) and the Republican leadership and the American public knew that we could do more.

With their support, the House passed, despite the opposition of the Clinton-Gore administration, legislation I sponsored, the Social Security lockbox, by an overwhelming 416–12 vote.

As this next chart shows, last year President Clinton and AL GORE only agreed to set aside 62 percent of the Social Security surplus and proposed to spend the other 38 percent, or $52 billion, of Social Security on risky spending schemes. But we knew 62 percent was not good enough and refused to allow this reckless Social Security raid to continue.

Even with the overwhelming endorsement of the Social Security lockbox vote, again this year the Clinton-Gore administration budget would have raided the Social Security Trust Fund by an additional $60 billion when the tax hikes and budget gimmicks were taken out.

The budget resolution we are considering here today reinforces our Social Security lockbox for fiscal year 2001 and beyond. I urge my colleagues to support our seniors by protecting their Social Security benefits, vote for this Republican budget resolution.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to introduce the subject that the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Armed Services, is going to address, because it deals with a major difference between our resolution and their resolution.

Our resolution contains $16.3 billion over the next 10 years specifically earmarked for health care initiatives for military retirees over the age of 65.

Our alternative includes the funding that would be necessary to cover the major provisions of H.R. 3655, a bill that was introduced by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) who is the ranking Democrat on the Military Personnel Subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) who is the ranking Democrat on the House Committee on Armed Services, and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR).

Over that 10-year period, our Democratic alternative provides $5.4 billion in Function 550 for a prescription drug initiative and $10.9 billion in Function 570, the Medicare function, to provide for what we call around here Medicare subvention, to make military retirees over the age of 65 able to use their Medicare benefits at military treatment facilities. This is a major initiative and a major distinction between our budget and their budget.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I am curious how much time the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) yielded to himself. How much did he consume?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) consumed 1½ minutes.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON).

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Spratt budget alternative that is offered this afternoon.

As a ranking member of the House Committee on Armed Services, I believe this alternative is the only one that addresses the critical need to improve access to health care services for our men and women in uniform and for our military retirees who have given so much to the Nation in the past.

I also want to express my disappointment that the Kasich budget does not provide adequate funding for our military. In my view, it shortchanges the military by at least $12 billion this year.

But let me speak about the Spratt budget and the military health care. Today I speak for those young men and young women, their families, and the military retirees who have given so very much to our Nation, because they are entitled to the best health care available from our Government.

The Spratt substitute is the only one that meets the obligation we owe our active duty members, our military retirees, and their families. I am pleased that the Spratt substitute embodies a bill that the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) and I have introduced, H.R. 3655, to provide access to quality health care services for our retirees and for active duty and their families.

H.R. 3655 is supported by the Military Coalition, an organization comprised of 28 nationally prominent associations representing more than 5½ million current and former members of the seven uniform services.

The Spratt substitute provides for a comprehensive approach to address the problem of access to military health care, particularly for retirees and family members over the age of 65. It includes a comprehensive mail order and retail pharmacy benefit for all military retirees. It includes an expansion of the Medicare subvention program so that Medicare-eligible retirees may be treated at military hospitals and have the cost of their care reimbursed by Medicare.

It includes the elimination of co-payments for active duty family members under TRICARE so that our active duty service members will have fewer out-of-pocket expenses.

It also includes expansion of the TRICARE program to remote locations so the service members not near military hospitals may receive better, more affordable health care.

Overall, this Spratt substitute provides over $16 billion over 10 years for military health care.

How many times, Mr. Chairman, have we heard military retirees say, do something to live up to the obligation? This does it. This provides the money therefor.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds to say that, in our defense budget, we are going to be adding $17.4 billion more to our defense.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) a member of the House Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Science and the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), my understanding is, I read in the Democrat Spratt budget that my colleagues are putting in the same amount that the President did at $306.3 billion, and the Republicans are putting $307.3 billion into the defense. How they divide it up, we were not as articulate as our colleagues are, but just the fact that we are upping them one on the military budget.

I would yield to the gentleman, but I only have a minute to talk about what I need to talk about, and that is where we are going on Social Security.

Too often I think Republicans want to move ahead and do not look back to how much they have accomplished. And what we have accomplished is significant since 1995, when we took the majority. We actually for the first time in almost 40 years quit using Social Security surplus for other Government programs.

What has happened is, in 1995, we were looking at on-budget deficits of approximately $300 billion. Today we have a surplus. We are moving ahead in the right direction.

I am disappointed that this budget, Republican, Democrat, nobody else, deals with the huge problem of really fixing Social Security. The Democrat budget says they are extending the life of Social Security and Medicare by 13 years and 10 years, respectively, but actually what they are doing is adding just two more giant IOUs to those trust funds. It does nothing to fix the program. That has got to be the challenge in the years ahead.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that the Kasich budget has not one cent in that budget for the military retirees and the Spratt budget does.

We have got to think of our military retirees. They have given us so much.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I agree. If the Spratt budget is the same as the budget of the President budget, we add an additional $1 billion to up that budget by, I think, $18 billion.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON).

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) please explain that, in his budget, we do take care of military retirees, as opposed to the Kasich budget, which does not.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to say that that is absolutely correct and to further clarify the difference, the very slight difference, between our resolution and theirs, the budget of the President and theirs.

Over this year and next year, their budget would add $1 billion for defense. It would increase the President's request of $16.4 billion up to $17.4 billion.

When the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) says they provide $17.4 billion, that is a billion more than the President requested.

By the way, the President's request is $24.4 billion more than we provided for defense in 2001 when we did the Balanced Budget Agreement of 1997.

Over the 5-year period of time, both budgets provide about $1.6 trillion. The difference between our budget and theirs over that period of time is less than one-tenth of one percent.

When my colleagues add what we just provided, we are adding $16.3 billion on top of that, on top of that $1.6 trillion, $16.3 billion to go to military retirees and to be reconciled and designed for application to them by the House Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA).

Mr. BACA. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget contains tax breaks for the wealthy while ignoring working Americans, which I think is an irresponsible and not a fiscally oriented budget that looks toward the future.

I believe the budget that has been presented right now from the Democratic side has specifics in terms of the dollars for each of the areas. I am not going to go into depth in that area, but I will go into areas that I feel impact our area.

The Republican budget cuts down domestic spending. The Republican budget cuts down the FBI agents and Drug Enforcement agents. This will open up a season for drug dealers. We already have enough drug dealers in our streets.

College scholarships. It will cut down college scholarships. This presents an opportunity of hope for many of our individuals to go to school. Many of our individuals will be dropping out if we do not provide the assistance.

The Republican party cuts down the air traffic controllers. We are already having a lot of problems with our flights every day, and every day we are looking at the emergency on that level. So if we cut down the funding in that area, look at the impact it has on many of us who fly in that area.

Programs for women and children. Women and children will be out on the streets. We look at the services that we need to provide there. There will be more latch-key kids with nowhere to go in my area or many other areas. There will also be a burden on our churches to take care of these individuals because we have not provided the assistance.

By contrast, the Democratic plan would invest in education. And it is a high priority. Education is the foundation. It affects behavior and attitudes. It prepares us for the working force of the 21st century. It reduces class size. It builds more schools. It provides scholarship opportunity. It protects our seniors. It provides affordable drug prescription. It preserves Social Security and Medicare that is very important to a lot of our seniors. And our seniors know that that is the one issue that they very much care about when we are talking about Social Security and we are talking about Medicare and protecting them.

□ 1430

It eliminates the marriage penalty on low-income households. It invests in public safety. It helps veterans as we just discussed earlier. Democrats have a responsible budget. It pays down the debt before spending and emptying the bank account. The Democrats look at the future. It saves for a rainy day, it is a sensible budget, it deals with tax relief, it deals with opportunities for all individuals of America. It provides for our children, our senior citizens, those who are less fortunate, for the middle class and for all working Americans.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. FLETCHER), a member of the Committee on the Budget as well as the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, I think one of the things that we need to come back and look at is that when the Democrats controlled Congress, we had deficits approaching $200 billion a year. Now we have surpluses, a surplus last year of $178 billion that we have used to pay down the publicly held debt. And so even the fact that they can have this discussion about talking about paying down the debt, it amazes me; and it is because of the work of the Republican Congress that they have been even able to talk about paying down the debt, which was really not part of their dialogue until we were able to balance the budget and to have the surpluses.

What does this budget do? First, it protects Social Security. Remember last year when the President wanted to spend 38 percent of Social Security on more and bigger government? We are saving 100 percent of Social Security. We are strengthening Medicare and prescription drugs, setting aside $40 billion for that over the next 5 years. The President had a plan. He has a plan that puts zero in next year, the year after that zero, the year after that zero and then the last 2 years of his plan, he begins to put in some money.

When you watch his plan, the cost skyrockets. Why? Because you have working people, a bricklayer, a teacher paying taxes to buy prescription drugs for the Ross Perots of the world. But we have set aside $40 billion for prescription drugs and for Medicare for help with our hospitals back home that we will be able to provide targeted relief for those who need it in a fiscally responsible way.

We also plan on retiring the public debt by 2013. Who wants to see a child born here and have the debt of $20,000 upon their back? We are going to eliminate that publicly held debt that has been passed on by the minority for years to our future generations. We are going to strengthen and support education. We put more money into education, more flexibility, more money coming right back to the classrooms where it can be used most effectively with local control.

We promote tax fairness for families, farmers and seniors. It is interesting, they are talking about the huge tax breaks. What we are talking about is tax breaks that have to do with relief and fairness. I can remember them talking about not wanting to pass the marriage penalty tax, not wanting to relieve that $1,400 penalty. We have been able to set aside money to make sure that our taxes are more fair while we are paying down the debt and certainly restore America's defense.

Let me say additionally, we are adding money to basic research and

science, hoping to find cures for disease like cancer, diabetes, Alzheimer's disease. We have consistently increased our support for the National Institutes of Health well above what the Democrats have proposed.

I am very pleased with this budget. I certainly encourage my colleagues to vote against the Democratic budget and for the Republican budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend from South Carolina for yielding me this time. The budget speaks to priorities. The Republicans are not very subtle as to what their priority is all about. It is about a tax cut. We know that this budget, their budget, says that that is their top priority. We do not have the details as to how it would specifically be organized, but all we have to do is look to last year and know that it will be an irresponsible tax cut, reckless and benefit the most wealthy. And we know that it jeopardizes the Social Security and Medicare and our ability to reduce our national debt.

We could take a look at what Senator MCCAIN said when he said it is fiscally irresponsible to promise a huge tax cut that is based on a surplus that we may not have. To bank it all on the unending surpluses at the possible risk of the Social Security trust fund is our fundamental disagreement. We could not agree more with Senator MCCAIN.

Now, we have an alternative. The Democratic alternative makes it clear that our priority is to protect Social Security, Medicare, and reduce our national debt, to have targeted tax relief to those who really need it, to make sure that we can continue our investments in education and the priorities that are important for our economic progress to continue. Fortunately, the budget that the Republicans enacted last year did not become law. The irresponsible tax cut was vetoed by the President. It is interesting that that veto message was never brought up before this body for a veto override, because I think my Republican colleagues know how reckless that really was.

Mr. Chairman, we are going to have a choice in a few moments to speak to what we think the priority should be for our Nation. Should we put tax cuts first or should we put the Social Security Medicare and continuing our economic prosperity first? I urge my colleagues to defeat the Republican resolution and to pass the substitute.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond with no disrespect, but I think some of what I heard was almost silly. The bottom line is we are reducing taxes in the next 5 years by 2 percent of total revenues. Out of $10 trillion, the gentleman from Maryland thinks we cannot afford $200 billion of tax cuts, some of which many of his members have even voted for. Of course we can afford to reduce taxes 2 percent. And we are doing it after we are paying down our debt. We are doing it after we are dealing with Social Security. We are doing it after we pay for Medicare payments and prescription drugs.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), a member of both the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I rise in strong support of the resolution today. I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) for the work that he has done. I wish the chairman luck in his future endeavors. He has made a substantial difference here, and his leadership has been extraordinary.

The Republican budget pays down $1 trillion in debt, protects Social Security, strengthens Medicare, and increases funding for defense and education. With these priorities fulfilled, it is time to give back to Americans their hard-earned money. Promoting tax fairness is the subject. When the Government is running continuous on-budget surpluses and CBO is forecasting surpluses far into the future, it is now time to provide tax relief. If we cannot return the overpayment of taxpayers' money now at a time when we have surpluses and a strong economy, when can we?

It is obvious that money left in Washington will be spent. Why do I say that? The Clinton-Gore budget creates 84 new Federal programs, increases spending at twice the rate of inflation, and despite our surpluses the administration again proposes to raise taxes and fees on working families. Our Republican budget would return the surplus back to the American people who earned it and who deserve it.

The Republican budget provides at least $150 billion in tax relief, including the recently passed marriage penalty relief and small business tax relief. A very responsible $60 billion will be included for additional tax relief or further debt reduction. Let us look at facts. Facts are facts. American taxpayers are overpaying the Federal Government. This money does not belong in Washington, not to Washington bureaucrats. The budget is paid for by the hard work and the sweat of the American worker. With the strong economy and the Federal Government in the black, it is our responsibility to provide tax relief. The Republican budget is a responsible plan for our Nation's future. I urge my colleagues to support this budget resolution.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS).

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Budget Committee budget recommendation for fiscal year 2001. As was said by previous speakers, this is quite an extraordinary event which we can produce over a period of less than 5 years a budget that goes from deficit to not only to going to surplus but protecting 100 percent of that surplus for Social Security while strengthening Medicare and providing the resources that are necessary to provide prescription coverage for seniors; retiring potentially the entire public debt by the year 2013; at the same time promoting tax relief for families, farmers and seniors; providing significant increases in defense; and strengthening support for education and science.

I am here specifically to talk about one aspect of education that is of particular interest to me, and that is funding for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, commonly known as special education. When I came to Congress in 1996, total funding was just a little bit more than $3.5 billion, or about 5 percent of the total 40 percent mandated as required by law. I am pleased to say that in this budget this year, we have incorporated instructions to the appropriators to increase special education funding by a full $2 billion, which is almost 100 percent of what the entire funding was when I came to Congress in 1996.

Full funding of special education is good education policy. It is good policy for communities, for families, for school administrators, for those who are affected and participate in IDEA programs; but most importantly it is also a form of tax relief. For us to have failed to meet this unfunded mandate for so many years is inexcusable. What we do in this budget is move a long way towards meeting that obligation.

I stand here today as a proud supporter of the budget plan that we have here before us today; and for American families, for taxpayers, I urge the adoption of this budget.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY MILLER), a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of the House budget resolution. The American people need to know what we are really talking about here, $1.8 trillion of your money. The money does not belong to government. It is the money we took from you and you have asked us to spend wisely or allow you to keep it, in many cases. What we are talking about today and what the other side is arguing against is allowing you to keep a little of your hard-earned money. What we happen to think does not matter. It is what the American people happen to think and what they say.

I would like to read part of a letter written to me by Mr. Todd Kolber of Upland, California. His dad was a physician; his dad was raised poor and worked his way through college. He specialized in chemotherapy to help people with cancer. His father passed away. He wrote me:

''I am the son and executor of the estate that he worked so hard saving for and didn't get to enjoy. Today I am

going to have the pleasure of writing two checks totaling nearly $1 million divided between the State and Federal Government. This is the most revolting and disgusting thing that I have ever had to do. When the CPA told me how much money the death penalty imposed on my dad's estate, I literally almost threw up. I was sick to my stomach.''

Mr. Kolber closes with the following question:

''Can you write me back with even one good reason that validates the usurpation of $1 million that was left by my dad to my family?''

I cannot justify this tax of 50 percent on this family. I cannot justify this tax on any American citizen. For this reason I urge my colleagues to do what is right, the right thing for Mr. Kolber and his family and the right thing for you and the constituents of my district who will undoubtedly find themselves in the same situation at some time. I urge my colleagues to vote for the budget resolution that begins to dismantle this unfair tax that does nothing for grieving families. It is wrong. We need to change it. The debate here should be focusing on the fact that this is your money. It is not our money. We got this money because we took this money from you. We are saving Social Security. We are saving Medicare and Medicaid. It is time for you to save a little bit for your family. If you want to buy shoes or clothes or whatever you want to do, you should have your money to do that.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following letter for the RECORD.

TODD M. KOLBER,
*Upland, CA, March 7, 2000.*

Representative GARY MILLER,
*Diamond Bar, CA.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MILLER: Today marks the 1st day of the 9th month since my dad passed away. He was a physician specializing in chemotherapy treatments for cancer patients. He grew up in a very poor family in Brooklyn, New York, and he still managed to put himself through school and become a doctor, without the help of the government I might add. His plan was to retire this summer, after doing so much good for his patients and our community, and spend time sailing the 15 year old 27 foot sailboat he bought two weeks before he died. He paid untold sums of money in taxes throughout his lifetime while working to the age of 65, a requirement necessary to save enough money to retire at a financial level that a physician deserves. While paying 50% of his income in taxes to the government, money that might otherwise have been used to fund an early retirement, he died.

I am his son and executor of the estate that he worked so hard saving for and didn't get to enjoy. Today I am going to have the pleasure of writing two checks totaling nearly one million dollars divided between the state and federal government. This is the most revolting and disgusting thing that I have ever had to do. When the CPA told me how much money the death penalty imposed on my dad's estate, I literally almost threw up. I was sick to my stomach. As a result of my dad's strong desire to save for his retirement the majority of his estate is in Individual Retirement Accounts and you know the tax consequences that creates when distributed to heirs, right? After all is said and done, the government will have taken over 50% of my dad's property and money.

I adamantly believe that the government's only societal role is to protect the rights, lives, and property of the law abiding. Period. All socialized legislation beyond that is an unnecessary intrusion into my life and a waste of my money.

The government already confiscates too much money through taxation by means of Income tax, Property tax, Capital Gains tax, Gasoline tax, Social Security tax, Medicare tax, Telephone tax, Hotel tax, Airline Ticket tax, Energy Tax, Entertainment tax and numerous other hidden Excise taxes that I continuously pay.

Having stated that, and inasmuch as you are supposed to be representing me, can you write me back with even one good reason that validates the usurpation of one million dollars that was left by my dad, to my family?

Sincerely,

TODD M. KOLBER.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCI).

□ 1445

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would like to point out that we are probably $200 billion or plus each year having to pay interest on the debt that we do have. I think what we need to do, and we owe it to the American public, is to reduce the debt and the interest on the debt that they are paying for and that we are all paying for and the children are going to be paying for and to begin to be responsible in addressing those issues in not allowing for a very large tax cut to benefit the very few in America at the expense of everybody else in America.

We know from hearing from small business people if we can reduce an interest rate by 1 point over a 30-year note that we are going to be able to save them $25,000 on $100,000. And businessmen are telling me if you do more to reduce the interest rates, to reduce the rates and the interest on the debt, that is going to mean more business for me, more purchases that people are going to be able to make, and by keeping our economy strong.

We have to keep our economy strong, because our economy has produced the benefits that we are now enjoying, and it was the American public through the hard work that they have been undergoing that have given us this opportunity; and we should not do it and jeopardize it on a very risky large tax scheme that does nothing for prescription drugs, that does nothing on the interest on the debt, that does nothing to preserve and protect Medicare or strengthen Social Security.

We need to be able to make sure that those are the programs that we take care of and the interest that we take care of, not on a very risky tax scheme that is going to benefit very few people.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS), a member of the Committee on Armed Services and Chairman of the Republican Conference.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. I thank my friend from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, we hear that giving people their money back is a risky thing. It is a risky thing for the economy not to give people their money back, because what happens is, if those dollars stay here in Washington, we then grow the Government and create more government; and then we have to take more money from the American people to feed those new government programs.

It is an amazing thing to me that someone would say that it is risky to give people their money back when you consider that the economy, the strength of the economy is driven by, or 70 percent of the economy is driven by consumer spending. So when you give people their money back to buy appliances, to buy food for the kids, to buy cars, or to buy new tires, to buy a new washer and dryer, to make the house payment, that is good for the economy. That is not risky.

Again, I repeat, it is risky to leave that money here in Washington. I think the Committee on the Budget has come up with a very responsible budget. It takes care of 100 percent of the Social Security surplus. It strengthens Medicare and prescription drugs.

It sets aside about $40 billion for the prescription drug benefit, retires the public debt by 2013. I think it is important that we pay down the public debt, that we get rid of that public debt and not strap our kids and our grandkids with that. It promotes tax fairness for families and farmers and seniors. So it benefits our farmers. It eliminates the marriage tax penalty.

We set aside a dedicated reserve fund of $50 billion for tax and debt relief only, rejects the $96 billion gross tax increases over the next 5 years by the Clinton and Gore budget, restores America's defense, puts more dollars in national defense, and strengthens support for education and science.

Again, I think the Committee on the Budget has come up with a very responsible budget.

One thing before I sit down, Mr. Chairman, I want to add, I just had a press conference with the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman KASICH), about 10 or 11 of us; we had a press conference talking about the waste, fraud and abuse and what the General Accounting Office has found in our Federal agencies. We looked through some of those reports.

We have a Dow that is approaching 11,000. The economy is good. Unemployment is low. And I hope we do not get complacent, because our economy is doing good and we have surpluses; and it still does not mean that the Federal Government is not wasting money or abusing taxpayers' dollars.

We should be good stewards of taxpayers. We have a lot of waste and a lot of abuse in this government that we can go at and go after and even create

more tax revenue for the American people.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I would say to my good friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS), here is what we are concerned about. Here are the risks that we are really concerned about. The gentleman claims that he generated an on-budget surplus of $110 billion, but he is also claiming a tax cut of $250 billion. We have spread that tax cut out at the same rate as the gentleman increases the $150 billion tax cut over time. And when we look at the bottom line, when we add in the gentleman's $40 billion for Medicare, prescription drugs, add in the additional 50 for additional tax cuts, the surplus vanishes in the year 2003. It goes into the red in 2004 and stays in the red in 2005.

The bottom line, instead of being $110 billion of cumulative surplus instead is $11 billion and declining, because it has been in a deficit for 2 years. We are back in the Social Security fund, back into Social Security in 3 years if the gentleman does it this way. That is what is risky. That is what concerns us.

If somebody will show us this arithmetic is wrong, we will listen; but until then, we say this is what the budget leads us to, dangerously close to being in deficit again, back into the Social Security Trust Fund.

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Connecticut for yielding me the time.

I would like to actually take a look at some of the numbers that the minority staff continues to bring on the floor of Congress. If you take a look at the numbers, they are trying to tell us that we are dipping into the Social Security surplus.

Take a look at these numbers. These numbers they made up. These numbers they made up. These numbers right here, the costs of the Medicare plan, they do not even add up on their chart. If you look at this chart, in their report, I noticed they took a little bit out of this on the chart.

They say, on this chart over here, that the figures in the year 2002 to 2005 are interpolated by the Democratic staff. In Webster's dictionary, interpolate, that means to alter by text, by insertion of a new matter deceptively or without authorization.

They go on to say that the extrapolations for the second 5 years are made by the Democratic staff.

Well, Mr. Chairman, if we take a look at these numbers, they are wrong. The numbers on the surplus are wrong. The numbers that they are making up are wrong. The numbers do not add up. It is an extrapolation. It is an interpolation, which the definition is simply stated here in Webster's Dictionary.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would ask the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) a question.

Mr. Chairman, what the gentleman is reading, the quote, is the footnotes in their own documents?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, yes, absolutely.

Mr. SHAYS. So these are their own words?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Yes.

If we take a look at the chart that the minority staff has prepared, the footnote of these two quotes on this chart, the figures on this chart are interpolated by Democratic staff. They are extrapolations for the second 5 years made by the Democratic staff.

If we look at the dictionary, interpolation means insert new or spurious matter in this manner, meaning insert, estimate or find an immediate term deceptively or without authorization.

That is what we see here with these numbers. They do not even add up their totals. The numbers that they are taking from the Republican budget, if we look at the Republican budget, they are different numbers. This does not add up.

Mr. Chairman, it is the same thing. Last year they said we were raiding Social Security. Guess what? We stopped the raid on the Social Security trust fund. Last year they said we were going to take $17 billion out of Social Security when we debated this bill last year.

Guess what happened? For the first time in 30 years this Congress actually stopped the raid on Social Security and put 100 percent of the Social Security money back in the Social Security trust funds.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman please tell us then what is the year-by-year impact of the $200 billion tax cut over the next 5 years so that we can put it in the chart correctly and we can tell what the bottom line properly is?

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) to respond.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that the gentleman has recognized that his numbers are interpolations; that his numbers are estimates.

Our numbers add up. Our numbers on the 5-year spendup, our numbers on the tax relief, do add up. If we take a look at the gentleman's surplus numbers, taken out of our budget, they are lower numbers as well. They do not add up.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has a year-by-year breakout for the $150 billion tax cut.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRATT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, yes, we do.

Mr. SPRATT. For the $50 billion tax cut that is additional to that, the gentleman has no year-by-year break out. That is all I am asking for, if we could see the year-by-year breakout of the $50 billion tax cut, too.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, to respond to the gentleman's question, in his chart he says in the first year that we have zero tax cuts. If we take a look at page 29 of the bill, we actually have $5 billion in tax cuts.

So looking at the legislation that we are here voting on right now, the chart that the gentleman has prepared is actually in error by $5 billion in the first year alone.

Mr. SPRATT. Well, we know that because the chart was changed last night at 1:00 a.m., and we received that information then.

We have adjusted the numbers, added the $50 billion to the $150 billion, and increased it at the same rate that the $150 billion tax cut was increased.

Using that method of interpolation, the budget is still $5 billion in deficit by 2004 and a billion dollars in deficit in 2005. We are using the gentleman's same numbers, the gentleman's same proportionate increases each year and we come up with that result.

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), who is a member of both the Committee on Science and Committee on Agriculture, as well the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, this has been an interesting debate but it almost is as if there is an echo in here. This debate certainly sounds like debates we have had around this House. Every year when the budget comes up, many of the same expressions, we are hearing terms like exploding tax cuts, risky tax cuts. Somehow I am not really certain what a risky tax cut is and especially when we look at what we are doing with this budget. All we are really doing is making room to eliminate the marriage penalty tax.

Now, nobody wants to debate that because we all know that it is incredibly unfair to say to married couples that they have to pay extra taxes just because they are married.

I do not think it is risky for us to say we are going to make room in our budget to eliminate that unfairness over the next 5 years. That is not risky.

Then we hear always, and this is a common refrain, that this is a tax cut for the rich. Well, I think the only tax cut that they can be talking about, because certainly what is being said is not that married people, just because they are married they are rich. Perhaps what is being talked about is reducing or eliminating the estate tax.

Now, currently, as we all know, it does not take very long for a small

business person or a farmer to reach that threshold where their estate is going to pay 55 percent, 55 percent.

That is confiscatory.

How can it be risky to say it is wrong to say to a farmer or a small business person, to their families, that we are going to take away 55 percent of their estate after they reach a certain level?

If the tax relief that we have put into this bill is looked at, it is absolutely fair.

I am reminded of the story and I said it the other day, of the little red hen. Nobody wanted to help bake the bread.

No one wanted to help create the surpluses, but it is amazing how people argue about who is going to get the biggest slice.

This budget, Mr. Chairman, is absolutely fair, and for the first time in my adult lifetime we are actually allowing the Federal budget to grow at a slower rate, in fact about half the rate of the average family budget. If we do that over the next 5 years, if we control Federal spending, we are going to create big surpluses. Some of that surplus ought to go back to the people who pay the taxes.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my disappointment that once again our friends on the other side have chosen to offer what I consider to be a very irresponsible and unrealistic budgetary mirage rather than a real budget based upon real values.

Rather than work toward our common objectives, they have again put irresponsible tax cuts first. They have offered a budget that puts Social Security at risk, and for the same reasons backed off their proposals last summer, in 1999, in that particular budget, when they saw that Social Security was at risk.

Senator MCCAIN has repeatedly said this is a, quote/unquote, ''fiscally irresponsible approach.''

□ 1500

There is a simple question here: Are we better off now than we were 8 years ago? Are we better off with the fiscal discipline and key investments we started in 1993? The answer is yes, and we should not fail our values by endorsing the failed policies of the past.

Most importantly, the budget from our friends on the other side proposes cuts that just will not happen. Do they believe that by October of this year Head Start will be cut by 40,000 kids? Do they believe that if we provide for 300,000 less college students for Pell grants over the next 5 years, that that will be a part of the final budget? And do they believe that cutting home energy assistance to 160,000 families will actually be a reality in October? This budget is irresponsible. It is not a base from which to do our work here.

We believe in tax cuts, we believe in paying down our debt, we believe in allocating money for veterans health care and prescription drugs for seniors. We can do that. We should do it together. We agree on it.

Let us get down to business and do something today that will actually be useful when decisions must be made later this year. Let us adopt a budget blueprint that embraces all of our values, not one that ignores them.

I ask that Members support the Democratic substitute.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, could the chairman tell us who has the right to close and how much time is remaining on each side?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) has 6 minutes remaining, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 6½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Connecticut has the right to close.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN), a member of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services and the Committee on Science.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Minnesota a little while ago talked about the story of a little red hen. I was reminded of a different story. It is a story about the rooster who used to get up every morning and crow right before the sun came up. One morning the rooster overslept, and the sun came up anyway and the rooster was shattered and crushed.

I think our friends on the other side in the minority are like that rooster. They have been crowing, as they have been every year, about how Republican plans would hurt the debt, hurt Social Security and set us back. Yet, every year we have made great progress.

Here we are again. We are here today on the threshold of a chance to make history, paying down the debt, strengthening our retirement security system, making major new investments in the programs that families care about. With our budget plan, we will make sure that every family has the tools and the opportunity to pursue the American dream, and we do it in a responsible fashion, built on conservative values and conservative priorities.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this great budget plan.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, one more time let me put our chart up. The reason we had zero in allocating the $50 billion tax cut to 2001 is that is what your resolution provided, until last night at 1 o'clock. Your resolution now provides $5 billion, no more in that particular year.

We have, therefore, taken that single number, the only one you provided in breaking out the tax cut, and we have increased the $50 billion tax cut at the same rate that your $150 billion tax cut increased it every year. The same proportion.

When you do that, in 2001 the tax cut becomes $15 billion. In 2002, the total tax cut becomes $29 billion. In 2003, it becomes $41 billion. In 2004, it becomes $55 billion. In 2005, it becomes $59 billion. The total tax cut over that period of time is $200 billion.

As a result, using simple arithmetic, as a result of those adjustments, just trying to figure out how your $200 billion tax cut would distribute, we get a bottom line that is $5 billion in deficit in the year 2004, and in the year 2005, still negative, minus $2 billion. You are back in deficit, back in the Social Security surplus.

If these numbers are wrong, come change them.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and the Committee on Small Business.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of the Committee on the Budget and have not been part of the process that caused this incredible debt that caused this high taxation or that has caused repeated raids on the Social Security system, but I am proud to be part of the solution.

I am proud to support this budget which strengthens Medicare. I am proud to be part of this process that pays down the national debt. I am proud to support this budget that provides tax relief in the areas of marriage penalty tax, death tax, education, health care, and repeal of seniors' earning limitations.

I am proud to support this budget which strengthens national defense, strengthens education funding, aggressively attacks waste and fraud.

Lastly, I am proud to support this Republican budget which strengthens and protects Social Security and permanently ends the raid on that. I am proud to do that, Mr. Chairman, as the father of three children, because I am proud to give them the future and America's children the future they deserve.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as I said at the outset, we have come a long way since 1992 when the budget was in deficit $290 billion. We have wiped out the deficit. Now we stand at a fiscal fork in the road, deciding whether or not we take on the second biggest and toughest problem, and that is the long-term solvency of Social Security and Medicare, or whether we take another fork and ignore those particular problems.

We have presented to the House a budget resolution which cuts taxes, not by as much as our Republican colleagues, but it is a significant tax cut, $50 billion net tax cut over 5 years, $201

billion over 10 years. We provide for tax cuts. We also pay down our mountainous national debt, at long last, $48 billion over 5 years in debt reduction, $364 billion over 10 years in debt reduction.

But we go further. Given the opportunity that we have, we step up to the problem of the long-term solvency of Social Security and Medicare by transferring over the next 10 years $300 billion into the Medicare trust fund, extending its life by 10 years, and then by transferring funds from the general fund into Social Security and extending its life by 15 years.

We do this, and at the same time we provide for things that the country needs. I come from a district where there are a lot of military retirees. I have heard their complaints about the kind of commitment we have made to them and the extent to which we have kept it. So, consequently, we have made room in our resolution to provide for a major increase in retiree health care benefits. We are going to say to them, Medicare subvention, we can do it. If you want to use your Medicare benefits at a military treatment facility, we have provided for it in this resolution.

Furthermore, for those over 65 who do not have a drug or pharmacy benefit anymore, we are going to reinstate it. We are going to fully fund the Abercrombie-Skelton bill.

When you look at these things, the $20.5 billion for education, the additional amounts we provide for law enforcement over and above what they provide, the realistic level of funding we provide for community and regional development, as opposed to their cut, which is $2.5 billion in CDBGs, EDA and these agencies that help us help the hardest hit parts of our country, there is no question about it, we have not just a balanced budget in the sense that the bottom line is in the black, thank goodness, but it is balanced as to its priorities. It is the better budget of the two, and I urge support for it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. PRICE.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the gentleman in a colloquy here about this tax cut debate we have been having.

I understand that one of our friends on the other side said there was no such thing as an irresponsible tax cut. That is a dangerous view. In fact, the tax cut proposed by George W. Bush, the Republican presidential candidate, seemed to fit that category very well, because our Republican friends refused to even allow us to vote on it in the Committee on the Budget.

This chart indicates where we are with these various tax cut proposals. The Republican tax cut proposal that is included in this budget would use the entire non-Social Security surplus and take us into deficit, into borrowing from the Social Security surplus to the tune of $68 billion over the 10 year period. It would just barely avoid doing that over the first 5 years and be $68 billion in the red over 10 years.

The Bush tax cut is even more irresponsible, $136 billion into the red in 5 years, and $376 billion over 10 years. So, it is not surprising, I suppose, that our Republican friends would not permit a vote on that.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I think that is a good presentation of exactly the point we have been trying to make all day long. We have called it risky and dangerous. What we are talking about is skating on thin ice. For the first 5 years, this resolution, which has $200 billion of tax reduction in it, comes perilously close to putting us back in deficit. If we do, we are back into the Social Security trust fund.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the Democratic alternative does have responsible tax relief, targeted at the marriage penalty, targeted at the need to get school construction moving in this country, targeted at a number of important priorities. But it is balanced and responsible. That is the key point. It is balanced with the other priorities of shoring up Medicare and Social Security and paying down the national debt. It is that sort of balance that I think is missing in our Republican friends' resolution.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina has 15 seconds.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, in the time remaining, I would urge every Member to look in earnest at these two proposals. We have made the House a budget proposal that pays down the debt, provides for tax relief, but also provides for the real needs of this country.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut has 3¾ minutes to close this portion of the debate.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, only in Washington when you cut taxes by $200 billion in a $10 trillion revenue stream would people call it irresponsible.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU).

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, it is never easy to put together a budget that spends $1.8 trillion. It is difficult to bring together all of the Members on this floor on either side of the aisle, talk through priorities, make tradeoffs and set forth a blueprint that talks about our broad vision for where this economy ought to be headed, for where Federal spending ought to be headed and for what we ought to be doing to protect the taxpayers of this country. But the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) has provided tremendous leadership to the Committee on the Budget; and I think it is worth reviewing, not just the record that he has established in setting these priorities, but where this budget is really going to take us.

Let us cut through the rhetoric a little bit and talk about what our priorities are. First and foremost, it is to set aside every penny of the Social Security surplus. This is not old hat. This is not an idea that Democrats or Republicans have been talking about for 4, 5, or 6 years. It was just last year that Republicans responded to the President's call to spend 40 percent of the Social Security surplus with a commitment that no longer will we take funds out of the Social Security surplus, that we will set aside every penny. We did it despite the calls of critics that we would not be able to do it. We did it because we had the will and determination to put forward spending bills that achieve that goal.

What else does this budget do? It sets aside funds for Medicare, for prescription drug benefit. We have heard a lot of scare tactics about losing benefits, Medicare or Social Security, trying to intimidate Members of this House, trying to intimidate the American people. But the fact is we have set aside $40 billion. If you just take a look at the allocations for Medicare, the red showing the President's set-aside for Medicare, the blue slowing the Republic plan for Medicare, there is a dramatic difference. If we have the wherewithal and will to pass bipartisan legislation in the Committee on Ways and Means, we will achieve historic Medicare reform and deliver that prescription drug benefit to those seniors in need.

□ 1515

Set aside Social Security surplus, protect Medicare, and pay down debt.

Look at the record on debt relief. This is not a projection; this is what has actually been done. In 1998, $50 billion. In 1999, over $80 billion. This fiscal year, $163 billion. Despite the fact that the critics on the other side said we were going to dip into the Social Security Trust Fund surplus, we did not. Over 4 years we have paid down over $450 billion in debt. It keeps interest rates low, it keeps the cost of one's home mortgage or car loan low, and that money never has to be sent back to Washington.

Critics say we could pay down more debt if we did not cut taxes. Well, of course, we could pay down a little more debt if we did not cut the marriage penalty, if we kept penalizing married couples; but that would be the wrong thing to do. If we did not eliminate the Social Security earnings ban, we could pay down a little bit more in debt, but that would be the wrong thing to do. If we did not give individuals health insurance deductibility just like we give to big corporations, we could pay down a little bit more in debt, but that would be wrong. We are supporting this historic tax relief for Americans, not because of what it does or does not add

up to, but because of eliminating the marriage tax penalty, eliminating the death tax, because giving individuals health insurance deductibility is the right thing to do.

Even with this historic tax relief, we pay down debt over the next 5 years. Mr. Chairman, $1 trillion in debt paid down over the next 5 years. What a historic achievement, bringing public debt from over $3.9 trillion to well under $3 trillion over the next 5 years. That achievement will not just serve fiscal responsibility or serve our budget priorities well, but it will serve the American people well.

Mr. Chairman, this is the right set of priorities for America, from paying down debt and cutting taxes to investing in defense and funding our special education mandate. I urge my colleagues to support this vision, this set of priorities, and support the Republican resolution.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to this Republican Fiscal Year 2001 Budget Resolution and in strong support of America's home healthcare agencies and patients. This resolution is skewed and misguided. It is a framework for disaster and for a return to the deficit spending of the 1980s. It is a political document designed to further the Majority's ill-advised tax cut agenda. Instead of focusing on strengthening Social Security, improving education, and extending Medicare, this budget will place our surplus in jeopardy through the risky tax cut scheme that was vetoed last year. I challenge the Republicans to take a stand for America and fund the programs Americans depend on.

One of those programs is home healthcare, which received some of the worst cuts in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (BBA). Home healthcare is vital to millions of people across this country. It allows patients to recover from illness or surgery and to receive treatment in the comfort of their own homes and in the security of their own families, instead of having to move into a nursing home or stay in a hospital. In addition, treating patients at home saves money for Medicare in the long run.

Home healthcare received attention last year because there was a pressing need to restore funding for ailing home healthcare agencies. This need has not diminished. An important provision in last year's budget resolution expressed support for delaying the automatic 15 percent cut in home healthcare funding upon implementation of the Prospective Payment System (PPS) and for the enactment of the PPS in a timely fashion. At the end of the year, the BBRA included a one-year delay of the 15 percent cut, in part due to the language in the Budget Resolution.

Today we are debating the FY 2001 Budget Resolution, and while I will not support final passage because of the misguided policies outlined in this resolution, I am somewhat encouraged by the home healthcare language it includes. However, I believe it is time for the Majority to show some courage and dedicate specific funds for home healthcare agencies.

This Budget Resolution contains a Sense of Congress that ''Congress and the Administration should work together to avoid the implementation of the 15 percent reduction in the prospective payment system and ensured timely implementation of that system.''

Instead of a Sense of Congress, I challenge the Majority to include $5 billion to eliminate the 15 percent reduction. It is time for the Majority to admit it made a mistake with the BBA and begin to fix that mistake.

I am extremely disappointed that the Republican Majority does not recognize the damage done by the BBA, especially to home healthcare. We are living in the most prosperous time in this nation's history. Our seniors deserve better than this budget.

Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. Chairman, today I address H. Con. Res. 290, the Republican budget resolution for FY 2001. Further, I would like to discuss the opportunities that the Blue Dog substitute provides. I am working to amend some of the inequities in the resolution drafted by my Republican colleagues.

In 1993, when President Clinton first came to office, the deficit stood at $332 billion. Beginning with the Deficit Reduction Act in 1993, the Administration worked its way to a surplus. By Fiscal Year 1998, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) reported that total revenues exceeded spending by $70 billion, producing the first surplus in almost 30 years. This surplus allowed us to move our attention beyond the deficit and onto other pressing national problems.

Mr. Chairman today seniors make up a greater percentage of our population than ever before. The generation that made this nation great—that lifted us out of an economic depression, won both world wars and the cold war—is retiring by the millions and in need of care. This trend will continue with the fast-approaching retirement of the baby boom generation, placing an unprecedented strain on Social Security and Medicare—programs created by the Democrats for the people.

Medicare, the primary vehicle of health care for seniors, is threatened with insolvency by 2008. Population increases, coupled with rising health costs, have threatened to annihilate this program. However, we have an opportunity to change this.

The Blue Dog substitute, which I support, pays heed to these vital programs. This substitute promotes responsible budgetary policy by reserving half of the on-budget surplus for debt reduction and saving the entire Social Security surplus. While the Republicans budget uses the surplus for irresponsible tax cuts, we save Medicare and Social Security. We also establish a Medicare reserve of $40 billion over 5 years that could be used to finance reforms that extend solvency, create a prescription drug benefit, or allow for additional health care provider relief. Further, we take care of our rural health care programs by increasing funding for discretionary health care programs by $4.6 billion over the Republican budget.

The Blue Dog substitute will put the government on the path to completely eliminate the publicly held debt by 2012, one year earlier than the goal set forth by the President. Because the Republican plan spends the Social Security surplus for other purposes, it reduces less debt. Federal reserve Chairman Alan Greesnspan has stated that paying down the debt is crucial to preparing for the fiscal hurdles that face Medicare. It's clear that social Security, Medicare, Social Security and the national debt are intricately linked.

Mr. Chairman, another thing I simply cannot overlook is the lack of funding that the Republican budget resolution provides for education programs. The substitute I am supporting provides $15 billion more funding over the next five years for education than proposed in the Republican budget. These funding increases are targeted toward education reform initiatives. Although our children have no legislative voice, they represent our nation's future and deserve an investment in their education today.

Our budget should not only educate our children, but also protect their security in an increasingly dangerous world. I support a budget that will give this nation an appropriate level of military readiness. Mr. Chairman, several renegade nations have recently completed successful nuclear weapons testing. Although the Cold War has ended, the nuclear arms race continues to this day. With this concern in mind, the Blue Dog substitute provides $15 billion more in defense budget authority (over 5 years) than the Republican budget. In addition, the Blue Dog substitute takes care of veterans by providing funding for prescription drug benefits.

The Blue Dog budget also meets the agricultural and energy needs of this nation—areas of crucial importance in my district of East Texas. The Blue Dog substitute increases the baseline for mandatory agricultural programs by $23.6 billion over the next five years, in addition to providing $6 billion for assistance in fiscal year 2000. This increase provides funding for crop insurance legislation, long-term agricultural safety net and income support programs, and agricultural research. In contrast, the Republican budget does nothing to increase the agricultural baseline beyond the minimum necessary to fund crop insurance reform.

While the Republican budget cuts the energy function by $2.2 billion, the Blue Dog substitute includes funding for research to increase domestic energy production, develop alternative energy sources, and promote energy conservation. The Blue Dog budget prioritizes funding for energy initiatives critical to the economic vitality of this nation.

Although I have only highlighted a few differences between the Republican budget resolution and the Blue Dog substitute, it should be obvious that they are significant. I encourage my colleagues to vote for the blue Dog substitute, a budget with responsible priorities. This is our opportunity to vote for comprehensive fiscal change and support a budget that will improve the lives of our fellow Americans.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise tonight to say a few words about the budget resolution. Unfortunately, I will not be able to vote for the resolution or any of the five alternatives put forth before us tonight, because none of them have a good combination of debt relief and spending priorities.

The Republican resolution offered by Mr. KASICH shortchanges important domestic programs by cutting non-defense discretionary spending by $6.9 billion over 2000 levels. This would mean that over 300,000 students will lose their Pell grants for college, and that almost 2,000 FBI and DEA agents will lose their jobs. In addition, the Kasich resolution does not provide near enough money for debt relief. Virtually all economists, including Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan, have argued that there is almost no better way of improving the government's finances than reducing the debt. That is also why I am opposing the Democratic, Black Caucus, and Progressive

Caucus alternatives, because they do not reserve enough money for debt reduction.

In contrast, while I support the Blue Dog's position on using one-half of the surplus debt reduction, I believe that their high spending on defense—even higher than the Kasich resolution—jeopardizes other discretionary spending. Specifically, I am particularly opposed to the Blue Dog substitute because of the cuts in transportation spending. Under this proposal, and that of the CATS substitute and the Black Caucus substitute, it would not be possible to honor the commitments Congress made in TEA 21 and AIR 21 transportation bills, thereby risking the safety of millions of motorists and air travelers.

I appreciate the hard work and effort that my colleagues put into their respective proposals, but unfortunately, I do not feel that any of these proposals have the right mix of savings for debt reduction and funding for our nation's infrastructure needs. Moreover, this and other recent budget resolutions have been composed of blue smoke and mirrors that do not reflect year-spending agreements, Rather, it is unfortunate that the budget resolutions have been and will continue to be breached during appropriation's negotiations between Congressional leaders and the White House. Hopefully, this and future Congress will break that cycle and lead us into the 21st Century in a fiscally responsible manner.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this Budget Resolution because I believe that, in this time of great prosperity and urgent needs, we can do better. We should be voting on a bipartisan and realistic budget resolution.

Instead, we have a resolution that doesn't secure the future of Social Security and Medicare, and doesn't focus on critical education, health, and consumer safety needs.

Under this resolution, our federal commitment to education would be $4.7 billion under the President's budget. The increases proposed are solely for elementary and secondary education, leaving no increase for critical needs in school modernization, professional development, Title I, and higher and adult education.

Under this resolution, the NIH would received a lower increase than necessary to continue our bipartisan effort to double funding for the world's premiere biomedical research institution. And this increase would mean that other, equally worthy health programs at CDC, SAMHSA, HRSA and related agencies would be at or below a freeze.

Under this resolution, programs like LIHEAP—so desperately needed this winter—would serve 164,000 fewer low-income families. Pell Grants would go to 316,000 fewer students by 2005; and more than 40,000 kids would be denied access to Head Start by 2005.

The fact is that this budget resolution sets us against each other. We cannot have tax cuts of the extraordinary magnitude being discussed unless we make deep cuts in programs that millions of Americans rely upon.

I believe maintaining a strong defense and providing meaningful tax relief does not need to come at the expense of vital programs that help get kids through college, translate scientific discoveries to patient care, and help families raise healthy kids. No one wins when we set program against program.

I hope we can avoid that destructive game and work together to provide strong support to the important and worthy efforts that Americans are calling on us to support. Together, we can improve the lives of the American people.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, the greatest magician of all time was Harry Houdini. He was the first person to do the Straight Jacket Escape. In that one, Houdini allowed himself to be tied up in a straight jacket and hung upside down from the eaves of a tall building. Invariably, Houdini found some sensational way to escape.

The Republican majority has turned the budget process into an annual escape act. Each year, the Republicans march down here and tie themselves up in a straight jacket budget. Then they spend the next few months trying to escape from it. Invariably they fail and they resort to budgetary sleight-of-hand, smoke and mirrors and accounting gimmicks. Invariably, the appropriation bills are not passed and we are left with a last minute, take-it-or-leave-it, catch-all budget that funds most of the government.

This year's Republican budget is no exception. The budget the Republican Majority is advancing today is completely unrealistic. It calls for a $150 to $200 billion tax cut, but the only way they can achieve this is through draconian cuts in discretionary spending, which even they won't be willing to vote for when the appropriations bills reach the Floor.

The fact is that if the Majority actually implemented everything in their budget, the tax cuts would significantly exceed the projected non-Social Security surpluses for the next five years. This is irresponsible. We should use the budget surpluses to pay down the debt and extend the solvency of Social Security and Medicare.

The bottom line is this: The GOP budget is a straight jacket that Houdini himself couldn't escape from. I urge my colleagues to reject the Majority's budget and adopt the Spratt Substitute.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, when I was growing up near Detroit, the Four Tops had a hit single called: ''It's The Same Old Song.'' Well, that could be the title of this Republican Budget Resolution. Because when you listen closely to what they're proposing you'll hear is the same old song they were singing this time last year.

What's in their budget? Over $1 trillion dollars in tax cuts for the wealthy over 10 years. And who gets stuck with the tab? You guessed it: America's families do.

Sound familiar? It ought to: this is what the Republicans tried to peddle to the American people last year. It's the same old song.

Well, I've got some news for the Republican leadership: the American people weren't dancing to it then and they're not dancing to it now. And what made their proposal a bad idea last year makes it an even worse one today.

It's the fact that while they wrote a tax cut for the rich into their plan, they wrote America's working families out.

Mr. Chairman, when I listen to working families back home in Michigan they're not telling me they want to cut taxes for the rich. No. What they're telling me is that they want to see us start paying down the debt. They're telling me they want us to strengthen Social Security.

What they're telling me is they want us to make Medicare efficient and modern—and that includes making sure it offers a prescription drug benefit.

But this budget plan not only fails to address any of those priorities—it would tie our hands so we couldn't respond to them in the future. And, if that's not enough, it would also slash needed investments to the tune of $114 billion dollars. That would knock the stuffing out of our efforts to provide clean drinking water and promote energy conservation.

It would rob us of the resources we need to enforce environmental protection laws the way they ought to be. And it doesn't stop there.

Under their plan, the WIC nutrition program would have to turn away three-quarters of a million pregnant women, new moms, babies and little children.

Mr. Chairman, if that's what George W. Bush calls compassionate conservatism I'd hate to see the other kind.

It's the same old song—and today we're saying that America's families deserve better.

What America's families want is a sensible, balanced budget that invests in America's future, not some ''golden oldie'' of a budget that would only repeat the mistakes of the past. What working families back home in Michigan want is a budget that's responsive—and responsible. We want a budget that enables us to strengthen Social Security. A budget that allows us to modernize Medicare. We want a budget that gives us the ability to pay down the national debt. Those are the priorities of the families I listen to.

And while the Republicans talk sometimes like they know the words—proposals like this remind us that they just can't carry the tune.

I urge you to vote ''no'' on the resolution.

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the American people have told us exactly what we're here to do: we are here to retire the national debt so our children aren't forced to pay our bills, we are here to maintain a balanced budget, we are here to ensure the long term solvency of Social Security and Medicare, we are here to relieve the tremendous burden from our nation's seniors by including basic prescription drug benefits in Medicare, we are here to invest in our children's future. We are her to offer prudent, targeted tax cuts for America's working families.

H. Con. Res. 290 abandons the middle-class family, disregards the plight of America's senior citizens, and sacrifices our hard won fiscal discipline. H. Con. Res. 290, if adopted, will spend us right back into deficit, thus jeopardizing the Social Security trust funds, and will fail to stabilize Medicare or improve the quality of health care. Not one single dime will be used to reduce our national debt. In fact, by 2004 the budget must dip into the Social Security trust funds in order to finance the massive tax cuts for special interests sought in the Republican measure.

Mr. Chairman, in 1999 our Federal Government spent 13 percent of its entire budget just paying off the interest on our national debt. Because of the Budget Act of 1994 and our continuing fiscal discipline to maintain a sound economy, we can pay off our debt by 2013. This must be our top priority. H. Con. Res. 290 jeopardizes paying off the debt and continuing our strong economy.

Mr. Chairman, I support the Spratt substitute because it pays down the debt, ensures the solvency of Social Security, invests in our children, and includes prescription drug coverage in Medicare. Throughout my district I am approached by seniors who express their frustrations with having to choose between medically

needed prescription drugs and putting food on their table. Whether these seniors live in the public housing complex at Brush Creek Towers in the economically depressed central city or in the more affluent part of my district in Lee's Summit's John Knox Village, the astronomical cost of their medications is forcing them to make an impossible choice: food or medicine. This must not continue.

I strongly encourage my colleagues to reject H. Con. Res. 290, and vote to protect the Social Security trust fund. We must pay down the national debt. We need to ease the burden on our seniors and invest in our children, and provide for modest, prudent, targeted tax cuts for working families. Let's do what's right for the future of America.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican budget resolution.

In order to make room for $150 billion of irresponsible tax cuts, the Republicans cut budget authority for nondefense discretionary programs by a total of $138 billion over 5 years below the baseline needed to maintain program levels. As a result, this would among other things: Cut 310,000 low-income women, infants, and children off WIC assistance in 2001 alone, and more in years thereafter; cut 1,000 FBI agents and 800 Drug Enforcement agents by 2005; cut LIHEAP to only 164,000 low income families in 2001, just as oil prices are skyrocketing; provide Pell grants to 316,000 fewer low-income students by 2005; eliminate Head Start for more than 40,000 children and their families by 2005; and raid the Social Security surplus to pay for its tax cuts.

It is time for the Republicans to stop trying to cut taxes on the backs of America's seniors, working families and children.

It is also time for the Republicans to stop claiming that we can't afford to spend more on important programs, like education and health, when they are pouring more and more money into defense.

We have 11 million children who are not covered by health insurance; we have a Head Start program so chronically underfunded that only 2 out of every 5 eligible children can get in; and we have 26,000 schools—serving 14 million kids—that need major repair or replacement.

This past fall, 53.2 million U.S. students returned to school. For the fourth year in a row, we set a record for enrollment rates—447,000 more children than last year. And public high school enrollment is expected to increase by 11 percent between 1998 and 2008—on top of a 16 percent jump since 1988.

Schools are straining to accommodate the influx of students, setting up classrooms in trailers, hallways and closets. The U.S. Department of Education estimates that 6,000 new schools must be built by 2006, at a cost of billions of dollars, to handle this overflow.

Yet the Republicans have chosen to cut non-defense discretionary spending, like education.

Furthermore, 46 percent of today's schools lack adequate electrical wiring to support the full-scale use of technology. And our schools are still suffering from a digital divide. Schools with 90 percent or more of minority students have less access to computers—17 students per computer compared with only 10 students per computer in schools with less than 25 percent minority students.

Yet, instead of focusing on these important issues, the Republicans are increasing defense spending by $17.4 billion.

The biggest percentage increase in the DOD budget (11 percent) is not for what is really needed, like pay raises or operations and maintenance. Countless numbers of our soldiers are on food stamps, but the Republican budget focuses more on building new weapons than helping to retain our soldiers, and to improve their quality of life.

Our long-term national security depends not just on how many bombs and missiles we build, but how well we can retain our soldiers and how we can prepare our children for the highly-competitive global economy they will face.

The Democratic alternative focuses on these important issues. It focuses on the needs of Americans by: Extending the solvency of both Social Security and Medicare and protecting 100 percent of the Social Security surplus; providing a voluntary prescription drug benefit for all schools through Medicare and issuing reconciliation instructions to the Ways and Means Committee to make it real; providing more debt reduction than the Republican budget by not spending all of the on-budget surplus. The Democratic alternative maintains on-budget surpluses for the next ten years, unlike the Republican budget. Thus, the entire debt would be eliminated by 2013 under the Democratic alternative; maintaining funding for non-defense discretionary programs at the level needed to adjust for inflation; Providing targeted tax cuts to average families of $78 billion over five years and $263 billion over ten years, and offsetting this cost by closing corporate loopholes and shutting down corporate tax shelters; and, by including initiatives to extend access to health care and health insurance and reforming the health care system for military retirees.

What we do in this budget will affect more than what we do next year—it will affect what we do years down the road.

We must prepare for our future. We must provide security for our Seniors. We must support our working families, and we must invest in our children. The Democratic alternative does that.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the Republican proposal and to support the Democratic alternative.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in proud support of a responsible Fiscal Year 2001 Budget Resolution put forth by this Republican Congress. This budget provides the blueprint to do great things this year, including: Balancing the budget for the second consecutive year, eliminating the public debt by 2013, safeguarding Social Security, increasing defense spending, setting aside $40 billion for Medicare reform and prescription drug coverage, increasing elementary and secondary education funding by more than 9 percent and much more.

The Clinton-Gore administration's budget, submitted to Congress on February 7 this year, increases discretionary spending by over $39 billion. That is an increase of more than twice the rate of inflation—evidence that the Clinton-Gore-Gephardt alliance continues to support a ''government on autopilot'' approach.

Mr. Chairman, that is simply irresponsible. There is plenty of fat that can still be trimmed off Uncle Sam. Just because we have increasing surpluses does not mean all Government spending is responsible or justified. We need to continue to address the billions of dollars lost on waste, fraud, and abuse. We need to eliminate those programs that don't work and are a burden to the American taxpayers. This budget resolution will do that by restraining federal spending, setting aside funds for paying down the debt and saving Social Security.

This budget resolution will allow Americans to keep more of their hard earned dollars and allow us to keep our promises to the nation's youth, small businesses, parents and seniors.

In closing Mr. Chairman, I strongly encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the Fiscal Year 2001 Budget Resolution.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Chairman, today, the House will vote to approve a Republican budget resolution which will set the priorities for spending in the next fiscal year. I will join many of my colleagues in opposing this irresponsible plan.

I have many concerns about the resolution. It fails to take the necessary steps to keep our economy going strong so that all parts of our country can benefit. It does not meet our national priorities of paying down the debt, preserving Social Security, providing targeted tax cuts for working families, and making crucial investments in important areas.

The majority's resolution calls for spending $114 billion less on domestic programs than is required simply to keep up with inflation. This could have a devastating effect. It would require us to stop providing LIHEAP assistance to 164,000 families; to cut-off 310,000 low-income women, infants, and children from WIC assistance; to give Pell grants to 316,000 fewer low-income students; to end Head Start services for more than 40,000 children and their families by 2005. These cuts do not match our national priorities, especially as we enjoy a significant non-Social Security surplus for the first time in decades. Moreover, at the same time it erodes support for important safety net programs, the majority's resolution provides for a $250 billion tax cut over the next 5 years, which could grow to up to $1 trillion over 10 years. These cuts are not targeted to working people, but rather would benefit primarily those who are most wealthy. I could not support such a plan.

Instead, I supported a substitute plan which would have paid off the national debt by 2013, provided $50 billion in targeted tax cuts, invested in domestic priorities, and extended the solvency of Social Security and Medicare. This plan struck me as being more balanced with regard to maintaining our fiscal discipline and planning for future needs. Unfortunately, it did not prevail.

We are fortunate to be enjoying a robust economy which has resulted in significant budgetary surpluses. Instead of splurging on expensive giveaways, we need to maintain fiscal discipline and keep an eye toward the challenges that are coming our way. Social Security and Medicare will soon be facing serious financial problems due to the huge demographic shift that will occur when the baby boomers retire. We must act now to prepare for that reality.

I also believe that we should use more of our surplus to retire our national debt. Currently, the federal debt is about $5.5 trillion. In 1998 alone, we paid about $243 billion just in interest on that debt. By paying down the

debt, we could free up tens, if not hundreds of billions of dollars for more productive use. In addition, it would prepare the country for future fiscal challenges.

I am not opposed to tax cuts. The plan that I supported includes $50 billion in targeted cuts. Last year, I voted for approximately $100 billion in tax cuts that were signed into law. However, the $250 billion plan contained in this year's budget resolution runs the risk of not only eating up the entire budget surplus, but some of the Social Security surplus as well.

As we continue work on the budget this year, my goal remains to ensure that we maintain fiscal discipline to keep our economy going strong, to shore up Social Security and Medicare, to pay down the national debt, and to provide adequate funding levels for our domestic priorities. I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to achieve a budget of which all Americans can be proud.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this Member rises today to express his support for H. Con. Res. 290, the FY 2001 Budget Resolution, as approved by the House Budget Committee.

This budget resolution proposes $596.5 billion in total discretionary spending for fiscal year 2001, a $10.5 billion increase which amounts to half of the rate of inflation. In fact, the spending limits for most of the five budget alternatives offered today are relatively close in total spending. This Member votes for H. Con. Res. 290 only with the expressed understanding the resolution presents an overall guidance to the House on spending and revenues which he supports. However, this Member views the spending breakdown by categories as only advisory; he does not agree with several areas of this part of the committee's recommendations. Therefore this Member does not view himself as committed to the detailed budget function breakdown included in H. Con. Res. 290. Indeed, this Member intends to ask the leadership to make certain different recommendations to the Appropriation Committee as allocation decisions are made among its subcommittees.

Having said that, this Member is pleased that H. Con. Res. 290 provides an increase for the category education, training, employment, and social services programs. The resolution also includes a necessary increase for Medicare. Moreover, the budget category for transportation is adequate to permit spending of accumulated dollars in the highway trust fund and aviation trust fund, so these funds will not be diverted for other purposes. This Member strongly supports that concept. Also very importantly, the budget resolution stipulates that if a portion of a FY 2001 tax relief is vetoed by the president, the vetoed amount must be allocated toward debt reduction, not additional spending—in effect creating a debt reduction ''lockbox.'' In addition, H. Con. Res. 290 proposes to devote the entire amount of excess Social Security receipts (an estimated $166 billion in FY 2001) to a lockbox to prevent these Social Security funds from being used to finance other government programs.

Importantly, there is $8 billion over the next 5 years for crop insurance reform. It is this Member's hope that since the other body passed its version of crop insurance legislation today, we will have a conference committee appointed shortly and actually enact crop insurance reform well before FY 2001 begins. Furthermore, H. Con. Res. 290 includes $6 billion for a reserve fund to address potential agriculture emergencies during FY 2000. This fund will allow Congress the flexibility to quickly address agricultural emergencies within the framework of the budget throughout the year.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, this Member supports the Budget Committee version of H. Con. Res. 290 and urges his colleagues to vote ''aye.''

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the budget resolution before us today.

This resolution, like many in recent years, makes unacceptable cuts in domestic discretionary spending to pay for unwise tax cuts and increased defense spending. This bill would hold domestic discretionary spending $114 billion below inflation over the next five years. That means that a number of important Government functions would be shortchanged—maybe education, maybe veterans, maybe scientific research, or maybe air traffic control. I don't think that we should shortchange any of those activities. In fact, I think that we need to invest more in the federal programs that will make this country safer, healthier, and more productive in the future.

In addition, this budget fails to do enough to pay down the national debt and shore up Social Security and Medicare. By providing such a large tax cut, this budget consumes the projected on-budget surpluses in just a few short years. In fact, according to Representative John Spratt, Ranking Member of the House Budget Committee, the tax cuts provided for in this budget resolution would start eating into the Social Security Surplus by 2004. That means the Government would pay down less on the debt than it otherwise would. That means the Government would do less to strengthen Social Security and Medicare. And that means that a comprehensive Medicare prescription drug benefit would be much harder to enact. I believe that paying down the debt and fixing Social Security and Medicare must come first.

Finally, I would like to point out that Congress has not adhered to similar budget resolutions passed in the last few years. It couldn't—these budgets required unrealistic and unacceptable levels of spending for important domestic programs like education and health care. Many Members, myself included, have pointed out how unrealistic these budget resolutions were when the House considered them in past years, but the Majority pushed them through without regard for our concerns—concerns which with hindsight appear to have been correct.

In conclusion, I urge my colleagues to reject this unrealistic and unwise budget. Instead, let us work together to produce a budget resolution which pays down the debt, strengthens Social Security and Medicare, provides a Medicare prescription drug benefit, and invests in the health and education of our people.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge support for H. Con. Res. 290, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001.

The budget allocations for transportation contained in this resolution are fully consistent with the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st century (TEA 21) and the Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st century (AIR 21).

As a result, this budget resolution keeps faith with the American taxpayer and preserves the integrity of the transportation trust funds.

TEA 21

The resolution allocates to the Appropriations Committee sufficient budget authority and outlays to fully fund TEA 21, thereby ensuring that highway trust fund revenues are used for their intended purpose of improving our Nation's highway and transit systems.

In addition, the function 400 allocation in this resolution is sufficient to restore in fiscal year 2001 the 0.38 percent across-the-board cut that was imposed on highway and transit programs in fiscal year 2000.

Last year's Omnibus appropriations bill applied this cut to the highway and transit budget categories even though highway and transit spending was within the levels established by the TEA 21 firewalls. In effect, highway and transit spending was cut to cover a funding breach in the general discretionary budget category.

The House leadership has assured me that these funds will be restored in fiscal year 2001 so that, over the two-year period from 2000–2001, the link between highway trust fund revenues and spending that was established in TEA 21 will be maintained.

Not only does the resolution fully fund TEA 21, it assumes that all TEA 21 funds will be used according to the formula distribution that was agreed to in TEA 21.

The resolution also assumes that highway and transit programs are held harmless from, and not reduced by, technical differences between Office of Management and Budget and Congressional Budget Office scoring of the TEA 21 firewalls. Similar to last year, these technical scoring differences will be accommodated in a manner that does not reduce the guaranteed spending levels below those provided by TEA 21.

AIR 21

Regarding aviation, the budget resolution allocates to the Appropriations Committee sufficient budget authority and outlays to fully fund AIR 21, thereby ensuring that the taxes and interest credited to the airport and airway trust fund each year are used for their intended purposes and that the general fund contributes its fair share toward meeting aviation funding needs.

The 18 percent general fund contribution that is assumed both in AIR 21 and in this budget resolution is far less than the historical average of 30 percent.

It is important to note that this budget resolution ensures sufficient resources to fully fund Federal Aviation Administration operations, as well as aviation capital programs, and it does so without reducing funding for any other transportation program, such as Coast Guard and Amtrak.

This is because the function 400 allocations in this resolution have been increased to accommodate the funding increases in TEA 21 and AIR 21 without requiring reductions in any other function 400 programs.

Therefore, it is simply not accurate to say that TEA 21 or AIR 21 will force the Appropriations Committee to reduce funding for FAA operations, Amtrak, on Coast Guard. Funding for all of these programs has been accommodated within this budget resolution.

I congratulate the Budget Committee for restoring honesty to the budget process, and ending the use of the transportation trust funds to mask the deficit or fund other, nontransportation programs.

Given the commitment of the Senate majority leader and the chairman of the Senate

Budget Committee to fully fund AIR 21 without affecting other transportation programs, I am confident that the conference report on the budget resolution will likewise be fully consistent with TEA 21 and AIR 21.

Again, I urge you to support the fiscal year 2001 budget resolution as proposed by Chairman KASICH.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the budget and to highlight the need for budget accountability in our federal agencies. Waste, fraud and abuse is rampant under the Clinton-Gore Administration and has plagued my own congressional district. $300,000 toilets and half-million dollar federal employee housing in Yosemite National Park demonstrate the gross misuse of taxpayer dollars by the National Park Service. This is an outrage.

The budget before us today provides federal agencies with needed funds. It is now up to the Administration to eliminate the blatant fiscal irresponsibility found in these agencies. By operating more efficiently, federal agencies can accomplish their purpose without flushing taxpayer dollars down $300,000 toilets.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Republican Majority's socially and fiscally irresponsible budget resolution for fiscal year 2001. I strongly support the Democratic substitute, and urge Members to do the same.

This bill is socially irresponsible because it cuts non-defense discretionary spending $114 billion below inflation over the next five years. It does so in order to fund a fiscally irresponsible tax cut that could balloon to as much as $200 billion in five years, and over $1 trillion in ten years. This bill hurts the most needy Americans whom the Republican Party has traditionally ignored. It benefits the most wealthy, as well as the Republicans' special interest friends.

Let's take a close look.

Under the Majority's bill funding for critical education, training, employment, and social service programs is either frozen or cut, producing significant reductions in current service levels. Only special education is spared the sledgehammer. For example, by fiscal year 2005, 40,000 fewer children would be able to participate in Head Start; and 164,000 fewer low-income families would be able to receive LIHEAP assistance. In just one year, 316,000 fewer low-income students would be able to receive Pell Grants; and 310,000 fewer low-income women, infants, and children would be able to participate in the WIC program.

The bill would also slash Title I funding, forcing school districts to provide services to a smaller number of low-income students. The Clinton/Clay class size reduction initiative would be cut, leaving school districts with fewer resources to hire and train new teachers. After-school and summer programs established to help improve student achievement and reduce juvenile crime would be cut back, undermining vital school reform efforts.

Clearly, this budget abandons those most in need of Federal support. It also fails to address important national priorities such as securing Social Security and Medicare, and paying down the debt. None of this is necessary. The Democratic substitute shows why. Our substitute cuts taxes, but does so in a manner that targets the benefits to working families. Our substitute provides sufficient resources to invest in education and develop our communities. Our substitute would make Social Security and Medicare strong and solvent, while reducing the debt and preserving the hard-won budget surplus.

Mr. Chairman, for these reasons, I urge the rejection of the Republican Majority's budget resolution, and urge the adoption of the Democratic substitute.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the GOP's Budget Resolution. Once again, we are confronted with a Republican budget that inserts risky tax cuts in place of a sound federal budget and the general welfare of our nation. The current reality of budget surpluses presents this Congress with a historic opportunity to help ensure the solvency of the Social Security and Medicare trust funds, pay down the national debt, and make necessary investments in our public infrastructure and education system. Yet, the Republicans continue to adhere to the mantra that tax cuts should drive the Congressional agenda, even with the certain risk of future deficits that results from such action. Moreover, they continue to show an inexplicable willingness to shortchange critical spending programs for millions of Americans to help pay for these tax cuts.

This second session of the 106th Congress should have at least learned from the mistakes of the first. Last year's GOP budget denied reality and insisted upon tax cuts beyond the performance of the growing economy. Finally, last November, after the public had resoundingly rejected those tax cuts, and through unusual manipulation of budgetary gimmicks, we were able to come to agreement. Today, just four months later, the Republicans seem to want to resuscitate that legislative farce.

Despite widespread public opposition to last year's irresponsible tax schemes, the Republicans are again seeking to facilitate large tax cuts. Numerous reports and studies have shown that these tax proposals will disproportionately benefit a very small, wealthy segment of Americans. In addition, these tax cuts will grow exponentially over the next ten years, completely obviating future surpluses and jeopardizing the fiscal prudence that has allowed us to start paying for our burgeoning national debt. Congress should be seeking ways to help all Americans share in this time of prosperity, not exacerbating income disparities between rich and poor. It is particularly unfortunate that the Republican leadership is prepared to implement cuts to environmental programs, Head Start, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Coast Guard, anti-drug activities, and the National Park Service to realize misguided tax breaks.

As another example of the skewed priorities in this Republican budget, five miles the resources have been dedicated to tax cuts as for a Medicare prescription drug benefit, and nothing has been devoted to the solvency of the overall Medicare program. Millions of Americans have no prescription drug coverage and the insurance that does exist is in many instances inadequate. Yet, this budget does little to address the financial burden of escalating drug costs or improve access for millions of middle income seniors. Furthermore, the Republican prescription drug proposal is a contingent fund, which means there are no guarantees. Without a substantial investment in Medicare, a new wave of retirees will quickly overburden the program. Congress should take advantage of this booming U.S. economy and ensure that this critical program is modernized to meet the needs of our nation's seniors.

Not surprisingly, this budget blueprint also fails to take any steps to extend the solvency of the Social Security program. In fact, this resolution is completely silent on the most important insurance challenge facing older Americans. Republicans have repeatedly rejected President Clinton's proposal to dedicate a portion of debt reduction savings to Social Security solvency, even though non-partisan actuaries have certified that the President's plan significantly extends the lifespan of the program. Still worse, this resolution fails to save the entire Social Security surplus solely for debt reduction. Walling off the surplus allows the federal government to pay down the national debt and then channel interest savings to other government programs. The so-called GOP ''lock box'' has broken hinges.

Education is a key area of investment in our future and in the engine of economic success that drives our nation. On the surface, the increase in funding for education seems like a step in the right direction. However, virtually all of this increase is for special education. The GOP plan essentially freezes funding for all other education initiatives, and that translates into a $1.1 billion cut in purchasing power for higher education, social service, and employment training programs. Make no mistake, ensuring the success of children with special needs should be a priority, but focusing only on this segment of students shortchanges the other education programs. All of our children could benefit from initiatives such as reducing class sizes, modernization of facilities and greater financial support for higher education. Unfortunately, this budget plan simply does not allow enough dollars to implement these important programs.

The Pentagon budget continues to mushrooms and consume over half of the total discretionary expenditures. With this resolution, defense spending would increase each year until reaching a whopping level of $328.9 billion in FY 2005. Of course, under the Republican plan, these increases in defense spending will be accompanied by decreases in other domestic social programs. Now is the time to reassess our national security goals and show that a strong military does not preclude other important spending initiatives. We need to eliminate unnecessary pork projects and Cold War era programs, reduce the U.S. nuclear weapons force to the START III level of 2,500, stop any further production of the budget busting F–22 fighter jets, and finally abandon the unsuccessful deployment of a national missile defense. We need smart soldiers and sailors, not just more smart weapons.

This budget resolution also reduces the government's ability to spend additional funds on important environmental initiatives. Funding programs such as the Lands Legacy Initiative would go a long way toward helping communities around the nation develop smart growth strategies, preserve open space and restore oft-neglected urban parks. While this resolution fails to look toward the future to solve today's problems, it also fails to look back at the huge maintenance backlog in our national parks. As a result, our parks will have to wait indefinitely for badly needed upgrades to facilities that serve millions of visitors each year.

The United States imports more crude oil now than at any other time in this nation's history, and gasoline, diesel and heating oil

prices are reaching an all time high. Congress must develop solutions to reduce our dependence on foreign oil through energy research and conservation programs. Instead, this budget resolution reduces funds for these programs by almost one-third. The rise in home heating oil prices has also left our low-income families struggling to keep their homes warm. While energy bills have almost doubled as a result of price increases this past winter, the Republican's want to cut access to LIHEAP, an important federal heating assistance program. The volatility of the oil market is too great to rely on low heating oil prices to get our needy families through cold, harsh winters.

The budget resolution also does little to solve the many hardships that our family farmers face. Our nation is built upon and around an agrarian society, and owes must of its success to this agricultural sector. The resolution, which is akin to patching the holes in a boat when the hull must be replaced, provides money to farmers, but not to those who need the economic assistance most. It is inflexible and unworkable.

Finally, in regard to housing and community development allocations, the GOP budget is unrealistic at best or destined to gut core programs at worst. The very lack of specificity in most cases within the different functions should not give anyone comfort. For example, under Function 370, which covers housing credits, the allocation could lead one to wonder if the billion dollar slight will harm the Federal Housing Administration (FHA), one of the most successful homeownership programs in the world. Although the FHA has contributed to record homeownership rates by providing the opportunity for millions of Americans to own their first home, the GOP continues to attack this program!

As written, though I would again point to the lack of specificity, Function 450, Housing and Regional Development, could do nothing less than gut core rural, suburban and urban community development. Assessing only across the board reductions, CDBG, a core component of community upkeep and revitalization, faces a $1.1 billion cut in purchasing power and a $1 billion cut below the FY 2000 freeze level.

I am particularly concerned about Function 600, Income Security. While there may have been statements that the Section 8 outstanding would be fully renewed, a similar attitude to that taken in the past could prevail, whereby Section 8 continues to serve as a honey pot for those looking for money to spend on other, non-housing programs. Furthermore, presuming a full renewal of Section 8, this function is woefully inadequate to meet the needs in other accounts under this function. People will face serious harm if Congress were to actually implement the goals as encompassed by this GOP budget.

In sum, the budget does nothing to address the affordable housing crisis being faced across this nation. It does nothing to further community and economic development in neighborhoods across this nation. And it places in jeopardy the lives of millions of Americans who are served by the programs of housing, community development and homeownership.

I urge all members to vote no on this GOP budget resolution, as it does not reflect the priorities of the American people to strengthen Social Security and Medicare, reduce our national debt, and invest in necessary and important public programs.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the ''Straight Talk Express!'' As you all will recall, the Presidential candidate from my home state, Arizona, took to the campaign trail and gave our country some ''Strait Talk'' on some important issues, including campaign finance reform, health care reform, veterans programs, defense spending, deficit reduction, and massive tax cuts.

But of all his ''Straight Talk,'' Candidate MCCAIN made one point perfectly clear. He called it irresponsible to propose and implement massive tax cuts in this time, or even in the near future. He believes, as do many people in this Chamber, that any significant tax reduction will only weaken Social Security and Medicare. And while it may give the wealthiest one percent of the people in our nation more spending change, it will do nothing to stimulate the economy, it will do nothing to pay down the debt which continues to drain precious funds away from important programs that can really help people, it will do nothing to ensure that a strong Medicare program exists as the baby boom generation begins to age, and a huge tax cut will do nothing to shore up a Social Security that many claim will be broke in thirty years.

But Candidate MCCAIN went a step further. He not only said that a huge tax cut will weaken Medicare and Social Security, he said that huge tax cuts will actually hurt Social Security and Medicare. And this doesn't mean it will hurt these programs—these words ''Social Security'' and ''Medicare.'' What it means is that it will hurt people. It will hurt the elderly woman in Yuma, Arizona who is trying to decide if she should turn off her air conditioner so she can pay her doctor, or if she will be able to go to the drug store and get her much needed medicine and still have enough to eat at the end of the month. It will hurt the elderly widower in Phoenix who has been saving for months, maybe even years, to finally visit his grandchildren in Tucson, but then has the unexpected illness that keeps him at home because he can't afford to pay his rent and his doctor's bills and his drug store bill.

My point is simple. We can talk of cutting taxes all we want, but, according to the ''Straight Talk Express,'' such a tax cut will cut into Social Security and Medicare. It will cut into the daily lives of our parents, and our grandparents, and it will cut into our own lives in just a few years when we reach that age of dependence.

This Republican budget makes irresponsible tax cuts. Over the next five years, this budget cuts $150 billion worth of taxes, with another $50 billion ''reserve tax cut fund,'' for a total of $200 billion in tax cuts. And there is another $40 billion ''reserve fund'' set up for Medicare reforms. If both these ''reserve funds'' are used as the authors of this Resolution intend, it will mean the Social Security surplus will be breached. We might give a little to Medicare, but it will be at the expense of Social Security. And while we give some wealthy businesses and super wealthy individuals a little extra money in their pockets, we will be taking it from the pockets of the elderly.

But worse, over the next ten years, it is projected that this budget resolution will cut taxes by $750 billion, with another $250 billion in a tax cut ''reserve fund.'' This is a $1 trillion tax cut! One trillion dollars!

Mr. Chairman, I support tax cuts. I support tax cuts when they make sense for our economy. When we needed to stimulate our economy and put some capital on the streets, we have done that, and I have supported it. And I could support tax cuts now, if I knew they were going to help that elderly lady in Yuma and that elderly man in Phoenix, and the plumber in Tucson who is trying to make this house payments and keep his two kids in good clothes and maybe put a little something away in case they have the opportunity to go to college. But I can't support this huge, massive tax cut proposal that I know will only go to line the pocket of multi-millionaires.

We should take this money, this $1 trillion, and use it for our people.

We should use it for education. We should make sure that every child in this country has a fair and equal chance to use his talents and intelligence and knowledge to make us a stronger nation in the long run. We should try and give every eligible child the opportunity to attend college. We should make sure that every child is taught to read, that every child is given the chance to learn about, enjoy and appreciate the arts and music, that every child has a place to go after school where he feels safe and can continue to learn. We should make sure that every child is given a fair chance to learn English and is not penalized because he can't. We should make sure that every child can go to a school where he is not afraid and his parents are never concerned that a classmate has come to school with a gun. We should make sure that every child is attending a school where the teachers still care and are trained in the newest techniques and are still motivated when they look into the wonders gleaming from a kid's eyes when he finally ''gets'' the math problem.

Could we not even give just a portion of this one trillion dollars to education?

And a trillion dollars would go a long way in our hopes of solidifying a strong and viable Social Security system beyond 2032. We have spent almost four years around here talking about how Social Security is going broke, yet we never do anything about it, except put it in a ''lockbox'' that is not made of steel, but only of worthless words. It's time to put our money where only our words have been. Let's take some of this $1 trillion and put it into Social Security and Medicare. Let's take the advice from the ''Straight Talk Express'' that rolled through this whole country winning the hearts and minds of people. They know we need to do something to strengthen Social Security. The people know we must do something to stabilize Medicare. Let's do it. And we have $1 trillion to use.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, we can use some of this $1 trillion to pay down the debt. When President Carter left office we owed $930 billion. When President Bush left office we owed $4.1 trillion. We borrowed ourselves out of a recession. And now, the American economy is the strongest economy in the history of civilization and we have the opportunity to pay back some of that money we owe. Our alternative is to continue to use more than ten percent of our money to pay only the interest on this debt. But this budget resolution only ignores this responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, the Presidential candidate from Arizona and I do not agree on a lot of things a lot of times. But we do agree that these will be irresponsible tax cuts. Let's use

this money wisely. We owe it to ourselves, we owe it to our elderly, and we owe it to our children.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Fiscal Year 2001 Budget Resolution.

Building on last year's historic $1.7 billion increase in funding for veteran's health care, this year's budget continues to increase our commitment to veterans by providing an additional $1.3 billion.

Last year, I hosted the largest town meeting in the history of the Texas Hill Country. Over 1,400 veterans and concerned citizens came together to discuss the Administration's short-changing of veteran's medical care. The message was clear: veterans will stand up for what is right. And what is right, Mr. Speaker, is full funding for veterans' medical care. This budget moves us in that direction.

The Kerrville VA Hospital in my district provides health care to more than 16,000 veterans in Texas. This is just one hospital among hundreds across the nation that veterans depend on for their health care needs. With the $3 billion increases in the last two years, veterans can be assured that the high quality health care they deserve will continue.

Responsibility tells us that this finding is necessary. Commitment and dedication is what the men and women of the armed services have given to our country, and commitment and dedication to our veterans is what this budget rightly gives.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). All time allocated for the Committee on the Budget has expired.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), as now the designee of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), and the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) each will control 30 minutes on the subject of economic goals and policies.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to show my colleagues a couple of charts regarding the budget. Last year, the President gave us a budget which said, he wanted to take $52 billion out of the Social Security surplus to spend on other Federal Government programs. We countered with a different budget which said, put all of the Social Security surplus back into Social Security. At this time during this debate on this bill last year, we had so many Members of the other side coming to Congress on the floor saying, we are going to raid Social Security. The Republican budget will raid $13 billion from Social Security. The Republican budget will raid $18 billion, $24 billion, $17 billion from Social Security.

Well, Mr. Chairman, here is what actually transpired last year.

For the first time in 30 years, this Congress stopped the raid on the Social Security Trust Fund. So when we hear the rhetoric now that we will be raiding Social Security again, remember they said that last year and here is what happened. We raided nothing from Social Security. In fact, for the first time in my lifetime, for the first time in 30 years, this Congress in 1999 stopped raiding the Social Security Trust Fund.

If we look at all past years dating back to 1969, the red ink, Congress, the President, both parties, I might add, dipped into the Social Security Trust Fund. Now, that is what we are offering the American people, an extension of this policy, of not raiding the Social Security Trust Fund.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) and myself will be bringing legislation later this year to make sure that never again will Congress go back to the days of raiding the Social Security Trust Fund, that every dime we pay in Social Security taxes will actually go toward paying off our national debt and paying back the debt we owe to Social Security so Social Security can be a program that is solvent, not just for the current generation, but for the baby boomer generation and for their children.

Many things have been talked about regarding what the Democratic plan has done for the Social Security solvency of the Social Security Trust Fund. The President gave us a plan. Well, here is exactly what the President and the Democratic budget does with the Social Security Trust Fund. It simply takes a credit card and increases the credit limit. What they are doing is putting $300 billion of IOUs into the Social Security Trust Fund. It is illusory. It creates the illusion that we are going to increase the solvency of Social Security; yet according to the GAO, according to the Congressional Budget Office, it does not put one more penny into the Social Security Trust Fund. It gives us the illusion that we are fixing Social Security when, in actuality, here is what they are doing. They are taking the U.S. Government credit card, they are taking the limit and they are adding to it.

They are not changing the income to Social Security. They are simply saying, we are saving Social Security, extending solvency from the year 2034, crossing that out and making it solvent to the year 2050 by simply raising the credit limit on the Social Security credit card from $7.8 trillion to $28.6 trillion. No new income to Social Security, no changes in the Social Security program, just more IOUs into the Social Security Trust Fund, which gives the illusion of reform; but what in actuality it does is simply raise the credit limit to the Social Security credit card. It does nothing to reform Social Security.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, I think it is very important to note, what did the President propose this year? Last year the President said, take 38 percent out of the Social Security Trust Fund, or $52 billion to spend on other government programs. This year, the President said, he is in favor, he agrees with the Republican Congress that we will stop raiding Social Security; but in order for the President's budget to add up, in order for the President's budget to work, to stop him from actually raiding Social Security, he does this: he takes the estimated surplus; then he increases taxes by $96 billion; he increases user fees by $19 billion; he cuts Medicare, skilled nursing facilities, home health agencies, hospitals; he cuts Medicare by $18 billion; and he has fantom interest savings of another $17 billion; cuts to Medicare, tax increases by $60 billion to keep the President from raiding Social Security.

If Congress, which it wisely will do, I believe, on a bipartisan basis, rejects these tax increases and Medicare cuts, then the President's budget will have raided Social Security by $60 billion.

This is what we are dealing with. We are simply trying to take rhetoric and divide it with truth. The truth is, this Congress, for the first time in a generation, last year actually stopped the raid on the Social Security Trust Fund. The other side said that would not be possible; the other side said it was not happening, but it did happen.

This budget attempts to do the same thing and move on to it, for once and for all, forever, stop raiding the Social Security Trust Fund, so that when one pays their Social Security taxes, it actually goes to Social Security. Pay off our national debt. This budget over the next 5 years alone pays off $1 trillion in national debt. If people are still paying their taxes after we stop the raid on Social Security, after we put money back into Medicare for prescription drugs and paid off our national debt, if they are still overpaying their taxes, the President is proposing to create 84 new government spending programs.

We are saying no to that. We are saying give hard-working Americans, working families their money back, by making the Tax Code more fair and simpler if they still overpay their taxes.

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

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Many years ago distinguished legislators, Senator Humphrey and Congressman Hawkins, had the Humphrey-Hawkins bill which was to deal with unemployment and the right of all Americans to participate in our economy and the largest that this country has to offer. We have had success. Currently unemployment and inflation are low, and the average wages are rising; productivity is growing, and there is cause to celebrate. These economic gains were due largely to the policies of the last 7 years. But we may have met the numeric targets of Humphrey and Hawkins, but we still have a lot to do to meet the overreaching goals which the Joint Economic Committee is charged with researching and analyzing.

Despite the prosperity that we have experienced, the average after-tax income of the wealthiest families grows

faster than that for all Americans. Some of my colleagues would like to argue that the Tax Code should not be used to redistribute income to the poor, and I will buy that; but we should also stop using the Tax Code to redistribute income to the rich, such as we have been doing.

Today, 2 million or 3 million people took home as much after-tax income as 100 million people in the lowest 38 percent of our population combined. That does not seem right. We have been ignoring these 100 million people. It has led us to some serious problems.

As the Republican budget would call for increasing defense $17 billion above the administration's request and above, in many instances, the request of the Defense Department branches themselves, this additional $17.5 billion could, indeed, provide Head Start to 2 million additional children; it could provide child care to 8 million additional children; it could provide, in addition, good high-quality 21st century after-school to close to 35 million additional children. Think what we could do for our children if we were willing to forego just one new weapons system that indeed the armed forces say they do not want.

In addition to being a budget-buster, this excessive defense spending forces us to shift priorities away from feeding and clothing and educating children, caring for the sick, the elderly and the poor. The Republicans, of course, have a solution to this problem: cut non-defense discretionary spending by 6 percent or $115 billion. Where are they going to get that money? Well, they are going to cut 310,000 low-income women off of WIC just next year. The Republicans will deny child care to over 12,000 children of working parents in 2001; they will eliminate Head Start services for more than 40,000 children and their families by 2005; and they are going to cut emergency energy assistance to 164,000 low-income families.

Now, that may be compassion, but with compassionate senior-friendly friends like that, who needs enemies?

The Republicans say they set aside money for reforming Medicare, but they did not; and as I said before, every Republican on the Committee on Ways and Means voted against providing a prescription drug benefit to seniors at no cost. This was free.

Now, I would invite the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), for instance, who has a lot of seniors in his district, to explain to the seniors. Come to the floor, I say to the gentleman from Florida, and I will give him time, and tell the seniors in Florida why he will not give them a discount on their prescription drugs such as we get, say, for the Veterans' Administration. Or the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) where we have a lot of seniors to come and say why he voted against providing a drug benefit to seniors in Arizona, or the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON), and why she voted against it for seniors in Connecticut, or the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH), why the seniors in Pennsylvania should be hamstrung and have to pay twice the reasonable cost for their prescription drugs because he voted against a provision to provide a discount to seniors for their prescription drugs, and it would have no cost.

I know the Republicans do not want to spend any money and take it away from the tax cuts they want to give to the rich, but why can we not help all of the seniors at no cost? I would like any Republican to stand up and explain to the seniors of America why they oppose giving them a break on their prescription drug benefits. To me, that is not compassion, that is indifference and arrogance. The only answer could be is that they want to help those pharmaceutical companies, with big campaign contributions, to continue to make their outrageous profits on the backs of our poor elderly citizens. And to campaign for the White House on the basis of compassion with that kind of a record, to me, is a travesty; and I am sure that the American people will see through it.

□ 1530

The Democrats will offer several budgets. We are a broader coalition. We include more people. We have more than just rich people in our party.

My colleagues will hear some disagreement, and there will be different votes this afternoon. None of the budgets offered will increase defense spending, and particularly on unneeded, unwanted weapons and, in many cases, weapons that have been proven not to work. None of the budgets will cut programs to the needy and the elderly and children in our country at the rate the Republicans will.

This is a priority that we are establishing. This budget tells one what one's legislators believe in. Look at it carefully. The Democrats believe in helping all Americans in closing the income gap and educating our children and providing prescription drug benefits and good health care to all Americans.

The Republicans would give it to the 2 or 3 percent richest people and the largest campaign contributors only and let the poor people and the innocent children take the hind most. If that is what my colleagues want, and there may be some very rich people in the country who want it, fine, vote for Republican. But for those of my colleagues who want to help our seniors and children and provide education and medical care to all Americans, they better support the Democratic budget, because it is the humane, decent American thing to do.

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

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I guess I should begin by suggesting to the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) that that was about the best political speech I ever heard on the floor. I am not sure what it had to do with the budget, but it was a great speech anyway.

The purpose of the Humphrey-Hawkins section of this budget debate is to reflect on perhaps what the economy is doing and what it is that the Federal Government has done in some way to effect that. I would just like to reflect on those thoughts for a few minutes here.

Mr. Chairman, the performance of the economy in recent years has been very, very strong, and I think that all Americans have noted for one reason or another, either because they watched job growth, perhaps they watched the rate of unemployment fall, or perhaps they have watched income go up. But the performance has been strong and people are working all across the country. It is very encouraging.

During the expansion, the Federal Reserve's policy has been gradually moving to price stability and has resulted in declines of inflation, which is hardly perceptible today, and as a result, lower interest rates, and, of course, the lowest unemployment in many decades. Those things have happened all at the same time.

Now, let me repeat, we do not usually hear about low rates of inflation, low unemployment, and low interest rates all at the same time. That is a very interesting phenomenon, and I think one that we ought to say if we have done something collectively to make that happen that, maybe, we ought to continue to do the things that made it happen.

The thrust of this policy has been very successful. Although I have some differences with recent explanations of Fed policy overall, over the last 2 decades, we have seen very successful economic growth with the exception of one 9-month period in 1990, 1991. The health of the economic performance has also generated higher than expected revenues for the Federal Government.

As a result, we get to have this discussion today about how we are going to spend money over the next fiscal year in the atmosphere of surpluses. State and local governments have also enjoyed a fiscal bonus from the combination of positive economic trends.

The benefits of the United States economic growth have also been seen outside the country, and this has produced very positive results for the citizens of our country as well as citizens of many other countries.

All of this, including the role of Chairman Greenspan, is more or less well recognized by most Americans. What is less well known is the specific policy framework which the Federal Reserve has used to achieve the positive results that I have just described.

Chairman Greenspan's exceptional leadership of the Fed is associated with the framework of policy-making known as inflation targeting. That is right. The Fed has had its sites set on

creating an environment in which low rates of inflation will take place.

As the chairman and I have discussed at previous JEC hearings, the Federal Reserve has essentially adopted an informal policy of inflation targeting and used it to gradually reduce or squeeze inflation out of our economy.

Now, serious discussion of this policy might be useful to explain what the Fed under Chairman Greenspan has done and how it has fostered the extraordinary economic expansion we enjoy. Personal judgment and wisdom have played an important role, and that, of course, is the personal judgment of Chairman Greenspan. But the framework for policy-making is even more important. The success of Fed policy is a combination of several factors, but more understanding is needed about the basis of the policy framework itself.

Formal inflation targets are a narrow range of permissible increases in a broad-priced index expressed as annual percentage increases. For example, an inflation target could be defined as an increase in a retail price index of between, say, zero to 2 percent. We have been within that zero to 2 percent on many occasions for the last couple of years.

Price stability improves the operation of the price system and promotes economic and efficient growth.

As noted previously, during this expansion, inflation has been reduced, but unemployment has fallen as well. Low employment and low inflation, low rates of inflation are mostly unheard of or have been mostly unheard of in economic circles until the last decade or possibly a little bit longer.

In addition to its successful monetary policy, recently the Federal Reserve has made further strides toward increased transparency. Another important factor.

Perhaps my colleagues have noticed with me, however, that things have begun to change just a little. We have had five interest rate increases in the last year by the Fed.

In recent months, the public explanation of Federal policy has increasingly tended to shift from trends in price measures to tight labor market conditions and excessive economic growth related to GDP. In other words, the Fed now appears to be less targeted on inflation and more targeted on economic growth and potential GDP growth.

In other words, the recent explanations of Fed policy are reminiscent of the notion of a Phillips curve tradeoff, which essentially said that good economic growth always causes high rates of inflation. We have proven over the last decade that that is false, and, yet, there are indications that the Fed is returning to that framework for some reason.

This shift towards the view that solid labor market and economic conditions may increase the potential for inflation seems to be associated with the changing composition of the Federal Reserve Board. As new members have come on board, things have begun to change.

Although Chairman Greenspan has relatively new colleagues on the board that seem to have a somewhat Keynesian perspective, I hope he is able to avoid the mistakes that this point of view is prone to produce.

I hope that we will be able to continue on the path that we have, which has produced this budget situation where we can debate this budget in terms of a surplus rather than the deficits that persisted for so many years.

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

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The question is on the motion to rise offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 245, noes 165, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 69]

AYES—245

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Eshoo
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fletcher
Foley
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hansen
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
Kildee
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCrery
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Meehan
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—165

Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldwin
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Blumenauer
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Doggett
Edwards
Engel
Etheridge
Evans
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frost
Gejdenson
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kilpatrick
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shows
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Weygand
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—24

Ackerman
Archer
Bonior
Crane
DeMint
Dixon
Dooley
Doyle
Forbes
Greenwood
Hastings (FL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Lowey
Martinez
McCollum
McDermott
McHugh
Murtha
Pallone
Quinn
Royce
Schakowsky
Thomas
Vento

□ 1601

Messrs. FATTAH, PASCRELL, and MORAN of Virginia changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. PICKERING, HILLEARY, LEWIS of Kentucky, LIPINSKI, BLAGOJEVICH, BALDACCI, BONILLA, COSTELLO, LARGENT, KILDEE, and Mrs. ROUKEMA changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

Mr. OXLEY changed his vote from ''present'' to ''aye.''

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. LATOURETTE, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con.Res. 290) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2005, had come to no resolution thereon.

□

## PERSONAL PRIVILEGE—SELECTION OF HOUSE CHAPLAIN

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Based on press accounts examined by the Chair, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) is recognized for 1 hour on a question of personal privilege.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I come to this well today following a long period of prayerful consideration. I want to talk to you about the choice of our next Chaplain, a man whose job it is to ask God's blessing on our work.

When I became your Speaker last year, I stood in this very spot and said that this House needed to heal. Impeachment had hardened the hearts of too many of our Members and ruptured the trust necessary for effective legislating.

Frankly, we had made progress toward that end. We successfully worked together to bring economic security to our country. We worked together to strengthen our schools and our national defense. And, working together, we lowered our rhetoric from this well and we returned some sense of civility to this chamber.

When I first heard that our current Chaplain wanted to retire, I decided I wanted to build on that growing sense of trust. Instead of simply appointing a Chaplain, as some of my predecessors had done, I appointed the largest and most bipartisan search committee in the history of this House.

I want to take a moment to describe that process because it has been much distorted in the last 4 months.

I knew that finding the right person would be difficult. Many religious faiths are represented in this House, and many of you had candidates you believed would be good for the job.

The Search Committee the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) and I created was asked to review the many applicants and to send to the leadership up to three unranked candidates for final consideration.

I suppose that the committee could have ignored those instructions and sent us only one candidate because they believed he or she far superior, that they stood out above all the other applicants. But they did not.

In fact, I learned early and recently that the search committee discussed that very option and rejected it. Instead, the committee, under the able leadership of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), a Catholic, and the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY), a Presbyterian, selected three outstanding candidates: Reverend Robert Dvorak, Father Tim O'Brien, and Dr. Charles Wright.

These names were sent to us in alphabetical order. There was no ranking of candidates. There was no first choice of the committee, as some would have the public believe. And, in fact, there could not be a first choice because the committee never set out to select a first choice.

The report to this House by the bipartisan co-chairman of the committee makes this fact abundantly clear. The truth is simple: each of the three candidates was deemed as acceptable to the search committee.

Along with Majority Leader ARMEY and Minority Leader GEPHARDT, I interviewed the three candidates sent to us by the bipartisan search committee. I was looking for a kind person with a caring heart. I was looking for a person who had extensive counseling and pastoral or parish experience. And I was looking for a person who Members of Congress could take their problems to and find reassurance and wisdom.

I was not looking for a particular denomination or faith, and I did not make my selection based on a candidate's religious doctrine or the past history of other House Chaplains. I was trying to be fair to all candidates.

While I found all three candidates to have impressive credentials, I was most impressed with the pastoral experience and personal warmth of Dr. Charles Wright, who for years has ministered to the needs of the Capitol Hill community. And, in addition, he had years of experience in the inner city, as well as the international community. He spent a long time trying to break down the walls of apartheid in South Africa and to seek common understanding between blacks and whites.

I made my selection based on that experience and the qualities that I found in him. No one other than the candidates themselves influenced my decision. Any suggestion to the contrary is simply wrong.

After the interviews and a period of reflection, I consulted with majority leader and the minority leader twice before I made my final decision.

In the first discussion, one preferred Dr. Wright and one preferred Reverend Dvorak. In the second discussion, one preferred Dr. Wright and one preferred Father O'Brien. The choice was not unanimous. But both signed off on the choice of Dr. Wright, and we issued a joint press release announcing the selection. I thought we had reached consensus.

Following our joint press statement, there were immediate charges of anti-Catholic bigotry, I was surprised and disappointed. Since there was no bias in the decision, I assumed that the disappointment held by some that a Catholic was not chosen would go away when people understood the truth. But I was wrong.

I then thought that once the search committee issued their report and laid out the facts of the selection process that the controversy would be over. Sadly, the facts were ignored and the controversy continued to be stoked.

It was then that I realized that a far more serious effort was afoot. Some were trying to take political advantage out of what was essentially a spiritual decision and charged me with anti-Catholic sentiment.

Is there anti-Catholic sentiment still alive in our country? In fact, is there anti-religious bias alive in our country? Sad as it is to admit, I believe the answer to both these questions may be yes.

This bias comes in many shapes and sizes. Whether it be television shows that hold the church in contempt, the activist who desecrates St. Patrick's Cathedral, or the so-called ''artists'' who denigrate important religious symbols, my friends, that is anti-Catholic and anti-religious bias.

Certainly, there are those who differ with some of the views held by the Catholic Church; and even some Catholics respectfully disagree with some Church positions.

I agree with the Catholic Church on many things. I agree with the Catholic Church that we should protect the unborn. I agree with the mission of the Catholic schools to help so many Catholic and non-Catholic students get a values-based education.

I wholeheartedly support the Catholic Church's great work to help the poor. And I believe that the Vatican should have a seat at the United Nations.

I have the greatest respect and admiration for the Pope, who has done so much to bring peace to our troubled world and played such a critical role in ending the scourge of communism in Eastern Europe.

I am a patient man. In my role as Speaker of the Whole House, I believe I should try to be especially patient and seek compromise and not confrontation. But even I did not easily take in stride carelessly tossed accusations of bigotry. Where I come from, such slander is an ugly business. I can only conclude that those who accuse me of anti-

Catholic bigotry either do not know me or are maliciously seeking political advantage by making these accusations.

The institution of this House means a great deal to me. I believe each of us, as Members of this House, should look out for this institution and treat it with respect.

As your Speaker, I feel a special burden to do so. It is with that conviction that I say to each of you that I believe the political maneuvering on this issue may have catastrophic unintended consequences, like children playing with matches.

In fact, in light of this controversy, some critics now advocate that we get rid of the Office of the Chaplain altogether. There are editorials being written to that effect in papers around this country. I ask each of you to search your heart: Is that what is good for this institution? I hope your answer is no.

But that, my friends, is where the political games could be taking us. I think to lose the Office of the Chaplain would be a grave mistake. Ever since the first prayer was offered in the Continental Congress on September 7, 1774, 2 years before the Declaration of Independence was written, Congress has been blessed by a daily prayer.

The daily prayer has served as a peaceful refuge for the partisan wrangling. It has bound disparate factions under the unifying theme of God's love.

The first amendment to the Constitution states clearly that ''Congress should make no law respecting an establishment of religion.'' But, at the same time, the rules and precedents of this House say that the Chaplain shall attend at the commencement of the House and open the same with prayer.

These contrary impulses signify two great American themes: Americans should have the freedom to practice any religion they want, but Americans also believe that this Nation was founded under God to fulfill a greater mission.

The House Chaplain must reflect both traditions. The Chaplain of the House must submerge his or her own doctrinal views while reaching out to all Members regardless of religious faith. He must say a prayer that unites us rather than divides us.

Our current House Chaplain, Jim Ford, has blessed us with daily prayers and counseled Members quietly with honesty and integrity.

Jim Ford is a Lutheran, but he does not preach Lutheran doctrine from the House pulpit.

□ 1615

His message is universal. In fact, Tip O'Neill, an Irish Catholic and our respected former Speaker, often called Jim Ford monsignor as a way to signify his approval of Ford's universal message. I believe that any representative of any religion can provide a similar universal message for the House of Representatives. My support for Charles Wright had nothing to do with Mr. Wright's denomination or his religious doctrine. Of the three candidates presented to me by the committee, I believed he had the best ability to help the Members of the House based on his extensive experience in counseling. I agree with our colleague Tony Hall, who first suggested to Dr. Wright that he apply, that first and foremost Charles Wright has a pastor's heart.

Sadly, it has become clear that the minority will never support Charles Wright to be the House Chaplain. I have waited more than 4 months in the hope that voices of reason would prevail. Charles Wright is a good and decent man. He would make an excellent chaplain. That is why I asked Leader GEPHARDT to allow him to meet with the Democratic Caucus and that is why our colleague TONY HALL, a man whose respect in this House is unmatched, made the same request. But those requests have not been fulfilled. Instead of hearing the positive voice of a Godly and caring man, the only voices we hear are whispered hints in dark places that his selection is the result of anti-Catholic bias.

My friends, in all my years in this Congress, I have never seen a more cynical and more destructive political campaign. That such a campaign should be waged in connection with the selection of the House Chaplain brings shame on this House.

During the interview process, DICK GEPHARDT explained very eloquently to one of the candidates that democracy was a substitute for war. He was warning the candidate that if he became the Chaplain, his flock would not always behave like folks on a Sunday afternoon picnic. He went on to say that unlike war, where men set out to destroy one another, in a democracy, we were constrained by a set of rules and a common decency. It was a moving and profound observation that I have often thought a lot about. But I must say that the history of this Chaplain issue over the last 4 months does not appear to be constrained by common decency. It looks a lot like war and it has an ugly face.

This institution, so important in the protection of our freedom, is more important than which one of us sits in that chair. In the light of this controversy, Charles Wright has told me that he does not want to serve as Chaplain in a divided House. I reluctantly agreed that I would accept his decision not to be our Chaplain. I regret that decision of Dr. Wright, but I understand it.

So where do we go from here? As Speaker of this whole House, I will act to stop those who want to persist in this unseemly political game. I will not allow this House to be torn apart and the office of Chaplain to be destroyed. Having formally received the resignation of Chaplain Ford, I am today under the authority granted to me under the rules and precedents of this House to fill vacancies naming Daniel Coughlin to serve as Chaplain of the House. Father Coughlin is the vicar of the Archdiocese of Chicago and comes with the highest recommendations from a man of God for whom I have great respect, my good friend Cardinal George of Chicago. I believe that Daniel Coughlin will bring to the House a caring and a healing heart. He has been a parish priest and spent the past several years counseling parish priests within the Archdiocese. He brings 40 years of ministerial experience to this House.

Daniel Coughlin is a Catholic. That does not make him more nor less qualified for the job. But I am proud of his historic appointment. I hope his appointment will help us to heal and that it will bring a sense of pride to the millions of Catholic men and women around this country who have had legitimate feelings of past discrimination which some in this House have sought to manipulate.

I urge all of my colleagues to get to know Father Coughlin. He is a good man who will provide this House with spiritual guidance and counseling support necessary to bring us together again. Let me say to every leader of this House and to every Member of this House: let us embrace our new Chaplain, put this episode behind us, and move forward to do the people's business.

□

## RESIGNATION AS CHAPLAIN OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) laid before the House the following resignation from the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CHAPLAIN,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, DC, March 23, 2000.*

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
*Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: During the last 21 years it has been my privilege and honor to serve as Chaplain of the U.S. House of Representatives. I came to the House with a view that the practice of politics can be a noble vocation and should be considered a high calling and I leave with that view strengthened and with my admiration enhanced for the people who serve in government.

I write now to inform you that effective Thursday, March 23, 2000, I resign my office as Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

It has been a singular opportunity to be elected to the position of Chaplain and now to be named Chaplain Emeritus, as I have sought to serve all the Members of the House and to honor their political and religious traditions. The friendships that have begun here have nourished my life and my work and I leave with appreciation for our years together and with a salute for the opportunities of the future.

With every good wish, I remain.

Sincerely,

JAMES D. FORD,
*Chaplain.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and with regret, the resignation is accepted.

Mr. KLECZKA. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I have an inquiry of the Chair. Is the Chair prepared to allot some time for this side of the aisle to be heard on this issue?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain requests, and it depends on what the request is.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for up to 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chaplain's resignation is accepted, with regret.

There was no objection.

□

## CONCERNING THE CHAPLAIN SELECTION PROCESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) for 15 minutes.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for allowing us to express our thoughts on this important matter. I would begin my thoughts by joining the Speaker's expression of regret about the resignation of Dr. Ford, who has served this institution so well and been a dear friend and an important chaplain to each of us. I thought that at some point, I might, as cochair of the chaplain selection process, have the opportunity to address the body as to the version, our version in the minority, of the events that have transpired throughout this chaplain selection process. I did not anticipate it coming today, in the middle of the budget vote; and I did not anticipate following the Speaker of the House, a person for whom I have considerable regard relative to his obviously heartfelt remarks just delivered. My remarks are not prepared. I ask you to bear with me.

I want to convey a deep sense of sorrow and regret that a process that began so honorably by the Speaker has ended in this fashion. Clearly, Speaker HASTERT wanted to capture the bipartisan efforts of other Speakers as the chaplain was selected but improve upon it. So when Speaker O'Neill asked the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations to go and agree on a chaplain that he might then appoint, that was bipartisanship. It could have been improved upon and Speaker HASTERT set upon a process that did improve upon it. It had even broader involvement, eight minority, eight majority. We were even given a cochair opportunity. We were very, very pleased and heartened by this gesture by the Speaker, because we believe that the chaplain is the chaplain of the House, not the Speaker's chaplain, not the majority chaplain, but the chaplain for all of us.

We advanced with the work, and it was considerable. Thirty-eight resumes to pore through. We culled it down in a process that had more comity and agreement across the party aisle to 17 interviews. Going through the hours of interviews, we developed friendships across party aisles, members of the committee. I so enjoyed working with my cochair, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), and each of the members, majority and minority alike.

□ 1630

We then got it down to six semifinalists working toward the list of three. And while the Speaker is absolutely correct, his letter to us says send up to three names, the discussion throughout was to send three names. And we did not seriously consider sending less than three names.

As the final balloting occurred, even though this had been a process utterly without partisanship, there were, and it is not surprising, party distinctions in the relative support behind the candidates.

The candidate that finished fourth had only Democrat support. The candidate that finished third, Dr. Wright, had Republican support, with 1½ Democrat votes and a token showing across the party aisle. Two candidates, Dr. Dvorak and Father O'Brien, had significant bipartisan support, with Father O'Brien having the first showing in terms of vote totals.

We did not rank these candidates. We decided not to rank them. Ranking involves making a judgment, who is the best one, who is the second best one. We thought all three were qualified individuals, but what was important was the bipartisan consensus behind them.

Again, this is the chaplain of the House. It was a bipartisan process; and, therefore, the degree of consensus behind the final three is very important to us in the selection process, because this determines really the candidates that were able to capture support across the party aisle.

In this respect, in my presentation to the Speaker, the Minority Leader, as they began their work of the final committee of three, I indicated that Father O'Brien had had the most support; that Dr. Dvorak had the second level of support; that Dr. Wright had the third level of support.

I believed that the discussions that followed also captured this sense of consensus behind O'Brien, consensus behind Dvorak, not consensus behind Wright. So there were two meetings, as the Speaker just indicated, largely because they did not come to closure the first time. And the second time, in a divided vote, we in the minority know how divided votes go, you lose them. And the selection was made, Dr. Wright; not a consensus selection.

Here is where I really hope you can understand where our hard feelings on this matter arise. We are asked to participate. We willingly participated. We cared a great deal about the chaplaincy, and we felt as though our view was ignored when the final decision was made. Majority only, once again. We felt that. We believed that.

You may disagree with that interpretation, but that is what we believed. Others had another feeling as well, and that is that in the passing over of the top candidate, a Roman Catholic priest, there had to be some other motives that were at issue that were untoward. Frankly, I did not have that view.

I felt that the problem was ignoring the bipartisan consensus for the candidate, that it did not have bipartisan consensus. We did not ask Dr. Wright to our caucus because Dr. Wright was not the issue for us. The process was the issue. The process was the problem.

In reacting to how the Speaker has resolved this matter, we look forward to getting to know Father Coughlin, if I have the name right. He is an individual we have not met. I think we can do better than this going forward.

I would ask each of us to seriously consider a resolution that will be offered this week by the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY) that would call for the selection of the chaplain to be much in the same way as the selection of Inspector General.

At the end of the process, two votes, two for the majority, two for the minority. This is the chaplain of the House. This individual will be our minister. This individual will be our counselor. This individual will be our friend, not just the Speaker, not just the majority, but all of us.

And so next time, we will never let this happen again, next time. I would ask that we pass this resolution, changing the rules by which we deal with the chaplain and so that both sides have equal say.

Perhaps my deepest regret from this is, I felt a lot of good could come from the institution of the chaplain. I still have that hope for the institution and would only echo the Speaker's comments relative to the chaplain and what the chaplain might mean to this institution.

I look forward to working collectively under the newly announced chaplain and with the chaplains to come in the future, should I still be a Member of this body. I do think it might be one institution that can play an important role in restoring a greater degree of civility and trust between us.

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

Mr. POMEROY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

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

I would like to say a few things in regard to what the Speaker said. First, nothing in anyone's mind today is anything but concern for Dr. Wright. I am sorry that it has come to this. And I would hope that we would welcome the new Chaplain that has been appointed by the Speaker and try our level best

to make his service in this Congress as positive as it possibly can be. I am very sorry that we have come to this point.

I tried in what we did in our committee with Majority Leader ARMEY and Speaker HASTERT to come to a bipartisan agreement on who the Chaplain would be. I had concerns when the process was announced that it would be maybe difficult to get to a bipartisan selection, but I hoped we could do that.

We have a different view of the facts of what happened in the meetings, but that is not important. When we finally got to the point where there was not complete agreement between all three of us, I asked to come back to the bipartisan committee so that both the Speaker and Dr. Wright knew exactly the feelings of the members of our committee. And I tried in the best way that I could to get those feelings across.

I have never said and never believed that there was bias of any kind in the making of this selection. And I have never said that.

I do believe that in the future, as the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) has just said, we can find a process that will ensure bipartisanship in the selection of this important office. I will certainly work toward that end.

I respect the Speaker's choice, and for my part and our part we will do everything in our power to welcome this new Chaplain and to make his service here a positive force for every Member of this body.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KLECZKA) rise?

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, since I was the one who asked Father Tim O'Brien to seek the chaplaincy, I would ask the courtesy of 2 or 3 minutes to make a few comments.

The SPEAKER. We will give the gentleman the courtesy of 2 to 3 minutes, but first let us have the courtesy of swearing in the Chaplain.

□

## APPOINTMENT AS CHAPLAIN OF THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to 2 U.S. Code, 75a-1, the Chair appoints Father Daniel Coughlin of Illinois to act as and to exercise temporarily the duties of Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

Will Father Coughlin please come forward and take the oath of office.

Father Daniel Coughlin appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you will take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter. So help you God.

□ 1645

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Before we return to the Committee of the Whole, the Chair intends to recognize the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KLECZKA) for 5 minutes and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) for 5 minutes.

Without objection, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KLECZKA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

□

## COMMENTS ON FATHER TIM O'BRIEN

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I join with all of you in welcoming our new Chaplain, Father Coughlin, to the House of Representatives.

What I would like to do is spend a few moments not reopening the wounds of this, what I would term a sorry chapter in the House of Representatives, but I take the floor today to defend a family friend, a person who I asked to think about running for the post of Chaplain of the House of Representatives, Father Tim O'Brien, who I have known for over 30 years.

Father Tim O'Brien comes from the State of Wisconsin, born on a family dairy farm in Eden, Wisconsin. His ordination was from St. Francis Seminary in my district in Milwaukee. He was an associate pastor in a parish in my district. He went on to complete his education and received a doctorate, and he is a professor at Marquette University.

Because of his love of politics and this House and teaching young minds, he started on his own the Les Aspin Institute named after our former colleague Les Aspin. His intention in starting this program was to bring students from Marquette University in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, here to Washington, DC, to work in our offices, to work for the agencies, to possibly work for some lobby firms, to get a hands-on feel for what the government is all about, so when they graduate and start their livelihood, in no matter what job it might be, they will understand what goes on here, and hopefully they will be a better citizen, hopefully they will be a better voter, or a voter, and possibly they might run for office.

Mr. Speaker, one of those interns who was in my office who has graduated from Marquette was the first Hispanic elected to the State legislature in Wisconsin who hales from my district. So I think the program is working.

So I said to Father O'Brien, ''Because of your love of the institution and government, consider becoming our Chaplain,'' and he did. He put his nomination and his application in, and in every step of the process he came out on top.

Oh, I tracked this process like a hawk. I talked to every member of that screening committee. How did Father O'Brien do? And you know what I heard repeatedly, time after time? Home run. A triple. Best of the lot. And, in the final analysis, he was the top pick of the committee.

Now, was that related to the leaders who made the choice of someone other than him? Yes. The gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) admitted that even though the formal paper did not have the ranking, he verbalized it, and so did the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY). So to say that we did not know who was the top candidate is not accurate.

One of the Republican leaders said, My gosh, I did not know the denominations of the candidates. That is not accurate. I personally talked to that leader on at least two occasions on the floor. I am just so hesitant to go and try to correct all the misstatements, because I think that opens up the issue again.

I want closure, like you. But here we have this Catholic priest, who just thought he would like to be the Chaplain. He thought he could do well for all of us in the House. And, since that time, he has been greatly maligned.

In Roll Call last week we read, Well, he does not have enough counseling experience. Well, he can weather that, because we all know as a colonel in the Army Reserves he counsels enlisted and officers every day he is on duty. As a faculty member, he counsels students and other faculty. He has counseled me and continues to do so. So it is not the idea of counseling.

But to go after this Catholic priest, who did nothing but want to be the Chaplain. There were rumors leaked, and I cannot point fingers because I do not know where they came from, that his home in Wauwatosa, Wisconsin, was purchased with some Federal funds. Naturally, the reporters descend on the poor guy like locusts. Is that true? Is it true? Is that true? Actually, it was not true.

He absconded with some money from a drug and alcohol program, one which he has never run, and the reporters again called him and descended. Is it true?

It is not, because I never was involved in such a program. I never got any funding. So I know full well that throughout the process this individual and his reputation have suffered also.

So, today, Mr. Speaker, we close the book on this sad chapter. But I ask my Republican colleagues not to rewrite history, because that we should not do. But I think there are some in this body that owe Father Tim O'Brien an apology. As we go on from today, I think I can be confident that not only Father Tim O'Brien has been vindicated, but a lot of us, with the appointment of our new Chaplain.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

COMMENTS ON SELECTION OF HOUSE CHAPLAIN

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I, too, was not prepared to speak today, by I think the record does need some correction.

We met, as my cochair, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY), said, we had endless meetings. We narrowed the 38 to 17. We narrowed those to six. Then we decided, we at the next meeting, we would reduce the six to three. We interviewed the 17, and then we re-interviewed the six.

We decided that we would send them, and ''we'' as a group, without instructions from the leadership on either side of the aisle, that we would send the names to the leadership unranked, and, as the Speaker said, in alphabetic order. And that is exactly what we did.

Now, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) and I met with the Speaker, the majority leader and the minority leader in the Speaker's rooms, and we presented the three names. The gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) and I both said we personally thought that Father O'Brien was the best. But that was our personal opinion, that was not the statement from the committee. The committee clearly intended that the decision be made by the three leaders, without any bias for what we had done. Our job was to go out and advertise, bring in applicants, interview them, narrow the field to three, and send the names up to be picked by the leadership.

This Speaker should be commended for opening the process. Three of the last four Democrat Speakers were Catholic. They never considered a priest. Over 50 years of the last 60-some in the history of this House, the Democrat party has been in charge. They never considered a priest.

So I think that we have said enough. The record was we did not rank these people, and the decision was to be made by the leadership without bias.

□

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET—FISCAL YEAR 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). Pursuant to House Resolution 446 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 290.

□ 1655

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 290) with Mr. LAHOOD (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, 40 minutes of debate remained on the subject of economic goals and policies.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) has 17½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) has 22½ minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON).

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, before we were delayed for the proceedings that just concluded, I was involved with the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) in carrying out the statutory rights that we have as members of the Joint Economic Committee to discuss the budget in the context of our economy and the various aspects of the economy that may have something to do with policies of our government.

I would like to turn to another subject. I discussed Fed policy at some length earlier, and I would like to spend a few minutes discussing one other set of issues that had to do with the potential effect of high oil prices on the economy as we move forward.

As I said before, overall economic conditions are strong. Rising oil prices and gasoline prices are one of several economic issues, however, that concerns millions of Americans.

This week Energy Secretary Richardson began a trip to OPEC nations to try to convince them to lower sky-high oil and gas prices. I believe the administration should release some oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, like several other Members do, but there is another source of pressure also available to help American consumers.

A review of the situation reveals that U.S. taxpayer dollars are being provided to nations involved with the OPEC conspiracy to raise oil and gas prices. Consumers across America are outraged when they pull up to the pump and view each day or each week the rapid price increase in home heating fuel and gasoline prices over the last few months. In the section of the country where I live, that is the Northeast, I am from New Jersey, of course, we are especially hard hit because of our dependence on home heating oil.

OPEC's supply restrictions are a primary reason for these price hikes, I think all Americans know that today, and many Americans are justifiably angry at the oil producing nations and their allies. These citizens would be even more angry if they knew their hard-earned tax dollars were being funneled to key oil producing nations by the United States Government. That is right, billions of U.S. taxpayer dollars are being funneled to oil producers such as Algeria, Venezuela, Indonesia, and Mexico. These U.S. resources are first contributed to the international monetary fund, the IMF, and then lent to various nations at cut-rate rates.

The oil producers are now borrowing from the IMF at interest rates of about 4.7 percent, much lower interest rates than typical taxpayers can get on their home or their car or their credit card loans. Interest rates this low do not make any economic sense. Subsidies are being provided by taxpayers, our constituents, to these borrowing nations who are Members of OPEC who are forcing up the price of petroleum.

Many argue that this is a way to provide foreign aid or to promote U.S. interests. However, the IMF is not supposed to be an aid agency, and much of its activity does not reflect U.S. interests. Only a year ago I had to act to force the IMF to stop a planned mission to Iraq, another oil producing Nation that is also an enemy and on the U.S. list of states that sponsor terrorism.

□ 1700

If taxpayer subsidies to several of the oil-producing nations cause them to argue against OPEC supply reductions, this would be consistent with the argument that U.S. subsidies to the IMF and its borrowers were in our Nation's best interest. However, this is not the case. These oil producers cooperate with OPEC even after receiving IMF loans. In other words, they take our money and act against us anyway. In fact, at least four of these oil-producing nations have been among the most active borrowers of the IMF over the last 2 decades. One of these, of course, is Algeria, traditionally one of the hard-line price hawks in OPEC.

I am currently drafting legislation to address this situation, and I hope to have the grand support of Members from both sides of the aisle. We will address the situation by exerting pressure on oil-producing nations that are subsidized by U.S. taxpayers through the IMF. The U.S. Government should tell these countries in no uncertain terms that past aid extended through the IMF demands reciprocity now. The perpetual IMF borrowers should be reminded that the U.S. is the largest single source of IMF funds and that the U.S. will not support continued IMF borrowing by unfriendly nations. The U.S. Government, including the U.S. representative on the executive board of the IMF, should pressure oil-borrowing producers to undercut the OPEC cartel and let market forces lower oil prices. U.S. taxpayers are under no obligation, Mr. Chairman, to subsidize OPEC or its allies as they conspire to keep oil prices high.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Chair will remind all Members to remove charts and exhibits from the well of the House when they are not being utilized in debate. The point is, if Members are not utilizing these, they should not be exhibited. When the Members come to the well, they can use them; but when they are not in the well, they should be removed.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE).

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, may I respond to the Speaker's comment before we go on?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman has 3 minutes. He may proceed.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I was the next speaker and had these charts up earlier, and I am the next speaker now, and that is why they are on the floor, in answer to the Chairman's announcement.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair will remind all Members to remove charts and exhibits from the well of the House when they are not being utilized in debate.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE).

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, we are embarked on a very important exercise this week, the adoption of the House budget resolution. I think that it is well that we keep in mind the state of our Nation's economy and the state of the Nation's debt as we proceed. So as a member of the Joint Economic Committee, I would like to review these matters in the context of the budget.

First, with respect to the debt, the United States currently has a debt of about $5.7 trillion, about $21,000 for every man, woman, and child in this country. And we can see, Mr. Chairman, how this debt has mushroomed since 1980. It has increased over fivefold, 570 percent, in fact, in a period of 20 years.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the previous person to address the House reminded us that we have seen good economic times. I would point out that during these good economic times we built the economy or strengthened it, if you will, on the backs of our children and our grandchildren. Now that we finally have an era when a balanced budget is possible, I think it is very important not to forget that even with a balanced budget, we still have $5.7 trillion of debt.

Balancing the budget in the year 2000 in no way wipes out the enormous size of this debt. Our first obligation, I submit, as we move ahead is to make sure that we responsibly use this surplus to pay down on this debt. We cannot say that we are doing that if we simply respect the integrity of the Social Security program. Yes, it may reduce some of this red ink in terms of what we owe to private investors or foreign investors in American bonds, but in no way does it diminish the debt that we owe all together. I submit that what we owe to the Social Security program is just as much debt as anything else that we owe.

Mr. Chairman, I know that my Republican colleagues like to try to paint over this with a happy scenario and neglect to explain that even with the 5-year projections that they have for their budget, that the size of the U.S. debt grows, let me emphasize that, that over the next 5 years, the size of the United States debt will grow to $5.9 trillion. This, I submit, is unconscionable. In a period of surplus, we ought to be reducing the debt that we owe, not seeing it expand to $5.9 trillion.

We have several different budget proposals that will be voted on this evening. I would like to point out the differences between three of them. This is how much is devoted to debt reduction over the next 10 years; that is, how much smaller will our debt be. The debt, unfortunately, will not shrink with the Republican proposal; it will shrink with the Democratic proposal, and it will shrink more dramatically with the Blue Dog Coalition proposal.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN).

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I sat in my office and I was listening to some of the debate today. I was meeting with different constituents, all coming up to ask for different things because of needs that they have, and I was somewhat astonished that we kept hearing about how only the Republican Congress put this national government back into surpluses. Well, I quite frankly do not agree with that. I just have to voice my opinion about that. I think that is just a real stretch here.

However, I do want to say that I will not vote for the Republican budget resolution and will support the Democratic alternative for lots of reasons. Yesterday on this floor I talked about renewable resources for gas so that we could go on with solar energy, wind, biomass; and I think that is an absolute necessity for this country. I think the veterans' mail order plan is absolutely something that has to be done, something that I have looked at and actually introduced. I think the extension of Social Security for 15 years, the Republican plan, does nothing in that area, Medicare by 10 years, and then the long-term tax credit for caregivers, and then also in education, reducing class size, renovation of schools, Pell grants, Head Start; we can go on and on. And as importantly as all of these expenditures are, so is paying down the debt.

Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons I come here today is to talk about an issue that I think has become a national interest; and obviously, it has caught people's attention, because everybody wants to talk about it now, and that is prescription drugs. Last year my colleagues and I on the Committee on Ways and Means actually offered a no-cost program to this country to have a prescription drug plan that would have cut the benefit or to have cut the actual drug cost in half. It was denied. We never even had the chance to talk about it last year.

Now, we have $40 billion in the Democratic budget, which I think is tied to a prescription drug benefit; and my understanding is that on the Republican side they have $40 billion reserve fund for an undefined prescription drug benefit and defined only if Medicare reform happens. If Medicare reform happens, as I know some on the other side would like to have, it changes how we see Medicare in this country. It actually potentially puts us in a voucher system, some people like to call it premium support.

So I cannot support something that is tied. Why, why are we going to hold our seniors hostage, hostage to Medicare reform to get a prescription drug benefit? Let us face it. We give them in the hospitals through health care already prescription drugs to make them better. We get them stabilized, we do everything that we possibly can, and then we send them home and we do nothing.

So please support the Democratic substitute.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), the vice chairman of the Joint Economic Committee on which I serve.

The purpose of this Humphrey-Hawkins debate here is to talk about the law and how it relates to the Federal Government; and for educational purposes, the Humphrey-Hawkins law is the law that governs the Federal Reserve. We are here to talk about how these laws impact our economy.

The chairman of the Federal Reserve, in multiple testimony to Congress in both the House and the Senate, has said, and this is a quote from the chairman of the Federal Reserve, Alan Greenspan, January 26, 2000, testifying before the Senate Banking Committee. Chairman Greenspan said,

> My first priority would be to allow as much of the surplus to flow through and into a reduction of the debt to the public. If that proves politically unfeasible, I would opt for cutting taxes, and under no conditions do I see any room in the longer term outlook for major changes in expenditures.

Let us review what we are trying to accomplish in this budget. What we have accomplished just in the last few years alone is an unprecedented level of debt reduction, following Chairman Greenspan's advice. In 1998 we paid $51 billion off on the Federal debt. In 1999, $88 billion paid toward reducing the Federal debt. In the year 2000, this year alone, we are dedicating $163 billion toward reducing the national debt held by the public; and next year as we project, we will be dedicating $170 billion to reducing the public debt, for a grand total of paying off the Federal debt held by the public to zero in 12 years.

Mr. Chairman, this budget we are considering before us today is the most sweeping document this body has ever agreed to in a generation. We, for the first time in a generation, are stopping the raid on the Social Security Trust Fund.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) and I plan to bring legislation to the floor of Congress which says no longer can Congress ever go back to the days of dipping into the Social Security Trust Fund. We are going to use those surpluses to pay off the debt held by the public. In the first 5 years alone in this budget, we will pay off $1 trillion of debt. We will bring our public debt from $3.5 trillion down to $2.4 trillion in the next 5 years alone. This is what fiscal responsibility is all about. This is what we are achieving in this budget resolution we are having here. This is what Chairman Alan Greenspan is telling us to do.

Remember what he said after we get the debt paid off. He said, after you pay off the public debt, reduce taxes. Under no conditions spend more money.

So here is what we are doing. The priorities of this budget are basically this: first, stop raiding the Social Security Trust Fund. Second, pay off the national debt. And as we pay off the national debt, if taxpayers are still overpaying their taxes, give them their money back, rather than spend it on new programs in Washington. That is the division here.

What are we trying to do by giving people their money back after paying off the debt, after stopping the raid on Social Security? We are doing this: we are ending the marriage tax penalty so that those who are married do not have to pay taxes just for being married. We are repealing the Social Security earnings limit so seniors who want to go back into the workforce are not penalized by losing some of their Social Security benefit simply for trying to supplement their insurance income. We are reducing the death tax, so that small business owners, family farmers, can pass their businesses, their farms on to the next generation without the Government taking it away from them. We are expanding educational savings accounts so parents can pay for sending their children to schools, to private schools, to public schools, to college, to vocational technical colleges. We are increasing health care deductibility for the self-employed. For people who, if they do not get health insurance from their job, we are saying, you should be able to write your premiums off of your income taxes just like any other corporation can do.

□ 1715

We are providing tax breaks for poor communities to revive those urban, inner-city areas that are in despair that need a help on that rung of the economic ladder where they are at the bottom.

We are trying to strengthen pension plans so that workers who are changing jobs in a rapidly changing economy can bring their pensions with them as they change those jobs without fear of tax taking away their pensions, without fear of losing some of their pension when they change their jobs. This is the priority spelled out in this budget.

Mr. Chairman, the responsible budget is the Republican budget and a budget that pays off debt and lets people keep more of their own hard working money in the Republican budget.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Doggett).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, as the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN) just pointed out, we offered the Republican majority an opportunity in the Committee on Ways and Means last fall in the Thurman-Doggett proposal to deal with this problem of prescriptions for our seniors. It was soundly rejected, as it is in this resolution.

Instead of addressing the price discrimination that our seniors face where, in Travis County, for example, on the five most commonly used drugs, those seniors who do not have insurance are paying 136 percent more than the most favored customers of the pharmaceutical industry, instead of addressing that discrimination which could be done for very little no cost to the federal government, the pharmaceutical industry's best friends in this Congress are blocking action.

What do they offer in this proposal as an alternative? A new welfare program. I can tell my colleagues that our seniors do not need another welfare program. What they need is an end to the discrimination that the pharmaceutical industry, backed by its many Republican supporters in this Congress, cause our American seniors to face with reference to getting the essentials for their health care.

But of course there is a medicinal aspect to this resolution. One can almost see in this resolution, coming out of the Old West, a dilapidated wagon with a banner that promises ''better health, restored youth, quality schools, more of one's money in one's pocket,'' this is the old time medicine man with ''tax cut elixir,'' the same old snake oil that pours out here every spring. We seem to have spring ritual, rite of spring in this House with this medicine man coming along most every year. It does not make any difference what the season is economically or the reason politically, there is always a tax cut for every need of this country. The same elixir that is offered every year at this time.

Mr. Chairman, they used to say, how do you spell relief? T-U-M-S. Now it is ''tax relief.'' What kind of tax relief does the ordinary American citizen get? Not much from this Congress.

We had the so-called ''marriage penalty relief.'' I do not know if my colleagues have noticed, but our Republican leadership devotes a lot more energy to the titles they put on their bills than what is in them. What did the marriage tax penalty bill do? Well, it gave most of its relief to people that do not incur any marriage tax penalty.

Yesterday, in committee, we considered the educational savings account that is to allow people to send their kids to elite private academies. It is not the kind of tax relief that benefits most American families. I believe in reasonable tax relief but it must be accomplished in a fiscally responsible way. And this resolution fails to do that.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time is remaining on each side.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) has 7 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the chairman of the Committee on Budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me that skimpy amount of time, but I will try to do it in that time.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to just talk for just a few minutes about the economic condition of our country. I wanted to say that it is amazing the prosperity that we are experiencing and continue to experience, with many Americans every day getting up and watching the market, reading the economic reports with disbelief.

I do not think this is just a wild happenstance that we have seen such economic growth and such economic progress. Number one, we have revived our tradition of free trade. When nations are able to trade across borders, it brings prosperity to everyone. That does not mean trade should supplant all values. But it does mean that the fundamental policy of free trade will lift all boats, as my friend Jack Kemp likes to say. He stole that, by the way, from John Kennedy. A free trade will, in fact, rise all boats.

Secondly, of course, we have had new markets. With the fall of the Berlin Wall and with the ability to trade in many parts of the world that we could not trade before, we have been able to, not only experience and promote free trade, but we have been able to practice it with more opportunity because more nations can avail themselves of a unique opportunity to practice free enterprise and free markets and free trade.

We also have had a policy of sound money. Obviously Alan Greenspan deserves a lot of the credit. But all of the Fed Board, and, frankly, even I will give credit today to Robert Rubin, the former Treasury Secretary, I think they always pursued the policy of sound money, which allowed this Nation and the Fed to pursue a policy of low interest rates, which has driven economic growth.

I also believe that the House, the Senate, and the President deserves a great amount of credit for the 1997 budget agreement, for our vigilance in wanting to keep government growth at a low rate to provide continual tax cuts to reduce some of the public debt.

But also, of course, has been the development of new technologies. We are

on the edge of what is a remarkable revolution. It comes about every hundred years. How do we recognize it? We recognize it because industries grow off the major growth industries in these kinds of periods.

What we are seeing in biotech and with the communications and with all the information technologies is an amazing development of a new revolution that is driving the essential part of economic growth, which is greater productivity, the ability of people in the same amount of time with the same amount of resources to produce more.

With growing productivity, we begin to dampen the threat of inflation because we eliminate the bottlenecks. Increased productivity means more income for more workers, and it means more supply. When supply is consistent with demand and meets the wage growth, we lose the prospects of inflation.

Let me just give my colleagues a warning and a suggestion that I think the House ought to consider. We need to keep the incentives in place. We need to cut capital gains. Frankly, I think we ought to zero out the capital gains tax because we want people to have incentives to invest, risk take, and build this economy.

Secondly, we should do nothing destructive that damages this new economy. I want to applaud the commission that just met in Dallas for agreeing to extend the no tax of the Internet until at least 2006. We have obviously got to continue to promote free trade in the world.

In addition, the legal system in this country needs significant reform. We need a loser pays legal system with limits on the liabilities, the punitive damages that are strangling, not only medicine, education, all businesses in America, it is choking us, and it holds us back from even stronger economic growth.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we also need to have a school choice program in America where mothers and fathers can send their kids to the best educational settings. With all those, I believe we can continue to grow.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) a member of the Committee on Budget.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, if my colleagues review carefully the Republicans' budget, it really appears to be a massive shell game. They would have us believe that they can deliver massive tax cuts, extend the life of Social Security and Medicare, eliminate every dime of public debt, increase defense spending by massive amounts, not reduce other domestic programs, give prescription drug benefits. They sound like they used to accuse the Democratic Party of being, everything for everybody.

The problem is that the numbers system do not add up. There is not enough money to do all of this. So what one then has to do is figure out now what is their top priority, what will it be under all circumstances, regardless of what happens; and that is reducing taxes by unreasonable and massive amounts.

Now, what did Alan Greenspan say about this? One of the previous speakers put his quote up, and he said we ought to be paying down the debt. I was at the hearing where he testified, and he said we should not be giving tax cuts before we pay down the debt. That is the highest priority we have, paying down the debt. That is what is going to keep our economy moving and sustain the economy moving in the direction that it is going now.

Yet, do they put that at the top of the priority list? No. They put massive tax cuts ahead of paying down the debt. They want to be everything to everybody in this equation.

Mr. Chairman, when we look at the number of dollars that are projected in surplus, the money is simply not there to do all this. We should reject the Republican budget and pass some of the alternative budgets.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, last week, House Republicans held a press conference to announce that their budget would include $40 billion to help low-income elderly pay for their prescription drugs. Today the House Republicans present their budget. But they have already abandoned last week's $40 billion promise. The Republican budget contains no funds specifically reserved for a prescription drug benefit.

Instead, the resolution allows the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to allocate up to $40 billion of the non-Social Security surplus if a bill that reforms Medicare also provides coverage for prescription drugs. This is a separate reserve fund. If they did not create a separate reserve fund, their budget would have a deficit.

Furthermore, their prescription drug reserve is contingent upon a plan to reform the entire Medicare program by turning it over to HMOs. That is a nonstarter.

In short, to make room for huge tax cuts for the wealthy, they have abandoned seniors who are trying to stretch their Social Security checks and modest pensions to cover both food and medicine. It is wrong, and this budget should be rejected.

Our seniors do not need empty promises. They need relief now. They are 12 percent of the population, but they use one-third of all prescription drugs. We have done studies which show that, on average, seniors pay twice as much for their medications as the drug companies' best customers, the HMOs, the hospitals, and the Federal Government. They pay more than consumers in Canada or Mexico or anywhere else in the world.

Seniors need action now. They do not get it in the Republican budget. They need a universal prescription drug benefit under Medicare and an end to pharmaceutical company price discrimination. The Democratic budget has $40 billion committed to those goals, and the Republican budget does not.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, here we are today debating the budget, which is the most important work that we have to do as Members of Congress. Our national budget should be a statement of our national values. We should spend our money on what is important to us. But it is hard to see how the Republican budget, the risky, irresponsible Republican budget is a statement of the values of the American people.

The differences between the two parties have been highlighted for us once again in today's debate on the budget resolution. While the Democrats fight for a budget that protects middle class values, extends the life of Social Security and Medicare trust funds, and enables families to meet their responsibilities at home and at work, the Republicans again have sacrificed fiscal responsibility for large and risky tax breaks.

Is it a statement of our national values to give a $200 million tax break to the wealthiest over the next 5 years while cutting $114 billion in domestic initiatives for education, health care, and the environment?

□ 1730

This downpayment that Republicans are making on the trillion dollar tax scheme proposed by candidate George W. Bush will result in 750,000 fewer women receiving WIC benefits, and that applies to women, infants, and children; 316,000 fewer Pell Grants; and 1,100 fewer FBI agents.

Is it a statement of our national values to give a Republican tax break over the next 10 years which will utilize all of the resources needed to pay down the debt, strengthen the Social Security and Medicare trust funds, and fund priority investments like education, child care and law enforcement?

We know that trading health care, education, and law enforcement for tax cuts does not match the priorities of many American people. It is not a statement of our national values and should be rejected by this House of Representatives.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE).

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

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, as the ranking member of the House Subcommittee on Military Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services, I

rise today in strong support of the amendment offered by my dear friend and colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

All Members who believe that we owe our military service members and their family members access to quality health care should support the substitute amendment being offered by the gentleman from South Carolina. The budget being proposed by the gentleman from South Carolina upholds the commitment to our armed forces personnel, particularly our military retirees who were promised health care in return for service to this great Nation.

I support the Democratic budget amendment because it embodies the spirit of H.R. 3655, a bill I introduced along with the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking member of the House Committee on Armed Services, and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR), to improve health care services for our Nation's service members, retirees, and their dependents.

I regret deeply that the Committee on the Budget failed to incorporate necessary authority for the Subcommittee on Military Personnel, enabling us to complete that which should be a bipartisan task. I have high regard for the commitment of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) on these issues. Last year's success on efforts regarding pay, promotion, and benefits in the context of recruitment, retention, and retirement demonstrated what can be done when we set aside partisan considerations. I intend to continue to work with the chairman to accomplish these goals.

But absent the Committee on the Budget preparing us for this, we have to go with the Democratic substitute in order to have our military retirees, our existing active duty members and their families receive the kind of health care that they have been promised. Our active duty troops and their families are having difficulty with access to military health care systems.

The budget alternative before us today would allow for the elimination of copays for active duty personnel and their families who are in the TRICARE Prime program. The amendment also increases access to health care.

Currently, families that receive care at a military treatment facility pay no co-payments. However, families that are not fortunate to live near a military treatment facility and use civilian health care providers in the TRICARE PRIME system must pay co-pays. This is not fair.

The amendment also increases access to health care for our military family members who are often living in remote, rural areas by expanding the TRICARE Prime Remote program. These families are doing some of the hardest duty in the military. We should ensure that these families are cared for, which means that they should not have to drive hundreds of miles to receive health care for which they are entitled. Their ability to access health care services is just as important.

Mr. Chairman, as our honored retired service members continue to age, their need for access to quality health care continues to grow. Today, thousands of our military retirees and their families are often going without the necessary medical care that they need and deserve because they have been shut out of the military health care system.

As you may know, under the current program, military retirees who reach the age of 65 are forced out of the TRICARE Program and receive their health care services through Medicare. For many of these retirees who were promised access to military health care for their lifetime, this has been a broken promise of their faith. Many of these retirees and their families were led to believe that they would have access to military health care services if they made a career of serving their nation.

Unfortunately, as the Department of Defense has drawn down and a number of military hospitals and clinics continue to close, space-available care remains elusive for most retirees. For these Medicare-eligible retirees, many of who are living on a fixed income, the prospects of costly medical care and high-priced pharmaceuticals is a scary proposition.

The alternative budget proposal before us today would allow us to restore the necessary access to quality health care for military retirees over age 65 and their families. The amendment includes a provision that would incorporate the expansion of the TRICARE Senior Prime program, more commonly known as Medicare Subvention. This three-year demonstration program, which will be completed at the end of the year, has been well received by the over 65 retirees. Expansion of this program within the Department of Defense will help a number of military retirees who live near military treatment facilities.

For those who may not live near a military treatment facility, the budget proposal includes funding to expand the current pharmacy benefits. Pharmacy costs for these individuals are often the largest share of health care spending. The average retiree over age 65 spends approximately $620 for prescriptions. For a retired enlisted noncommissioned officer and his family, pharmacy costs can sometimes be nearly 50 percent of their monthly income. Often these families are placed in a difficult and traumatic position of choosing between whether to purchase their prescription drugs or food on their table.

The substitute amendment before us today will improve access to the TRICARE program and enhance access to care for military retirees. I hope that my colleagues will support the Spratt budget amendment and uphold our moral obligation to provide for the health care of our nation's Armed Forces.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget returns to its old ways. The budget that is being offered to us ignores the wishes of the American public and caters to special interests. I would have thought the Republicans would have learned; but they did not, and they are back at it again.

The Republican leadership is offering a budget that fails to extend the life of Social Security and Medicare, that recklessly cuts taxes and squanders the surplus we have worked so hard to gain for the American public. At the same time, they are cutting Head Start and telling 40,000 children and their parents that they cannot participate in this very valuable program. They cut millions of funding from child care, even though families are having a more difficult time finding quality care for their children as more and more Americans find a place in the American work force for the sustainability of their families.

They make empty promises about fully funding special education, but they do so without providing the necessary funds to achieve that goal. They freeze higher education and training funds and cut the purchasing power by 9 percent over 5 years. That means that they deny Pell Grants to 316,000 students who desperately need that assistance to go on to higher education so they can participate in the American economy.

They fail to make the needed investments to fix crumbling and overcrowded schools. They fail to invest in boosting the skills and the knowledge of teachers while continuing to funnel money into scores of wasteful programs and dozens of tax loopholes that benefit those who least need it.

We, on the other hand, are offering a substitute and a clear alternative, a budget that supports millions of hard-working families; that protects Social Security and Medicare; that provides better care and real prescription drug coverage for all of our Nation's seniors with dedicated funds to do so; and that would direct sorely needed support to our schools, provide the resources necessary to help our children reach their highest academic potential.

When it comes to special education, we put our money where the Republicans' mouths are because we provide $4.8 billion more in our plan. We should support the Democratic substitute.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST).

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Chairman, it has been almost comical to watch Republican Member after Republican Member come to the floor today and read the same talking points off the same blue chart. Well, Mr. Chairman, in politics as in life, talk is cheap.

I was reminded of this fact earlier this week when I had the pleasure of speaking with a group of high school students. One of their major concerns, as we can all imagine, is the future of Social Security and Medicare. I remembered that the Republican talking points called this GOP budget ''senior friendly,'' Mr. Chairman. But these students wanted the facts, and the fact is

that this Republican budget would have us spending the Social Security surplus in 4 years.

The fact is that this budget does not devote a single dime to extending the life of the Social Security and Medicare trust funds. Mr. Chairman, under the Republican budget, the Social Security Trust Fund would be insolvent just about the time these 17 and 18 year olds that I spoke to this week reach retirement age.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

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

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to issue a statement in response and in disagreement with the position of the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) that only the Democrats' budget has a response to military health care. That is false.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, may I ask what the remaining time is?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Each side has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. STARK. And the majority closes; is that correct, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct, the majority closes.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, there have been a lot of comments made on the floor, particularly by the majority, about how they have come around to not spending any of the Social Security surplus. I think in our debate we have made it clear if their budget is fully implemented, if they really do make the cuts in discretionary spending, the 11 percent real cuts they talk about, even with their huge tax cut they will still spend part of the Social Security surplus.

But I think history is an even better guide, and there are two points of history that I will bring up. One is that back in 1998 the Republicans brought their budget to the floor, which cut into the Social Security surplus, spent the Social Security surplus as part of their tax cut. They made the argument then that they were going to preserve 80 percent of the Social Security surplus, but they were going to spend 20 percent for a tax cut.

The second point of history that I think needs to be made clear is that since the Republicans have been in control of the Congress, and this is the whole time I have been here, the rate of spending, for nondefense discretionary spending, has gone up above the rate of inflation. As such, it would be hard to make the case that the Republican majority this year is going to actually cut nondefense discretionary spending by 6 percent and by 2003 by 11 percent.

Now, they may pursue that, and they may tell us they are going to do that; but history is working against them. So I think the protestations that they are not cutting into the Social Security surplus are rather hollow.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS) to close the debate for us.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS) is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, as the ranking Democrat on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I rise in strong support for the substitute budget resolution offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking Democratic Member of the House Committee on the Budget.

The Spratt budget resolution is a strong pro-veteran proposal that deserves the support of every Member of this body. It provides more discretionary spending in fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Veterans Affairs than either the budget proposed by the President or the budget resolution reported by the committee. With these additional funds, VA can better meet the medical needs of our Nation's aging veteran population.

Specifically, for fiscal year 2001, the Spratt alternative provides $22.3 billion in appropriations for veterans' programs, $100 million more than the Republican plan and $200 million more than the President's plan. Over 5 years, 2001 through 2005, the Spratt alternative provides $1 billion more than the Republican proposal for veterans' medical care.

Significantly, the Spratt proposal also increases the monthly GI bill benefit, which is mandatory spending. This increase in the educational benefit for veterans who have honorably served our Nation in uniform is clearly needed and long overdue.

This increase proposed by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) is an important first step in restoring our commitment to providing veterans a readjustment benefit for education which is worthy of their sacrifices to this country. Under this proposal, the basic educational benefit for veterans will increase from the current $535 a month for 36 months to nearly $700 a month.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, this has been an interesting debate; but I would like to remind the last string of 1½ minute or 2-minute speakers on the other side that the purpose of the Humphrey-Hawkins discussion is to talk about the Federal Government and the potential effect the Fed has on the economy and the potential effect that our government has on the economy.

Let me make five points, five reasons why the economy is doing good. And maybe some people will feel good about it, I hope they will, because we have done some things right around here, both Republicans and Democrats, Members of the House and the administration.

I already talked about point number one. Lower inflation actually improves growth. And the Federal Reserve has gone out of its way to target inflation. It has brought interest rates down along with inflation and that has provided a lift for our economy.

Number two. Government spending has actually fallen as a percentage of GDP. This is an important point. As a matter of fact, in 1992, our government spent 22 percent of our GDP. Today, we spend 19.5 percent of our GDP. And members of the Committee on the Budget, led by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), should say a cheer for themselves for that point.

Number three. Lower tax rates remain in place. In spite of the hyperbole coming from the other side about Republicans that want to the cut taxes, marginal rates are still lower than they were in the 1960s, the 1970s, or the 1980s; and it is a primary factor in helping us lift the economy.

Number four. Investment has worked to expand capacity, particularly technological change, which has increased productivity. American workers today produce more per man-hour and woman-hour than ever before because of the technological changes that have taken place, another important factor in improving our economy.

Finally, global competition and freer trade have fostered growth. As we have opened markets around the world, as we have encouraged exports to take place, we have opened those new markets and created new opportunities for businesses all across our country and, therefore, opportunities for workers all across our country, another major boost to our economy.

□ 1745

So, Mr. Chairman, when speaker after speaker gets up on the other side, they are ignoring the facts, they are ignoring the progress that we have made in terms of spending, in terms of taxing, in terms of fighting inflation. All of these are important factors that need to be discussed.

So I am pleased to have had the opportunity to close, Mr. Chairman, to make these points.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in Part A of House Report 106–535 is considered as an original concurrent resolution for the purpose of amendment and is considered read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 290

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),*

**SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001.**

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000 is hereby revised and replaced and that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001 and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2002 through 2005 are hereby set forth.

**SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.**

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2005:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,465,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,504,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,549,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,598,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,650,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,719,100,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be reduced are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $0.
Fiscal year 2001: $10,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $22,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $31,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $42,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $45,000,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,478,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,524,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,557,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,603,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,653,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,712,200,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,460,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,490,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,536,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,581,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,630,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,689,200,000,000.

(4) SURPLUSES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the surpluses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $5,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $14,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $12,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $16,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $20,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $29,900,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $5,640,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $5,710,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $5,787,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $5,869,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $5,944,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $6,007,800,000,000.

**SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.**

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and budget outlays for fiscal years 2000 through 2005 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $288,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $282,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $306,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $297,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $309,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $302,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $315,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $309,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $323,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $317,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $331,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $328,100,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $20,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $19,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $19,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $18,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $18,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $18,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,800,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $19,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $20,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $20,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $20,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $20,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $21,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,500,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $1,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $1,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$900,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $24,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $25,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $25,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $25,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $25,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $25,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,100,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $35,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $19,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $18,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $17,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $17,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $15,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,200,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $7,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $6,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $8,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $9,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $13,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $13,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,600,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $54,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $59,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $57,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $58,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $58,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $58,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,100,000,000.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $11,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $9,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $8,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $8,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $8,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $8,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,800,000,000.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $57,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $72,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $74,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $72,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $75,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $76,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $77,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,200,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $159,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $152,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $169,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $167,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $179,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $177,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $191,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $190,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $205,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $205,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $221,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $220,300,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $199,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $199,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $215,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $216,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $221,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $221,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $239,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $239,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $255,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $255,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $278,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $278,700,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $238,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $248,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $252,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $254,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $263,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $264,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $272,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $273,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $281,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $283,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $294,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $295,900,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $14,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $14,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $15,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $16,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $17,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,400,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $46,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $47,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $49,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $50,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $52,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $55,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,900,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $27,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $28,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $27,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $27,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $28,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $28,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,100,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $13,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $13,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $13,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
ew budget authority, $13,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $13,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,500,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $284,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $284,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $288,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $288,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $290,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $290,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $285,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $285,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $280,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $280,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $275,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $275,400,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $8,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$4,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$8,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$2,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$2,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$2,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$4,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$4,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, −$4,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$4,300,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$34,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$34,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$38,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$38,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$41,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$41,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$40,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$40,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$38,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$38,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, −$39,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$39,200,000,000.

**SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.**

(a) LEGISLATION PROVIDING $150 BILLION IN TAX RELIEF OVER A 5-YEAR PERIOD.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report to the House a reconciliation bill—

(1) not later than May 26, 2000;
(2) not later than June 23, 2000;
(3) not later than July 28, 2000; and
(4) not later than September 22, 2000;

that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the total level of revenues by not more than: $10,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and $150,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

(b) SUBMISSIONS REGARDING DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report to the House a reconciliation bill—

(1) not later than May 26, 2000, that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the debt held by the public by $10,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2001; and

(2) not later than September 22, 2000, that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the debt held by the public by not more than $20,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2001.

**SEC. 5. LOCK-BOX FOR SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUSES.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) under the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the social security trust funds are off-budget for purposes of the President's budget submission and the concurrent resolution on the budget;

(2) the social security trust funds have been running surpluses for 17 years;

(3) these surpluses have been used to implicitly finance the general operations of the Federal Government;

(4) in fiscal year 2001, the social security surplus will be $166 billion;

(5) this resolution balances the Federal budget without counting the social security surpluses;

(6) the only way to ensure that social security surpluses are not diverted for other purposes is to balance the budget exclusive of such surpluses; and

(7) Congress and the President should take such steps as are necessary to ensure that future budgets are balanced excluding the surpluses generated by the social security trust funds.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any revision to this resolution or a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2002, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that sets forth a deficit for any fiscal year.

(2) DEFICIT LEVELS.—For purposes of this subsection, a deficit shall be the level (if any) set forth in the most recently agreed to

concurrent resolution on the budget for that fiscal year pursuant to section 301(a)(3) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that legislation should be enacted in this session of Congress that would enforce the reduction in debt held by the public assumed in this resolution by the imposition of a statutory limit on such debt or other appropriate means.

**SEC. 6. DEBT REDUCTION LOCK-BOX.**

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any reported bill or joint resolution, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that would cause a surplus for fiscal year 2001 to be less than the level (as adjusted for reconciliation or other tax-related legislation, medicare, or agriculture as considered pursuant to section 4, 7, 8(a) or (c), 9, 10, 11, or 12) set forth in section 2(4) for that fiscal year.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—The level of the surplus for purposes of subsection (a) shall take into account amounts adjusted under section 314(a)(2)(B) or (C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

**SEC. 7. SPECIAL PROCEDURES TO SAFEGUARD TAX RELIEF.**

(a) ADJUSTMENTS TO PRESERVE SURPLUSES.—Upon the reporting of a reconciliation bill by the Committee on Ways and Means pursuant to section 4(a) or, the offering of an amendment to, or the submission of a conference report on, H.R. 3081, H.R. 6, or H.R. 2990, whichever occurs first, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House shall reduce to zero the amounts by which aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be reduced as set forth in section 2(1)(B) (and make all other appropriate conforming adjustments).

(b) ADJUSTMENTS FOR REVENUE BILLS.—After making the adjustments referred to in paragraph (1), and whenever the Committee on Ways and Means reports any reconciliation bill pursuant to section 4(a) (or an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted) or an amendment to H.R. 3081, H.R. 6, or H.R. 2990 is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted after the date of adoption of this resolution, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House shall increase the levels by which Federal revenues should be reduced by the reduction in revenue caused by such measure for each applicable year or period, but not to exceed, after taking into account any other bill or joint resolution enacted during this session of the One Hundred Sixth Congress that causes a reduction in revenues for such year or period, $10,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2001 and $150,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005 (and make all other appropriate conforming adjustments).

**SEC. 8. RESERVE FUND PROVIDING AN ADDITIONAL $50 BILLION FOR ADDITIONAL TAX RELIEF AND DEBT REDUCTION.**

(a) ADDITIONAL TAX RELIEF AND DEBT REDUCTION.—Whenever the Committee on Ways and Means reports any reconciliation bill pursuant to section 4(a) (or an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted), or an amendment to H.R. 3081, H.R. 2990, or to H.R. 6 is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted after the date of adoption of this resolution (after taking into account any other bill or joint resolution enacted during this session of the One Hundred Sixth Congress that would cause a reduction in revenues for fiscal year 2001 or the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005) that would cause the level by which Federal revenues should be reduced, as set forth in section 2(1)(B) for such fiscal year or for such period, as adjusted, to be exceeded, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House may increase the levels by which Federal revenues should be reduced by the amount exceeding such level resulting from such measure, but not to exceed $5,155,000,000 in fiscal year 2001 and $50,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005 (and make all other appropriate conforming adjustments, including reconciliation instructions set forth in section 4(a)).

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ADDITIONAL HEALTH-RELATED TAX RELIEF.—It is the sense of Congress that the reserve fund set forth in subsection (a) assumes $446,000,000 in fiscal year 2001 and $4,352,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005 for health-related tax provisions comparable to those contained in H.R. 2990 (as passed the House).

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON FEDERAL EMPLOYEES BENEFIT PACKAGE.—It is the sense of Congress that the reserve fund set forth in subsection (a) assumes $17,000,000 in fiscal year 2001 and $107,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005 for legislation that permits Federal employees to immediately participate in the Thrift Savings Plan.

**SEC. 9. RESERVE FUND FOR AUGUST UPDATE REVISION OF BUDGET SURPLUSES.**

(a) REPORTING A SURPLUS.—If the Congressional Budget Office report referred to in subsection (c) projects an increase in the surplus for fiscal year 2000, fiscal year 2001, and the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005 over the corresponding levels set forth in its March 2000 economic and budget forecast for fiscal year 2001, submitted pursuant to section 202(e)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House may make the adjustments as provided in subsection (b).

(b) ADJUSTMENTS.—Whenever the Committee on Ways and Means reports any reconciliation bill pursuant to section 4(a) (or an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted), or an amendment to H.R. 3081, H.R. 6, or H.R. 2990 is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted after the date of adoption of this resolution that (after taking into account any other bill or joint resolution enacted during this session of the One Hundred Sixth Congress that would cause a reduction in revenues for such year or period) would cause the level by which Federal revenues should be reduced, as set forth in section 2(1)(B) for fiscal year 2001 or for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005, as adjusted, to be exceeded, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House may increase the levels by which Federal revenues should be reduced by the amount exceeding such level resulting from such measure for each applicable year or period (or for fiscal year 2000 may increase the level of the surplus and make all other appropriate conforming adjustments, including reconciliation instructions set forth in section 4(a)), but not to exceed the increase in the surplus for such year or period in the report referred to in subsection (a).

(c) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE UPDATED BUDGET FORECAST FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001—The report referred to in subsection (a) is the Congressional Budget Office updated budget forecast for fiscal year 2001.

**SEC. 10. RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE.**

Whenever the Committee on Ways and Means or Committee on Commerce of the House reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto is offered (in the House), or a conference report thereon is submitted that reforms the medicare program and provides coverage for prescription drugs, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the aggregates and allocations of new budget authority (and outlays resulting therefrom) by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, but not to exceed $2,000,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 2001 and $40,000,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005 (and make all other appropriate conforming adjustments).

**SEC. 11. RESERVE FUND FOR AGRICULTURE IN FISCAL YEAR 2000.**

Whenever the Committee on Agriculture of the House reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto is offered (in the House), or a conference report thereon is submitted that provides income support to owners and producers of farms, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of new budget authority and outlays to that committee for fiscal year 2000 by the amount of new budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) provided by that measure for that purpose not to exceed $6,000,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 2000, $0 in new budget authority and outlays for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2004, and $6,000,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004 (and make all other appropriate conforming adjustments).

**SEC. 12. RESERVE FUND FOR AGRICULTURE IN FISCAL YEAR 2001.**

Whenever the Committee on Agriculture of the House reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto is offered (in the House), or a conference report thereon is submitted that provides risk management or income assistance for agricultural producers, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of new budget authority and outlays to that committee by the amount of new budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) if such legislation does not exceed $1,355,000,000 in new budget authority and $595,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2001 and $8,359,000,000 in new budget authority and $7,223,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005 (and make all other appropriate conforming adjustments).

**SEC. 13. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.**

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to section 7(b), 8(a) or (c), 9, 10, 11, or 12 for any measure shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution—

(1) the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives or the Senate, as applicable; and

(2) such chairman, as applicable, may make any other necessary adjustments to such levels to carry out this resolution.

**SEC. 14. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) while the budget may be in balance, it continues to be ridden with waste, fraud, and abuse;

(2) just last month, auditors documented more than $19,000,000,000 in improper payments each year by such agencies as the Agency of International Development, the Internal Revenue Service, the Social Security Administration, and the Department of Defense;

(3) the General Accounting Office (GAO) recently reported that the financial management practices of some Federal agencies are so poor that it is unable to determine the full extent of improper government payments; and

(4) the GAO now lists a record number of 25 Federal programs that are at ''high risk'' of waste, fraud, and abuse.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that the Committee on the Budget has created task forces to address this issue and that the President should take immediate steps to reduce waste, fraud, and abuse within the Federal Government and report on such actions to the Congress and that the resolution should include reconciliation directives to the appropriate committees of jurisdiction to dedicate the resulting savings to debt reduction and tax relief.

**SEC. 15. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PROVIDING ADDITIONAL DOLLARS TO THE CLASSROOM.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) strengthening America's public schools while respecting State and local control is critically important to the future of our children and our Nation;

(2) education is a local responsibility, a State priority, and a national concern;

(3) a partnership with the Nation's governors, parents, teachers, and principals must take place in order to strengthen public schools and foster educational excellence;

(4) the consolidation of various Federal education programs will benefit our Nation's children, parents, and teachers by sending more dollars directly to the classroom; and

(5) our Nation's children deserve an educational system that will provide opportunities to excel.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Congress should enact legislation that would consolidate thirty-one Federal K–12 education programs; and

(2) the Department of Education, the States, and local educational agencies should work together to ensure that not less than 95 percent of all funds appropriated for the purpose of carrying out elementary and secondary education programs administered by the Department of Education is spent for our children in their classrooms.

**SEC. 16. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING EMERGENCY SPENDING.**

It is the sense of Congress that, as a part of a comprehensive reform of the budget process, the Committees on the Budget should develop a definition of, and a process for, funding emergencies consistent with the applicable provisions of H.R. 853, the Comprehensive Budget Process Reform Act of 1999, that could be incorporated into the Rules of the House of Representatives and the Standing Rules of the Senate.

**SEC. 17. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON ESTIMATES OF THE IMPACT OF REGULATIONS ON THE PRIVATE SECTOR.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) the Federal regulatory system sometimes adversely affects many Americans and businesses by imposing financial burdens with little corresponding public benefit;

(2) currently, Congress has no general mechanism for assessing the financial impact of regulatory activities on the private sector;

(3) Congress is ultimately responsible for making sure agencies act in accordance with congressional intent and, while the executive branch is responsible for promulgating regulations, Congress should curb ineffective regulations by using its oversight and regulatory powers; and

(4) a variety of reforms have been suggested to increase congressional oversight over regulatory activity, including directing the President to prepare an annual accounting statement containing several cost/benefit analyses, recommendations to reform inefficient regulatory programs, and an identification and analysis of duplications and inconsistencies among such programs.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that the House should reclaim its role as reformer and take the first step toward curbing inefficient regulatory activity by passing legislation authorizing the Congressional Budget Office to prepare regular estimates on the impact of proposed Federal regulations on the private sector.

**SEC. 18. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON BIENNIAL BUDGET.**

It is the sense of the House that there is a wide range of views on the advisability of biennial budgeting and this issue should be considered only within the context of comprehensive budget process reform.

**SEC. 19. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ACCESS TO HEALTH INSURANCE AND PRESERVING HOME HEALTH SERVICES FOR ALL MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES.**

(a) ACCESS TO HEALTH INSURANCE.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) 44.4 million Americans are currently without health insurance, and that this number is expected to rise to nearly 60 million people in the next 10 years;

(B) the cost of health insurance continues to rise, a key factor in increasing the number of uninsured; and

(C) there is a consensus that working Americans and their families will suffer from reduced access to health insurance.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON IMPROVING ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE INSURANCE.—It is the sense of Congress that access to affordable health care coverage for all Americans is a priority of the 106th Congress.

(b) PRESERVING HOME HEALTH SERVICE FOR ALL MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 reformed Medicare home health care spending by instructing the Health Care Financing Administration to implement a prospective payment system and instituted an interim payment system to achieve savings;

(B) the Medicare, Medicaid, and SCHIP Balanced Budget Refinement Act, 1999, reformed the interim payment system to increase reimbursements to low-cost providers and delayed the automatic 15 percent payment reduction until after the first year of the implementation of the prospective payment system; and

(C) patients whose care is more extensive and expensive than the typical Medicare patient do not receive supplemental payments in the interim payment system but will receive special protection in the home health care prospective payment system.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ACCESS TO HOME HEALTH CARE.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(A) Congress recognizes the importance of home health care for seniors and disabled citizens;

(B) Congress and the Administration should work together to maintain quality care for patients whose care is more extensive and expensive than the typical Medicare patient, including the sickest and frailest Medicare beneficiaries, while home health care agencies operate in the interim payment system; and

(C) Congress and the Administration should work together to avoid the implementation of the 15 percent reduction in the prospective payment system and ensured timely implementation of that system.

**SEC. 20. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING MEDICARE+CHOICE PROGRAMS/REIMBURSEMENT RATES.**

It is the sense of Congress that the Medicare+Choice regional disparity among reimbursement rates is unfair, and that full funding of the Medicare+Choice program is a priority as Congress deals with any medicare reform legislation.

**SEC. 21. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON DIRECTING THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TO ACCEPT NEGATIVE NUMBERS IN FARM INCOME AVERAGING.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) farmers' and ranchers' incomes vary widely from year to year due to uncontrollable markets and unpredictable weather;

(2) in the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997, Congress enacted 3-year farm income averaging to protect agricultural producers from excessive tax rates in profitable years;

(3) last year, the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) proposed final regulations for averaging farm income which fail to make clear that taxable income in a given year may be a negative number; and

(4) this IRS interpretation can result in farmers having to pay additional taxes during years in which they experience a loss in income.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that during this session of the 106th Congress, legislation should be considered to direct the Internal Revenue Service to count any net loss of income in determining the proper rate of taxation.

**SEC. 22. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING THE STABILIZATION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL PAYMENTS TO STATES, COUNTIES, AND BOROUGHS.**

It is the sense of the House that Federal revenue-sharing payments to States, counties, and boroughs pursuant to the Act of May 23, 1908 (35 Stat. 260; 16 U.S.C. 500), the Act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 963; 16 U.S.C. 500), the Act of August 28, 1937 (chapter 876; 50 Stat. 875; 43 U.S.C. 1181f), the Act of May 24, 1939 (chapter 144; 53 Stat. 753; 43 U.S.C. 1181f–1 et seq.), and sections 13982 and 13983 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 (Public Law 103–66; 16 U.S.C. 500 note; 43 U.S.C. 1181f note) should be stabilized and maintained for the long-term benefit of schools, roads, public services, and communities, and that providing such permanent, stable funding is a priority of the 106th Congress.

**SEC. 23. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE IMPORTANCE OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the year 2000 will mark the 50th Anniversary of the National Science Foundation;

(2) the National Science Foundation is the largest supporter of basic research in the Federal Government;

(3) the National Science Foundation is the second largest supporter of university-based research;

(4) research conducted by the grantees of the National Science Foundation has led to innovations that have dramatically improved the quality of life of all Americans;

(5) grants made by the National Science Foundation have been a crucial factor in the development of important technologies that Americans take for granted, such as lasers, Magnetic Resonance Imaging, Doppler Radar, and the Internet;

(6) because basic research funded by the National Science Foundation is high-risk, cutting edge, fundamental, and may not produce tangible benefits for over a decade,

the Federal Government is uniquely suited to support such research; and

(7) the National Science Foundation's focus on peer-reviewed merit based grants represents a model for research agencies across the Federal Government.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the function 250 (Basic Science) levels assume an amount of funding which ensures that the National Science Foundation is a priority in the resolution; recognizing the National Science Foundation's critical role in funding basic research, which leads to the innovations that assure the Nation's economic future, and in cultivating America's intellectual infrastructure.

**SEC. 24. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING SKILLED NURSING FACILITIES.**

It is the sense of Congress that the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission continue to carefully monitor the medicare skilled nursing benefit to determine if payment rates are sufficient to provide quality care, and that if reform is recommended, Congress should pass legislation as quickly as possible to assure quality skilled nursing care.

**SEC. 25. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON SPECIAL EDUCATION.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) all children deserve a quality education, including children with disabilities;

(2) the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act provides that the Federal, State, and local governments are to share in the expense of educating children with disabilities and commits the Federal Government to pay up to 40 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure for children with disabilities;

(3) the high cost of educating children with disabilities and the Federal Government's failure to fully meet its obligation under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act stretches limited State and local education funds, creating difficulty in providing a quality education to all students, including children with disabilities;

(4) the current level of Federal funding to States and localities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act is contrary to the goal of ensuring that children with disabilities receive a quality education;

(5) the Federal Government has failed to appropriate 40 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure per child with a disability as required under the Individuals with Disabilities Act to assist States and localities to educate children with disabilities; and

(6) the levels in function 500 (Education) for fiscal year 2001 assume sufficient discretionary budget authority to accommodate fiscal year 2001 appropriations for IDEA at least $2,000,000,000 above such funding levels appropriated in fiscal year 2000.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Congress and the President should increase fiscal year 2001 funding for programs under the Individuals with Disabilities Act by at least $2,000,000,000 above fiscal year 2000 appropriated levels;

(2) Congress and the President should give programs under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act the highest priority among Federal elementary and secondary education programs by meeting the commitment to fund the maximum State grant allocation for educating children with disabilities under such Act prior to authorizing or appropriating funds for any new education initiative;

(3) Congress and the President may consider, if new or increased funding is authorized or appropriated for any elementary and secondary education initiative that directs funds to local educational agencies, providing the flexibility in such authorization or appropriation necessary to allow local educational agencies the authority to use such funds for programs under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; and

(4) if a local educational agency chooses to utilize the authority under section 613(a)(2)(C)(i) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to treat as local funds up to 20 percent of the amount of funds the agency receives under part B of such Act that exceeds the amount it received under that part for the previous fiscal year, then the agency should use those local funds to provide additional funding for any Federal, State, or local education program.

**SEC. 26. ASSUMED FUNDING LEVELS FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION.**

It is the sense of Congress that function 500 (Education) levels assume at least a $2,000,000,000 increase in fiscal year 2001 over the current fiscal year to reflect the commitment of Congress to appropriate 40 percent of the national per pupil expenditure for children with disabilities by a date certain.

**SEC. 27. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON A FEDERAL EMPLOYEE PAY RAISE.**

It is the sense of Congress that the pay increase for Federal employees in January 2001 should be at least 3.7 percent.

**SEC. 28. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING HCFA DRAFT GUIDELINES.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) on February 15, 2000, the Health Care Financing Administration in the Department of Health and Human Services issued a draft Medicaid School-Based Administrative Claiming (MAC) Guide; and

(2) in its introduction, the stated purpose of the draft MAC guide is to provide information for schools, State medicaid agencies, HCFA staff, and other interested parties on the existing requirements for claiming Federal funds under the medicaid program for the costs of administrative activities, such as medicaid outreach, that are performed in the school setting associated with school-based health services programs.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) many school-based health programs provide a broad range of services that are covered by medicaid, affording access to care for children who otherwise might well go without needed services;

(2) such programs also can play a powerful role in identifying and enrolling children who are eligible for medicaid, as well as the State Children's Health Insurance programs;

(3) undue administrative burdens may be placed on school districts and States and deter timely application approval;

(4) the Health Care Financing Administration should substantially revise or abandon the current draft MAC guide because it appears to promulgate new rules that place excessive administrative burdens on participating school districts;

(5) the goal of the revised guide should be to encourage the appropriate use of Medicaid school-based services without undue administrative burdens; and

(6) the best way to ensure the continued viability of medicaid school-based services is to guarantee that the guidelines are fair and responsible.

**SEC. 29. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ASSET-BUILDING FOR THE WORKING POOR.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) 33 percent of all American households and 60 percent of African American households have either no financial assets or negative financial assets;

(2) 46.9 percent of children in America live in households with no financial assets, including 40 percent of Caucasian children and 75 percent of African American children;

(3) in order to provide low-income families with more tools for empowerment, incentives, including individual development accounts, are demonstrating success at empowering low-income workers;

(5) middle and upper income Americans currently benefit from tax incentives for building assets; and

(6) the Federal Government should utilize the Federal tax code to provide low-income Americans with incentives to work and build assets in order to escape poverty permanently.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the provisions of this resolution assume that Congress should modify the Federal tax law to include Individual Development Account provisions in order to encourage low-income workers and their families to save for buying a first home, starting a business, obtaining an education, or taking other measures to prepare for the future.

**SEC. 30. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE IMPORTANCE OF SUPPORTING THE NATION'S EMERGENCY FIRST-RESPONDERS.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) over 1.2 million men and women work as fire and emergency services personnel in 32,000 fire and emergency medical services departments across the Nation;

(2) over eighty percent of those who serve do so as volunteers;

(3) the Nation's firefighters responded to more than 18 million calls in 1998, including over 1.7 million fires;

(4) an average of 100 firefighters per year lose their lives in the course of their duties; and

(5) the Federal Government has a role in protecting the health and safety of the Nation's fire fighting personnel.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) recognizing the Nation's firefighters and emergency services crucial role in preserving and protecting life and property, such Federal assistance as low-interest loan programs, community development block grant reforms, emergency radio spectrum reallocations, and volunteer fire assistance programs, should be considered; and

(2) additional resources should be set aside for such assistance.

**SEC. 31. ENHANCED ENFORCEMENT OF BUDGETARY LIMITS.**

(a) PROHIBITION ON USE OF DIRECTED SCOREKEEPING.—

(1) It shall not be in order in the House to consider any reported bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that contains a directed scorekeeping provision.

(2) As used in this subsection, the term ''directed scorekeeping'' means directing the Congressional Budget Office or the Office of Management and Budget to estimate any provision providing discretionary new budget authority in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations for a fiscal year for budgetary enforcement purposes.

(b) PROHIBITION ON USE OF ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.—(1) It shall not be in order in the House to consider any reported bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that would cause the total level of discretionary advance appropriations provided for fiscal years after 2001 to exceed $23 billion (which represents the total level of advance appropriations for fiscal year 2001).

(2) As used in this subsection, the term ''advance appropriation''means any discretionary new budget authority in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations for fiscal year 2001 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2001.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall cease to have any force or effect on January 1, 2001.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. No amendment to that amendment is in order except the amendments printed in Part B of the report. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by the Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment.

After conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, there shall be a final period of general debate which shall not exceed 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 1 printed in Part B of House Report 106–535.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. OWENS

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Part B Amendment No. 1 in the Nature of a Substitute offered by Mr. OWENS:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

**SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001.**

The Congress declares that concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001 and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2002 through 2005 are hereby set forth.

**SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.**

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2005:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2001: $2,026,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $2,097,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $2,171,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $2,262,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $2,352,000,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be reduced are as follows:

Fiscal year 2001: $96,800,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $109,700,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $129,994,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $154,043,480,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $182,241,520,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2001: $1,548,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,618,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,918,041,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $2,272,878,500,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $2,693,361,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2001: $1,525,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,589,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,883,202,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $2,231,594,300,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $2,644,439,200,000.

(4) SURPLUSES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the surpluses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2001: $20,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $20,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $20,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $20,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $20,000,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2001: $3,287,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $3,100,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $2,903,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $2,690,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $2,465,000,000,000.

**SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.**

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and budget outlays for fiscal years 2001 through 2005 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $255,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $252,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $262,080,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $261,080,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $268,081,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $267,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $271,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $270,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $286,090,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $287,071,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $22,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $22,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $26,070,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,892,950,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $30,892,950,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,608,145,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $36,608,145,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,380,651,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $14,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $14,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $17,656,500,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,922,952,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $20,922,952,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,793,698,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $24,793,698,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,380,532,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $3,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $3,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $2,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $2,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $2,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $600,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $20,818,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,518,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $20,818,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,418,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $20,818,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,418,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $20,818,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,418,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $20,818,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,418,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $8,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $8,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $10,546,500,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,176,500,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $12,492,602,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,689,152,500.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $14,809,658,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,481,645,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $12,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $12,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $13,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $13,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $13,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,000,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $14,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $14,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $15,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $15,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $16,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,900,000,000.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $13,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $13,905,500,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,114,082,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $14,114,082,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,325,793,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $14,325,753,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,540,679,000.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $88,875,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $76,875,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $89,875,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $85,005,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $77,875,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $84,910,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $89,250,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $88,764,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $90,750,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $89,984,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $198,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $198,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $215,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $214,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $233,602,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $231,661,300,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $253,224,560,000.
(B) Outlays, $249,962,540,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $274,495,420,000.
(B) Outlays, $269,709,580,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $222,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $218,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $232,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $223,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $242,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $241,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $258,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $255,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $287,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $277,500,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $241,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $217,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $241,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $229,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $241,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $240,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $242,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $221,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $243,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $234,300,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $14,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $15,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $12,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,662,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $13,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $14,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,100,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $44,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $45,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $46,902,400,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,124,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $47,196,405,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,011,440,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $48,329,118,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,072,126,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $24,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $24,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $24,565,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $25,030,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,830,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $25,495,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,295,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $14,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $14,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $14,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $14,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $15,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,900,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $208,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $198,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $189,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $177,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $163,600,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,600,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 446, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS).

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to present the Congressional Black Caucus budget. I shall manage only a small part of the time.

The Congressional Black Caucus budget is a budget for maximum investment and opportunity. We are carrying forward the great Democratic Party traditions of Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal, Harry Truman's Marshall Plan and health care proposal, Lyndon Johnson's Great Society that produced Medicaid and Medicare.

As advocates for the Democratic Party mainstream philosophy, the Congressional Black Caucus sets forth this budget for maximum investment and maximum opportunities.

As we prepare the year 2001 budget, we are blessed by the long, warm rays of a sun of a coming decade of surpluses. Compassion and vision are no longer blocked by the spectre of budget deficits.

The conservative estimate is that there will be a $1.9 trillion non-Social Security surplus over the next 10 years. Using simple logic, we should be able to program and apply this year about $200 billion for the 2001 budget as this window of opportunity opens.

Investment for the future must be our first priority. Maximizing opportunities for individual citizens is synonymous with maximizing the growth and the expansion of a U.S. superpower economy.

It is the age of information, stupid. It is a time of a computer and a time of digitalization. It is the era of thousands of high-level vacancies because there are not enough information technology workers. With enlightened budget decisions, we can at this moment begin the shaping of the contours of a new cybercivilization.

The boldest and most vital proposal contained in the CBC budget is the Function 500. It is at the heart of our budget. Funding for school construction, responding to the fact that the American people in numerous polls have indicated that their number one priority for Federal budget action is education.

Each of the budgets being presented offer increases in education. Even the Blue Dog budget at one end of the spectrum of the Democratic Party offers a $21 billion increase in education. The Republican budget offers a slight increase, also.

But only the CBC budget has chosen to focus on the kingpin issue of school physical infrastructure. While we applaud the President's inclusion of $1.3 billion for our emergency repairs, we deem it to be grossly inadequate.

We support school financing via the Tax Code, also. However, most of the local education agencies cannot borrow money without a lengthy taxpayer referendum procedure. This CBC budget proposes a $10 billion increase for funding for school construction. This amount would be taken from the $200 billion surplus.

In addition to this 5 percent for infrastructure, and by ''infrastructure'' we mean wiring, repair, security, and new construction, the CBC budget also proposes another 5 percent, another $10 billion, to address other education, social service, and employment initiatives.

Only 10 percent of the overall surplus will be utilized for the all-important mission of investment in human resources, only 10 percent of this amount available above the Social Security surplus.

Other projected increases in our budget, and certainly the critical Function 500 section, include additional funding for Head Start, summer youth employment, TRIO programs, historically black colleges and universities, and community technology centers.

We oppose the Department of Education's elimination of certain vitally needed ongoing technical assistance and research programs. OERI projects should not be dumped into a general slush fund for the Department of Education.

The Department of Education's weak administration, with its bargain basement peer-review procedures, is not in a position to mount new programs on a timely basis. A better utilization of existing programs will be more efficient and more effective.

For the critically important welfare to work programs administered by the Department of Labor, the year 2001 budget assumes a life-and-death importance. Infant mortality rates in poor communities will continue to rise, and families will suffer needlessly unless there is an end to the current Federal permissive policy which allows States to pilfer funds from the poor and to use welfare contracts as political patronage.

The CBC proposes greater earmarking of funding connected with the chaotic welfare reform measures. A better funded and stronger Federal administration and direction is needed to restrain the greed and the neglect of our State governments.

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this budget because it taxes too much, spends too much, and does not pay down enough debt.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I want to just take a few minutes to say that we really believe that today, in the consideration of all these budgets, that we would like to take the six themes that I know the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) is so fond of. I am disappointed that he has left the floor. We wanted to take these six themes and kind of compare all the different budgets that are going to come to the House floor today against what we think is the best proposal.

If I could go through this again rather quickly. As my colleagues know, the Republican budget proposal will protect 100 percent of the Social Security surplus for the second year in a row. We will not dip into that surplus. We will use that Social Security surplus only for purposes of paying benefits and paying down the publicly held debt.

Secondly, we, in our budget, provide for the strengthening of Medicare, reform of Medicare, and also make money available for a prescription drug for the neediest of our senior citizens. We think it is absolutely vital that those who are needy have access to prescription drugs.

Thirdly, we also move to retire the publicly held debt over the next 5 years by $1 trillion. Now, some budgets are going to propose that we pay it down by more. Other budgets are going to propose that we pay it down by less.

We think that the trillion-dollar paydown, in combination with additional spending needs and with tax cuts, are the right formula. So we believe that not only should we move first to protect Social Security and Medicare, but we also believe that the trillion-dollar number is the right number to pay down public debt, thereby giving good signals to the Federal Reserve in terms of their interest rate policies.

Fourthly, we believe that we can have tax fairness. And we have a tax cut bill that approaches by the end of this summer, we believe, somewhere in the neighborhood of $250 billion. We provide for $200 billion in tax relief. That will provide tax relief to America's families by being able to ease the penalty on getting married that all too many couples face today; that, in fact, we will take small businesses and farmers and not force them to visit the undertaker and the IRS on the same day but begin to ease that penalty on success, ease that penalty that people experience when they try to pass their bounty on to their children.

We also believe that our senior citizens ought not to be penalized for their independence and hard work by cutting their Social Security as an offset to any dollar they earn. We think that is just a bogus idea that was cooked up here in Washington.

Furthermore, we think that it is important that we restore America's defense and also believe, however, that the message that the Black Caucus sends of one that this Pentagon needs reviewed and reformed is clearly a point of which we can all agree, and that we believe we need to support education and the National Institutes of Health and basic science research in the country.

So, today I would like to say that I think that this is the right formula. And if we can come with a formula that protects Social Security and strengthens Medicare and provides the prescription drug and pays down the public debt by a trillion dollars and provides significant tax relief while rebuilding our defense and education as a priority, we are going to be pretty close to what we think is the right formula.

I know that the Congressional Black Caucus comes to the floor every year with a budget, they lay it out there, and their priorities reflect the needs as they see them in this country. I want to offer my respect and congratulations to the members of the Black Caucus for their hard work. I know it is a tradition, and I am very thankful that they have the opportunity to come to the floor.

I do not want to stand here and say a number of negative things against their budget, because I think it reflects their priorities as they see them. We should study their budget and communicate with them; and perhaps at a later point we can improve on our priorities, we can have a better understanding of some of the priorities that they have. I hope that at some point, and maybe even in the conference committee, we can perhaps improve on our document.

But, nevertheless, I think that we should not approve that budget; and I think we ought to stick to the Republican proposal that we have today. I think it will provide for a continued strong economy, more power for individuals, and a sense of fairness for families and small businesses and our senior citizens in the country.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time we have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) has 14½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my appreciation for the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), our brilliant and distinguished budget chairman, and tell him that we welcome criticisms of our budget; and we certainly would criticize the other budgets. We very much would like to see some dialogue take place between the people who put forward these budgets.

We think a $17 billion increase for defense over the President's already very generous increases shows that there is a basic misunderstanding as to what the world is all about and where America and the rest of the world is going.

It is brain power, stupid. It is brain power. Brain power drives everything else. It drives the military. It drives the economy. And if we do not invest in education, we will have beautiful high-tech ships out there that nobody can operate.

□ 1800

We would like to see some dialogue. If you would agree to take part of that $17 billion and put about $10 billion of it into education, school construction, computers and wiring of schools, I think you would do far more for defense than you are doing with the kinds of increases that are there.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time for the management of our bill to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus; and I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman control the time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman from New York for his help in substituting for us as we got to the floor.

Let me begin by thanking the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget for all of his hard work and to assure him that we, the members of the Congressional Black Caucus, are very, very aware of the work that he has put into this budget, and we commend him for the work. I would also like to thank the Committee on Rules for working with us and helping us to bring our budget to this floor, because we think that we have some things worth discussing.

Mr. Chairman, if we fail to seize this moment to make investments that will allow our great Nation to surge forward in the creation of this new cyber-civilization, then our children and grandchildren will frown on us and will lament the fact that we failed not because we lacked fiscal resources but our failures, our very devastating blunder was due to a poverty of vision.

Mr. Chairman, we are the custodians of unprecedented wealth in a giant economy. But we must not allow midget minds and tiny spirits to control our destiny. At a time when positive generosity is possible, such a proposal maximizes great selfishness.

The preparation of this budget for maximum investment and growth was guided by a set of 10 principles and assumptions set forth below.

Number one. We accept the general direction of the President's budget and the House Democratic Caucus. Families First is a motto we wholeheartedly endorse. However, more resources must be directed toward working families and the unique problems of African American families.

Number two. We view the projection of a $1.9 trillion surplus over a 10-year period as an overriding factor for the basic decisions to be made for fiscal year 2001. Common sense dictates that we approach this first year of the decade of budget surpluses with proposals for the most advantageous uses of one-tenth of the projected surplus.

Number three. Investment in the CBC-designated priorities should be our number one concern. We support a moderate plan to pay down the national debt. However, the President's blueprint moves too far and too fast with debt reduction at the expense of investment.

Number four. The protection of Social Security, Medicaid, and Medicare are among the highest priorities of the CBC.

Number five. In budgeting for each function, the CBC accepts the principles of a balanced budget. However, increases in CBC priorities must not be inhibited by present budget caps and conventional assumptions.

Number six. The CBC accepts the basic thrust of President Clinton's proposal for the distribution of the surplus. However, the CBC will insist that the emphasis in priorities must be shifted. At least 10 percent of the surplus should be devoted to investments in programs for education and a second 10 percent should be allotted for investments which benefit working families and for the safety net programs.

Number seven. Tax cuts, which must be taken from the 80 percent of the surplus which remains, are not a high priority of the CBC.

Number eight. Within the priorities earmarked by the President's budget in each function, the CBC will strive to target some portion of the proposed allocations to the special needs of working families.

Number nine. Budget allocations for necessary programs that currently do not exist are encouraged.

And, number 10, the currently stated CBC fiscal year 2001 priorities are education, housing, health, economic development, and livable communities.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that serious consideration of this budget is called for at this time. We believe it provides a blueprint for the launching of this new millennium.

NATIONAL DEFENSE (050)

*Function in brief*

Function 050 funds the pay and benefits of military and civilian personnel; operations and maintenance; research, development, testing, evaluation, engineering, and procurement of new weapons systems (including nuclear weapons and research provided by the Department of Energy); and military construction, including family housing; and other military-related activities.

The CBC believes that the Defense budget, with it current estimates consumes more than one-half of the discretionary spending of the Federal government's budget. While the Caucus wants to ensure that our men and women in uniform enjoy necessary and proper support from sufficient forces and the right equipment, training, and housing, we do not want this reality to prevail at the expense of our nation's other priorities.

*Function 050: National defense*

[Fiscal years, in billions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| Budget Authority: | |
| 2001 | 255.0 |
| Outlays; | |
| 2001 | 252.0 |
| Budget Authority: | |
| 2002 | 262.0 |
| 2003 | 268.0 |
| 2004 | 271.0 |

*Function 050: National defense—Continued*

| | |
|---|---|
| 2005 | 286.0 |
| Outlays: | |
| 2002 | 261.0 |
| 2003 | 267.0 |
| 2004 | 270.0 |
| 2005 | 287.0 |

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS (150)

*Function in brief*

Functions 150 funds the operation of the State Department, embassies and consulate offices abroad, bilateral assistance programs, democracy and free market economies education, multilateral assistance programs, multilateral development banks, and public diplomacy through educational and cultural exchanges. It also funds libraries and broadcasting abroad as well as international security through peacekeeping assistance, nonproliferation and disarmament, foreign military grants and loans, military education and training, and refugee and disaster assistance: Some of the specific programs it funds include: Development Fund for Africa, African Development Fund, African Development Bank, Great Lakes Initiative, Development Assistance, Peace Corps, Inter-American Development, Debt Restructuring, Debt Restructuring (HIPC), Wye and Egypt Supplemental, UN Arrearage Payments, Migration and Refugee Assistance, Peacekeeping Operation (PKO), Child Survival and Disease Fund, Economic Support Fund (ESF), International Development Association, National Endowment for Democracy, World Health Organization, African Crisis Response Force, International Disaster Assistance, Trade and Development Agency and PL 480 Titles II and III.

*Function 150: International affairs*

[Fiscal years, in billions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| Budget Authority: | |
| 2001 | 22.0 |
| Outlays: | |
| 2001 | 20.0 |
| Budget Authority: | |
| 2002 | 22.0 |
| 2003 | 26.0 |
| 2004 | 30.8 |
| 2005 | 36.6 |
| Outlays: | |
| 2002 | 20.0 |
| 2003 | 30.8 |
| 2004 | 36.6 |
| 2005 | 43.3 |

GENERAL SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY (250)

*Function in brief*

Function 250 provides funding for general science and basic research, including the National Science Foundation; Department of Energy general science programs, particularly the high energy physics and nuclear physics programs; space flight, research and supporting activities.

The CBC maintains a significant overall Federal investment in science and engineering research and development while paring back support for those research initiatives which offer minimal public benefits and would be more appropriately financed by private industry.

HIGHLIGHTS

NASA—Funds the International Space Station at the level proposed by the President which allows for space based medical research and breakthroughs in medicine for diseases that greatly affect the African American community.

HBCU's—Provides additional funding for Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU's) Minority University Research and Education Programs.

NSF—Provides additional funding for the Next Generation Internet initiative in order

to connect HBCU's and other similarly situated educational institutions to the Internet.

Elementary, Secondary and information education—Provides additional funding to the Elementary, Secondary and Information Educational activity of the Educational and Human Resources appropriation of the NSF.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—Provides additional funding for the Global Learning and Observations to Benefit the Environment Program (GLOBE).

*Function 250: General science, space and technology*

[Fiscal years, in billions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| Budget Authority: | |
| 2001 | 14.9 |
| Budget Authority: | |
| 2002 | 14.9 |
| 2003 | 17.6 |
| 2004 | 20.9 |
| 2005 | 24.7 |
| Outlays: | |
| 2001 | 14.9 |
| Outlays: | |
| 2002 | 14.9 |
| 2003 | 20.9 |
| 2004 | 24.7 |
| 2005 | 28.3 |

ENERGY (270)

*Function in Brief*

Function 250 provides funding for most of the programs for the Department of Energy, including research and development and energy conservation; the Power Marketing Administrations, the Strategic Petroleum Reserve; uranium enrichment; funding for electrification and telephone credit subsidies provided through the Rural Utilities Service; the Tennessee Valley Authority power program; the Nucelar Regulatory Commission and other activities.

*Function 270: Energy*

[Fiscal years, in billions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| Budget Authority: | |
| 2001 | 3.3 |
| Outlays: | |
| 2001 | 1.8 |
| Budget Authority: | |
| 2002 | 2.0 |
| 2003 | 2.7 |
| 2004 | 2.4 |
| 2005 | 2.1 |
| Outlays: | |
| 2002 | 1.5 |
| 2003 | 1.2 |
| 2004 | 2.4 |
| 2005 | 0.6 |

NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT (300)

*Function in brief*

Function 300 Funds water resources management; activities of the Army Corps of Engineers; the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA); the National Park Service, including recreation programs; the Department of the Interior; conservation and land management; pollution control and abatement. Other agencies under this function are the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Fish and Wildlife Service, certain agencies within the Department of Agriculture, including the Forest Service and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), in the Department of Commerce.

*Function 300: Natural resources and environment*

[Fiscal years, in billions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| Budget Authority: | |
| 2001 | 20.8 |
| Outlays: | |
| 2001 | 20.5 |
| Budget Authority: | |
| 2002 | 20.8 |

*Function 300: Natural resources and environment—Continued*

| | |
|---|---|
| 2003 | 20.8 |
| 2004 | 20.8 |
| 2005 | 20.8 |
| Outlays: | |
| 2002 | 20.4 |
| 2003 | 20.4 |
| 2004 | 20.4 |
| 2005 | 20.4 |

AGRICULTURE (350)

*Function in brief*

Function 350 provides funding for agricultural programs, including farm income stabilization, commodity price support programs, crop insurance, export credit guarantee loans, the emergency food assistance program, the Foreign Agricultural Service, the Agricultural Marketing Service, the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, the Economic Research Service, National Agricultural Statistics Service, animal and plant protection, and other agricultural programs and agricultural export promotion.

*Function 350: Agriculture*

[Fiscal years, in billions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| Budget Authority: | |
| 2001 | 8.6 |
| Outlays: | |
| 2001 | 7.1 |
| Budget Authority: | |
| 2002 | 8.9 |
| 2003 | 10.5 |
| 2004 | 12.4 |
| 2005 | 14.8 |
| Outlays: | |
| 2002 | 6.9 |
| 2003 | 8.1 |
| 2004 | 9.6 |
| 2005 | 11.4 |

COMMERCE AND HOUSING CREDIT (370)

*Function in brief*

Function 370 includes funding for mortgage credit rural housing programs, the Census Bureau, International trade and export promotion programs, technology programs, and the patent and trademark program of the Department of Commerce; small business assistance; the U.S. Postal Service; and major regulatory agencies, such as the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Federal Trade Commission.

*Function 370: Commerce and housing credit*

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| Budget Authority: | |
| 2001 | 12.4 |
| Outlays: | |
| 2001 | 7.6 |
| Budget Authority: | |
| 2002 | 12.7 |
| 2003 | 13.0 |
| 2004 | 13.3 |
| 2005 | 13.6 |
| Outlays: | |
| 2002 | 8.2 |
| 2003 | 8.8 |
| 2004 | 9.4 |
| 2005 | 10.0 |

TRANSPORTATION (400)

*Function in brief*

Function 400 includes ground transportation programs, such as the federal-aid highway program, mass transit, rail transportation, and the Interstate Commerce Commission; air transportation through the Coast Guard and Maritime Administration; and related transportation support activities.

Rather than cutting investment in the nation's transportation infrastructure, the CBC Alternative Budget maintains investment in these vital functions by funding them at the level of current services through fiscal year 2000. Public investment in transportation produces broad economic benefits, and our nation must have a safe and efficient transportation system for all people if the United States is to compete successfully in the 21st Century.

*Function 400: Transportation*

[Fiscal years, in billions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| Budget Authority: | |
| 2001 | 14.5 |
| Outlays: | |
| 2001 | 12.1 |
| Budget Authority: | |
| 2002 | 14.5 |
| 2003 | 15.1 |
| 2004 | 15.6 |
| 2005 | 16.3 |
| Outlays: | |
| 2002 | 12.1 |
| 2003 | 12.7 |
| 2004 | 12.9 |
| 2005 | 13.0 |

COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT: 450

*Function in brief*

The Community and Regional Development function provides for a wide variety of urban and rural development programs, including the Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG), the Economic Development Agency (EDA), the Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC, numerous rural development programs administered by the Rural Development Administration (RDA) and the non-power programs of the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA). The function also includes funding for most Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) programs.

*Function 450: Community and regional development*

[Fiscal years, in billions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| Budget Authority: | |
| 2001 | 13.7 |
| Outlays: | |
| 2001 | 13.1 |
| Budget Authority: | |
| 2002 | 13.7 |
| 2003 | 13.9 |
| 2004 | 14.1 |
| 2005 | 14.3 |
| Outlays: | |
| 2002 | 13.3 |
| 2003 | 14.1 |
| 2004 | 14.3 |
| 2005 | 14.5 |

EDUCATION, TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES (500)

*Function in brief*

The boldest and most vital proposal contained in the CBC Budget is at the heart of this function: funding for school construction. Responding to the fact that the American people in numerous polls have indicated that their number one priority for federal budget action is Education, each of the budgets being presented offer increases in Education. But only the CBC Budget has chosen to focus on the kingpin issue of school physical infrastructure. While we applaud the President's inclusion of 1.3 billion dollars for ''emergency repairs,'' we deem it to be grossly inadequate. We support school financing via the tax code; however, most of the Local Education Agencies can not borrow money without a lengthy taxpayer referendum procedure. This CBC Budget proposes a 10 billion dollar increase over the President's Budget for school construction. This amount would be taken from the 200 billion dollar surplus. In addition to this five percent for infrastructure-wiring, repair, security, and new construction—the CBC Budget proposes another five percent, 10 billion dollars, to address other education, social service, and employment initiatives. Only ten per cent of

the overall surplus would be utilized for the all important mission of investment in human resources.

Other projected increases include additional funding for Head Start, Summer Youth Employment, TRIO programs, Historically Black Colleges and Universities, and Community Technology Centers. We oppose the Department of Education's elimination of vitally needed ongoing technical assistance and research programs. OERI projects should not be dumped into a general slush fund. The DOE's weak administration with its bargain basement peer review procedures, is not in a position to mount new programs on a timely basis. A better utilization of existing programs would be more efficient and more effective.

For the critically important welfare to work programs administered by the Department of Labor, the Year 2001 Budget assumes a life and death importance. Infant mortality rates in poor communities will continue to rise and families will suffer needlessly unless there is an end to the current federal permissive policy which allows states to pilfer funds from the poor, and to use welfare contracts as political patronage. The CBC proposes greater earmarking of funding connected with the chaotic welfare reform ''measures.'' A better funded and stronger Federal administration and direction is needed to restrain the greed and neglect of state governments.

*Function 500: Education, training and employment services*

[Fiscal years, in billions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| Budget Authority: | |
| 2001 | 88.8 |
| Outlays: | |
| 2001 | 76.8 |
| Budget Authority: | |
| 2002 | 89.8 |
| 2003 | 77.8 |
| 2004 | 89.2 |
| 2005 | 90.7 |
| Outlays: | |
| 2002 | 85.0 |
| 2003 | 84.9 |
| 2004 | 88.7 |
| 2005 | 89.9 |

HEALTH (550) AND MEDICARE (570)

*Function in brief*

Functions 550 and 570 include funds for health care services, health research and training, consumer and occupational health and safety, and Medicare. The major agency budgets accounts include the Health Resources and Services Administration, National Institutes of Health, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Health Care Financing Administration, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health and the Office of Minority Health.

*Function 550: Health*

[Fiscal years, in billions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| Budget Authority: | |
| 2001 | 198.8 |
| Outlays: | |
| 2001 | 198.0 |
| Budget Authority: | |
| 2002 | 215.5 |
| 2003 | 233.6 |
| 2004 | 253.2 |
| 2005 | 274.4 |
| Outlays: | |
| 2002 | 214.7 |
| 2003 | 231.6 |
| 2004 | 249.9 |
| 2005 | 269.7 |

*Function 570: Medicare*

[Fiscal years, in billions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| Budget Authority: | |
| 2001 | 14.5 |

*Function 570: Medicare—Continued*

| | |
|---|---|
| Outlays: | |
| 2001 | 14.5 |
| Budget Authority: | |
| 2002 | 15.4 |
| 2003 | 12.5 |
| 2004 | 13.2 |
| 2005 | 14.0 |
| Outlays: | |
| 2002 | 15.4 |
| 2003 | 12.6 |
| 2004 | 13.1 |
| 2005 | 14.0 |

INCOME SECURITY (600)

*Function in briefs*

Function 600 contains programs which help meet the needs of individuals by insuring against loss of income from retirement, disability, death or unemployment of a wage earner, and by assisting those whose incomes are inadequate to meet minimum levels of nutrition, housing or other basic necessities.

Major programs within this function include: retirement and disability programs for federal civilian and military personnel; food stamps, school lunch, WIC and other nutrition programs; unemployment insurance; family support payments (AFDC); Supplemental Security Income (SSI); low-income home energy assistance; foster care and child welfare programs; child care; low-income and elderly housing assistance and programs for the homeless; and the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC).

*Function 600: Income security*

[Fiscal years, in million of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| Budget Authority: | |
| 2001 | 241.3 |
| Outlays: | |
| 2001 | 217.2 |
| Budget Authority: | |
| 2002 | 241.3 |
| 2003 | 241.8 |
| 2004 | 242.9 |
| 2005 | 243.8 |
| Outlays: | |
| 2002 | 229.7 |
| 2003 | 240.9 |
| 2004 | 221.1 |
| 2005 | 234.3 |

SOCIAL SECURITY (650)

*Function in brief*

Function 650 includes Social Security, Old-Age and Survivors Insurance (OASI), and the Disability Insurance (DI) programs. These programs provide monthly cash assistance to more than 42 million beneficiaries.

*Function 650: Social Security (650)*

[Fiscal year, in billions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| Budget Authority: | |
| 2001 | 14.5 |
| Outlays: | |
| 2001 | 14.5 |
| Budget Authority: | |
| 2002 | 15.4 |
| 2003 | 12.5 |
| 2004 | 13.2 |
| 2005 | 14.0 |
| Outlays: | |
| 2002 | 15.4 |
| 2003 | 12.6 |
| 2004 | 13.1 |
| 2005 | 16.1 |

VETERANS BENEFITS AND SERVICES (700)

*Function in brief*

Function 700 includes compensation for veterans with service-related disabilities; pensions for low-income wartime veterans with non-service connected disabilities; education and training; medical care; and housing loan guarantees.

*Function 700: Veterans benefits and services*

[Fiscal years, in billions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| Budget Authority: | |
| 2001 | 44.0 |

*Function 700: Veterans benefits and services—Continued*

| | |
|---|---|
| Outlays: | |
| 2001 | 42.8 |
| Budget Authority: | |
| 2002 | 45.1 |
| 2003 | 46.9 |
| 2004 | 47.1 |
| 2005 | 48.3 |
| Outlays: | |
| 2002 | 45.4 |
| 2003 | 48.1 |
| 2004 | 51.0 |
| 2005 | 54.0 |

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE (750)

*Function in brief*

Function 750 provides funding for the law enforcement and anti-drug abuse activities of the Departments of Justice and Treasury; federal judicial, litigation, and correctional activities; criminal justice assistance grants to state and local governments; and legal services for the poor.

The CBC Caring Majority Budget understands the urgency of addressing the rising rate of crime in the United States. All credible research has shown that prevention and early intervention initiatives, combined with a continuum of services aimed at high-risk youth, best serve to reduced crime when compared to incarceration and other punitive approaches.

A comprehensive prevention strategy includes an investment in education and training resources as well as research and evaluation of model programs that offer non-punitive methods of crime reduction.

*Function 750: Administration of Justice*

[Fiscal years, in billions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| Budget Authority: | |
| 2001 | 24.7 |
| Outlays: | |
| 2001 | 25.6 |
| Budget Authority: | |
| 2002 | 24.1 |
| 2003 | 24.6 |
| 2004 | 25.0 |
| 2005 | 25.5 |
| Outlays: | |
| 2002 | 25.6 |
| 2003 | 25.4 |
| 2004 | 25.8 |
| 2005 | 26.3 |

GENERAL GOVERNMENT (800)

*Function in brief*

Function 800 provides funding for general overhead costs of the federal government.

*Function 800: General government*

[Fiscal year, in million of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| Budget Authority: | |
| 2001 | 14.7 |
| Outlays: | |
| 2001 | 14.0 |
| Budget Authority: | |
| 2002 | 14.5 |
| 2003 | 14.6 |
| 2004 | 14.8 |
| 2005 | 15.0 |
| Outlays: | |
| 2002 | 14.3 |
| 2003 | 14.0 |
| 2004 | 14.6 |
| 2005 | 14.9 |

NET INTEREST (900)

*Function in brief*

Function 900 provides for interest payments on the national debt. Net interest outlays are determined by the size of the debt, market interest rates, and debt management practices.

*Function 900: Net interest*

[Fiscal years, in billions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| Outlays: | |
| 2001 | 208.3 |

*Function 900: Net interest—Continued*

| | |
|---|---|
| Outlays: | |
| 2002 | 198.6 |
| 2003 | 189.2 |
| 2004 | 177.4 |
| 2005 | 163.6 |

ALLOWANCES (920)

*Function in brief*

Function 920 reflects amounts of any budget increase or reduction for which specific funding levels by program or function have yet to be determined. It also includes amounts for contingencies which may affect more than one function.

*Function 920: Allowances*

[Fiscal years, in billions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| Budget Authority: | |
| 2001 | 200.0 |
| Budget Authority: | |
| 2002 | 200.0 |
| 2003 | 300.0 |
| 2004 | 300.0 |
| 2005 | 300.0 |

UNDISTRIBUTED OFFSETTING RECEIPTS (950)

*Function in brief*

Function 950 includes the employer's share of employee retirement costs; government receipts (bonuses, rents, royals) from the sale of oil and gas produced from the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS); and receipts for the sale of assets controlled or owned by the federal government.

*Function 950: Undistributed offsetting receipts*

[Fiscal years, in billions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| Budget Authority: | |
| 2001 | .200 |
| Outlays: | |
| 2001 | 45.7 |
| Budget Authority: | |
| 2002 | .200 |
| 2003 | .200 |
| 2004 | .200 |
| 2005 | .200 |
| Outlays: | |
| 2002 | 49.1 |
| 2003 | 47.3 |
| 2004 | 46.9 |
| 2005 | 48.6 |

PRINCIPLES AND ASSUMPTIONS FOR THE CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS MAXIMUM OPPORTUNITY AND INVESTMENT BUDGET FY'2001

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS

[Congressman James Clyburn, Chairman; Congressman Bennie Thompson, Chairperson—CBC Budget Task Force; Congressman Major R. Owens, Vice Chairperson, CBC Budget Task Force]

The mission of the Congressional Black Caucus is advocacy for those left out and forgotten: the poor in general and more specifically African Americans and other neglected minorities. To guide the budget preparation process and fully accomplish our mission we shall begin by adopting the following Principles and Assumptions:

1. We accept the general direction of the President's Budget and the House Democratic Caucus. ''Families First'' is a motto we wholeheartedly endorse; however, more resources must be directed toward working families and the unique problems of African American families.

2. We view the projection of a 1.9 trillion surplus over a ten year period as an overriding factor for the basic decisions to be made for the FY'2001 Budget. Common sense dictates that we approach this first year of the decade of budget surpluses with proposals for the most advantageous uses of one-tenth of the projected surplus.

3. Investment in the CBC designated priorities shall be our number one concern. We support a moderate plan to pay the national debt; however, the President's blueprint moves too far and too fast with debt reduction at the expense of investment.

4. The protection of Social Security, Medicaid and Medicare are among the highest priorities of the CBC; however, investments in the education and training of the present and future workforce will provide greater guarantees for the solvency of Social Security and the sound financing of health care than any other policies or actions under consideration.

5. In budgeting for each function, the CBC accepts the principles of a balanced budget, however, increase in CBC priorities must not be inhibited by present budget caps and conventional assumptions. We assume that there is waste in several key areas which may be transferred to enhance better investments for the future. We also assume that there are excessive revenue expenditures to continue corporate welfare which may be eliminated to increase funding for our designated priorities. And finally, we assume that one-tenth of the projected ten year surplus must be factored into the development of this budget for maximum opportunity and investment.

6. The CBC accepts the basic thrust of President Clinton's proposal for the distribution of the surplus; however, the CBC will insist that the emphasis in priorities must be shifted. At least 10 percent of the surplus should be devoted to investments in programs for education and a second 10 percent should be allotted for investments which benefit working families and for safety net programs.

7. Tax cuts, which must be taken from the 80 percent of the surplus which remains, are not a high priority of the CBC; however, since the current political power equation dictates the inevitability of a White House approved tax cut, the CBC must insist that the tax cuts not exceed the percentage of the surplus which is allocated for CBC priorities.

8. Within the priorities earmarked by the President's budget, in each function, the CBC will strive to target some portion of the proposed allocations to the special needs of working families, the poor and the African American Community. New market opportunities and minority contract set-asides must apply across the board—and special units should be funded to implement and facilitate the targeting of CBC designated constituents.

9. Budget allocations for necessary programs that currently do not exist are encouraged. The proponents must also later develop legislation for authorization as part of the process to sell the ideas and convince the President to place the item on his priority list at the time of the end-game negotiations. Proposals for new methods of proposal solicitation, peer review, technical assistance, etc. are also in order.

10. The currently stated CBC FY 2001 Priorities are: Education, Housing, Health, Economic Development and Livable Communities, Foreign Aid, Welfare and Low Income Assistance and Juvenile Justice and Law Enforcement. Some additions or subtractions from these categories are possible; however, they will remain as the basic frame-work for CBC Budget and Appropriations demands for the entire session of the 106th Congress. Members preparing budget functions should also consider promoting tactics and strategies which support the CBC's ongoing advocacy of these dollar allocation positions.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN).

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, the health budget is a critical piece of our overall budget and agenda. It is defined by the glaring disparities in health status that exist for the African American community. HIV and AIDS have been our focus, but we also die from heart disease, cancer, diabetes, infant mortality, stroke, and other diseases in numbers greater than all other minority groups combined.

Mr. Chairman, this is an emergency. Specifically, this budget will include a minimum of $500 million for the CBC Minority HIV/AIDS initiative. In addition to continuing the programs already started, the increase will allow us to address HIV and AIDS in correctional facilities, increase funding to more vulnerable groups, increase prevention and treatment activities for sexually transmitted diseases and substance abuse, expand research, increase Medicaid funding, bring our programs to smaller cities and rural areas, and greatly increase the technical assistance that will enable our community-based organizations to take advantage of this important resource.

In the broader area of disparities, we will fund an expansion of the racial and ethnic approach to community health programs, to expand it beyond the existing 32 communities and enhance funding to the health careers opportunities program and National Health Service Corps to do better outreach and provide scholarships for young people of color to enter health profession schools. We would fully fund, also, the provisions of H.R. 1860, 2391, and 3250.

Mr. Chairman, with regard to our children, the CBC funds the continuation and strengthening of the Healthy Start program in communities of color and also provides for increased child care at $917 million. Mr. Chairman, the elimination of health disparities in African American communities and other communities of color is one of the most important challenges facing this country. For the sake of all of those who have been left behind in past centuries and for the sake of a fairer and healthier Nation, I ask my colleagues to support the CBC budget.

Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman CLYBURN for yielding me this time to present the CBC Health Budget.

This is a critical piece of the overall Budget and Agenda. Our health is the necessary underpinning of everything else we aspire to accomplish to make our communities whole, and prepared to meet the challenges of the new Century and the Coming millennium.

What defines our Health Agenda and thus this budget are the glaring disparities in health status, and services that exist for the African American community and other communities of color. HIV and AIDS has been our focus, and rightfully so because of our overwhelmingly disproportionate numbers, and the devastation it has wrought in our communities.

But we also die and are disabled in far greater proportion than our representation in the population from heart disease, cancer, diabetes, infant mortality, stroke and other diseases in numbers greater than all other minority groups combined.

Our budget not only includes funding to address prevention and treatment for HIV/AIDS

and related illnesses, and continue and expands capacity building within communities of color in this country for this disease, it will extend this effort to the international community. Beyond this it will better address some of the glaring infrastructure deficiencies that have caused the epidemic to take root, and the other diseases to have such adverse impact, severely reducing our life expectancy, in our communities in the first place.

Mr. Chairman, responding to our health needs is nothing less than an emergency, and a matter of national security.

We ask our colleagues to consider the CBC request in that light.

More specifically, this budget will include a minimum of $500 million for the CBC Minority HIV/AIDS initiative.

In addition to continuing the programs already started, the increase will allow us to address HIV and AIDS in correctional facilities, increase funding to more vulnerable and at-risk groups, such as women and youth, increase prevention and treatment activities for Syphilis, other sexually transmitted diseases and substance abuse which contribute greatly to this crisis, expand research, increase Medicaid funding to provide treatment at the earlier stages of HIV infection, bring our programs to smaller cities and rural areas, and greatly increase the technical assistance that limited many of our community based organizations from taking advantage of these important resources.

In the broader area of the disparities, we are asking for $162.3 million for REACH—Racial and Ethnic Approach to Community Health—to expand this program beyond the now 32 communities who have been provided the resources to improve their health outcomes. The CBC Budget will also enhance funding for the Health Careers Opportunities Program, and National Health Service Corps to do better outreach and provide scholarships for young people of color to enter health profession schools. We would fully fund the provisions of H.R. 1860, H.R. 2391, and H.R. 3250, to increase access for providers and patients of color into managed care, address the need for data, and diversity training in the health professions, and elevate the Office of Minority Health Research at NIH to a center.

Mr. Chairman, in all this, we have grave concern for the welfare of our children, and are committed to giving them the best possible start in life. The CBC Budget therefore funds the continuation and strengthening of Healthy Start in communities of color and other disadvantaged communities, in the amount of $130 million. This measure also provides, among other things, for increased child care. In this regard our request is above that of the Department, at $917 million.

Our communities are at great risk. The elimination of health disparities in African American communities and other communities of color is one of the most important challenges facing this country.

For the sake of all of those who have been left behind in past centuries, and for the sake of a fairer and healthier nation, I ask my colleagues to support the CBC budget.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL of Montana. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I have only had the privilege of serving in this House for 4 years. Over these 4 years we have had this annual budget debate. What I have noticed is that my Democratic colleagues have come to the floor every one of those 4 years, and they have predicted doom and gloom over the Republican budget. They are the most pessimistic group of people I have ever met in my life.

When Republicans 4 years ago said that we wanted to balance the budget, this group cried crocodile tears saying that we were going to create great hardship in America. But they were wrong when they said that budget would threaten seniors. They were wrong when they said that budget would threaten Social Security. They were wrong when they said that budget would threaten the economy. The fact is the economy is now stronger, Social Security is more secure than ever, Medicare is more solvent than it has been in over a decade; and we are doing more to educate our children today than we ever have.

Just last year when Republicans said we were going to set aside 100 percent of Social Security for Social Security, they said that was impossible. But we did it. Some of those who were so strong in their opposition now cannot wait to stand in line to take credit for that effort. Two years ago, we said we could lower taxes and we could keep the economy growing. They said that tax cut was irresponsible, some said it was a risky scheme; and they said it would undermine government. They were wrong again.

I asked my constituents what should we do with this surplus. Here is what they said. They said protect Social Security so that Congress cannot raid it ever again in the future. They said pay down the debt. This budget pays down $1 trillion of the debt in 5 years, and pays it off entirely by the year 2015. They said to me, let us modernize Medicare. We have made it solvent now till the middle of the next decade, but let us modernize it. This budget sets aside $40 billion to do that. And then they said, let us make the Tax Code fairer than it has been. Get rid of this marriage penalty and the unfair death tax that is out there.

But bigger government and higher taxes were never on that list. But one or the other of every one of the Democrat alternatives either raises taxes or cuts Medicare or puts more IOUs in the Social Security Trust Fund, and that is wrong. They are wrong again. I say reject all of these Democrat plans and support the Republican budget.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

(Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the budget we are trying to accomplish here has six very simple principles. We have been talking about these six principles today, but I want to talk about the Social Security portion of our budget, the most important aspect of this budget. This budget with Social Security starts on the work we tried to accomplish last year. If Members recall last year, Mr. Chairman, the President sent us a budget that said he would take 38 percent of the Social Security surplus out of Social Security to spend on the creation of other government programs, 120 to be specific, and keep 62 percent of the Social Security surplus in Social Security. Last year we said, no, that is not enough. One hundred percent of Social Security should go to Social Security. We, in fact, did that.

But last year during consideration of this budget resolution, many Members from the other side of the aisle were actually saying we were raiding Social Security, we were taking money out of Social Security. So what actually happened last year? We heard the rhetoric, and we are hearing it again today. Let us dispense with the rhetoric and look at the results. The results are that for the first time in a generation, this Congress actually stopped the raid on Social Security. If we look at the year 1999, last year, we stopped raiding Social Security. This year, in the year 2000, we stopped raiding Social Security. What we are trying to accomplish is to forever stop the raid on the Social Security Trust Fund with this budget, make sure that every penny of Social Security taxes actually go to Social Security.

I am going to be bringing a piece of legislation to the floor later with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, to pass a law to make sure that we never again go back to the days of raiding the Social Security Trust Fund and so that we take that money to pay back the debt we owe to Social Security and pay off the national public debt.

If we take a look at the President's plan, the President tries to give the illusion that he is actually increasing the solvency of Social Security; but what the President's plan actually only does, and I would like to add the Spratt budget's plan as well, is take the Social Security government credit card and add more money to the credit card limit. They are putting more IOUs into the Social Security Trust Fund, not committing an additional penny to paying benefits to Social Security. But they are simply saying, put more IOUs, raise the credit card limit to Social Security and hope the problem goes away.

Mr. Chairman, we need results. We need legislation that actually stops the raiding of Social Security. We need to pass this budget resolution.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to stand in strong support of the Congressional Black Caucus budget. This substitute shows that supporting good fiscal policy does not have to mean excluding low-wage workers, the poor,

communities of color and African Americans. This budget increases domestic spending by 50 percent and spends 25 percent less on defense by cutting waste, fraud and abuse.

Let me highlight what we have proposed in the areas of housing and also in order to end the HIV/AIDS crisis abroad. First, the Congressional Black Caucus addresses these issues by investing $1 billion more for section 8 housing, $100 million more for the community development block grant program, and $350 million more for the HOME program. We also invest over $1 billion over 5 years to stop the spread of HIV and AIDS in countries hardest hit in sub-Saharan Africa and the Caribbean.

□ 1845

It funds H.R. 3519, the World Bank AIDS Marshal Trust Fund Plan. And we passed that last week out of the House Banking Committee. I stand in strong support for the CBC alternative.

Mr. Chairman, I commend my colleagues for their vision and leadership in bringing this to the floor.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

I congratulate the caucus for a budget that very well represents what the priorities ought to be. We have a very wealthy Nation now. We have a greater degree of power disparity between the United States militarily and the rest of the world than we have ever seen in our history.

What this budget does is to make a sensible, prudent reduction in the amount of money spent on the military so that we can deal with the real threats to America's security to the problems of health, poverty, inadequate education. We have a real deadlock in this country right now. We have people telling us that we ought to participate more enthusiastically in the international economy for the World Trade Organizations and elsewhere.

As long as grave disparities persist within this country, as long as lower-income people, people working at the low end of the skill level feel threatened by it, we are not going to be able to go forward. This budget takes a very big set of steps forward towards creating within the United States by reducing the excess that the military has gotten the kind of social stability that we need as a framework for going forward.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) has 10½ minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE).

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

I would first like to compliment the Congressional Black Caucus on their budget. Every year since I have been in Congress, the CBC has come forward with a budget. It is not easy to do; but every single year, you have in a very responsible way outlined your priorities.

And, in fact, it has always amazed me that you have been able to do a better job than even, in some instances, over the last 7 years than our President has been able to do in outlining the priorities that you happen to believe in and putting real numbers with those priorities.

Your numbers add up. The concern I have with the President's budget, and it is probably the reason why the Congressional Black Caucus and so many others are providing substitute amendments is they do not agree with the priorities that the President has laid out. We did not agree with that either.

We felt it was important to protect 100 percent of the Social Security Trust Fund; to strengthen Medicare and provide a real prescription drug benefit within that; to retire the public debt entirely; to promote tax fairness for families, farmers, seniors; to restore America's defense, and to do it in a way that recognizes that people do come first; and strength for support for education and science.

Let me just talk about Medicare, because I think this is the one that probably is the most different. We have heard so many folks run to the floor today to talk about how their plan looks exactly like the Republicans, and there is a reason, because when the Democrats or through the President provided their original proposal, what we found out is that the way they paid for a prescription drug benefit was by cutting Medicare.

You cut Medicare in one side to pay for increases in another side, and those increases did not even take effect to the fourth year. So the President held this great Rose Garden ceremony and had a great 96-minute State of the Union address; and he said how we were all going to have prescription drug benefit and then didn't fund it in the budget he proposed 2 weeks later.

So I can understand why you would come forward with a substitute amendment, a substitute amendment that hopefully does not cut, as the President does, the kidney program, the hospital payments. As I said to a gentleman earlier today, you cannot close hospitals around this country and extend a prescription drug benefit and call that health care.

If my hospital in my hometown of Manchester, Iowa, closes, that is a 30-minute drive for everybody who lives in my town for every emergency that occurs in that town, and you can add up your own miles and minutes that that would occur. You cannot cut hospitals to give a prescription drug benefit. That is why we reject the President's budget, and I believe that is why you do, too.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, we all know that budgets really are about priorities. And this budget presented by the Congressional Black Caucus speaks to the needs of millions of Americans who, in many instances, are left behind and left out of the great economic expansion we are experiencing.

It speaks to the needs of the 165,000 people in my congressional direct who live at or below the poverty line and millions of others throughout America. It speaks to the needs of individuals living in public housing and low-income communities. This budget is compassionate, comprehensive, and balanced.

This budget would provide 250 million additional dollars for community and migrant health centers who do an outstanding job of providing health care for the poor.

In reality, Mr. Chairman, this budget protects Medicare, Social Security, and small businesses and provides a prescription drug benefit for older Americans.

It lifts a lot of those considered to be at the bottom of the economic ladder, the working poor, children, older Americans. I am proud to support it and urge its adoption.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, might I clarify, we do have the right to close, is that correct? We may end up having 1 minute or 1½ minutes that we will be able to yield over. We will go through our speakers and see how much time we do have.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman is correct, he does have the right to close.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU).

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, the preceding speakers on this side talked a little bit about the vision and the values that are embodied in the Republican budget, setting aside every penny of Social Security, paying down debt. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) talked about the importance of setting aside $40 billion, not just to cover prescription drug benefits but to improve and strengthen the Medicare system as well.

We have heard about the investments that we think are important to make in education and in defense and in basic science, and, of course, the tax relief that is in this budget, to make the Tax Code more fair and to reduce taxes for all Americans. And, unfortunately, that is one of the real shortcomings of the alternative being offered here, not only does it not lower taxes, it increases taxes, and that is just the wrong direction to take the country.

Let us, in fact, look where we have come over the past few years, even

while cutting taxes. Under this Republican Congress, we have seen the public debt begin to decrease. We are actually making payments against the debt held by the public, reducing that debt and increasing America's financial security.

We can see clearly the red, increases in debt year after year under a Democrat Congress. The tide was turned in 1998. Shortly after we had a Republican Congress, clearly the amount of debt was lower and lower in 1996, 1997. And what has happened over the past 4 years? What a turn around. In 1998, we paid down over $50 billion in debt; 1999 paid down over $80 billion in debt; and in fact, with this Republican budget that is here on the floor today, we will reduce the debt held by the public $450 billion over just 4 years.

It gets even better, because over the next 5 years we will pay down a trillion dollars in public debt, reducing the public debt, keeping interest rates low, even while making the Tax Code more fair, eliminating death tax provisions, giving health insurance deductibility for those that are self-employed.

Those are the values that are embodied in the Republican budget, and that is why we should reject this alternative and support the resolution.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, if there is no objection, we have 1½ minutes of our time we can yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) and allow him to distribute it.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, that means that according to my records we have 5 minutes left?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, my understanding is we have 4½ minutes remaining?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN).

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) for yielding, and I also recognize the hard work of the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS).

Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise in strong support of the CBC budget. The Congressional Black Caucus gives a progressive vision with an emphasis on education. We need to look to our future, and that means protecting education for our children. The CBC budget emphasizes an increase for Head Start to help our youngest children; an increase in Pell grants to help young people who are trying to go to college; and, critically, an increase in the 21st century schools programs that will enable us to provide care for young people after school to address the problem of crime and violence.

This is a progressive vision of a budget that will work for all Americans. I urge support of the CBC budget.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, America's veterans are not just Function 700 of the budget. They are the men and women who put their lives on the line protecting our freedom, and they need to be made a priority now, when they need our help the most.

I will never understand how Republicans can offer billions of dollars of tax cuts while our veterans are struggling for the services in health care that we promised them. The CBC budget offers our veterans the service that they have earned. It provides additional funds for medical research, nursing home construction, and the Montgomery GI bill, and the VA Center for Minority Veterans.

Mr. Chairman, we talk about a surplus; but we cannot have a surplus when we have not paid our bills. We owe the veterans. We should make them a priority, and I urge the support of the CBC budget substitute.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, since we have such little time, we have heard about the domestic priorities which I support, I would just like to say that in light of the flooding in Mozambique we have requested $320 million to the Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance to support in that emergency. Also we are asking for emergency supplemental of $1.6 billion for the HIPC countries hit by the floods, such as Mozambique, South Africa, Madagascar, Zimbabwe, and Zambia.

We also ask to restore the Development Fund for Africa to $804 million. This budget also provides an additional $100 million for the African Development Fund; $10 million for the Great Lakes Initiative, designed to build a credible and impartial system of justice in that region. We support an additional $200 million for AIDS through the World Bank; $60 million for economic development to support democratic institutions in Haiti; and $1 million to support bilateral/multilateral efforts in Papua New Guinea and to help the United Nations administration resolve the conflict on the island of Bougainville.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, we are evaluating all of the budgets based on six basic principles. One is to protect Social Security surpluses. Another is to provide for prescription drugs. Another is to retire debt. Another is to promote tax fairness. Another is to restore America's defense and strengthen education, science and health care. That is why we oppose the budget that is coming before us.

With regards to tax cuts, we want to provide an end to the marriage penalty tax, repeal Social Security earnings limits, reduce the death tax, expand educational savings accounts, increase health care deductibility, provide tax breaks for poor communities, and strengthen private pensions.

The President regretfully came in with a gross tax increase of $96 billion. Republicans have no tax increase. This tax increase results in the fact that next year the President would increase taxes $10 billion; we would cut taxes $10 billion.

Finally, over 5 years, the President has a net tax cut of $5 billion. We have over $200 billion of tax relief.

The reason we have that is we want a marriage penalty tax elimination. We want to eliminate and phase out the death tax. We have educational savings accounts. We would have health care deductibility. We had community renewal and we want pension reform.

The bottom line for us is that we need to get our country's financial house in order. A tax cut is part of it. We are cutting down and reducing debt. We are saving Social Security. We are providing $200 billion in the next 5 years for a tax cut.

□ 1830

It is only 2 percent of all revenues that are going to come in, $10 trillion, and we are asking this Congress to accept the fact that the taxpayers deserve a break of $200 billion in the next 5 years.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the Chair the time remaining?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Each side has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this substitute, and especially call attention to the section dealing with the National Science Foundation and NASA, which is the area that will have the potential of closing the digital divide. I will point out that the President's recommendations clearly took care of this area.

This is not a substitute for the President's proposal, it is a substitute for the Republican's proposal. If the President's proposal had been presented here today, we would have very little alteration to it.

So I rise in support of this substitute, in lieu of the fact that we have to speak on behalf of the people.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget is fiscally sound and family fair. It continues our stride towards debt elimination, one of those

principles, while making a stand against poverty. It protects Social Security and Medicare, while giving priority to our families and our children.

Mr. Chairman, we are experiencing the longest economic expansion in the history of the United States. However, many people are left out of that. Housing is an example of that. In fact, The Washington Post said that people are sleeping in their cars making $60,000.

Mr. Chairman, in our proposal there is a reasonable proposal in section 8, $100 million, and it could go into $1 billion, and you could buy homes. That is the way you accumulate wealth.

Mr. Chairman, The Congressional Black Caucus Alternative Budget is fiscally sound and family fair.

It continues our stride towards debt elimination, while making a stand against poverty.

It protects Social Security and Medicare while giving priority to our families and our children.

Mr. Chairman, we are experiencing the longest economic expansion in the history of the United States.

However, despite this rosy economic picture, many are being left out.

One sign of this dichotomy is in the area of housing.

It should concern all of us that, according to a recent report in the Washington Post, a man earning Sixty Thousand Dollars a year can not afford housing in Silicon Valley.

He sleeps in his car.

The headline in a recent edition of the Christian Science Monitor is equally alarming, ''Hot economy, but more homelessness''.

Housing is basic.

Housing affects every person alive on this earth.

Everyone has to live somewhere.

The lack of adequate housing is a problem, but the lack of affordable housing is an even greater problem.

A growing number of poor households have been left to compete for a shrinking supply of affordable housing.

The Congressional Black Caucus Alternative Budget addresses this problem, and we do so without any new spending. No offsets are required.

In our Budget, we shift $100 Million of Section 8 Voucher Funds to a cash assistance program.

This program would be used to promote home ownership, and thereby, stabilize families, help create wealth and ultimately reduce the dependency on Section 8 funds.

Moreover, when leveraged against private sector dollars, this program is valued at least ten times the amount of the investment.

One Hundred Million Dollars multiplies to a Billion Dollars.

Mr. Chairman, housing is the most important asset for wealth accumulation.

Home ownership is a good way to ease ''Cost-burden.''

Home ownership instills pride in a family.

Home ownership provides dignity.

When one owns a home, they are more likely to take care of it, maintain it and keep it clean and presentable.

The Congressional Black Caucus Alternative Budget embodies prudent economic policies while putting people as priority. It deserves our support.

THE NATION'S ECONOMY IS ROBUST

The economy of the United States is strong and robust, however, the challenge of the Congressional Black Caucus to find ways to have more citizens benefit from the growth we are currently experiencing.

We are experiencing the longest economic expansion in the history of the United States. We have gone from record federal deficits to record surpluses. 20 million new jobs have been created in the last eight years, and we currently have the highest overall home ownership rate ever, the lowest unemployment rate in 30 years and the lowest poverty rate in 20 years. Based upon current projections, we can expect to eliminate the federal debt in ten years. In 1992, when my Class entered Congress, we faced a $290 billion deficit that was on the rise and spiralling out of control. Today, we are anticipating a surplus in the unified budget of almost $3 trillion over the next ten years and to eliminating the federal debt by the year 2015.

YET, MANY ARE BEING LEFT OUT

For at least twenty years, however, there has been a troubling trend emerging—a trend that affects the quality of life for many Americans. Income and wealth inequality—the disparity in incomes and wealth due to wages, accumulated wealth, equity, investments and returns, etc.—has increased in intensity. As a result of this trend, those who have more end up getting more, while those who have less end up merely treading water, or in some instances, getting less.

This is a disturbing trend because, even in this time of prosperity, many Americans still cannot afford to purchase healthy meals for their families night after night or afford decent housing or health care. Many still cannot afford education expenses and other means needed to better their lives. This is a disturbing trend because slightly less than one-third of Americans remain poor; many remain hungry; many remain homeless.

John C. Weicher, a Senior Fellow at the Hudson Institute notes that, ''Wealth is much more concentrated than income.'' The top 1 percent of U.S. households own roughly one-third of total household net worth, yet receive roughly 10 percent of income. On the other hand, some 20 percent of the poorest households have no net worth, and a few percent have negative net worth.

But, the most troubling aspect of this trend is that income and wealth inequality is often influenced by Government Policy—what Government does and does not do. This has been documented by reliable sources—the Internal Revenue Service, the Census Bureau, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities and the Federal Reserve Board, among others.

WHAT IS THE TREND?

*''By 1997, one Man, Bill Gates, was worth about as much as the 40 million American households at the bottom of the wealth distribution!''*

According to Edward N. Wolff, a Professor of Economics at New York University and a leading authority on income and wealth inequality. ''In the 1970s, the level of wealth inequality in the United States was comparable to that of other, developed, industrialized countries.'' Since 1983, however, those with incomes in top 5 percent have steadily accumulated wealth and grown income. Persons with incomes in the lower brackets, however, have steadily fallen behind in wealth accumulation and income growth. As a consequence, according to Professor Wolff, the United States has now become the most unequal society with respect to the distribution of wealth among industrialized nations.

This inequality is reflected in the raw income and wealth data as well as by the inequity's apparent social impact. Recent Survey of Consumer Finances information assembled by the Federal Reserve Board, illustrates that the ''mean'' household net worth—adding together the net worth of the rich and poor alike, and then finding an average value—is close to $250,000. However, the ''median'' household net worth—ranking net worth values and finding the very middle value in the overall distribution—is slightly more than $60,000.

To further illustrate, in 1983, the top 1 percent of our population held 34 percent of total net worth, while the bottom 40 percent held .9 percent. Since then, the share of the top 1 percent has grown to nearly 40 percent, while the share of the bottom 40 percent has declined, to .2 of one percent. In 1998 dollar values, mean net worth of the top 1 percent was more than $7 million and has now grown to almost $8 million. On the other hand, the mean net worth of the bottom 40 percent was $47,000 in 1983, and currently has declined to $10,000—a precipitous decline in net worth!

Professor Edward Wolff in noting the trend toward the greater concentration of wealth, is mindful of the racial implications of this trend. More than 95 percent of the top one percent of wealth holders are White. Less than 1 percent are Black. Asians represent about 4 percent of the top one percent of wealth holders. The wealthiest 20 percent of households own 84 percent of the Nation's wealth. The top 2.7 million Americans—mostly White Americans—have as much income as the bottom 100 million persons in the Nation, which encompasses a sizeable portion of Black Americans. This wealth gap will likely continue to grow, especially if our economy remains strong and prosperous. The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities has concluded that both the top 2 percent and the top 20 percent of households are projected to receive a larger share of the after-tax income in the United States than in any previous year since data began to be collected.

WAGES ARE THE MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR AFFECTING INCOME

There is a close association between wealth and income. Income, however, is largely driven by wages. Moreover, there is greater inequality in the distribution of wages than in the distribution of income generally. Yet, while employment has been growing and unemployment falling, hourly wages—taking inflation into account—have remained stagnant. Due to the fact that wages have remained relatively stagnant, the overall gap in income distribution has widened.

WHITES EARN MORE AND HAVE MORE THAN BLACKS

More than one-fifth of Black households, about 21 percent, have incomes under $10,000 per year. Another 30 percent of Blacks have annual incomes above $10,000 but below $25,000. Thus, more than half of Black households have incomes below $25,000. On the other hand, only 11 percent of all Americans have incomes under $10,000, while 22 percent of all Americans have incomes between $10,000 and $25,000. The per capita income of all White Americans is $20,425, while the per capita income of Black

Americans is $12,351. Asian Americans have a per capita income of $18,226, while Hispanics, the only group below Blacks, have a per capita income of $10,773.

THERE IS A RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EDUCATION, INCOME, AND WEALTH

More education generally means more income and more wealth. Those with more schooling generally experience fewer bouts with unemployment and have higher earnings. Male college graduates today earn 92 percent more, on average, than male high school graduates. This compares to thirty years ago, when male college graduates earned 50 percent more than their high school counterparts. Female college graduates have a similar earnings advantage over those females with only a high school diploma. This advantage grew from 41 percent in 1970 to 76 percent in 1998.

While education generally means higher earnings, Black men and women college graduates do not always fare as well as White men and women college graduates. And, for women, Black or White, income disparities remain between them and their male counterparts.

HOUSING AN IMPORTANT ASSET FOR INCREASING WEALTH

Owner-occupied housing is the single most important asset that increases wealth. Indeed, almost two-thirds of the wealth of the bottom eighty percent of households is invested in their home. Yet, in the past decade, the percentage of owner-occupied housing as it relates to all assets has declined from more than 30 percent in 1990 to less than 24 percent in 1998. Mortgage debt has increased, from 21 percent of the value of homeowners' property in 1983, to 36 percent in 1995. This increase in debt relates to income and wealth inequality. Inasmuch as debt accounts for less than 10 percent of the assets of the top 1 percent of the population, it accounts for 71.7 percent of the bottom 80 percent of the population.

WHAT ARE SOME PROBLEMS RELATED TO INCOME AND WEALTH INEQUALITY?

*Children are affected the most*

Until 1993, there had been a steady decline in the number of children in poverty. This decline however, has slowed markedly, and worse yet, the children who remain in poverty are becoming poorer. Changes in government policies and practices have had severe impacts on children. Food stamps and cash assistance to families have in the past, been a vital part of helping to reduce the stinging pain of poverty. However, according to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, in 1995, 88 children received food stamps for every 100 who were poor, while 57 children received cash assistance for every 100 such poor children. By 1998, only 72 out of 100 poor children received food stamps, and only 41 out of 100 poor children received cash assistance—the lowest proportion since 1970.

*Housing is often not affordable or available*

The lack of adequate housing is a problem, but the lack of affordable housing is an even greater problem. A growing number of poor households have been left to compete for a shrinking supply of affordable housing. Studies indicate that a dearth of some 4 million affordable housing units exists in the country.

Also, unfortunately, substandard housing is a way of life for millions across the Nation. As unimaginable as it may seem, in the year 2000, some 3 million renters and another 3 million owners of housing reside in homes without bathrooms or fully equipped kitchens, in homes with poor and dangerous electrical wiring, in homes with falling ceilings and peeling plaster and in homes that have little or no heat in the winter and little or no cooling in the summer. Overcrowding for many remains a harsh reality.

Recently, there have been record lows in mortgage interest rates, leaving many to believe that housing in the United States is more affordable than ever. That is not true. Despite lower mortgage rates, many people are unable to afford to purchase homes. This is because income growth for the poor and working poor has been limited. This group of Americans are ''cost-burdened'' under H.U.D. standards. That is, they spend more than 40 percent of their income for housing. Therefore, many in the ranks of the poor and working poor find themselves on a treadmill to nowhere when it comes to breaking into the home ownership market.

Much attention has been placed on low interest rates and ''affordable'' mortgages, but the rising prices of rental housing have been ignored. Families locked into paying spiraling rental costs have a more difficult time of improving the quality of their lives, lifting themselves up, warding off poverty, main streaming and laying a solid foundation for the future.

*Homelessness is on the rise*

For too long in America, the homeless have been those we do not want to see. We believed that the homeless were those who wanted to be homeless—vagrants and derelicts who just did not want to work to improve their situations. We now know better. We know that the causes of homelessness are poverty, joblessness, declining incomes, changing family structures and the lack of affordable housing.

While it is hard to obtain an accurate account of the homeless, some estimates suggest that there may be as many as one and a half million who are homeless in America on any given day. They are not vagrants and derelicts. According to a 1996 study by the Urban Institute, about one-fifth of the homeless are families, with children. Many are women, single, female heads of households. The average age of homeless adults is mid to late thirties. Many of the homeless have been jobless longer than they have been homeless. The homeless, in urban areas primarily, are also disproportionately minority. According to one estimate, 54 percent of the homeless are nonwhite persons.

The average homeless person experienced a range of health difficulties. More than half had at least one major health problem. Lethal problems like HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis occur with uncommon frequency among the homeless. At least half have had a problem with the debilitating diseases of alcohol and drug abuse. It is no wonder then that more than half of the homeless have suffered from depression and demoralization, many have a history of mental hospitalization. Suicide attempts, far too many, is a way of life. Homeless women with children are five times more likely to attempt suicide than other adults. Almost half of the homeless have answered this Nation's call in the Armed Services of the United States. A large number of these veterans, who happen to be homeless, suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder.

WHAT CAN THE CBC DO TO ADDRESS THESE CONCERNS?

While we cannot and must not rely solely on the Federal Government as the solution to our problems, we must be prepared to push our federal partners to provide more help with this problem. This pushing will not be easy, however, we know that the best way to stabilize our communities is by increasing home ownership and by providing a sufficient stock of affordable housing.

In July of last year, we convened our first Regional Housing Summit. There in Charlotte, North Carolina, we pledged to try to help create a million new African American homeowners. Home ownership is a good fundamental way to generate equity and wealth. Home ownership instills a sense of pride and dignity in families and communities alike. When people own homes, they are more likely to establish strong ties and commitments to the community, and because of those ties, are more inclined to become civically engaged.

One of the greatest barriers to home ownership, however, is credit. According to recent reports, a disproportionate number of African Americans are especially burdened by what the industry deems as ''bad credit.'' Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac have exercised important leadership in dealing with credit problems many African Americans face. This is the kind of leadership we need as we begin this new millennium.

So, what do we have to do? First, we need to join together and push the public and private sectors to help resolve the ''hurricane-like'' housing situations that African Americans face each and every day.

Second, we have to fight to preserve Section 8 Housing and to increase funding for the Community Development Block Grant Program—the largest source of federal funding for housing. We need to protect the Community Reinvestment Act—an act that has played a critical role in improving housing. We need to be strong advocates for the full funding of the Shelter Plus Care Program. Let us push for improvement in the Section 202/811 GAP Funding Program. Let us ensure that Congress extends the HOPE Six Program. Let us vow that our elderly are properly housed. We must push for adequate funding for Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities. If we advocate and fight for the provisions listed above, we will have taken measurable steps toward bringing more African Americans into the fold of home ownership and decent housing.

EXAMPLES OF RELATED GOVERNMENT POLICIES AND PRACTICES WE CAN INFLUENCE

Increasing the minimum wage or restructuring tax rates are obvious ways to increase income for those who have less. There are, however, other actions we can seek, actions that in some cases may be more achievable. The mortgage deduction program in the United States is an $83 billion program. Again, however, the largest beneficiaries of this program are those with more income and wealth. Those with less income and wealth get fewer benefits from this program Some $53 billion of the mortgage deduction program benefit those in the higher income brackets. The other $30 billion benefits those in the remaining income brackets. Thus, persons earning $40,000 and below get minimal benefits from the program.

Do persons like Bill Gates really need to participate in the mortgage deduction program? What harm would it do to the rich—

what good might it do the working class—if the mortgage deduction program were changed to exclude those with incomes of a quarter of a million dollars or more and to ensure substantive benefits for those with incomes of $40,000 or less? The answer is no harm, but a lot of good!

Another example relates to how we spend money for housing programs. The President is seeking additional funds for Section 8 vouchers, and that, on its face, is a good thing. However, we have had generation upon generation of families, dislocated from the rest of society, isolated in public housing and, very often, dependent upon the government to provide them with a relatively decent place to live. Why not take some of those Section 8 funds and provide a suitable amount of cash assistance to these families—assistance that can be used to finance homes! If we do that, these families can begin the process of reducing their reliance on government and take the first step toward accumulating equity and wealth.

Investing in education can produce similar results. Education is a major contributor to net worth. According to reports, the average wealth of college graduates is 2.5 times the wealth of those with only a high school diploma. Moreover, a better educated population means a stronger and better work force, well into the future. We must develop programs and policies that provide lower income and working families with affordable educational options for our children.

For too long, the rich have gotten richer and the poor have gotten poorer, and America is less well off because of that trend. We, in the Congressional Black Caucus must work to reverse this trend. This rising tide of economic prosperity must lift many more boats. That is why it is important that we present and push an Alternative Budget. In so doing, we can send a critical message and lay the foundation for the enactment of authorizing and appropriations language that will impact Government policies and practices that will begin to reverse the severity of existing income and wealth inequality trends. By presenting and pushing an Alternative Budget, we can force policies and measures that benefit all of society, not just those who are better off.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK).

(Mrs. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the only budget that has been submitted that will help the conscience of the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Congressional Black Caucus' (CBC) substitute budget for FY 2001. Included in the CBC budget is an allocation for $150 million in support of lupus research and the delivery of lupus services. These funds will help to expand and intensify the research efforts of the NIH to diagnose, treat, and eventually cure lupus.

Lupus attacks the immune system. A patient's immune system loses its ability to tell the difference between foreign substances and the patient's own cells. As a result, the patient's immune system makes antibodies which end up attacking the patient's immune system. This can result in debilitating pain and fatigue, making it difficult for lupus victims to maintain employment and lead normal lives. Lupus can be fatal if not detected and treated early.

Thousands of women with lupus die each year. Lupus afflicts women nine times more than it does men, and has its most significant impact on women during the childbearing years. About 1.4 million Americans have some form of Lupus—one out of every 185 Americans. As estimated 1 in 250 African American women between the ages of 15 and 65 develop lupus.

Perhaps the most discouraging aspect of lupus for sufferers and family members is the fact that there is no cure. Lupus is devastating not only to the victim, but to family members as well. Research, treatment, education and financial support are essential so that we can help victims and their families cope until we are able to conquer this terrible disease.

I urge my colleagues to join us in providing this essential support for persons suffering from lupus and vote in favor of the CBC budget.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this fundamentally fair and morally principled budget.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentleman from California (Ms. WATERS).

(Ms. WATERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute budget.

I rise to support the alternative budget resolution presented by the Congressional Black Caucus (CBC). In particular, the CBC's alternative is significant for the funding allocated in the International Affairs portion of the budget resolution.

Between the fiscal years 2001 and 2005, the CBC budget resolution would allocate $43 billion more to International Affairs compared to the Republican budget resolution. This would provide essential funding to institutions such as the African Development Bank, the African Development Fund, the Child Survival and Disease Fund, and the Peace Corps.

This additional funding is critical particularly to ensure full funding for debt relief for heavily indebted poor countries.

Today, I am introducing the Limpopo River Debt Relief and Reconstruction Act to provide assistance to Mozambique and other countries of southern Africa that have been devastated by recent floods.

The Limpopo River Debt Relief and Reconstruction Act would completely cancel the debts owed by these countries to the United States and provide assistance for the repair and reconstruction of damaged infrastructure in these countries. Limpopo River Debt Relief and Reconstruction funding is essential to enable Mozambique and other southern African countries to provide for the needs of their people, repair their damaged infrastructure and rebuild their economies.

Debt relief is desperately needed by many other heavily indebted poor countries as well. The governments of these countries have been forced to make drastic cuts in basic services such as health and education in order to make payments on their debts.

Nigeria, for example, is a deeply impoverished country that would receive tremendous benefits from debt relief. Nigeria's per capita income is only $300 per year and the country spends no more than $5 per person per year on health services. Without debt relief, Nigeria's fragile democracy is in danger of collapse. Debt cancellation will give Nigeria a fresh start and a sound basis for a democratic future.

For these and many other important reasons, I urge my colleagues to support the Congressional Black Caucuses' alternative budget.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

(Mrs. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the other side for being so generous with their time this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, to close this debate, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), who sort of put this whole thing together for us.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) for his leadership in directing the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) and myself to prepare this budget. This budget, as you have heard, clearly reflects the priorities of the Congressional Black Caucus. Those priorities reflect our district.

For too long this economic upswing has missed a lot of the people we represent. So our budget, offered in the nature of a substitute, clearly directs the resources of this country to those individuals who have been left out.

Mr. Chairman, this budget will increase the education budget over $10 billion. We have to do something about educating our children.

In addition to this, we have to work on housing. The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) talked about a housing initiative for home ownership. We support that home ownership initiative.

More than that, Mr. Chairman, this budget is a balanced budget. Unlike many budgets of the past, we understand fiscal integrity. So what we have offered, in addition to this balanced budget, is one that also provides modest tax cuts for working Americans.

Mr. Chairman, we also protect Social Security, Medicare, and, yes, we pay down on the national debt.

Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Black Caucus budget is a reasonable

budget, and one I urge all my colleagues to support.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the vice chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to take a minute to commend the Black Caucus for putting this budget together and setting their priorities right. I have an historic black college in my district, Fort Valley State University, which I am very proud to represent and work very closely with those folks individually as well as through the university system to ensure their priorities are addressed. I have any number of good friends who are members of this caucus, and we appreciate the hard work that you all have done.

I want to talk for just a minute and remind folks again why we deem our budget to be the best. First of all, we are going to save and continue to protect Social Security by setting aside 100 percent of the Social Security surplus to pay the beneficiaries of Social Security. We are going to strengthen Medicare to include a prescription drug provision. We are going to retire the public debt. We are going to set it on course to be retired by 2013. In this budget, over the next 5 years we are going to retire $1 trillion worth of debt.

We are going to promote tax fairness for families, for small business people, for farmers, and for seniors. We are going to restore America's defense, and we are going to strengthen support for education and science.

I want to take just a minute to refer back to the defense budget that the President has submitted and show again what we have done with respect to plussing up the President's defense budget over the last 5 years. The red line represents the President's proposed budget. The blue line represents what we in this Congress have passed. The majority has made a real commitment to the defense of this country, and we continue to do so in this budget.

There is one particular provision that I want to make reference to that has an effect on everybody in this room, and it is the provision on impact aid. If you live near a military reservation, a military base of any sort, and you do not get the appropriate impact aid for your school system, then the ad valorem taxpayers in that jurisdiction wind up paying a penalty.

So what the President has done every year that this majority has been in Congress is to come in with a reduction in his budget for impact aid. What that is is a hidden tax on the landowners or everybody who resides close to a military base. We have got to have impact aid going to the school districts where our children are educated if they are going to get the quality education that we demand.

So what we have done over the last 5 years, what we again do in our budget this year, is to plus up the President's budget from an impact aid standpoint, so that we can ensure that all children, irrespective of whether their parents are in the military or not, will be able to get the quality of education that we dictate and demand.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the Black Caucus budget and a ''yes'' vote on the Republican budget.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the substitute amendment to H. Con. Res. 290 offered by Representative CLYBURN.

In particular, I offer my enthusiastic support for the $225.5 million in funding the substitute provides to the National Telecommunications and Information Agency (NTIA). NTIA administers many important programs designed to begin closing the Digital Divide—the gap between those with access to the Internet and information technologies and those without. NTIA will also be active next year in encouraging meaningful improvements to the Nation's telecommunications infrastructure by giving directed research and program grants.

Mr. Chairman, I am encouraged that the Clyburn substitute allocates $97.5 million to NTIA's Digital Divide cluster of programs. The centerpiece of this cluster of programs is the allocation of $45.1 million to fund grants for the Technology Opportunities Program. The Technology Opportunities Program matches private contributions with government funds to promote the widespread availability of advanced telecommunications technologies. Dollars allocated through this program would be used to purchase equipment for building networks and linking networks to one another, connect communications networks such as the Internet, train people in the use of equipment and software, and purchase telephone links and access to commercial on-line services. With these projects, rural and low-income communities that may not otherwise have the means or opportunity, are able to tap into the wealth of information that is accessible via advanced telecommunications technologies and use this technology to improve the delivery of health care, public safety efforts and other services.

Another important allocation for part of the NTIA's Digital Divide cluster of programs is $50.0 million for the Home Internet Access Program. This new program would provide low-income individuals and families with the connections, training, and support necessary for full participation in today's information economy. The goal of the Home Internet Access program is to bridge the digital divide by providing targeted investments to bring these at-risk populations online.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to closing the Digital Divide, the Clyburn substitute would support NTIA's programs to support critical infrastructure projects. Specifically, the Clyburn substitute allocates $110.1 million for Public Telecommunications Facilities, Planning, and Construction. Grants funded by this allocation would assist communities in purchasing the equipment needed by local public broadcasting organizations to meet the 2003 FCC deadline for public broadcasting organizations to convert to digital transmission.

Mr. Chairman, the Digital Divide is a major socio-economic problem facing our nation today, and it threatens future opportunities for large segments of the population that lack access to the Internet and other new technologies. In the new digital age, it is vital that all Americans have access to the new telecommunications and information technologies, and the Clyburn substitute provides essential funding to meet this challenge.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) as the designee of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 70, noes 348, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 70]

AYES—70

Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Berman
Bishop
Blumenauer
Bonior
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Capuano
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Conyers
Coyne
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
Engel
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kilpatrick
Kucinich
Larson
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Markey
Martinez
McGovern
McKinney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Millender-McDonald
Mink
Nadler
Napolitano
Olver
Owens
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Rahall
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Scott
Serrano
Stark
Thompson (MS)
Towns
Velazquez
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Woolsey
Wynn

NOES—348

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clement
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crowley
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
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)
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
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
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—16

Ackerman
Archer
Bonilla
Crane
Dixon
Greenwood
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Largent
Lowey
McCollum
McDermott
McHugh
Quinn
Royce
Schakowsky
Vento

□ 1900

Ms. DEGETTE and Messrs. PALLONE, ADERHOLT and BEREUTER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. KUCINICH, FARR of California, JACKSON of Illinois, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in Part B of House Report 106–535.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Part B Amendment No. 2 in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. DEFAZIO:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

**SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001.**

The Congress declares that concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001 and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2002 through 2005 are hereby set forth.

**SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.**

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2005:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2001: $1,533,703,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,582,252,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,634,316,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,702,913,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,766,406,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be reduced are as follows:

Fiscal year 2001: $0.
Fiscal year 2002: $4,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $10,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $17,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $24,000,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2001: $1,558,245,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,595,233,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,640,506,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,706,914,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,775,092,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2001: $1,502,313,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,566,294,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,616,960,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,682,278,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,752,016,000,000.

(4) SURPLUSES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the surpluses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2001: $31,390,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $15,958,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $17,357,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $20,636,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $14,390,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2001: $_____.
Fiscal year 2002: $_____.
Fiscal year 2003: $_____.
Fiscal year 2004: $_____.
Fiscal year 2005: $_____.

**SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.**

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and budget outlays for fiscal years 2001 through 2005 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $276,216,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $274,507,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $279,140,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $276,447,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $284,794,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $283,017,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $291,766,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $287,368,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $299,355,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $296,317,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $21,710,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,979,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $22,306,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,691,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $22,615,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,617,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $23,120,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,998,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $23,777,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,284,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $19,527,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,857,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $19,883,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,508,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $20,141,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,727,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $20,732,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,129,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $21,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,573,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $1,238,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $197,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $1,310,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $1,186,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−83,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $1,265,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−131,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $1,297,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−31,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $26,862,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,926,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $26,621,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,619,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $26,325,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,416,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $27,004,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,626,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $27,518,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,851,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $21,697,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,923,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $19,848,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $18,583,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $16,093,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,633,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $15,498,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,944,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $14,230,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,642,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $6,827,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,656,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $8,988,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,089,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $9,711,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,016,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $14,144,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,099,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $14,150,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,076,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $58,756,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,537,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $55,580,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,270,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $57,017,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,712,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $58,439,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,403,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $60,077,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,326,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $20,048,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,279,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $30,420,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,144,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $30,780,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,710,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $31,723,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,944,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $32,542,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,855,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $85,882,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,768,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $86,635,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $82,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $87,788,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $85,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $89,453,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $87,708,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $91,570,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $89,757,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $171,749,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $166,795,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $184,237,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $181,297,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $197,553,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $194,924,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $213,097,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $211,383,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $231,207,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $230,061,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $218,227,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $214,711,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $227,226,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $225,737,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $243,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $242,517,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $265,454,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,253,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $289,877,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $289,519,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $265,819,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $260,890,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $276,396,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $277,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $287,353,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $289,509,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $299,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $301,594,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $313,203,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $316,095,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $9,723,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,723,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $11,567,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,567,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $12,266,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,266,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $13,013,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,013,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $13,833,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,833,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $47,791,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,703,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $50,428,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,125,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $51,903,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,606,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $53,248,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,906,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $56,651,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,285,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $80,392,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,814,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $30,869,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,297,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $30,655,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,472,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $30,866,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,077,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $31,579,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,503,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $15,924,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,190,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $16,053,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,512,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $16,131,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,816,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $16,392,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,465,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $16,619,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,512,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $287,910,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $287,910,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $288,957,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $288,956,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $284,821,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $284,821,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $280,128,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $280,128,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $275,160,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $275,160,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $20,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $−38,073,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−38,073,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $−41,230,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−41,230,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $−40,381,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−40,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $−37,629,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−37,629,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $−38,652,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−38,652,000,000.

**SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.**

The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report to the House a reconciliation bill not later than May 26, 2000, that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to increase the total level of revenues by $9,345,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and $151,574,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 446, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is a debate about values and priorities. We are setting the scene for the entire spending of the budget of the United States of America, all the billions of dollars in taxes collected from our citizens. We want to see a change in the priorities.

Today, the United States ranks first in military spending. We spend five times as much as our strongest potential adversary, the Russians, who are pretty pathetic. Yet, the United States is tenth, tenth in per capita education spending. If we addressed what the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman KASICH) of the Committee on the Budget referred to earlier as sloppy management at the Pentagon with the 10 percent cut in exotic weapons procurement, keeping whole the readiness budget, keeping whole the housing, personnel, and other budgets, supporting our troops, we could be number one in the world in military spending by four and a half times instead of five times our next adversary.

But we could move from tenth to first in education. We could invest more in health care; in our veterans, fulfilling our obligations to them; infrastructure; schools; clean waters; sewers; transportation; housing. The list goes on.

The Republican budget assumes that all of those things I listed, except for the Pentagon, will be reduced by $19 billion below current levels of spending. Our budget, instead, would raise the levels of spending on education by more than $20 billion over the Republican levels. Health care would be dramatically increased. We would increase veterans over $2 billion over the Republican budget. Infrastructure, schools, clean water, sewers, housing, the list goes on.

This is about priorities, and it is about values, and it is about how we spend our people's money. We are proposing a budget that would spend the money more in line with the values of a majority of the American people.

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

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA).

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I think the most important thing that we compare this budget to the budget that the Republicans have proposed is that the Republicans have proposed a balanced, common sense approach.

What will this mean to the average American family? It means that we will have a debt-free Nation for our children. We have balanced the budget. The Republican budget will pay down the $3.6 trillion debt over the next 13 years. It means a more secure future for our seniors. We stop the 30-year raid on Social Security, and we preserve the Social Security surplus into the future.

It means a stronger effort to find cures for cancer and Alzheimer's. We are making a significant commitment to further research in the health area.

It means a safer world and fulfilling our pledge to those who made it that way. We are going to keep our commitment to our veterans.

We increase funding for education. What we do in education is we target those dollars so that, when the Federal dollars get down to the local level, it gives the local entities a maximum amount of flexibility to design the programs that best fit the needs of that community, that school, and the children in that area.

We increase funding for IDEA, the Individuals With Disabilities Education. We increase funding for title VI. This is innovative education programs. This is the most flexible dollars that come to a local school district.

We keep our commitment to defense by ensuring that those communities that have defense installations will get the Federal assistance that they need.

What does this mean? It means that we give local communities maximum flexibility. It is a very different approach than what the President is taking. The President's approach, the Democratic approach, is to develop more programs and run them through a bureaucracy in Washington and force local communities to accept programs that do not necessarily work, in many cases that do not work at all. We are running them through a bureaucracy that for 2 years has failed its audits and has told us that for 2 more years we can expect failed audits. It means that we are running $35 billion through this agency each and every year, and they cannot tell us where the dollars are going.

The Republican budget says and the Republican program says let us get these dollars back to a local community, let us give these dollars to local administrators, to parents and teachers that know the names of our kids.

It is not an issue of spending. It is an issue of getting maximum effectiveness for each and every dollar that we have committed to education.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Oregon for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Progressive Caucus budget. Unlike the Republicans, progressives understand and have developed a budget which addresses the reality that millions of Americans today are working longer hours for lower wages; that this country has, by far, the most unfair distribution of wealth and income in the industrialized world; and that, while the wealthiest people have never had it so good, 20 percent of our children live in poverty, 44 million Americans lack health insurance, and millions more are unable to afford the prescription drugs they need.

This budget understands that many in the middle class are going deeply into debt to be able to send their kids to college and that we must significantly increase funding for education so that every child has the opportunity to succeed.

This budget understands that we do not need to give tax breaks to billionaires, spend huge sums of money on wasteful and unneeded weapons systems, or provide multinational corporations with $125 billion a year in corporate welfare.

Mr. Chairman, the progressive budget addresses two particular outrages that this Congress must deal with. First, we significantly increase funding for the veterans of this country who have put their lives on the line to defend this Nation, and we are proud to do that.

Secondly, this budget in a meaningful way begins to address the horrific Medicare cuts brought about by the so-called Balanced Budget Act of 1997, cuts which have caused terrible reductions in services for the elderly, in hospitals, home health care agencies, and nursing homes.

The bottom line is that when we talk about priorities, we do not give tax breaks to millionaires and billionaires and turn our backs on the elderly, the children, or the veterans. The Progressive Caucus budget is a sensible budget that meets the needs of the middle class and working families of this country and must be passed.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. FLETCHER), a member of the Committee on the Budget and also a member of the House Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot of rhetoric regarding this progressive budget. But let me say this, as I was listening, if Ronald Reagan had paid attention to this sort of rhetoric and allowed our national security to slip as much as what this progressive budget would be, I could imagine we would still have the Soviet Union, we would still have the Iron Curtain.

But let me talk about what our budget does. It protects 100 percent of the Social Security surplus, strengthens Medicare with prescription drugs, $40 billion for that. It retires the publicly held debt by the year 2013. It strengthens education and science, and I want to talk specifically about science. It promotes tax fairness. Eliminating the marriage penalty tax is not to the wealthy, it is a fairness issue. It gets to the very values that we have in eliminating the earnings limit and decreasing the inheritance tax and allow farmers to pass on their farm from one generation to the next. It restores America's defense.

I want to talk a little bit about NIH funding, the National Institutes of Health. As we can see from this chart, we clearly show that the Republican priority over the Clinton-Gore priority and the Democratic priority has been to fund basic research, the kind of research that provides the cures to diseases that affect every family in this country.

Let me read a statement from the NIH: In these final years of the 20th century, we have seen an explosion of progress against cancer. We have begun

to gather significant information from programs launched only 2 or 3 years ago, right during the time we increased the funding. With our recent funding increase, we have been able to launch innovative new programs that will have far-reaching effects into the next century.

I think about results from the breast cancer prevention trial, showing that we had a 49 percent reduction in the incident of primary breast cancer during the treatment period in women of high risk for the disease. Things like this that affect every single family in America.

Is there anybody out there that has not been affected by Alzheimer's disease?

We have one of the major centers at the University of Kentucky, the Sanders Brown Center for Aging that does a lot of research on Alzheimer's disease. NIH is very important to that institution providing money to back basic research. One day my hope is that we do not have any family affected by this disease that has such tragic effects.

Because of the increased funding, I am hopeful that one day, because of the Republican priorities, which stand for the values of making sure that we provide the health care for this Nation, that we are going to cure diseases like cancer, diabetes, and Alzheimer's disease.

So I encourage my colleagues to vote against this progressive budget, vote for the Republican budget. It provides the necessary basic dollars for science, education, national defense, paying down the debt, providing real tax relief and fairness, and protecting Social Security.

□ 1915

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS).

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I begin by congratulating the Progressive Caucus budget for going a long way toward strengthening our defense and our security because they recognize that education is the most important priority of our government.

It is brainpower that will carry us forward in the military sector, the economic sector, whatever. Brainpower. Viewing our schools and our education system as a giant mobilization for whatever the future brings.

In our Republican budget, and even to some degree in the President's budget, we are still making the same error that the Russians made. They were building tanks, millions and millions of tanks, for a war theater that had long ago left tanks behind. We are increasing defense by $17 billion in the Republican budget and increasing it by too much in the President's budget; and we are neglecting the place where we should mobilize for all kinds of contingencies, and that is education.

I want to congratulate the Progressive Caucus budget. I want to say the Blue Dogs' budget is impressive in the area of education. They have increased education in their budget. It is only the Democratic substitute that lags behind and the President that lags behind in terms of understanding that it is brainpower that is going to drive our future.

As we go into a cyber-civilization, where digitalization is the key to all activities, it is ''dot com'' all over the place. We need smarter and smarter people to run our economy.

Social Security is jeopardized if we have a workforce that cannot get out there and generate the income and we have to contract all our income-generating activities to foreign countries which have the people who can run our high-tech society.

We are way behind in our thinking. This was a golden opportunity. I think that we should look at education, defense, and economics as being inextricably interwoven. We cannot separate education out from the rest and education comes first.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), a member of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, anytime we have to try to put together a Federal budget, we have a number of priorities and demands, and we have to try to find the appropriate balance among those different demands and priorities. I think that the budget which the Committee on the Budget has recommended is a far superior budget to the substitute now being offered.

It starts out by making sure that we set aside 100 percent of the money we take from people in social security taxes and not let that money be spent for any other government program. It then goes on to strengthen Medicare and trying to set aside $40 billion so that we can modernize and improve Medicare to include a prescription drug benefit. I think all of us recognize that a system born in the 1960s needs to try to keep up with the changes of health care and this will allow us to do that.

It goes further to retire a billion dollars of debt over the next 5 years, and it will strengthen and increase support for education and science, including vital medical research.

It then has two other important priorities, I think, that are missing from the substitute now before us. The budget recommended by the Committee on the Budget has important provisions to have tax relief for American taxpayers. And I think it is very easy for those of us in Washington to forget whose money it is that we are talking about. We have got to remember that the Federal Government reaches into the pockets of hard-working Americans and takes away from them part of the money that they work hard each day to earn. We have to be sure that if we are going to do that, and take their money out of their pockets, that we spend that money better than they. I think that is a very difficult test for us to meet.

Federal taxes are now higher than they have been at any time since World War II, and one of the priorities of this budget is to allow people to keep more of the money that they earn.

Finally, this budget also has a priority to restore America's defenses. I believe that the first function, really, of the Federal Government, is to defend the country. So we have a 6 percent increase in defense spending, $1 billion more than the President.

Our armed forces are committed all around the world. Some of us would not choose to have those same commitments, but the fact is they are there. Texas National Guard people are today on station in Bosnia. And while I wish they were not there, it is essential that we provide them everything that they need to do their job.

But in addition to making sure we keep the commitments we have today around the world, we have to prepare for the future, and that means some investment; that means research; that means developing new kinds of systems to help protect us from incoming ballistic missiles, to help fight against the spreading of nuclear, chemical, biological and radiological weapons that are going all across the world.

It means we have to be prepared to deal with new kinds of threats, threats with computers and threats to our vital national infrastructure. New things are threatening our country, and we have to be prepared to defend against them.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, how this Congress chooses to spend our Federal funds says a lot about who we are as people and as a Nation.

So what are we saying today? The Republican budget, which will cause 40,000 children to lose Head Start services by the year 2005, says that preschool services for low-income children just is not very important. On the other hand, the Progressive Caucus budget is the only budget resolution being offered today that will fully fund Head Start.

And should this Nation not increase funds for child care subsidies by $4 billion, as the Progressive Caucus budget does, instead of causing over 12,000 low-income children and their families to lose their child care subsidies, as the Republican budget does?

What priorities are being reflected when the Republican budget freezes funding for higher education, for training and employment programs? The progressive budget increases funding

for education at every level, including education technology and after-school programs.

The Republican budget, which increases defense spending, while making deep cuts in domestic spending, says loud and clear that weapons are more important than people. Is that what this Nation is really about? Is that who we are as people? I am not, and I say that this Nation's national security should be measured by how we invest in our children, not weapons.

Our true national security depends on how well our children are educated. That is why I will be voting against the Republican budget resolution, and I will be voting for the progressive budget. I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the 8th District of North Carolina (Mr. HAYES).

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

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time to speak about what is an excellent Republican budget.

This is a good budget. Maybe it is not a perfect budget, but it has balance. It meets critical needs. It addresses crucial policy issues. It saves every penny of Social Security for our seniors.

This budget provides generously for education, while stressing local decisions, local control, assuring opportunities for our public school system and for our children.

This budget wipes out the national debt in the very near future.

This budget restores our national defense and begins to mend broken promises made to our veterans and active duty personnel by this administration.

This budget addresses vital health care needs, strengthens Medicare, and provides assistance for seniors with prescription drugs.

Last but not least, the theme of my friends on the left is that Washington is more wise than the taxpayers are; Washington can spend taxpayers' money more wisely than they can. I respectfully disagree with this position. It is my belief that Americans can make better decisions than Washington can about how they spend their own money. Americans, and my folks in the 8th District, deserve tax fairness, and they deserve more of their own money to spend on their own needs.

This budget is good for North Carolina's 8th District and it is good for America. I recommend a ''yes'' vote for this fine Republican budget.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ).

(Ms. VELAZQUEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the House Republican budget and in support of the Progressive Caucus budget.

Mr. Chairman, at a time when our Nation is experiencing the most unprecedented economic expansion ever, more than 35 million Americans still live below the poverty level and have yet to experience benefits of this historic boom. Never in our Nation's history have so many had so much, and still the gap widens between this country's haves and have-nots. As the greatest industrial Nation in the world, this is a travesty; and changing this should be our top priority.

Instead of addressing this issue head on, the Republican budget fails to help those across ethnic communities that need the most help. It fails our seniors by providing nothing to strengthen Social Security or Medicare. It fails more than 300,000 low-income women dependent on programs like WIC and Head Start. It fails our youth by cutting student loans. And it fails our urban communities who want to help themselves by cutting funding for empowerment zones.

Republicans have sacrificed this Nation's working families all to fund another reckless scheme to benefit a wealthy few. My colleagues, the American people have been clear. They want Social Security fixed, they want better schools for their children, and they want all Americans to benefit from this current economic prosperity, not just the wealthy few who the Republicans carve out a special tax break for.

I ask my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this irresponsible budget that includes a risky tax proposal which leaves working families, American families, behind.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN), an outstanding freshman member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Right now we are talking about the so-called progressive substitute amendment. That term, progressive, actually means something very specifically to me, because I come from the State of Wisconsin, where the Progressive Party perhaps reached its greatest heights. Our two statutes, our contribution to Statuary Hall, include Fighting Bob La Follette, really the father of the Progressive Party.

I would also say that that progressive tradition is alive and well in Wisconsin today. All of my colleagues know about what we are doing in the area of education reform and welfare reform. Well, it seems to me, from the Wisconsin perspective, if we want to talk about progressive themes and a progressive budget, the budget that we should be supporting, quite frankly, is not the so-called progressive substitute, but is, instead, this budget, the Republican budget plan. Because in my view that is the true Republican progressive plan.

Number one, it strengthens retirement security. It protects 100 percent of the Social Security surplus. It sets aside $40 billion to provide for prescription drug coverage. That is progressive, to me.

It promotes tax fairness, attacking some of the absurdities, some of the injustices in our Tax Code. It provides for reducing the marriage penalty. It provides for small business tax relief. And thanks to a sense of the Congress resolution that we added in the Committee on the Budget, it also takes care of one of the great problems that our farmers are facing in income averaging.

My colleagues may not be aware, but as the IRS is looking to implement the income averaging plan from the 1997 balanced budget agreement, they will not let farmers take into account years in which they lose money. Well, I have news for the IRS. Coming from the Midwest, I know that we have lots of family farms who are losing money.

□ 1930

That to me is a progressive plan. Our budget plan strengthens support for science and education. We increase education funding by 9.4 percent over last year; that is progressive. A difference between our budget and the so-called progressive plan is that our education funding is student centered, not bureaucracy centered.

Under our plan, we ensure that money leaves Washington, leaves the bureaucracy and gets in the hands of classrooms and communities all across the Nation. We believe that our budget plan is the true progressive plan, because it seeks to make sure that every American will have the tools and the opportunity to pursue the American dream; that is progressive.

Let us take a look quickly at the progressive budget plan. It is well-intentioned; however, it cuts $30 billion out of defense. How is that progressive? How is that progressive? How can you worry about progressive values if you are not secure? How can you worry about progressive values if your Nation is at risk?

The progressive plan also raises taxes by about $151 billion over 5 years. How is that progressive? As we all know, the tax burden that we are facing right now is the highest that we faced since World War II. We are paying wartime taxes at a time when we are supposedly at peace.

More and more families have to have two wage earners, not by choice, they have to have two wage earners just to make ends meet. And, yet, the progressive plan would increase their tax burden.

My friends, I do not believe it is progressive. I am afraid I believe it is regressive. It is going backwards. It is going back to the days of tax and spend. Look carefully at what our budget does. It strengthens the retirement security system by locking away 100 percent of the Social Security surplus and providing for prescription drug coverage; that is progressive.

It retires the debt by the year 2013 to hopefully keep interest rates down and

keep the economy growing and keep those good jobs coming; that is progressive. It strengthens dramatically our investment in education and science; that is progressive. It promotes tax fairness for families and farmers and seniors, and, yes, it provides for defense. My friends, this is the progressive budget plan.

I urge you all to vote for it. I urge you all to reject the well-intentioned, but, I am afraid, regressive progressive budget plan.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) has 9½ minutes remaining and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

If it is progressive to cut taxes for the wealthy and continue huge corporate tax loopholes while taking the money out of the pockets and cutting the programs for middle-income and lower-income Americans, then, yes, your version of a budget is progressive. Our version of a budget puts money in the pockets of middle-income and working families, funds programs that are important to them. Yes, it does raise taxes on the largest corporations in the world that are skating on their taxes today and those who are the most wealthy who are doing very well.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Progressive Caucus Budget. I want to talk about one of the most important pieces of this budget, housing. As we all know, home is where the heart is, but if we leave America's current housing crisis in the hands of our Republican counterparts, a lot of hearts and families will be broken.

Do not ever forget that in 1994 the Republicans wanted to abolish the Department of Housing in their Contract on America. At a time when we have seen economic expansions throughout the Nation, the Republican budget makes significant decreases in critical housing programs.

Our housing and development programs are some of the most important things that we do to help communities and working people help themselves. The progressive budget increases funding for community development, grants empowerment zones, and economic development.

This budget would help our cities develop sewer systems and help our local government rebuild schools and water treatment plants. This budget would make a real difference for the Americans who need it the most.

I want to make it clear that I will be voting for the progressive budget and against the Republican continual reverse Robin Hood, robbing from the poor and working people to give a tax break to their rich friends.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, could the Chair tell us the remaining time, please?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) has 7½ minutes remaining and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I believe we have the right to close.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has the right to close.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who was here just a few moments ago mischaracterizes the tax portion of the progressive budget. I think that ought to be noted. During the Eisenhower administration, corporations in this country paid about one-third of the taxes that are collected by the Federal Government, under the Republican-run Congress, that number has declined to one-eighth, therefore, all of that tax obligation has been transferred to working Americans.

The working Americans that he was complaining about are bearing a higher share of the burden, as a result of the tax policies that are contained within the Republican budget.

The progressive budget would create a much fairer system, a system which recognizes that working people ought to get tax relief, and that is what that budget does. Among the other deficiencies in the Republican budget, it fails to recognize the fact that we live in community and community obligations and responsibilities.

The progressive budget would help rebuild America by providing a rebuild America infrastructure program which would provide tens of billions of dollars to communities across our country to rebuild schools, highways, bridges, and to fund water supply and sewer treatment facilities, all of which are desperately needed in every community across America.

Furthermore, the progressive budget recognizes our responsibility to education. For the first time, it fully funds Head Start. Head Start is recognized as the most effective educational program ever devised. It gives little children an opportunity to get a head start with their education. The progressive budget does many things that are good for our communities. Let us support it.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I thank him for introducing the progressive budget substitute.

There are many reasons to support this budget substitute: education, Head Start, the commitment to working people. But I would like to comment on fulfilling the long overdue commitment on public lands resources in this country.

Over 300 Members of the House have cosponsored legislation in this session which would reverse the shameful record of recent Congresses in severely underfunding programs to protect the public lands to promote recreation and resource protection.

The House Committee on Resources has reported out the Conservation Reinvestment Act by a 3–1 margin, and we are waiting for the Republican leadership to allow the full House to work its will on this historic bill.

In the meantime, the Republican budget perpetuates the failure of recent Congresses to protect threatened resources on behalf of future generations.

Congress made a promise to the American people 35 years ago: when we develop our offshore energy reserves, we will dedicate a small portion of the proceeds to the permanent protection of America's parks, wilderness, forests and other public lands.

So what happened? The leasing, exploration and development of the Outer Continental Shelf has proceeded for four decades, but the taxpayers and the Lands and Water Conservation Fund have been cheated. The money has been credited to the Land and Water Conservation Fund, but the Congress has refused to spend it year after year. And now the leaders of the Republican Party in this House are telling the American people that they want more offshore oil drilling off of California, off of New Jersey, off of Alaska, off of Florida, but still no willingness to live up to the promise they made in 1965 to protect our natural resources.

The Republican budget resolution that is before this House today perpetuates this larceny against the American public and American environment. Because the Republican budget ignores the Land and Water Conservation Fund, it ignores the current bill and it ignores what the American people said they want.

Eighty to 90 percent of the American people want the full funding of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. They want it in the North and the South, in the East and the West, and even in the Rocky Mountain West. These people want their resources protected, and the way that can be done is by fully funding the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

The substitute introduced by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) on behalf of the Progressive Caucus is a substitute that does that, and this Congress ought to support that effort tonight.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the alternative budget presented by the Progressive Caucus.

This resolution is a significant alternative for many reasons. Particularly, it is significant for the funding allocated to education, training, employment services, housing, and community development programs.

For Fiscal Year 2001, the progressive budget resolution will provide $9.13 billion more to education, training, and employment services and $15 billion more to community and regional development programs compared to the Republican budget resolution. This would provide essential funding to programs and institutions such as the Community Development Block Grant, the Economic Development Agency, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, historically black colleges and universities, summer youth employment, community technology centers, Head Start, and Pell Grants.

These programs are essential to enable America's most vulnerable citizens to improve their economic, educational, and housing circumstances.

Conversely, the Republican's budget resolution would cut those programs and other essential services such as Women, Infants and Children's nutrition program, known as WIC; the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, the Child Care Block Grant, and Section 8 Housing.

The Republicans intend to cut these important programs in order to give unreasonable and massive tax cuts.

Unlike the Republicans' plan, the Progressive Caucus's alternative budget puts America's most vulnerable citizens first.

For this reason, I urge my colleagues to support the Progressive Caucus's alternative budget.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE).

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Chairman, it is not enough around here to be against something. We have to be for something.

What we have laid out here is our marker. It is what we believe in. The President told us what he believed in in his budget. Nobody around here wanted it, which is why we have all these alternative budgets.

The alternative budget in front of us right now is different from the press's but, in a lot of respects, it is the same. It increases spending and raises taxes, cuts defense. That is what they are for.

What we are saying what we are for in this budget is protecting 100 percent of the Social Security surplus, strengthening Medicare, providing $40 billion, and making possible a prescription drug program, retiring the public debt by the year 2013, paying it down, strengthening support for education, increasing spending on special-ed by $2 billion, and promoting tax fairness for families, farmers and seniors, getting rid of the marriage penalty, earnings limit for seniors, and also dealing with small business tax relief. These are the things that we believe in. And, also, making investment and rebuilding the defense system in this country, which has been badly neglected for the past several years.

That is what this debate is about. We all get to vote. Everybody has their day. Everybody gets to talk about what they believe in. We have heard what they believe in. This is what we believe in. This is our budget. This is our statement of priorities. This is our vision for the future: Paying down debt, locking up Social Security for our seniors, strengthening support for education, promoting tax fairness, and helping our families and farmers, and also making investment in agriculture.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) for his leadership and his vision and thank the Progressive Caucus for putting forth this vision for a better America. I want to stand today in strong support of this budget.

Like the Congressional Black Caucus, the Progressive Caucus budget balances the budget, saves Social Security and Medicare, without excluding low-wage workers, the poor, and communities of color.

□ 1945

While poverty and unemployment have gone down, there are still millions of Americans who are not able to take advantage of this great economic boom. As a member of the Subcommittee on Housing and from northern California, I am particularly concerned about the rising cost of housing and access to affordable housing. The Joint Center for Housing Studies at Harvard University reports that because of the cost of housing, because it has actually outpaced wages, some renters are paying more for their housing today than they did for comparable units in the 1970s.

According to a February 12 Washington Post article which I will submit for the RECORD, the cost of housing is so high in northern California that software executives making over $53,000 a year are homeless and living out of their cars. In fact, the article cites one individual making $80,000 a year forced to live in a shelter. This is outrageous. The Progressive Caucus budget invests more in section 8 housing, homeless assistance, senior housing, housing for the disabled and other important housing programs.

This budget shows that during significant economic growth, we can invest where it is most needed, for education, for housing, the environment, foreign assistance, health care and violence prevention. This budget shows that sound fiscal policy does not have to leave out the poor, low-wage workers, communities of color, the disabled, our senior citizens, and our veterans. Let us make our peace dividend work here in America by ensuring our national security interest from within our own country as well as ensuring a safe and secure world. We must defend our country, not only from outside threats but from the threats of poverty and unemployment and income inequality and inadequate education and the growing gap between the rich and the poor.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following article for the RECORD:

THE HIGH-TECH HOMELESS; IN SILICON VALLEY, A DARK SIDE TO BOOMING ECONOMY

(By Mark Leibovich)

CUPERTINO, CALIF.—Each night, on the floor of a church that sits a few hundred yards from the campus of Apple Computer Inc., software executive Gordon Seybold unfurls a bedroll and attempts to sleep. It rarely comes. He often spends hours staring into blackness, wondering how Silicon Valley's wealth stampede could keep rushing past a man with his resume.

Last January, Seybold lost his job as a corporate sales manager for Oakland-based C2Net Software Inc., where he said he was on track to earn $125,000 last year, including commissions. He tried to find a new job, came close a few times, but ultimately turned up nothing after several months. In August, he was evicted from his $1,600-a-month apartment in West San Jose.

Since then Seybold, who holds three degrees and speaks five languages, has landed on the Silicon Skids, joining a fast-growing homeless population that might be the best credentialed in the nation.

They are marked by the same runs of bad luck, bad habits and bad decisions that lead to shelter doors anywhere. But Silicon Valley's homeless also provide a starkly different perspective on the giddy high-tech world, one that mocks every common mythology about this place. They are, in many cases, victims of the same aura of promise that keeps technology workers flooding here. Largely hidden and ignored—in shelters, on floors, in cars—their plights define this boom era just as aptly as any overnight geek tycoon.

If this were another place, at another time, it might be easier to reduce expectations, forget stock options and move to a place where tiny rooms don't rent for $1,200 a month. But it's hard not to wish big here. New millionaires get spawned in bull market litters—64 a day, by one count—and it imbues even homeless shelters with a gambler's sense of possibility.

''There's so much sudden wealth here, it's creating a Vegas mentality,'' said Barry Del Buono, executive director of the Emergency Housing Consortium, which operates seven shelters in Silicon Valley. ''A lot of our homeless are living on the hope this economy is creating. But people don't realize how brutal it can be here if you lose your footing.''

Or how the downward spiral can spin just as fast as the sudden-wealth machine. Seybold, 56 said he lost his job at C2Net in a mass layoff, though a company spokesman cited ''other factors.'' Whatever the reason, it caused him to become depressed, which hurt his employment prospects. So did his advancing age, an unspoken liability in a high-tech industry obsessed with the new and young. He spent last fall living in a 1984 Chevrolet van.

Today, Seybold is in a program for homeless men run by Cupertino Community Services. It provides career guidance, shelter and donated meals at a network of Silicon Valley churches, many of them nestled in neighborhoods of million-dollar homes. At night, his floormates keep him awake with their somnolent gunts and moans, which echo through the sanctuary in a chorus of unconscious unease.

''One of the drawbacks of sleeping in a big church room is that they have perfect acoustics.'' Seybold said. He stays in Silicon Valley because he has worked in technology for 25 years. ''There is 10 times more opportunity here than anywhere else for someone like me,'' he said, but added that he is thinking about leaving to join the Peace Corps. He

recently took a job as a salesclerk at a drugstore in Cupertino. It pays $8.50 an hour.

RETHINKING FAILURE AS SUCCESS

Here, as elsewhere, accounts of becoming homeless often involve a unique, precipitating circumstance: a fire or a big rent increase; some physical or mental hardship. It is rare to find a homeless person who has had plenty of breaks and has done everything right.

But the pioneer's mentality of Silicon Valley can impose perverse interpretations on personal failure. In entrepreneurial circles, failure is said to be a valuable experience, laudable even. It can be the source of vital business lessons and proof of a pioneer's willingness to take chances. And in the strange calculus of the dot-com world, failure is success, as revealed by the stock prices of Internet companies that have never made a profit.

But that's a santized notion of failure, describing an entrepreneur's ability to make large amounts of money vanish, often someone else's. Technology workers who wind up homeless represent a baser notion of failure.

''This is the kind of failure that no one in Silicon Valley likes to think about,'' said Ray Allen, who runs the Community Technology Alliance, a San Jose organization that provides voice-mail service to local homeless people and online resources to community aid groups. ''The fact is, the technology industry is creating incredible wealth, and it's also creating incredible poverty.''

At its crux, this poverty is born of simple economics. The prosperity has sent the cost of housing soaring and pushed lower-income people, many of them employed, onto the * * * margins of society.

''We all have perceptions of what a homeless person is supposed to be like, and I'm not it,'' said Tom McCormack, 38, who works as a system engineer at CompuNet Systems Solutions Inc., a network-software firm in San Jose. He wears crisp blue dress shirts and earns $52,000 a year, which should be enough to pay for a low-rent place, but isn't when it's added to child-support payments and past credit-card debts.

McCormack faced desperate circumstances last spring when a roommate moved out of his San Jose apartment and his landlord doubled the rent to $1,600. ''I'm a workaholic and I didn't have much of a social network,'' he said. ''I had nowhere to go.'' He moved into his 1982 Subaru.

Until a few days ago McCormack lived at Inn-Vision, a beige concrete shelter tucked between the San Jose Arena and a cluster of auto body shops. His quarters were a 4-by-7-foot cubicle separated from 88 roommates by curtain walls, as in a military hospital ward. Rules are strict. Last week one of his shelter mates, Randall Condon, 46, a computer-networking expert, said he was written up by a shelter manager for leaving a book about non-Euclidian geometry on his bunk bed.

Last weekend McCormack reached his six-month limit at Inn-Vision and is back living in his Subaru. He spends hours at night lying in the back seat, reading books on computer programming by flashlight.

The question recurs: Why does he stay in Silicon Valley?

The answer recurs: ''This place is just full of opportunity,'' he said. ''This is where my brain food is.''

And prospective Cyber Cinderellas keep coming: ''This place has this incredible mystique,'' said Cathy Erickson, who runs the Georgia Travis Center, a drop-in office for homeless people in San Jose. ''People come from all over the world to expect instant success, instant hope. But there's only so long you can afford to stay in a hotel.'' She frequently tells them to go back where they came from.

HIGH-TECH HELPING HANDS

Cisco Systems Inc., the San Jose-based computer-networking giant, comes to the main Emergency Housing Consortium shelter to train prospective technology workers. And Mary Ellen Chell, the executive director of Cupertino Community Services, said one large technology company, the name of which she can't divulge, has inquired about housing new-to-town employees in its shelters. This symbiosis between Silicon Valley's wealth centers and its fringes underscores a precarious separation between the two.

While homeless populations are notoriously difficult to track and quantify, Silicon Valley's has risen steadily in recent years, local social service workers said. Nearly 20,000 people will experience a ''homeless episode'' this year in Santa Clara County, which covers most of Silicon Valley, up from about 16,000 five years ago.

But what's most striking is the increasing percentage of working people who now live in homeless shelters, a nationwide phenomenon that is poignantly evident in Silicon Valley. Since 1992, 250,000 new jobs have been created here and only about 40,000 new housing units have been built.

''If they were somewhere else, there's a good chance they'd be living in the suburbs,'' the Emergency Housing Consortium's Del Buono said. ''We turn out people every day who are making $60,000 a year.'' He said that about half of the consortium's 1,100 clients are employed. The biggest shelter, a converted office building that houses 250 people next to a San Jose industrial park, is open 24 hours, but is nearly empty at midday.

Many of Silicon Valley's shelter dwellers fit the conventional shopping cart prototype: hard-luck veterans, unemployed single mothers, the mentally or criminally deinstitutionalized. But talk to enough homeless people and a theme resonates—it doesn't take a lot of misfortune here to start a rapid descent.

''I have a good job and I can't believe I wound up without a place to live,'' said Tracy Ramirez, a customer service representative at Cyantek, which makes chemicals for the semiconductor industry. She lives half a mile from the main runway of San Jose Airport in a one-room, Emergency Housing Consortium ''transitional home,'' where she shares a bed with her 3- and 9-year-old daughters.

Ramirez, 35, earns $16.90 an hour, about $34,000 a year. She pays $600 a month in day-care costs, $300 a month in car payments. She also has a litany of other bills, expenses and debts trailing from her past, many accrued during a since-ended marriage. A bad credit history, a bankruptcy and an eviction last September inevitably kill her chances with landlords, aside from the fact that the Department of Housing and Urban Development considers $47,800 a year to be ''low income'' for a three-person household in Silicon Valley. She started getting anxiety attacks last summer.

Her mother, Carolyn Cabral, earns $14,80 an hour working on an assembly line at 3COM Corp. but can't afford a place closer than Mantica, a two-hour drive to her office in Santa Clara. Cabral, 59, who has worked 16 years at 3COM, wakes up at 3:15 a.m. to come to work in the valley. (The commute can reach three hours with traffic.) She could get a job closer to home, but says it would cut her pay by half.

''Silicon Valley is a victim of its own success,'' said Carl Guardino, chief executive of the Silicon Valley Manufacturers Group, the area's biggest high-tech industry trade organization. With an unemployment rate of 2.7 percent and average annual wages that are nearly $20,000 higher than the national average, it's impossible to deny the success.

It's of some consolation that shelters receive donations from tech zillionaires, especially during the holidays. In December, for example, a Yahoo Inc. employee gave $100,000 in stock to 10 social service agencies, said Maury Kendall, communications manager at the Emergency Housing Consortium. Last month, after local news outlets reported that pets belonging to homeless people could not stay in shelters, donations poured in, Kendall said. ''We just got $15,000 to start a kennel.''

But the housing crisis is clearly exacting a toll on humans, A study revealed this week that for the first time in five years, more people are leaving Santa Clara County than are arriving. While the difference was negligible—1,284 more people moved out than in—the lack of affordable housing has become the biggest obstacle that valley companies face in keeping and recruiting employees, Guardino said.

''We would like technology workers to drive their cars, not live in them.''

A FAST FREE-FALL

''There's a very thin line in Silicon Valley between being a director and being a derelict,'' said Randall Condon, the computer-networking expert encamped at San Jose's Inn-Vision. ''Everything here is accelerated—business cycles, wealth creation, and certainly the rate at which your life can fall apart.''

Condon was living in Olympia, Wash., where he had moved to be with a girlfriend and work at an Internet service provider. In November, as the relationship was ending, he lost everything in an apartment fire. He came to Silicon Valley because he had worked in technology for 20 years.

After a brief and futile search for a rental, Condon came to Inn-Vision. He sleeps—or tries to—in a large room with 43 other men, whom he collectively refers to as ''the snoring symphony.'' Condon, who has sad blue eyes and oily chestnut hair, said he tries to stay busy and positive.

On a rainy Monday in mid-January, he calls his existence ''tortuous.'' Libraries were closed for Martin Luther King Jr. Day, which denied him access to his prime job-seeking tool, the Internet. ''I'm a total cyber-cripple in here,'' he said.

But a postscript: Condon got a job last week, at a San Jose Internet start-up company where he says he will earn more than $80,000 a year, plus stock options. He won't name his new employer because he doesn't want people there to see this article. They don't know that he lives in a shelter.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), a member of the Committee on the Budget.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I rise tonight in opposition to the Progressive budget and in favor of the common sense Republican budget. I do want to at least congratulate the progressives for their intellectual honesty. I may disagree with their conclusions, but at least I think they have been intellectually honest in bringing this budget forward. In fairness, what this budget does that they are proposing would cut $30 billion from defense. That is at a time when we have 265,000 troops in 132 different countries. Some of us do not believe that is the right thing to do. They increase spending by

$38 billion in fiscal year 2001, and they raise taxes by about $9 billion this year and $151 billion over 5 years. That is their conclusion. That is the plan that they are offering. We respect that.

But let me talk a little bit about where we are. I told the story earlier about the little red hen. That was that little red hen that had the chicks and she found some wheat, she planted the wheat, she asked how many of her barnyard friends would help her grow the wheat. Not I, said the cow; not I, said the pig; not I, said the cat. No one wanted to help her grow the wheat. Then when it was time to harvest the wheat she asked for help. Not I, said the cow; not I, said the pig; not I, said the cat. When it was time to bake the bread, nobody wanted to help. Not I, said the cow; not I, said the pig; not I, said the cat. But when it was time to eat the bread, everybody wanted to be there.

Over the last several years, we have built up a surplus. We have done it by making some of those tough decisions. Now everybody wants to get in on the act and decide how we will divide that surplus. This is a common sense budget, but let us look at where we have been. If we would have stuck just to the spending levels that we were left when we came here as a majority in 1995, we would have spent an additional $625 billion. That is not my numbers, that is the Congressional Budget Office.

Let us compare where we are compared to what the President proposed. What the President proposed this year in additional discretionary spending was a 6.6 percent increase. We are proposing only 1.8 percent. You can see the inflation line. We are making tremendous progress. But I think this is the most important chart of all. For the first time in my adult lifetime, the Federal budget is going to grow at a slower rate than the average family budget over the next 5 years.

The average family budget according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics is going to grow by 4.6 percent annually and our total Federal budget is going to increase by 2.9 percent. What will happen? We will create enormous surpluses and we are saying, $1 trillion over the next 5 years ought to go to pay down debt, debt held by the public, about another third of it ought to go to strengthen Social Security and Medicare, and yes, make room for a prescription drug benefit. But the final third ought to go back to the people who pay the taxes.

Here is one other area where we differ. We do not believe that married couples just because they are married are rich. We do not think businesspeople and farmers just because they are farmers are rich. We believe this is a fair budget. We hope that you will support us in the common sense Republican budget and oppose the so-called Progressive budget.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 61, noes 351, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 71]

AYES—61

Baldwin
Becerra
Blumenauer
Bonior
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Capuano
Carson
Clayton
Clyburn
Conyers
Coyne
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
Engel
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hilliard
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jones (OH)
Kilpatrick
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Markey
McGovern
McKinney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Oberstar
Olver
Owens
Payne
Pelosi
Rahall
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Serrano
Slaughter
Stark
Thompson (MS)
Towns
Velazquez
Waters
Watt (NC)
Weiner
Woolsey
Wynn

NOES—351

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
Clement
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crowley
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Deal
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
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)
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—22

Ackerman
Archer
Bonilla
Boucher
Crane
Davis (VA)
Delahunt
Dixon
Greenwood
Hinchey
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Lowey
Martinez
McCollum
McDermott
McHugh
Moran (VA)
Quinn
Royce
Schakowsky
Taylor (NC)
Vento

□ 2012

Messrs. RADANOVICH, PASTOR, PALLONE and HOLT changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. SLAUGHTER changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 106–535.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. STENHOLM

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 3 offered by Mr. STENHOLM:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

**SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001.**

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000 is hereby revised and replaced and that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001 and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2002 through 2005 are hereby set forth.

**SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.**

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2005:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,405,500,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,509,718,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,557,246,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,610,844,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,610,757,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,738,810,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be reduced are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $0.
Fiscal year 2001: $5,082,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $6,254,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $7,556,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $8,281,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $9,919,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,475,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,527,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,569,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,619,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,704,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,753,000,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,465,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,504,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,507,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,551,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,603,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,737,000,000,000.

(4) SURPLUSES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the surpluses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $8,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $14,017,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $16,547,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $19,112,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $16,429,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $20,103,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $5,640,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $5,710,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $5,766,007,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $5,866,788,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $5,947,471,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $6,018,197,000,000.

**SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.**

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and budget outlays for fiscal years 2000 through 2005 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $287,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $282,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $308,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $298,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $311,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $303,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $317,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $311,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $327,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $320,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $336,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $332,400,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $17,510,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,640,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $19,080,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $18,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,990,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $18,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,030,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $18,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,750,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $18,480,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,840,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $19,280,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,460,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $19,670,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,260,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $20,740,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,150,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $20,840,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,240,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $21,240,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,640,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $21,540,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,150,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $−1,020,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,328,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $167,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,731,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $−140,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,728,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $−110,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,730,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $−120,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,817,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $3,850,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $24,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,160,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $25,010,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,780,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $25,080,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,070,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $25,150,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,220,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $25,280,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,170,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $25,350,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,070,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $35,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $22,830,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,910,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $24,130,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,090,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $21,150,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,180,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $20,020,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $18,350,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,770,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $8,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $7,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $9,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $10,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $15,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $18,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,600,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $51,820,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,580,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $55,960,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,260,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $54,060,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,520,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $55,360,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,840,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $56,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,050,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $56,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,860,000,000.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $11,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,760,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $12,030,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,220,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $11,870,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,340,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $12,040,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,180,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $12,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $12,490,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,480,000,000.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $57,740,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $74,380,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,650,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $76,380,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,820,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $78,050,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $76,920,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $79,660,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $78,420,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $82,220,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $80,640,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $159,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $152,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $170,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $167,172,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $181,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $181,272,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $193,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $191,572,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $207,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $206,372,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $224,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $222,172,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $199,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $199,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $218,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $218,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $227,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $227,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $247,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $246,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $269,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $269,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $295,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $295,700,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $238,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $247,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $252,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $255,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $263,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $264,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $272,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $274,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $294,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $285,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $295,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $297,200,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $14,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $15,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $15,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $26,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $17,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,400,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $46,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,180,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $48,760,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,160,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $50,070,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,670,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $52,520,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $55,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,720,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $58,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,340,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $27,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $28,410,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,330,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $28,290,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,750,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $29,010,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,940,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $31,080,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,760,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $31,850,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,550,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $13,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,680,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,640,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,240,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $13,570,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,860,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $13,540,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,740,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $13,530,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $13,560,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,520,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $284,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $284,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $288,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $288,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $290,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $290,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $286,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $286,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $281,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $281,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $28,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $278,700,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $7,732,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,730,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $−3,430,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−7,270,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $−1,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−3,130,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $−1,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−1,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $−2,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−2,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $−2,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−2,500,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $−41,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−41,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $−46,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−46,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $−50,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−50,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $−50,020,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−50,020,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $−48,210,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−48,210,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $−50,130,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−50,130,000,000.

**SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.**

(a) SUBMISSIONS REGARDING REVENUES.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report to the House a reconciliation bill—

(1) not later than May 26, 2000;
(2) not later than June 23, 2000;
(3) not later than July 28, 2000; and
(4) not later than September 22, 2000;

that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the total level of revenues by not more than: $5,082,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and $35,680,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

(b) SUBMISSIONS REGARDING DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report to the House a reconciliation bill—

(1) not later than May 26, 2000; and
(2) not later than September 22, 2000;

that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the debt held by the public by not more than $8,189,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and $80,580,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

**SEC. 5. USE OF CBO ESTIMATES IN ENFORCEMENT OF RESOLUTION.**

For purposes of enforcing the budgetary aggregates and allocations under this resolution, the Chairman of the House Committee on the Budget shall, in advising the presiding officer on the cost of any piece of legislation, rely exclusively on estimates prepared by the Congressional Budget Office or the Joint Tax Committee, in a form certified by that agency to be consistent with its own economic and technical estimates, unless in each case he first receives the approval of the Committee on the Budget by recorded vote to use a different estimate.

**SEC. 6. TAX CUTS AND NEW SPENDING CONTINGENT ON DEBT REDUCTION.**

Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, it shall not be in order to consider a reconciliation bill pursuant to Section 4 of this resolution or any legislation reducing revenues for the period of fiscal years 2001 to 2005 or increasing outlays for mandatory spending programs unless there is a certification by Director of the Congressional Budget Office that the House has approved legislation which:

(1) ensures that a sufficient portion of the on-budget surplus is reserved for debt retirement to put the government on a path to eliminate the publicly held debt by 2013 under current economic and technical projections;

(2) legislation has been enacted which establishes points of order or other protections

to ensure that funds reserved for debt retirement may not be used for any other purpose, except for adjustments to reflect economic and technical changes in budget projections.

**SEC. 7. RESERVE FUND FOR AUGUST UPDATE REVISION OF BUDGET SURPLUSES.**

(a) ALLOCATION OF INCREASED SURPLUS PROJECTIONS.—If the Congressional Budget Office report referred to in subsection (b) projects an increase in the surplus for fiscal year 2000, fiscal year 2001, and the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005 over the corresponding levels set forth in its economic and budget forecast for 2001 submitted pursuant to section 202(e)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House shall make the adjustments as provided in subsection (c).

(b) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE UPDATED BUDGET FORECAST FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001.—The report referred to in subsection (a) is the Congressional Budget Office updated budget forecast for fiscal year 2001.

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—If the Committee on Ways and Means reports any reconciliation legislation or other legislation reducing revenues exceeding the revenue aggregates in section 2(1)(B), reduce the revenue aggregates in section 2(1)(A) and increase the amounts the revenues can be reduced by in section 2(1)(B) by an amount not to exceed one-quarter of the increased surplus. If the Committees on Agriculture, Appropriations, Commerce, National Security, or Ways and Means report legislation increasing spending above the allocation for that committee, increase the allocation for that committee and the aggregates set forth in sections 2(2) and 2(3) by an amount not to exceed one-quarter of the increased surplus.

(d) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments made pursuant to subsection (c) for any measure shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

**SEC. 8. SAFE DEPOSIT BOX FOR SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUSES.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) under the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the social security trust funds are off-budget for purposes of the President's budget submission and the concurrent resolution on the budget;

(2) the social security trust funds have been running surpluses for 17 years;

(3) these surpluses have been used to implicitly finance the general operations of the Federal Government;

(4) in fiscal year 2001, the social security surplus will exceed $166 billion;

(5) for the first time, a concurrent resolution on the budget balances the Federal budget without counting the social security surpluses;

(6) the only way to ensure that social security surpluses are not diverted for other purposes is to balance the budget exclusive of such surpluses; and

(7) Congress and the President should take such steps as are necessary to ensure that future budgets are balanced excluding the surpluses generated by the social security trust funds.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any revision to this resolution or a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2002, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that sets forth a deficit for any fiscal year.

(2) DEFICIT LEVELS.—For purposes of this subsection, a deficit shall be the level (if any) set forth in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for that fiscal year pursuant to section 301(a)(3) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

**SEC. 9. DEBT REDUCTION LOCK-BOX.**

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any reported bill or joint resolution, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that would cause a surplus for fiscal year 2001 to be less than the level (as adjusted pursuant to section 7) set forth in section 2(4) for that fiscal year.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—The level of the surplus for purposes of subsection (a) shall not take into account any adjustment made under section 314(a)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

**SEC. 10. RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE.**

If the Committee on Ways and Means or Committee on Commerce of the House reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto is offered (in the House), or a conference report thereon is submitted that reforms medicare, provides coverage for medicare prescription drugs, or adjusts medicare reimbursement for health care providers, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the aggregates and allocations of new budget authority (and outlays resulting therefrom) by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, but not to exceed $2,000,000,000 in new budget authority and $2,000,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2001 and $40,000,00,000 in new budget authority and $40,000,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005 (and make all other appropriate conforming adjustments).

**SEC. 11. RESERVE FUND FOR AGRICULTURE.**

(a) FISCAL YEAR 2000.—If the Committee on Agriculture of the House reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto is offered (in the House), or a conference report thereon is submitted that provides income support to owners and producers of farms, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of new budget authority and outlays to that committee for fiscal year 2000 by the amount of new budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) provided by that measure for that purpose not to exceed $6,000,000,000 in new budget authority and $6,000,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2000, $0 in new budget authority and outlays for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2004, and $6,000,000,000 in new budget authority and $6,000,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004 (and make all other appropriate conforming adjustments).

(b) FISCAL YEAR 2001.—If the Committee on Agriculture of the House reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto is offered (in the House), or a conference report thereon is submitted that provides risk management or income support or other assistance for agricultural producers, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of new budget authority and outlays to that committee by the amount of new budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) if such legislation does not exceed $4,998,000,000 in new budget authority and $4,354,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2001 and $24,761,000,000 in new budget authority and $23,610,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005 (and make all other appropriate conforming adjustments).

**SEC. 13. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.**

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to section 10, 11, or 12 for any measure shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution—

(1) the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives or the Senate, as applicable; and

(2) such chairman, as applicable, may make any other necessary adjustments to such levels to carry out this resolution.

**SEC. 14. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING BUDGET ENFORCEMENT.**

It is the sense of Congress that legislation should be enacting enforcing this resolution by—

(1) establishing a plan to eliminate the publicly held debt by 2012;

(2) setting discretionary spending limits for budget authority and outlays at the levels set forth in this resolution for each of the next five years; and

(3) extending the pay as you go rules set forth in Section 252 of the BBEDCA for the next ten years.

**SEC. 15. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING THE STABILIZATION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL PAYMENTS TO STATES, COUNTIES, AND BOROUGHS.**

It is the sense of the House that Federal revenue-sharing payments to States, counties, and boroughs pursuant to the Act of May 23, 1908 (35 Stat. 260; 16 U.S.C. 500), the Act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 963; 16 U.S.C. 500), the Act of August 28, 1937 (chapter 876; 50 Stat. 875; 43 U.S.C. 1181f), the Act of May 24, 1939 (chapter 144; 53 Stat. 753; 43 U.S.C. 1181f–1 et seq.), and sections 13982 and 13983 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 (Public Law 103–66; 16 U.S.C. 500 note; 43 U.S.C. 1181f note) should be stabilized and maintained for the long-term benefit of schools, roads, public services, and communities, and that providing such permanent, stable funding is a priority of the 106th Congress.

**SEC. 16. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON DIRECTING THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TO ACCEPT NEGATIVE NUMBERS IN FARM INCOME AVERAGING.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) farmers' and ranchers' income vary widely from year to year due to uncontrollable markets and unpredictable weather;

(2) in the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997, Congress enacted 3-year farm income averaging to protect agricultural producers from excessive tax rates in profitable years;

(3) last year, the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) proposed final regulations for averaging farm income which fail to make clear that taxable income in a given year may be a negative number; and

(4) this IRS interpretation can result in farmers having to pay additional taxes during years in which they experience a loss in income.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that during this session of the 106th Congress, legislation should be considered to direct the Internal Revenue Service to count any net loss of income in determining the proper rate of taxation.

**SEC. 17. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON ESTIMATES OF THE IMPACT OF REGULATIONS ON THE PRIVATE SECTOR.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) the Federal regulatory system sometimes adversely affects many Americans and businesses by imposing financial burdens with little corresponding public benefit;

(2) currently, Congress has no general mechanism for assessing the financial impact of regulatory activities on the private sector;

(3) congress is ultimately responsible for making sure agencies act in accordance with congressional intent and while the executive branch is responsible for promulgating regulations, Congress ultimately can and should curb ineffective regulations by using its oversight and regulatory powers; and

(4) a variety of reforms have been suggested to increase congressional oversight over regulatory activity, including directing the President to prepare an annual accounting statement containing several cost/benefit analyses, recommendations to reform inefficient regulatory programs, and an identification and analysis of duplications and inconsistencies among such programs.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that the House should reclaim its role as reformer and take the first step toward curbing inefficient regulatory activity by passing legislation authorizing the Congressional Budget Office to prepare regular estimates on the impact of proposed Federal regulations on the private sector.

**SEC. 18. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING EDUCATION REFORM.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) strengthening America's public schools while respecting State and local control is critically important to the future of our children and our Nation;

(2) education is a local responsibility, a State priority, and a national concern;

(3) a partnership with the Nation's governors, parents, teachers, and principals must take place in order to strengthen public schools and foster educational excellence;

(4) the consolidation of various Federal education programs will benefit our Nation's children, parents, and teachers by sending more dollars directly to the classroom;

(5) our Nation's children deserve an educational system that will provide opportunities to excel; and

(6) our children and society will benefit from States and local educators working together with the Federal Government to raise standards and improve educational opportunities, particularly for America's poorest children.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Federal funding should be increased to States and local schools, with funds targeted to the poorest schools;

(2) the role of Federal education policy is to raise standards for all children, and close the achievement gap between groups of students;

(3) legislation should be enacted which gives States and local schools flexibility with Federal funds coupled with increased accountability for performance and results, including the requirement that states to ensure that all students have fully qualified teachers; and

(4) the Federal Government should demand increased student performance, with consequences for schools and school districts that continuously fail.

**SEC. 19. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON SPECIAL EDUCATION.**

(a) Congress finds that—

(1) all children deserve a quality education, including children with disabilities;

(2) the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act provides that the Federal, State, and local governments are to share in the expense of educating children with disabilities and commits the Federal Government to pay up to 40 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure for children with disabilities;

(3) the high cost of educating children with disabilities and the Federal Government's failure to fully meet its obligation under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act stretches limited State and local education funds, creating difficulty in providing a quality education to all students, including children with disabilities;

(4) the current level of Federal funding to States and localities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act is contrary to the goal of ensuring that children with disabilities receive a quality education;

(5) the Federal Government has failed to appropriate 40 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure per child with a disability as required under the Individuals with Disabilities Act to assist States and localities to educate children with disabilities; and

(6) the levels in function 500 (Education) for fiscal year 2001 assume sufficient discretionary budget authority to accommodate fiscal year 2001 appropriations for IDEA at least $2,000,000,000 above such funding levels appropriated in fiscal year 2000.

(b) It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Congress and the President should increase function 500 (Education) fiscal year 2001 funding for programs under the Individuals with Disabilities Act by at least $2,000,000,000 above fiscal year 2000 appropriated levels;

(2) Congress and the President should give programs under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act the highest priority among Federal elementary and secondary education programs by meeting the commitment to fund the maximum State grant allocation for educating children with disabilities under such Act prior to authorizing or appropriating funds for any new education initiative;

(3) Congress and the President should, if new or increased funding is authorized or appropriated for any education initiative, provide the flexibility in such authorization or appropriation necessary to allow local educational agencies the authority to use such funds for programs under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; and

(4) if a local educational agency chooses to utilize the authority under section 613(a)(2)(C)(i) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to treat as local funds up to 20 percent of the amount of funds the agency receives under part B of such Act that exceeds the amount it received under that part for the previous fiscal year, then the agency should use those local funds to provide additional funding for any Federal, State, or local education program.

**SEC. 20. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS ON ACCESS TO HEALTH INSURANCE AND PRESERVING HOME HEALTH SERVICES FOR ALL MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES.**

(a) ACCESS TO HEALTH INSURANCE.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) 43.4 million Americans are currently without health insurance, and that this number is expected to rise to nearly 60 million people in the next 10 years;

(B) the cost of health insurance continues to rise, a key factor in increasing the number of uninsured; and

(C) there is a consensus that working Americans and their families and children will suffer from reduced access to health insurance.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON IMPROVING ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE INSURANCE.—It is the sense of Congress that access to affordable health care coverage for all Americans is a priority of the 106th Congress.

(b) PRESERVING HOME HEALTH SERVICE FOR ALL MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 reformed Medicare home health care spending by instructing the Health Care Financing Administration to implement a prospective payment system and instituted an interim payment system to achieve savings;

(B) the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999, reformed the interim payment system to increase reimbursements to low-cost providers, added $900 million in funding, and delayed the automatic 15 percent payment reduction for one year, to October 1, 2000; and

(C) patients whose care is more extensive and expensive than the typical Medicare patient do not receive supplemental payments in the interim payment system but will receive special protection in the home health care prospective payment system.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ACCESS TO HOME HEALTH CARE.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(A) Congress recognizes the importance of home health care for seniors and disabled citizens;

(B) Congress and the Administration should work together to maintain quality care for patients whose care is more extensive and expensive than the typical Medicare patient, including the sickest and frailest Medicare beneficiaries, while home health care agencies operate in the interim payment system; and

(C) Congress and the Administration should work together to avoid the implementation of the 15 percent reduction in the interim payment system and ensure timely implementation of the prospective payment system.

**SEC. 21. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON EMERGENCY SPENDING.**

It is the sense of Congress that as a part of a comprehensive reform of the budget process the Committees on the Budget should develop a definition of and a process for, funding emergencies consistent with the applicable proviso of H.R. 853, the Comprehensive Budget Process Reform Act of 1999 that could be incorporated into the Rules of the House of Representatives and the Standing Rules of the Senate.

**SEC. 22. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON MEDICARE+CHOICE PROGRAMS/REIMBURSEMENT RATES.**

It is the sense of Congress that Medicare+Choice regional disparity among reimbursement rates are unfair; and that full funding of the Medicare+Choice program is a priority as Congress deals with any medicare reform legislation.

**SEC. 23. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON SKILLED NURSING FACILITIES.**

It is the sense of Congress that the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission continue to carefully monitor the medicare skilled nursing benefit to determine if payment rates are sufficient to provide quality care, and that if reform is recommended, Congress pass legislation as quickly as possible to assure quality skilled nursing care.

MODIFICATION OF AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. STENHOLM

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment in the nature of a substitute be modified.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification of amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 3 offered by Mr. STENHOLM:

Page 11, line 5, in the matter proposed to be inserted, strike $51,820,000,000. Insert $54,320,000;

Line 9, strike $55,960,000,000 and insert $55,020,000;

Line 13, strike $54,060,000,000 and insert $57,360,000;

Line 17, strike $55,360,000,000 and insert $58,760,000;

Line 21, strike $56,300,000,000 and insert $58,800,000;

Line 25, strike $56,330,000,000 and insert $58,800,000.

□ 2015

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 446, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) and a Member opposed each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, for 4 years, the Blue Dogs have offered an honest, fiscally responsible budget. We were the first to talk about balanced budgets without counting Social Security surpluses. We are the folks who consistently have hounded our colleagues about debt reduction. Why have we obsessed on this one topic? Because, just as tax dollars are your money, as is so often said by Members on this floor and at home, so is the $5.6 trillion debt your debt, and it is unconscionable to continue to pass that burden on to our children and grandchildren.

In a release just delivered to my office, the highly respected Concord Coalition says, ''We believe the Blue Dog alternative provides the best overall budgetary framework for the next 5 years.''

Last year the Blue Dog budget established the 50–25–25 rule in dealing with any non-Social Security surpluses: 50 percent to debt reduction, 25 percent to tax cuts, 25 percent to spending priorities. This substitute we now consider continues that philosophy.

We retire the debt by 2012, 1 year earlier than any other proposal considered in the House today. We reject all budget gimmicks, like unrealistic caps or baselines, insecure lockboxes, backloading, and directed scorekeeping. We protect 10 percent of the Social Security trust funds. We provide for fiscally responsible tax cuts. We also respond to critical program needs in agriculture, in defense, for veterans and military retirees, in education and health care, including Medicare.

We are proud of this budget, and we are proud of the influence which we think our small band of relentless true believers have had on this body over the past number of years. We encourage Members on both sides of the aisle, regardless of your label, to listen seriously to the next 40 minutes of debate to see if you do not agree with us, and with the Concord Coalition, that this is the most reasonable and responsible and doable budget on the floor today.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER).

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, balanced budget security for America's future, a GOP plan. I would like to go down this, if I could, to outline the six points of the Republican plan.

Number one, protects 100 percent of Social Security surplus. All of the $166 billion Social Security surplus is off limits to Clinton-Gore spending. This will be the second year in a row that Republicans will be protecting the Social Security surplus.

Secondly, we strengthen Medicare with prescription drugs. It sets aside $40 billion to help needy seniors afford their prescription drugs, and it rejects the $18.2 billion Clinton-Gore Medicare cuts.

Point three, it retires the public debt by 2013. It pays off more than $1 trillion of public debt over the next 5 years. Our budget has already repaid $302 billion since 1998.

Our next point, it promotes tax fairness for families, farmers, and seniors. It provides for the House-passed marriage penalty an average of $1,400 per married couple and small business tax relief, education and health care assistance amounting to $150 billion, and it rejects the $96 billion gross tax increase over 5 years in the Clinton-Gore budget.

Number five, it restores American defense, 6 percent more than last year's for overdeployed Armed Forces. The GOP defense budget provides $1 billion more than the Clinton-Gore plan.

Finally, number six, it strengthens support for education and science, 9.4 percent for elementary and secondary education, IDEA increases of nearly $2 billion. It fights cancer, AIDS and diabetes and other diseases with $1 billion more for NIH, and also $1 billion for basic research into biology, science, engineering, and math.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, our Federal public debt stands now at $3.6 trillion. This equates to $56,000 for the average family of four. This year nearly $1,000 in taxes from every man, woman, and child in the United States will be used just to pay the interest on the debt.

The Republican budget resolution sends our Nation on the path towards eliminating public debt by paying off $1 trillion over the next 5 years. Paying off public debt makes good sense. It makes more money available in the private sector and saving and for investment in health.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 seconds to respond in saying that this was great rhetoric we just heard, but it has nothing to do with the budget we are now discussing.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE).

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, the critical question this evening as we debate the budget is how much are we doing to reduce our Nation's debt?

The budget that is before us, the Blue Dog Coalition budget, clearly comes out ahead. To understand this, we have to begin by understanding the size of the Nation's debt. It now stands at about $5.7 trillion. My good friend from California, the previous speaker, talked about the debt that is held by Federal trust funds. Well, that is all very interesting, and he is talking about limiting the debt to Social Security.

Well, that is interesting. But that does not mean it is not debt. If you look at the Republican budget that is under consideration tonight, you will find that at the end of 5 years the debt that we owe, that is that the United States of America owes, is up to $5.9 trillion. We are not reducing debt. All we are doing is what we are supposed to do with the Social Security trust fund, we are not invading it.

Now, the Blue Dog Coalition budget is going to reduce the Nation's debt in a significant way. Over a 10-year projected period of time it would reduce the debt, and this includes the debt owed to Social Security, by $428 billion. We are also doing the same things that our colleagues on the Republican side talk about, prescription drugs and so on. We are not neglecting that. But we are reducing our debt by $428 billion, whereas the Republican proposal is increasing that debt by $84 billion over that 10-year period of time.

I believe that this is a stinging indictment of the budget that the majority is trying to pull over our eyes. This is not a budget that they proposed that meets the demands of the American people, that we protect our children and grandchildren from this enormous $5.9 trillion debt that has been accumulated.

I would like to ask my colleagues how they can explain that, when they are done, the debt will be $5.9 trillion over 5 years.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to quickly reiterate and correct the math from the past speaker. If you look at the debt at the end of the 5-year window, the debt by the Republican budget resolution, the total debt subject to limit is actually lower than the debt in the Blue Dog budget, subject to limit, at the end of the 5 year window.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS).

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to rise in support of the Committee on the Budget budget and in opposition to the Blue Dog budget, with all due respect to what I think is a good effort to deal with the issue of debt retirement. However, as is the case in all budgets, we need to achieve balance. I just want to reiterate that what our budget does, most importantly, is to set aside 100 percent of the entire surplus in Social Security for Social Security. That will result in the reduction in the national debt of over $1 trillion over 5 years.

Now, we need to talk apples and apples here. I think, unfortunately, we had a 10-year budget cycle last year. We are back to 5 years this year. We should stick with 5 years, because it is as easy to predict the budget 5 years from now or 6 years from now as it is to predict the weather 6 or 7 days from now. We know with our budget we will strengthen Medicare and provide a prescription drug coverage for seniors; and, if we fail to do it, those resources will go into debt reduction as well.

Our budget will retire the entire public debt, if you believe in projections that go way out, by the year 2013, and our budget balances the issues of debt reduction and a stronger defense with the need to promote tax relief for working Americans. Never have taxes been higher than they are today. As we strive to deal with making a balance in a budget surplus environment, some portion of that budget surplus has to go to tax relief, to eliminate the marriage tax penalty, to eliminate the Social Security earnings limit, just to name a couple of them.

Lastly, what our budget does, and it is so important, is to strengthen support for education and science, most notably to increase funding for IDEA by over $2 billion.

Mr. Chairman, I respect the Blue Dog budget, but I think that our budget is a more balanced budget that will meet the needs of the American people.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY).

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise tonight in support of the Blue Dog substitute and in opposition to the Republican budget resolution.

The Republican budget is plain and simple, it is irresponsible. Basically their budget adds up to $800 billion in tax cuts that they pay for at the expense of everything else in the budget, especially at the expense of future generations and our Nation's seniors. It puts Social Security and Medicare at risk.

The Blue Dog budget protects our Nation's seniors. It increases funding for discretionary health care programs by $4.6 billion over the Republican budget. This higher funding level will allow for increased funding for rural health care programs, health research, and other programs to expand access to health care.

The Blue Dog budget establishes a Medicare reserve of $40 billion over the next 5 years and $150 billion over the next 10 years. This reserve could be used to extend the solvency of Medicare, create a prescription drug benefit and provide provider relief that is desperately needed by our hospitals.

□ 2030

The Blue Dog budget allocates 25 percent of the debt reduction dividend of the savings and interest on the debt held by the public to provide additional resources for Medicare reform after 2010. We need to do what is right for our Nation's seniors and for our Nation's children and pass the Blue Dog budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY MILLER).

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of debate today. Our budget clearly protects 100 percent of the Social Security surplus. Our budget strengthens Medicare and prescription drugs. I am going to save retiring the debt to last because I think that is an important issue here. Our budget promotes tax fairness, our budget restores America's defense where it should be, and our budget strengthens and supports education.

The reason we are here today with our debt is because the Democrats controlled this Congress from 1962 to 1994, and every dollar they took in, they spent $1.20. Since Republicans took over Congress, since 1994, for every new dollar we took in, we only spent 50 cents.

But that is not the main issue today. I rise to draw attention as to why we should not pass this amendment, and that is because this amendment puts the Federal budget on auto pilot again. We need to reform government; we need to get rid of the waste.

Let me show my colleagues one agency we could attack to get rid of much of the waste, and that is HUD. HUD is losing taxpayer dollars in huge amounts by keeping large inventories of foreclosed FHA houses. Just let me list a few of the statistics that we have.

The Federal Housing Administration, FHA mortgage insurance paid out almost 77,000 claims, or $6 billion, in 1998. There is no reform for that. That cost is passed on to consumers in higher premiums. In 1997, single-family homes stayed in Federal inventory on an average of 5.4 months; in 1998 it was 6.6 months; and in 1996, they had 25,000 single-family homes in inventory; and in 1998 it increased to 40,000; and in 1999, it was 50,000.

The HUD single-family inventory was valued at $1.9 billion in 1996, and it increased in value to $3.3 billion in 1998. Fifteen percent of HUD inventory properties are held longer than 12 months. The industry average out there has about 3 months in inventory for 12 months. In 1996, the average loss for property was $28,000. In 1998, the average loss had increased to $31,700. The average loss in 1999 was $32,470. If we multiply 50,000 properties in inventory by an average loss of $32,470, it is $1.6 billion.

This is a bad proposal. Let us take government off auto pilot. Let us give people their money back. Let us give people tax cuts. Let us not say that we are going to take the money that belongs to taxpayers and we are going to continue to invest it in programs that do not work. Let us change the Federal Government, and the best way to change the Federal Government is get the money out of Washington. We can do it two ways. Are we going to continue to have government on auto pilot, or are we going to give hard-working people their money back to do what they think they should do with it? This is a bad proposal.

The focus on paying down debt by 2012 compared to our proposal, paying it down by 2013 only changes the focus from the issue of putting government on auto pilot. We need to take it off auto pilot, we need to reform government, we need to get the waste and abuse out of government.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, American families deserve an honest budget based on realistic and conservative estimates of the surplus, a budget that takes a responsible approach to protecting Social Security and to ensuring that our children will not inherent a big national debt.

The Blue Dog Democrat budget protects 100 percent of the Social Security surplus for Social Security. It commits the projected surplus 50 percent to paying down the national debt, 25 percent to saving Social Security and Medicare, and 25 percent to tax relief. It is not fancy, it is not gimmicky, and it does not make promises that it cannot deliver. Most importantly, it is an honest budget that is good for our future.

The Blue Dog budget contrasts sharply with the Republican budget. The Blue Dog budget adopts a more conservative estimate of the surplus. After all, this good economy may not go on forever. The Blue Dog budget makes a stronger commitment to paying off our $5 trillion national debt, rather than risking our historic opportunity to give our children a debt-free America. The Blue Dog budget is stronger on national defense and veterans' health care.

The Blue Dog budget offers a realistic promise that not only will we keep our hands out of the Social Security Trust Fund, but that we will be prepared to put more in it when the baby boom generation retires and those deficits begin to mount in the trust fund. Finally, the Blue Dog budget guarantees that the tax relief we grant will be targeted to working, middle-income families who deserve to have their fair share of the prosperity of this new economy.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues, do the right thing and support the Blue Dog Democrat budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG).

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I would just like to say I have the greatest respect for the Blue Dogs; I think they honestly approach things in a straightforward fashion. I just think they are a little shy when it comes to the amount of money that they are getting back to the taxpayer.

With taxes at an all-time high and non-Social Security surpluses growing, we need to provide tax relief to the hard-working Americans who earned it. The Blue Dog budget, as I understand it, would provide a net tax cut of only $36 billion over the next 5 years. That will not even begin to pay for the marriage penalty relief; it will not pay for the Social Security earnings limit or the small business tax relief bills that have been demanded by the American people.

The Republican budget provides tax relief of at least $150 billion over the next 5 years, and an additional $60 billion for tax relief or debt reduction. The Republican budget is a responsible plan for all Americans. We have set our Nation on a course to pay down the public debt, to protect Social Security, to provide needed funds for Medicare reform and with prescription drug coverage. With these priorities met, how can we not justify providing tax relief for the American worker?

Mr. Chairman, this is not our money. It does not belong to Washington bureaucrats; it does not belong to Members of Congress. This budget is paid for by the hard work and the sweat of the American worker. Americans know how better to spend their money than a micromanaging Washington bureaucrat.

By lowering taxes, we will be telling the American people they are more important than bloated government bureaucracy. The Federal tax burden is at an all-time high, as I have said; and taxpayers frankly have overpaid. If we cannot give them their money back now, with the Government in the black and taxes at an all-time high, when the economy is strong, when can we do it?

Mr. Chairman, I urge a no vote on this amendment so that we can give the taxpayers what they rightly deserve.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time.

I rise today to speak to the agriculture part of the Blue Dog budget. Those of us from farm country, and I think we all ought to listen up and look at what is in this budget for agriculture. As we all know, we have a big problem out in farm country. Farmers are having a tough time. The Blue Dog budget increases the baseline for mandatory agriculture programs by $23.6 billion over the next 5 years, in addition to the $6 billion that is in the Republican budget, as well as ours. The increase in the agriculture baseline will provide funding for crop insurance legislation, initiatives to provide long-term agricultural safety net and income support programs, including dairy.

I would point out to my good friend from Wisconsin, this budget has money to extend the price supports for the program for dairy, and the Republican budget does not. We also have money for agriculture research, expanded conservation research programs. So we have the money to do the kinds of things that we need to do in agriculture.

The Republican budget does not provide any increase in the agriculture baseline beyond the increase necessary to fund crop insurance reform. I want to repeat that. There is no increase in the Republican budget for the baseline, which is going to be very important to us when we move out into doing something meaningful for agriculture in the future. There are no funds in the Republican budget to improve the agriculture safety net by providing any kind of income support program, which we all know we are going to need.

So support the Blue Dog budget, because we provide a greater commitment to agriculture with over $16 billion more than the Republican version over the next 5 years.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the vice chairman of the Committee on the Budget, a gentleman who has worked long and hard on agriculture issues.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say, as I said last night, that this budget is not a bad budget. It has a lot of provisions in it that I really like, particularly when it comes to agriculture and defense, two issues which I have a very keen interest in.

But there is a problem here. There are a couple of problems with this budget that need to be addressed; and if those were addressed, it would certainly make it a much better budget.

First of all, there is too much spending. The budget that the Republicans have put forward, really we had hoped would not spend as much money as we do, but we spend $595 billion. The Blue Dog budget spends $606 billion over the next 5 years, and those are uncontrollable expenses out there.

From an agricultural perspective, I agree with the gentleman that we have to work towards a safety net. I am not sure we know what the answer to it is, but some of the things that are in your budget I think do head us down that direction.

But there is one other problem with the agricultural portion in your budget that really ought to be addressed, that is, my farmers want a balance. They want a balance between some sort of income security and some sort of tax relief. The number one issue with my farmers outside of income is estate tax relief, and there is not enough room in the Blue Dog budget to provide for real meaningful estate tax relief.

Now, we are going to get there eventually. I think we are going to wind up working together to get there because I know my colleagues' feelings on that; and I think it is something that ultimately we are going to be able to get together on that is going to be extremely beneficial for farmers. But unless my Democratic colleagues address those major issues in the budget, it simply does not provide for the things that we provide for in the Republican budget that create that balance in agriculture country.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 seconds.

I would remind my friend from Georgia that our budget provides a better death tax than the budget that our Republican colleagues are supporting. Our budget does.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD).

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

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Stenholm substitute, better known as the Blue Dog budget.

Mr. Chairman, the cornerstone of this budget is debt reduction, and the Republican budget guarantees only $8 billion of their own budget surplus for debt reduction over 5 years. The Blue Dog budget, in contrast, provides $85 billion of their own budget surplus for debt reduction. The Blue Dog budget pays down 30 percent of the publicly held debt over the next 5 years. The Republican budget, in contrast, has most of its debt reduction after 2005.

Secondly, the Blue Dog budget provides realistic domestic discretionary spending levels. The Republican budget calls for a $20 billion inflation-adjusted cut in domestic spending. I say to my colleagues, the 5 years that the Republicans have been in control of this Congress, the average nondefense discretionary spending has increased by 2½ percent. We all know that a $20 billion inflation-adjusted cut is unreasonable. The Blue Dog budget recognizes this and provides for realistic budget-spending levels.

Thirdly, the Blue Dog has five spending-priority areas. Number one is defense, and it provides $15 billion more than the Republican budget in defense.

Fourthly, veterans. It provides over $3 billion more; agriculture, over $2 billion more; education, over $15 billion more; and health care, over $4 billion more than the Republican budget.

In addition to all of this, the Blue Dog budget provides over $36 billion over the next 5 years in tax relief. I say to my colleagues to support the Blue

Dog budget, support realistic spending levels that will not require gimmicks in the appropriations process later this year. This is a fiscally-responsible budget, and it provides responsible tax relief.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) has 8 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time.

The Republican budget as we have heard tonight has six key features, and I want to take a moment to talk about one of them, which is tax relief for hard-working Americans. When we talk about Federal taxes, it is useful to consider the overall context of the Federal budget here.

Let us remember, Federal spending is higher than it has ever been. Federal taxes are higher than any peacetime in our Nation's history. As we heard earlier, about 21 percent of our entire economic output goes to the Federal Government.

What the Republican budget does is it says after we set aside all of the Social Security funds for Social Security and to retire debt and after we pay down $1 trillion in debt over the next 5 years and after we set aside $40 billion of additional funding for Medicare over the next 5 years, and after rebuilding our national defense and reprioritizing funding for elementary and secondary education; after all of that, there is still an unprecedented surplus projected as far as the eye can see.

□ 2045

When taxpayers are paying more money than it takes to fund all of that, then it is obvious to me that taxes are just too high. So the Republican budget offers a modest but a meaningful measure of tax relief and tax fairness. We need to lower taxes and restore to working Americans some more of their freedom to decide how they want to spend their own money.

Our colleagues with this amendment are offering a tiny, little, merely symbolic, but not a real meaningful tax cut. It is just not enough.

Let us remember, when the Federal Government takes people's money away from them, it is taking part of their freedom away. This is money that the government takes from hard-working Americans that they will never be free to spend for themselves as they see fit. It is money that takes time to earn and that means time taken away that folks could spend doing other things like maybe spending more time with their children, maybe caring for an elderly family member, maybe volunteering in their community, or just enjoying some leisure time.

At a time of already huge government spending, record high Federal taxes, it is unconscionable at this point not to provide the American people with the opportunity to keep a little bit more of the money that they earn.

The Republican budget strikes the right balance. No more raiding of the Social Security surplus for the second consecutive year. Funding America's priorities like national defense and education, retiring a trillion dollars of debt over 5 years in tax relief for an overtaxed Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment with its puny, little tax cut and, instead, support the Republican budget.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHN).

Mr. JOHN. Mr. Chairman, truly a budget debate is strictly over priorities, priorities on what one does with one's money. The indisputable champion of debt reduction is the Blue Dog budget, $5.7 trillion, $21,000 for every man, woman, and child to pay off our national debt, $354 billion in interest.

Let me give my colleagues an idea of what that means. That is 100 times more than we spend on cancer research. It is six times more than we pay for salaries for the military, 15 times the size of the veterans' budget. The debt simply should be the priority.

The Republicans say that they pay off the debt by 2013. But their plan allots $50 billion over 5 years towards debt reduction, but it provides a loophole that says that they can use it for tax cuts. I do not understand that.

Let us give a true tax cut. Pay down the debt, keep interest rates low. The Blue Dog plan is the champion.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, when I sent out my legislative questionnaire, my constituents wanted me to protect Social Security and not spend the surplus. My constituents wanted prescription drug assistance. They wanted us to pay down the debt, and they wanted tax fairness. They wanted a tax cut. That is what our budget does. That is why we see absolutely no reason at all to have any other budget but the one we have.

What have we done? In the year 1999, the last year, we do not spend Social Security. We are not spending it in this year's budget, and we are not spending it in next year's budget. That is in our budget plan.

When we were elected in 1994 and took office in 1995, we were looking at public debt going up $34 billion, $48 billion, $67 billion. That is what we were looking at. Our plan changed that so it goes down rather than up. Public debt is going down.

In fact, what happened is, not only is it going down, it would have continued to go up but we are actually reducing public debt significantly.

What have we paid back? We paid back $51 billion in 1998, $88 billion in 1999, $163 billion in the year we are in now, for $332 billion of debt payment down, and in our budget another $170 billion in the budget to come. That has left us as well the opportunity, out of $10 trillion, to have a $200 billion tax cut.

I am absolutely amazed that we cannot cut 2 percent of our revenue in the next 5 years. We get $10 trillion, and we cannot cut $200 billion? We can, and we do.

We have a marriage penalty tax elimination. We reduce the death tax. We have educational savings account. We have health care deductibility, community renewal, and pension reform. Not a tax cut for the wealthy, as my colleagues would imply, but a tax cut for the middle class.

Then we make sure that, if we get additional surplus, we do not allow Democrats, frankly, to spend it. We set it aside for further debt reduction and more tax cuts. This is a sensible budget. We do not need another one.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL), the newest member of the Indiana Basketball Hall of Fame.

(Mr. HILL of Indiana asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILL of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, for many years, people in Washington, Democrats and Republicans, have not been writing budgets that use real numbers. The majority's budget we are considering today is more of the same old song and dance, spend money the government does not have and make promises Congress cannot keep.

The budget we are asked to vote on today sets spending levels that we all know will not address our national priorities and forces us to take money from Social Security and increase the national debt.

I am a fiscal conservative Democrat who believes we should write a budget that uses real numbers and makes promises Congress can actually keep. The Blue Dog budget does this. It proves we can write a realistic budget that addresses the national priorities both parties share.

For example, the Blue Dog proposal makes a serious commitment to our national defense and to the men and women who serve in the military. It provides $15 billion more than the Republicans do and the administration's plan and $10 billion for veterans. The Blue Dog budget also calls for a $40 billion tax relief. The American people need it, and we can afford this. It gives families, farms, and small business owners much needed tax relief but within a framework of fiscal responsibility.

The organizing principle behind this Blue Dog budget is restoring fiscal responsibility to a government that has

been spending more than it has taken in over the years. It pays off the national debt faster than any other budget proposal the House will consider today.

The moral thing to do is to relieve our children and our grandchildren of this debt. I urge my colleagues to support this Blue Dog budget resolution.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. Stenholm) has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, article 1, section 8 of the United States Constitution gives Congress the authority to provide for the common defense. It goes on to say that no money can be drawn from the Treasury except by appropriation by Congress.

For more than a decade, the budget for national defense has decreased. In particular, for the past 6 years, a Democratic President has asked for far too little, and the Republican Congress has achieved almost all of the debt reduction at the expense of our Nation's defense.

The result is its shrinking Navy fleet, almost 300 ships, aging weapons systems, the shortchanging of our men and women in uniform, the delay of their paychecks so that it will go on next year's bill instead of this.

In human terms, it means people like Harry Schein, a Marine Corps lance corporal has to work two part-time jobs to make ends meet and to take care of his son. It means that people like Lisa Joles, the wife of a United States Marine, has to pick up used furniture on the side of the road to take care of her and other Marine families.

But do my colleagues know, it gets worse. Our military retirees who were promised a lifetime of free health care if they served our country honorably for 20 years are being told they cannot come to the base hospital anymore.

The Blue Dog budget increases defense spending over the Republican proposal by over $4 billion a year. One billion dollars of that would fulfill the promise of lifetime health care to our military retirees. That proposal has been endorsed by over 24 veterans organizations.

The other $3 billion can go to address the pay problems. It can go to address the aging weapons systems. It can go to take care of readiness.

The promise that was made to our service members and military retirees are more important than the promises that were made over a steak dinner and cocktails to some big contributor for a tax break.

Tonight my colleagues get to decide which they think are more important.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, I support the Blue Dog budget very simply because it provides debt reduction with savings to Social Security and Medicare, priority spending for education, veterans, agriculture, defense, health care and prescription drugs, and provides responsible tax relief from the death tax, the marriage penalty, and it gives deductions for health care to the self-employed. It is a good budget. It is fiscally responsible, and we just ought to pass it.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, the caps are right. The budget we will consider next recognizes the gimmicks in the budget that we are considering at the base bill.

The reason my colleagues can claim all of the things that they claim regarding debt is they are back end loading. They are in fact double counting in areas in which many of them who have been speaking do not truly appreciate what their committee has done. They are back end loading.

It is true when we talk about Social Security and our tax cuts, it is true, ours are puny compared to theirs. The problem is that theirs explodes in 2014 when the Social Security drain will become real. When the baby boomers become retirees and begin drawing Social Security, that is when their tax cut will become a problem that the Blue Dogs wish to avoid. I wish they would recognize that.

We have been criticized for too much spending, but at the same time folks on this side have said we agree with your military spending. We agree with your defense spending. We agree with your spending for veterans. They cannot have it both ways. Ours is the most responsible.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 seconds to rebut.

The difference between the Blue Dog budget and the Republican budget is that the Blue Dog budget cuts less taxes and spends more money.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU).

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, one of the previous speakers, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), described very clearly what the fundamental difference is between these two budgets.

The Republican budget, after we set aside every single penny of the Social Security surplus, and after we set aside $40 billion for medical care reforms and prescription drug coverage, and after we pay down $1 trillion in debt over 5 years, and after we fund critical needs and defense, $2 billion more for the unfunded mandate of special education costs, after we invest in veterans' health care, only then do we recognize the importance of letting Americans keep a little bit more of their own money.

The Blue Dog budget just does not understand this. It is a minuscule tax cut over 5 years.

Let us look at the difference, the difference in values here. This is the tax relief in the Republican budget and the marriage penalty. Now, we could pay down a little bit more debt if we wanted to keep penalizing married couples simply because they chose to get married, but that would be wrong.

Repeal the Social Security earnings limit. We could pay down a little bit more debt if we wanted to keep punishing those seniors that want to be a productive part of the workforce, but that would be terribly wrong.

We could keep taxing family farms and small businesses, send them to the IRS and the undertaker on the same day, but that would be wrong.

We could decide not to give individuals health insurance deductibilities just like we give to big corporations, but that would be wrong.

□ 2100

Sure, we could pay down a little bit more debt in addition to the trillion dollars in debt over 5 years, but that would be wrong.

We fundamentally recognize that what we need to do is not just reduce the tax burden on citizens in this country, which is at an all-time high, but we need to make the Tax Code more fair through health insurance deductibility, eliminating the death tax, repealing the earnings limit, and expanding the opportunity to invest in IRAs and education savings accounts. The Republican proposal does just that.

Reject this amendment that does not treat the American taxpayer fairly and support the Republican resolution.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SISISKY).

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

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Chairman, I didn't now whether I was going to get into this debate or not. But after listening to everything that has been said today, I think I have to. Make no mistake about it: I support the Blue Dog Budget.

The Blue Dog Budget is the most balanced plan of any before us. It eliminates the public debt more quickly than any other plan. It makes room for responsible tax cuts. It provides realistic discretionary spending. It makes Medicare work better. It saves 100% of the Social Security surplus.

It addresses many other problems, ranging from agriculture to health care for military retirees, in better ways than any other option.

But what is of major importance to me is—over the next five years, it increases defense discretionary spending by $32 billion over the inflated baseline.

What's good about that is that it's $15 billion more than the Republican budget.

What's problematic is that it still doesn't meet unfunded requirements submitted by the service chiefs. To do that, you would need to add at least $15 billion a year for the next five years. And while not going that far, the Blue Dog Budget clearly moves us closer to meeting our requirements. And let me tell you why that's important.

Our fleet admirals say they need more than 350 ships to carry out the missions assigned today. But we're not building enough ships.

The Army is trying to build a force that is both more maneuverable and more lethal—in order to respond to current contingencies.

But we're forcing them to achieve that goal by canceling systems and undercutting current capabilities. There's not enough money. And the future of the Air Force depends on whether we can afford the development of two new planes, the F–22 and joint strike fighter.

You know what's so great about those two planes? They have the capabilities and characteristics to ensure that their pilots always come home. You only have to think back to Kosovo, where we lost two aircraft and no pilots, to see how important that is.

Nevertheless, with money so tight, I'm afraid we may postpone one of the programs simply to harvest the money for other defense programs. I hope it doesn't come to that, but that's how desperate the situation really is.

Not only are we short of money, we're short of people. We've negated our commitments to health care.

The net result is that veterans and military retirees—from families who have served this country for many generations—are telling their sons and daughters: ''Don't go into the service, they don't keep their promises.'' That's a very sad state of affairs.

It's a state of affairs that the Blue Dog budget tries to remedy, in part, by adding nearly $7 billion more for military retiree health care, and $10 billion more for veterans programs, than the Republican plan. I could go on and on. There are so many constructive solutions in the Blue Dog budget.

Unless you have a political agenda that carries you off in some other direction, this should be the easiest budget to vote for.

I ask you to support responsible, constructive solutions that will strengthen our nation at home and abroad. Vote ''yes'' on the Blue Dog budget.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER).

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

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Chairman, it has been a long day, and I think almost everything has been said, just not everyone has had a chance to say it.

I think it would be wise to remind ourselves that a budget and a budget resolution is merely a forecast of future economic events with an attending set of priorities based thereon.

It has been very well pointed out by the speakers before me that this country is right now laboring with a 13 percent mortgage on us. Over $300 billion a year. Now, my colleagues, no rational businessperson on earth, with a 13 percent mortgage on his business, would not make it a priority, when he came into some extra money, to reduce that staggering overhead.

My colleagues say the American people are overtaxed. We agree. And the reason they are overtaxed is because they are lugging around a 13 percent mortgage on themselves and their country.

Now, President Eisenhower said one time that he considered no money here in Washington a surplus as long as the Nation's children had a debt. And I know that all my colleagues have a priority of tax relief for the here and now, but the Blue Dog budget has a priority for tax relief for the then and there.

It is simply wrong to leave this country to our children, our posterity, with water so dirty that fish cannot live in it, air so polluted people cannot breathe it, and a 13 percent mortgage on it that they are going to have to strain and struggle and pay for eternity. That is simply wrong.

Our priority is debt reduction first, funding the programs we need to for the military; for the agriculture sector; for veterans; for education and for health care. It is a balanced budget. Tax relief for some; but more importantly, tax relief for those who follow.

This country will be stronger if we adopt the Blue Dog budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, let me first of all pay tribute to the Blue Dogs, because I think what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) said early on is right. I think the Blue Dogs have made an enormous contribution in this House towards the effort of being able to balance a budget and pay down debt.

I am, however, a little bit mystified with this budget because I have always felt that the Blue Dogs did not like the tax cuts because they wanted to pay down more debt. And in this budget they do not have the tax cuts, and they do not even pay down as much debt as we do. They went into the spending mode. We actually pay down $25 billion more than the Blue Dogs do.

But I want to pose a challenge to the Blue Dogs, because I am hopeful that we are going to beat their budget, and I am hopeful ours will pass. I think my colleagues ought to like our budget. It does cut a lot of taxes, but it pays down a trillion dollars in debt; and it does restrain spending, and it does protect Social Security. So I would ask my colleagues to think about it when we get to final passage.

But I also want my colleagues to know that today we unveiled, I think it was 170,000 general accounting reports today on waste, fraud and abuse in the Federal Government. And the Committee on the Budget is going to start an effort to try to root out that waste in order to make this government more efficient. And we need the Blue Dogs. We need all my colleagues to participate with us, and we invite them to participate with us through the Committee on the Budget. If Members want to come and sit with us, we would like to deputize them.

I think on a bipartisan basis we ought to attack the waste and the fraud and the abuse, and set our priorities. And the things that touch my colleagues' hearts, the poverty, they touch all our hearts too. So let us prioritize; but at the same time, let us clean it up and let us do it together.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Blue Dog budget which balances fiscal responsibility with the need to adequately fund programs addressing our national priorities and needs. The Blue Dog budget is a responsible plan that balances the budget and retires public debt without tapping into the Social Security trust fund.

Mr. Chairman, I am particularly pleased the Blue Dog budget provides needed funding to expand the Montgomery G.I. bill. The Armed Forces face serious recruiting problems. In order to meet our defense needs, the Armed Forces must have the tools it needs to draw men and women into uniform. The Montgomery G.I. bill has proven to be the military's most valuable recruiting tool. Unfortunately, the combination of a substantially devalued G.I. bill, which now pays only 36 percent of the cost of receiving a 4-year college education, and expanded Federal financial assistance to college-bound students without military service has crippled the G.I. bill's effectiveness.

Recent recruiting gimmicks such as psychedelic humvees, Spike Lee advertisements, drag racers, or desperate cash giveaways are not the answer to these problems. Nor is conscription. Congress would best help our Armed Forces by improving the G.I. bill. Providing access to higher education in exchange for national service is the right thing to do. A strong G.I. bill helps veterans and their families, aids our national defense, and strengthens the economy.

Last year, my colleague, LANE EVANS and I introduced the Montgomery GI Bill Expansion Act (H.R. 1071) to ensure that our All-Volunteer Armed Forces had the ability to attract recruits, and, at the same time, provide veterans with the skills they need to better our economy and their lives. The Blue Dog budget wisely provides funding to expand the G.I. bill in line with H.R. 1071 and will restore the MGIB's value both as a meaningful readjustment benefit and an effective recruiting incentive.

Mr. Chairman, the Blue Dog budget is good for America's veterans and soldiers and is a solid blueprint for our Nation's future. Unlike the Republican budget that would foolishly squander the surplus, the responsible Blue Dog budget pays down the national debt. It will put the nation on a course to eliminate the publicly held debt by 2012 with a strong, immediate commitment to debt reduction. In addition to this, it provides for needed investments in our Nation's health, establishing a $40 billion Medicare reserve fund that can be used to fund Medicare reform and a prescription drug benefit for our seniors.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to do the right thing for veterans, soldiers and our nation's future. Vote for the Blue Dog budget.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the conservative Blue Dog substitute to H. Con. Res. 290, the fiscal year 2001 budget resolution, because it establishes a responsible fiscal framework for Congress to maintain a true balanced budget and to eliminate our national debt.

The majority's budget resolution calls for $596.5 billion in discretionary spending for fiscal year 2001, which is 2 percent more than

the current levels. This budget protects funding for some education programs, veterans, and the NIH; however, it does so at the expense of other domestic priorities—most of which would be cut by the majority, on average, by nearly 10 percent. While I commend the majority's discipline on setting spending levels and prioritizing funding for some of our most pressing domestic needs, I am disappointed about the insistence on passing huge tax cuts that jeopardize our efforts to save Social Security, protect Medicare, and pay down the national debt.

Additionally, the majority plan sets no funding aside to extend the solvency of Social Security one single day. While the majority plan creates a ''reserve'' that could be used to fund Medicare reform or provide a prescription drug benefit; however, how these funds might be used are undefined. Finally, the majority plan provides little, if any room for debt reduction; they allow for a $150 billion tax cut that could explode to almost $250 billion if the majority uses its $40 billion Medicare ''reserve'' for tax cuts and the additional $50 billion reserve for tax cuts. Worse, if both reserves are used, all on-budget surpluses would be wiped out and there would be a $7 billion on-budget deficit in fiscal year 2004.

The majority's budget resolution clearly guides us down the wrong fiscal path by proposing risky tax cuts that will return us to an era of fiscal deficits and exploding national debt, without extending Social Security solvency, protecting Medicare, or reducing any of our national debt.

Similarly, the Democratic alternative does not do enough to focus on this nation's most pressing needs. While this substitute preserves Social Security and Medicare for the long run, begins paying down our national debt and provides targeted tax relief, it forsakes immediate attention to these needs by unnecessarily increasing discretionary spending levels by calling for $19.2 billion in spending increases for fiscal year 2001 and $118.3 billion more in discretionary budget authority than the majority's plan over five years. Like the majority budget resolution, the Democratic alternative directs our fiscal resources away from Social Security away from Medicare and away from debt reduction.

The conservative Blue Dog budget, by contrast, sets out responsible budgetary policy that achieves and maintains a true balanced budget raiding Social Security. The Blue Dog budget reserve half of the on-budget surpluses for debt reduction rather than spending it on tax cuts or new programs. This will allow the budget to remain balanced without dipping into the Social Security trust fund even if optimistic budget projections don't materialize. The Blue Dog budget divides the remaining half on the on-budge surplus between tax reduction and shoring up our nation's commitment to our other domestic priorities—education, veterans, health care and a strong national defense.

Mr. Chairman, the conservative Blue Dog budget, by prudently and responsibly allocating our resources, will allow this nation to maintain our unprecedented economic growth. This budget gets back to basic and common sense principles that most American families follow in their daily lives: Paying our debts; don't spend money we don't have; and provide for basic needs.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the conservative Blue Dog budget substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 171, noes 243, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 72]

AYES—171

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barton
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blumenauer
Bonior
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Clayton
Clement
Coburn
Condit
Cramer
Crowley
Danner
Davis (FL)
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Frost
Gilman
Gonzalez
Granger
Green (TX)
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hill (IN)
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Jefferson
John
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Levin
Lofgren
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McIntyre
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Napolitano
Neal
Norwood
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pickering
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sawyer
Scarborough
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shimkus
Shows
Sisisky
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Turner
Upton
Visclosky
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOES—243

Allen
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Biggert
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Green (WI)
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kasich
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
McCrery
McGovern
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meeks (NY)
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Myrick
Nadler
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Obey
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Payne
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Saxton
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Waters
Watts (OK)
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Young (AK)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Bateman

NOT VOTING—19

Ackerman
Archer
Bonilla
Crane
Dixon
Gordon
Greenwood
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Lowey
Martinez
McCollum
McDermott
McHugh
Porter
Quinn
Rangel
Royce
Schakowsky
Vento

□ 2125

Mr. GALLEGLY and Mr. HOEKSTRA changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. GRANGER, Ms. BROWN of Florida and Messrs. WELDON of Pennsylvania, GILMAN, and GREEN of Texas changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

Mr. BATEMAN changed his vote from ''no'' to ''present.''

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). It is now in order to consider

Amendment Number 4, printed in part B of House Report 106–535.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. SUNUNU

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 4 offered by Mr. SUNUNU:

**SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001.**

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000 is hereby revised and replaced and that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001 and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2002 through 2005 are hereby set forth.

**SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.**

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of the fiscal years 2000 through 2005:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,945,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $2,016,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $2,096,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $2,177,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $2,263,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $2,361,000,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be reduced are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $0.
Fiscal year 2001: $13,207,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $40,337,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $54,528,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $67,518,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $95,497,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,799,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,839,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,877,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,933,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,991,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $2,059,700,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,784,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,809,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,860,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,914,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,968,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $2,037,000,000,000.

(4) SURPLUSES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the surpluses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $ .
Fiscal year 2001: $ .
Fiscal year 2002: $ .
Fiscal year 2003: $ .
Fiscal year 2004: $ .
Fiscal year 2005: $ .

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $ .
Fiscal year 2001: $ .
Fiscal year 2002: $ .
Fiscal year 2003: $ .
Fiscal year 2004: $ .
Fiscal year 2005: $ .

**SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.**

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and budget outlays for fiscal years 2000 through 2005 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $288,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $282,500,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $309,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $299,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $317,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $307,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $326,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $319,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $335,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $328,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $344,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $340,500,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $20,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $17,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $16,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $15,800,000,000.,
(B) Outlays, $12,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $15,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $15,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,800,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $19,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $19,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $19,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $19,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $19,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $19,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,000,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $1,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $0:
(B) Outlays, −$1,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, −$300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,500,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $24,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $22,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $22,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $22,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $22,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $22,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,800,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $35,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $19,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $18,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $17,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $17,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $15,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,200,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $8,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $6,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $7,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $9,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $12,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $12,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,400,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $51,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $54,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $52,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $53,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $53,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $53,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,100,000,000.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $11,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $9,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $8,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $8,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $8,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $8,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $7,800,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $57,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $70,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $71,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $71,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $71,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $71,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,300,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $159,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $152,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $168,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $166,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $127,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $177,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $189,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $189,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $202,700,000.
(B) Outlays, $203,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $218,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $217,800,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $199,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $199,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $215,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $216,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $221,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $221,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $239,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $239,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $255,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $255,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $278,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $278,200,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $238,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $248,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $251,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $255,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $258,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $267,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $273,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $276,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $278,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $288,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $290,500,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $405,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $405,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $422,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $422,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $443,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $443,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $463,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $463,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $486,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $485,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $510,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $510,100,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $46,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $47,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $49,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $50,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $52,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $55,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,900,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $27,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $25,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $25,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $25,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $25,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $24,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,800,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $13,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $12,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $12,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $12,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $12,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $12,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,000,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $ .
(B) Outlays, $ .
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $ .
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $ .
(B) Outlays, $ .
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $ .
(B) Outlays, $ .
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $ .
(B) Outlays, $ .
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $ .
(B) Outlays, $ .
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $8,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$4,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$8,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$1,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$1,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$2,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$2,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, −$2,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$2,500,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$41,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$41,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$46,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$46,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$50,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$50,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$50,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$50,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$48,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$48,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, −$50,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$50,100,000,000.

**SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.**

(a) SUBMISSIONS REGARDING REVENUES.—In addition to changes in revenues included the House Committee on Ways and Means shall report to the House a reconciliation bill—

(1) not later than May 19, 2000 that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the total level of revenues by not more than: $4,100,000,000 for Fiscal Year 2001, and $50,700,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005;

(2) not later than May 19, 2000 that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the total level of revenues by not more than: $578,000,000 for Fiscal Year 2001, and $12,984,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005;

(3) not later than May 19, 2000 that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the total level of revenues by not more than: $2,353,000,000 for Fiscal Year 2001, and $45,750,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005;

(4) not later than May 26, 2000 that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the total level of revenues by not more than: $5,200,000,000 for Fiscal Year 2001, and $26,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005;

(5) not later than June 23, 2000 that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the total level of revenues by not more than: $500,000,000 for Fiscal Year 2001, and $15,600,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005;

(6) not later than July 28, 2000 that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the total level of revenues by not more than: $476,000,000 for Fiscal Year 2001, and $7,718,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005; and

(7) not later than September 22, 2000 that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the total level of revenues by not more than: $0 for Fiscal Year 2001, and $113,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005;

(b) SUBMISSIONS REGARDING DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report to the House a reconciliation bill—

(1) not later than May 26, 2000 that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the debt held by the public

by not more than $10,000,000,000 for Fiscal Year 2001; and

(2) not later than September 22, 2000 that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the debt held by the public by not more than $40,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2002 through 2005.

(c) SUBMISSIONS REGARDING MEDICARE.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report to the House a reconciliation bill not later than September 22, 2000 that reforms the medicare program and provides coverage for prescription drugs, but not to exceed $4 billion in new budget authority and $4,000,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2001 and −$2,000,000,000 in new budget authority and −$2,000,000,000 in outlays for the period fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

**SEC. 5. SPECIAL PROCEDURES TO SAFEGUARD TAX RELIEF.**

(a) ADJUSTMENTS.—

(1) Upon the reporting of a reconciliation bill by the Committee on Ways and Means pursuant to section 4(a) or, the offering of an amendment to, or the submission of a conference report on, H.R. 3081, H.R. 6, or H.R. 2990, whichever occurs first, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House shall reduce to zero the revenue aggregates set forth in section 2(1)(B) (and make all other appropriate conforming adjustments).

(2) After making the adjustments referred to in paragraph (1), and whenever the Committee on Ways and Means reports any reconciliation bill pursuant to section 4(a) (or an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted or an amendment to H.R. 3081, H.R. 6, or H.R. 2990 is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted after the date of adoption of this resolution, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House shall increase the levels by which Federal revenues should be reduced by the amount of revenue loss caused by such measure for each applicable year or period, but not to exceed, after taking into account any other bill or joint resolution enacted during this session of the One Hundred Sixth Congress that causes a reduction in revenues for such year or period, $ in fiscal year 2001 and $ for the period of fiscal year 2001 through 2005 (and make all other appropriate conforming adjustments).

(b) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments made pursuant to subsection (a)(1) for any measure shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

**SEC. 6. RESERVE FUND FOR AUGUST UPDATE REVISION OF BUDGET SURPLUSES.**

(a) REPORTING A SURPLUS.—If the Congressional Budget Office report referred to in subsection (b) projects an increase in the surplus for fiscal year 2000, fiscal year 2001, and the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005 over the corresponding levels set forth in its economic and budget forecast for 2001 submitted pursuant to section 202(c)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House may make the adjustments as provided in subsection (c).

(b) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE UPDATED BUDGET FORECAST FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001.—The report referred to in subsection (a) is the Congressional Budget Office updated budget forecast for fiscal year 2001.

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—If the Committee on Ways and Means reports any reconciliation bill pursuant to section 4(a) (or an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted), or an amendment to H.R. 3081, H.R. 6, or H.R. 2990 is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted after the date of adoption of this resolution that, after taking into account any other bill or joint resolution enacted during this session of the One Hundred Sixth Congress that causes a reduction in revenues for such year or period, would cause the level by which Federal revenues should be reduced, as set forth in section 2(1)(B) for fiscal year 2001 or for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005, to be exceeded, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House may increase the levels by which Federal revenues should be reduced by the amount exceeding such level resulting from such measure for each applicable year or period, but not to exceed the increase in the surplus for such year or period in the report referred to in subsection (a).

(d) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments made pursuant to subsection (c) for any measure shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

**SEC. 7. SAFE DEPOSIT BOX FOR SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUSES.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) under the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the social security trust funds are off-budget for purposes of the President's budget submission and the concurrent resolution on the budget;

(2) the social security trust funds have been running surpluses for 17 years;

(3) these surpluses have been used to implicitly finance the general operations of the Federal Government;

(4) in fiscal year 2001, the social security surplus will exceed $166 billion;

(5) for the first time, a concurrent resolution on the budget balances the Federal budget without counting the social security surpluses;

(6) the only way to ensure that social security surpluses are not diverted for other purposes is to balance the budget exclusive of such surpluses; and

(7) Congress and the President should take such steps as are necessary to ensure that future budgets are balanced excluding the surpluses generated by the social security trust funds.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any revision to this resolution or a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2002, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that sets forth a deficit for any fiscal year.

(2) DEFICIT LEVELS.—For purposes of this subsection, a deficit shall be the level (if any) set forth in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for that fiscal year pursuant to section 301(a)(3) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

**SEC. 8. DEBT REDUCTION LOCK-BOX.**

POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any reported bill or joint resolution, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that would cause a surplus for fiscal year 2001 to be less than the level (as adjusted) set forth in section 2(4) for that fiscal year.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—The level of the surplus for purposes of subsection (a) shall not take into account any adjustment made under section 314(a)(1)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

**SEC. 9. RESERVE FUND FOR AGRICULTURE IN FISCAL YEAR 2001.**

If the Committee on Agriculture of the House reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto is offered (in the House), or a conference report thereon is submitted that provides risk management or income assistance for agricultural producers, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of new budget authority and outlays to that committee by the amount of new budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) if such legislation does not exceed $ in new budget authority and $ in outlays for fiscal year 2001 and $ in new budget authority and $ in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005 (and make all other appropriate conforming adjustments).

**SEC. 10. RESERVE FUND FOR RETIREMENT SECURITY**

Whenever the Committee on Ways and Means of the House reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto is offered (in the House), or a conference report thereon is submitted that enhances retirement security through structural programmatic reform and the creation of personal retirement accounts, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may—

(1) increase the appropriate allocations and aggregates of new budget authority and outlays by the amount of new budget authority provided by such measure (and outlays flowing therefrom) for that purpose;

(2) reduce the revenue aggregates by the amount of the revenue loss resulting from that measure for that purpose; and

(3) make all other appropriate conforming adjustments.

**SEC. 11. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.**

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocation and aggregates made pursuant to section 9 or 10 for any measure shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution—

(1) the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives or the Senate, as applicable; and

(2) such chairman, as applicable, may make any other necessary adjustments to such levels to carry out this resolution.

**SEC. 12. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING THE STABILIZATION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL PAYMENTS TO STATES, COUNTIES, AND BOROUGHS.**

It is the sense of the House that Federal revenue-sharing payments to States, countries, and boroughs pursuant to the Act of May 23, 1908 (35 Stat. 260; 16 U.S.C. 500), the Act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 963; 16 U.S.C. 500), the Act of August 8, 1937 (chapter 876; 50 Stat. 875; 43 U.S.C. 1181f), the Act of May 24, 1939 (chapter 144; 53 Stat. 753, 43 U.S.C. 1181f–1 et seq.), and sections 13982 and 13983 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 (Public Law 103–66; 16 U.S.C. 500 note; 43 U.S.C. 1181f note) should be stabilized and maintained for the long-term benefit of schools, roads, public services, and communities, and that providing such permanent, stable funding is a priority of the 106th Congress.

**SEC. 13. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON DIRECTING THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TO ACCEPT NEGATIVE NUMBERS IN FARM INCOME AVERAGING.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) farmers' and ranchers' income vary widely from year to year due to uncontrollable markets and unpredictable weather;

(2) in the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997, Congress enacted 3-year farm income averaging to protect agricultural producers from excessive tax rates in profitable years;

(3) last year, the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) proposed final regulations for averaging farm income which fail to make clear that taxable income in a given year may be a negative number; and

(4) this IRS interpretation can result in farmers having to pay additional taxes during years in which they experience a loss in income.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that during this session of the 106th Congress, legislation should be considered to direct the Internal Revenue Service to count any net loss of income in determining the proper rate of taxation.

**SEC. 14. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON ESTIMATES OF THE IMPACT OF REGULATIONS ON THE PRIVATE SECTOR.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) the Federal regulatory system sometimes adversely affects many Americans and businesses by imposing financial burdens with little corresponding public benefit:

(2) currently, Congress has no general mechanism for assessing the financial impact of regulatory activities on the private sector;

(3) Congress is ultimately responsible for making sure agencies act in accordance with congressional intent and while the executive branch is responsible for promulgating regulations, Congress ultimately can and should curb ineffective regulations by using its oversight and regulatory powers; and

(4) a variety of reforms have been suggested to increase congressional oversight over regulatory activity, including directing the President to prepare an annual accounting statement containing several cost/benefit analyses, recommendations to reform inefficient regulatory programs, and an identification and analysis of duplications and inconsistencies among such programs.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that the House should reclaim its role as reformer and take the first step toward curbing inefficient regulatory activity by passing legislation authorizing the Congressional Budget Office to prepare regular estimates on the impact of proposed Federal regulations on the private sector.

**SEC. 15. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PROVIDING ADDITIONAL DOLLARS TO THE CLASSROOM.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) strengthening America's public schools while respecting State and local control is critically important to the future of our children and our Nation;

(2) education is a local responsibility, a State priority, and a national concern;

(3) a partnership with the Nation's governors, parents, teachers, and principals must take place in order to strengthen public schools and foster educational excellence;

(4) the consideration of various Federal education programs will benefit our Nation's children, parents, and teachers by sending more dollars directly to the classroom; and

(5) our Nation's children deserve an educational system that will provide opportunities to excel.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Congress should enact legislation that would consolidate thirty-one Federal K–12 education programs; and

(2) the Department of Education, the States, and local educational agencies should work together to ensure that not less than 95 percent of all funds appropriated for the purpose of carrying out elementary and secondary education programs administered by the Department of Education is spent for our children in their classrooms.

**SEC. 16. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING TAX RELIEF.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that this concurrent resolution dedicates $272,800,000 over 5 years to reduce the tax burden on American families.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that these funds should be used to—

(1) eliminate the marriage penalty by enacting into law the provisions of H.R. 6;

(2) increase access to health care by enacting into law the revenue provisions of H.R. 2990;

(3) provide tax relief to small business owners by enacting into law the revenue provisions of H.R. 3832;

(4) repeal the 1993 tax increase on Social Security benefits;

(5) expand educational opportunities by expanding Education Savings Accounts;

(6) repeal the 1993 4.3 cent tax increase on motor fuels;

(7) repeal the ''death tax''.

**SEC. 17. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) For more than 30 years, the Social Security Trust Fund has been used to mask on-budget deficits and this year the debt to the Social Security Trust Fund will exceed $1 trillion,

(2) While the debt held by the public will decrease over the next 10 years, the debt owed to the Social Security Trust Fund will continue to increase and the national debt is projected, by the Congressional Budget Office, to increase to more than $6 trillion by Fiscal Year 2006.

(3) By 2014, in order to pay benefits, the Social Security Trust Fund will begin redeeming the certificates of debt that are currently held and if nothing is done to reform the system before then, Congress will be forced to implement emergency provisions that either raise taxes, increase publicly held debt, or cut benefits,

(4) Although the Social Security Trust Fund has been taken off-budget, the only true way to prohibit Congress and the President from borrowing from the surpluses of the Social Security Trust Fund is to return those surpluses to workers today in the form of rebates to be used solely for the purposes of personal retirement accounts,

(5) Personal Retirement Accounts are the key to true retirement security and wealth creation that is owned and controlled by the worker, not the government.

(6) Only through Personal Retirement Accounts can this country achieve a fully-funded retirement program, and not one dependent on the taxation of the next generation.

(7) Sec. 10 of this concurrent resolution provides the necessary authority to accommodate structural Social Security reform that includes personal retirement accounts within the Fiscal Year 2001 budget.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that prior to the adjournment of the 106th Congress that Congress should enact structural Social Security reform that includes personal retirement accounts.

**SEC. 18. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING THE MODERNIZATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The health insurance coverage provided under the Medicare Program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) is an integral part of the financial security for retired and disabled individuals, as such coverage protects those individuals against the financially ruinous costs of a major illness.

(2) During the nearly 35 years since the Medicare Program was established, the Nation's health care delivery and financing system has undergone major transformations. However, the Medicare Program has not kept pace with such transformations.

(3) Former Congressional Budget Office Director Robert Reischauer has described the Medicare Program as it exists today as failing on the following four key dimensions (known as the ''Four I's''):

(A) The program is inefficient.

(B) The program is inequitable.

(C) The program is inadequate.

(D) The program is insolvent.

(4) The recommendations by Senator JOHN BREAUX and Representative WILLIAM THOMAS received the bipartisan support of a majority of members on the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare.

(5) The Breaux-Thomas recommendations provide for new prescription drug coverage for the neediest beneficiaries within a plan that substantially improves the solvency of the Medicare Program without transferring new IOUs to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund that must be redeemed later by raising taxes, cutting benefits, or borrowing more from the public.

(6) Sec. 4 of this concurrent resolution provides the necessary authority to accommodate structural Medicare reform within the Fiscal Year 2001 budget.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that:

(1) Congress should work in a bipartisan fashion to extend the solvency of the Medicare Program and to ensure that benefits under that program will be available to beneficiaries in the future.

(2) The recommendations by Senator BREAUX and Congressman THOMAS provide for new prescription drug coverage for the neediest beneficiaries within a plan that substantially improves the solvency of the Medicare Program without transferring to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund new IOUs that must be redeemed later by raising taxes, cutting benefits, or borrowing more from the public.

(3) Congress should move expeditiously to consider the bipartisan recommendations of the Chairmen of the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare.

**SEC. 19. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING FOREIGN AID.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The nation of Israel has been a reliable and dependable ally to the United States.

(2) The United States' support for Israel is vital to achieving peace in the Middle East.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that aid to Israel should not be reduced.

**SEC. 20. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING DEPARTMENT AND AGENCY AUDITS AND WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Each branch of government and every department and agency has a fiduciary responsibility to ensure that tax dollars are spent in the most efficient and effective manner possible and to eliminate mismanagement, waste, fraud, and abuse.

(2) A minimal measure of whether a department or agency is upholding its fiduciary responsibility is its ability to pass an audit.

(3) The most recent audits, for Fiscal Year 1998, revealed that six major agencies—the Department of Agriculture, Defense, Education, Justice, and Transportation, and the Agency for International Development—could not provide financial statements that could be independently audited.

(4) Mismanagement, waste, fraud, and abuse cost American taxpayers billions of dollars.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that no agency or department which has failed its most recent audit should receive an increase in their budget over the previous year, unless the availability of the increased funds is contingent upon the completion of a complete and successful financial audit.

**SEC. 21. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING TITLE X FUNDING.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The title X of the Public Health Service Act family planning program provides contraceptives, treatment for sexually transmitted diseases, and sexual counseling to minors without parental consent or notification.

(2) Almost 1,500,000 American minors receive title X family planning services each year.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that organizations or businesses which receive funds through Federal programs should obtain parental consent or confirmation of parental notification before contraceptives are provided to a minor.

**SEC. 22. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING INTERNATIONAL POPULATION CONTROL PROGRAMS.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) There is international consensus that under no circumstances should abortion be promoted as a method of family planning.

(2) The United States provides the largest percentage of population control assistance among donor nations.

(3) The activities of private organizations supported by United States taxpayers are a reflection of United States priorities in developing countries, and United States funds allow these organizations to expand their programs and influence.

(4) The United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) has signed contracts with the People's Republic of China (PRC) which persists in coercing its people to obtain abortions and undergo involuntary sterilizations.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that—

(1) United States taxpayers should not be forced to support international family planning programs;

(2) if the Congress is unwilling to stop supporting international family planning programs with taxpayer dollars, the Congress should limit such support to organizations that certify they will not perform, or lobby for the legalization of, abortions in other countries; and

(3) United States taxpayers should not be forced to support the United Nations Populations Fund (UNFPA) if it is conducting activities in the People's Republic of China (PRC) and the PRC's population control program continues to utilize coercive abortion.

**SEC. 23. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING HUMAN EMBRYO RESEARCH.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Human life is a precious resource which should not be created or destroyed simply for scientific experiments.

(2) A human embryo is a human being that must be accorded the moral status of a person from the time of fertilization.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that Congress should prohibit the use of taxpayer dollars for the creation of human embryos for research purposes and research in which human embryos are knowingly destroyed, a prohibition which also excludes support for stem cell research which depends upon the intentional killing of a living human embryo.

**SEC. 24. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING FUNDING OF UNAUTHORIZED PROGRAMS.**

(a) The House finds that—

(1) Each year, the House Appropriations Committee provides funding to hundreds of programs whose authorization has expired or were never authorized by an Act of Congress.

(2) For Fiscal Year 2000, there were 247 programs funded in 137 laws totaling over $120 billion whose authorization had expired.

(3) Rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives prohibits the funding of an appropriation which has not been authorized by law.

(4) The House Rules Committee typically waives Rule XXI when considering general appropriation bills.

(5) The respective authorizing committees have not made reauthorization of unauthorized programs a priority.

(6) The lack of congressional oversight over the years, some as late as 1979, has led to the deterioration of the power of the respective authorizing Committees and thus the loss of congressional oversight and fiscal responsibility, which is a blow to the voters of America and their role in the process.

(7) The lack of congressional oversight over the years has led to the shift of power away from the Legislative Branch toward the Executive Branch and unelected federal bureaucrats.

(b) It is the sense of the House that—

(1) Congress should pass, and the President should sign into law, legislation to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to require Congress to fund programs that are currently unauthorized at 90 percent of prior fiscal year levels.

(2) Congress should pass, and the President should sign into law, legislation to require the Congressional Budget Office to prepare budget baselines based on the figures where unauthorized programs are frozen and funded at 90 percent of current levels.

**SEC. 25. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON FULLY FUNDING OF SPECIAL EDUCATION.**

(a) Congress finds that—

(1) all children deserve a quality education, including children with disabilities;

(2) the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act provides that the Federal, State and local governments are to share in the expense of educating children with disabilities and commits the Federal Government to pay up to 40 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure for children with disabilities;

(3) the high cost of educating children with disabilities and the Federal Government's failure to fully meet its obligation under the Individual with Disabilities Education Act stretches limited State and local education funds, creating difficulty in providing a quality education to all students, including children with disabilities;

(4) the current level of Federal funding to States and localities under the Individual with Disabilities Act is contrary to the goal of ensuring that children with disabilities receive a quality education;

(5) the Federal Government has failed to fully fund the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and appropriate 40 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure per child with a disability as required under the Individual with Disabilities Act to assist States and localities to educate children with disabilities;

(6) the levels in function 500 (Education) for fiscal year 2001 assume sufficient discretionary budget authority to accommodate fiscal year 2001 appropriations for IDEA at least $11 billion above such funding levels appropriated in fiscal year 2000, thus, fully funding the Federal Government's commitment to special education;

(7) the levels in function 500 (Education) to accommodate the fiscal year 2001 appropriation for fully funding IDEA may be reached by eliminating inefficient, ineffective and unauthorized education programs.

(b) It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Congress and the President should increase function 500 (Education) fiscal year 2001 funding for programs under the Individual with Disabilities Act by at least $11 billion above fiscal year 2000 appropriated levels, thus fully funding the Federal Government's commitment;

(2) Congress and the President can accomplish the goal by eliminating inefficient, ineffective and unauthorized education programs.

**SEC. 26. ACTION PURSUANT TO SECTION 302(b)(1) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT.**

(a) COMPLIANCE.—When complying Section 302(b)(1) of Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Committee on Appropriations of each House shall consult with the Committee on Appropriations of the other House to ensure that the allocation of budget outlays and new budget authority among each Committee's subcommittees are identical.

(b) REPORT.—The Committee on Appropriations of each House shall report to its House when it determines that the report made by the Committee pursuant to Section 301(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the report made by the Committee on Appropriations of the other House pursuant to the same provision contain identical allocations of budget outlays and new budget authority among each Committee's subcommittees.

(c) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report providing new discretionary budget authority for Fiscal Year 2001 allocated to the Committee on Appropriations unless and until the Committee on Appropriations of that House has made the report required under paragraph (b) of this Section.

**SEC. 27. CHANGES TO HOUSE RULES.**

(a) Rule XIII(f)(1)(B) of the Rules of the House Representatives is amended by striking the section and inserting the following:

''(B) a list of all appropriations contained in the bill for expenditures not currently authorized by law along with the last year for which the expenditure was authorized, the level of expenditures authorized that year, the actual level of expenditure that year, and the level of expenditure contained in the accompanying bill (This provision shall not apply to classified intelligence or national security programs, projects or activities).''

(b) Rule X 2.(d) of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by adding at the end of section (b) the following and redesignating (C) as (D):

''(C) give priority consideration to including in its plan the review of those laws which are currently unauthorized and outline how the Committee intends to authorize currently unauthorized programs under its jurisdiction.''

**SEC. 28 SENSE OF THE CONGRESS ON ACCESS TO HEALTH INSURANCE AND PRESERVING HOME HEALTH SERVICES FOR ALL MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES.**

(a) ACCESS TO HEALTH INSURANCE.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(B) the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act,

1999, reformed the interim payment system to increase reimbursements to low-cost providers, added $900 million in funding, and delayed the automatic 15 percent payment reduction for one year, to October 1, 2000; and

(C) patients whose care is more extensive and expensive than the typical Medicare patient do not receive supplemental payments in the interim payment system but will receive special protection in the home health care prospective payment system.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ACCESS TO HOME HEALTH CARE.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(A) Congress recognizes the importance of home health care for seniors and disabled citizens;

(B) Congress and the Administration should work together to maintain quality care for patients whose care is more extensive and expensive than the typical Medicare patient, including the sickest and frailest Medicare beneficiaries, while home health care agencies operate in the interim payment system; and

(C) Congress and the Administration should work together to avoid the implementation of the 15 percent reduction in the interim payment system and ensure timely implementation of the prospective payment system.

**SEC. 29. REDUCTION OF PUBLICLY-HELD DEBT.**

(a) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this section to ensure that the fiscal year 2000 on-budget surplus is used to reduce publicly-held debt.

(b) REDUCTION OF PUBLICLY-HELD DEBT.—

(1) POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CERTAIN LEGISLATION.—Except as provided by paragraph (2), it shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report if—

(A) the enactment of that bill or resolution as reported;

(B) the adoption and enactment of that amendment; or

(C) the enactment of that bill or resolution in the form recommended in that conference report.

would cause a decrease in the on-budget surplus for fiscal year 2000.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The point of order set forth in paragraph (1) shall not apply to a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion of conference report if it—

(A) reduces revenues;

(B) implements structural social security reform; or

(C) implements structural medicare reform.

(3) WAIVERS AND APPEALS IN THE SENATE.—

(A) WAIVERS.—Paragraph (1) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(B) APPEALS.—(i) Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to paragraph (1) shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the mover and the manager of the bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report, as the case may be.

(ii) An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under paragraph (1).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The provisions of this section shall cease to have any force or effect on October 1, 2000.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 446, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU).

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

This is a budget proposal that highlights the vision and the priorities of the conservative Members of the House. It establishes a clear benchmark for fiscal responsibility, for commitment to our national security, and for lowering the tax burden on the American people.

We pay down over a trillion dollars in Federal debt over the next 5 years. We offer tax relief for all Americans that makes our Tax Code more fair.

We have a commitment to a strong defense that meets the priorities that have been outlined by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and we do not just set aside funds for Medicare or talk about Social Security.

We make a commitment to real reform of these programs, to strengthen them, not just for today's beneficiaries, but for future retirees and our children as well.

□ 2130

We set aside every penny of the Social Security surplus, and this is an idea that while it seems somewhat new was first offered in the conservative budget 2 years ago. But we go further than that. We endorse proposals to let employees control a portion of their own payroll taxes, empower the individual to invest in their own retirement security, and give them the peace of mind that comes from knowing that that savings will be there for them when they retire. We invest in priorities. As I mentioned, national defense, which over 15 years has been allowed to decay year on year. We saw our first real increase in defense spending last year. This budget increases our defense priorities up to a higher level than any other budget offered in this session. We make a commitment to veterans' health care, $1 billion above last year's spending. And we make a greater commitment to special education, the largest unfunded mandate on the books today, than any other budget that has been offered before us today, over $2.4 billion in immediate additional funding for special education, and make clear that this is our number one education priority to fully fund the special education mandate.

And once we fund these priorities, once we set aside the entire Social Security surplus, once we set aside funds to honestly reform and strengthen Medicare and provide prescription drug coverage, then we reduce taxes in a way that makes the Tax Code more fair for every American. We eliminate the marriage penalty entirely. We eliminate death taxes entirely, not because we are concerned about one income group or another but because we recognize that it is unfair to take 55 percent of what anyone in America wants to leave to their descendants whether they are rich or poor or otherwise.

We eliminate not just the Social Security earnings limit, but we repeal the 1993 increase on the taxes on Social Security beneficiaries. We expand IRA savings opportunities, educational savings opportunities, and cut the gasoline tax, the tax increase imposed as part of the biggest tax increase in this country's history that raised the price of gasoline at the pump. We roll back that tax as well.

Mr. Chairman, this is a budget that is committed not just to fiscal responsibility and lower taxes, not just to a real commitment to national defense; but it is committed to reform, reforming and strengthening Social Security and Medicare in a way that we recognize needs to be done on a bipartisan basis.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I think we have finally reached the point in this debate where we are getting to the facts. And I think we need to start off with the central fact that has finally been established tonight and that is the size over 10 years with respect to the tax cut. Let me start by reminding everyone about a statement that was made during the presidential campaign that we need to honor, both Democrats and Republicans, or it will come back to haunt us. It is a statement by Senator JOHN MCCAIN. He said,

> It's fiscally irresponsible to promise a huge tax cut that is based on a surplus that we may not have. To bank it all on unending surpluses at the possible risk of the Social Security trust fund is our fundamental disagreement.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman will suspend.

Members are reminded that the rules of the House do not permit such quoting of Senators.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, that concludes the quote with respect to a presidential candidate, but here is the point. There has been no even attempt tonight to rebut the statement that the tax cut that we are dealing with here over 10 years exceeds $1 trillion. This exceeds the tax cut that we adopted here last year and ultimately failed, and it will fail again ultimately. The reason it will fail is because what the American public expects us to do is to use the lion's share of this projected surplus to pay down the Federal debt, to preserve Social Security and Medicare for the future, to contribute to lower interest rates; and because it is simply the right thing to do, we should not pass this enormous Federal debt on to our children and grandchildren.

We can do a responsible tax cut, we can do responsible spending, we can invest in education and defense; but we need to take the lion's share of the projected surplus and pay down the Federal debt. That is why this particular

proposal should be defeated. It is why the underlying budget resolution should be defeated.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the CATs budget for many reasons, but in particular I would like to emphasize the principal statement that this budget makes regarding true, meaningful Social Security reform by acknowledging the need to create personal savings accounts. What we are talking about in this budget is first of all that the CATs budget sets aside every penny of Social Security surplus dollars for Social Security, not to be spent on other programs. We do that because we recognize we have got a sacred obligation to honor the promise we have made to senior citizens, those who are at or near retirement. They need to have this program ensured for their benefit.

But we also acknowledge that that alone does not solve the problems facing our Social Security system. But one way to solve that problem is to allow younger workers the opportunity to take a portion of the payroll tax they already pay and put that into accounts that they would own and control. They could invest and that savings would grow and provide the basis for their future benefits and their retirement, giving them more security and a better retirement than the current system promises and cannot deliver. This would be a permanent solution to the unfunded liability problem of Social Security. It would grant unprecedented freedom to working people who currently do not have the opportunity to make this kind of savings because the payroll tax takes it away from them.

We know this will cost money. This CATs budget is honest enough to acknowledge that it will cost money and create a mechanism that would provide the flexibility to fund that transition of one of our most important programs in the history of this government to one that would have long-term financial stability and provide enormous freedom to the working people of America.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman has explained that his resolution, which we are trying to understand over here because there is a huge paucity of information about it, but he said that it provides more for defense; but I think it probably forgets an essential element. There is something in the Democratic resolution that we will bring up shortly that distinguishes it sharply from what is being proposed here and, that is, we have specifically included in our resolution $16.3 billion over 10 years specifically for health care initiatives for military retirees who are over the age of 65. We have not forgotten defense, and in particular we have not forgotten the men and women who fought to make this country free. We provide for them. We keep the promises that were made to them by military health care. We put the money in function 550 and function 570. We provide $5.4 billion for a prescription drug initiative, $10.9 billion to allow Medicare eligible military retirees simply to go to a military treatment facility and use their Medicare benefits to gain admission. Today most of those over the age of 65 are not able to be treated there.

I would like to ask the gentleman if he makes any provision anywhere in his resolution for these men and women who are military retirees.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRATT. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, we have a number of Members that are going to talk about the defense provisions, the increase for funding of defense that is in this bill, the billion additional dollars for veterans' health care that is in this bill, and the fact that it represents $187 billion in real increases, in investment in the men and women serving in our armed services over 5 years. That is an unprecedented investment as compared to any of the budgets on this floor, whether it is yours or any other budget.

So I think that the commitment is there, it is delineated clearly in the resolution, and it is a substantial increase. And it is based on the recommendations of President Clinton's own Joint Chiefs that pointed out that there is an enormous unfunded mandate in operations and maintenance and in materiel and in procurement. That is where we are focused, on the technology and the resources necessary to provide adequate defense when we are deploying more military than ever before. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SPRATT. Reclaiming my time, the point still remains, you have put all this additional money into defense and forgotten the men and women who fought to defend this country. We in our resolution, everybody should know this, have included $16.3 billion, $5.4 billion for a prescription drug initiative for Medicare retirees and another $10.9 so that they can use their Medicare benefits at military treatment facilities. We are doing something about subvention. We have put it in a budget that is balanced and pays down the debt and also provides a modest tax cut.

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

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

Mr. COBURN. This is not a bidding war for the veterans. As a matter of fact, right now for every veteran we spend $4,000 more per veteran than we spend on the average Medicare patient in this country. So if we are going to spend more money into the VA system we have now that is not offering them the care, not giving them equivalent care, not offering them quality care that they could get in the private sector, you are throwing money down a rat hole. The fact is we spend $4,000 per year per veteran more than we do for the same person in Medicare. So yes, we may not direct it the way that your budget directs it; but the fact is we recognize that there is not an efficient system out there and that needs to be changed. Every veteran in this country needs to be given a card. Go get your health care wherever you want because we have an obligation to you. And if we did that, we can deliver the same health care for about 30 percent less than we are doing in the VA system now.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, if I could respond to the gentleman on my own time, this is not about the Veterans' Administration health care system. This is about retiree health care at military treatment facilities, base hospitals, not VA hospitals. However, I would add, if I can continue on my own time, that we do better in our resolution by veterans who have a claim, I think, on the Federal Government for the services they have rendered and the promises we have made. We have more than a billion dollars provided over 5 years than they have provided in their resolution for veterans' health care. We have an additional $16.5 billion for retiree health care.

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

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) who understands probably better than anyone else in Congress the scope and the nature of the unmet needs of our men and women serving in the armed forces.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his compliment which is undeserved, but let me tell my friend from South Carolina where we really have an obligation to those men and women and those service veterans of World War II who are departing at the rate of about 30,000 a month. Most of those folks now have young people, sons and daughters, serving in our armed forces around the world. I will tell him the best way to serve them, and I will tell him how this budget serves them.

We are short on ammunition. We are short on spare parts. We have so few precision munitions for our pilots, most of them do not even get a chance to train with one before they are sent into battle. We have a shortage on shipbuilding. We are building to a 200-ship Navy. We are short on military construction. I have got one of those veterans that the gentleman from South Carolina talked about. He is my uncle. But one thing he has got in his house is an old picture on the wall. That picture is of my cousin, Son Stillwell, who was killed in Korea along with 50,000 other people because the United States was not ready to fight.

The budgets that President Clinton has been presenting to the United States have taken us into a state of unreadiness where we cannot win a major war without massive casualties on our side. The best service we can give to those senior veterans is to make sure that their children have the ammo, the spare parts and all the other things that they do not have right now to be able to fight effectively and to survive and come home. With the $45 billion in extra money that this budget provides on defense, which the Democrat budget does not provide, of course you have got the head space for the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Personnel, to work a beautiful health care plan along with having something called ammunition.

The tragedy of the Democrat budget is it makes the service choose between having ammunition for the young people who are out there defending the country and having health care for the senior retired people.

□ 2145

That is a choice that we should not make them have to come to.

I thought the gentleman was going to come with a Democrat budget that would offer $40 billion, maybe $50 billion above this baseline Clinton budget on national defense, and he did not do it.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I thought the gentleman in the well, who is one of the strongest proponents and advocates of defense in this House, and I sit on the same committee with him, week after week he has bemoaned how much the President had sought in defense for next year and the next 5 years. I thought surely the gentleman would persuade his conference, the Republicans, to come forward with a resolution that provided more for defense.

What do we get? One-tenth of 1 percent over the next 5 years. That is all the increase the gentleman could muster.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, over the last 5 years we have provided $45 billion above the President's budget.

The commandant of the Marine Corps said it best. He said if we had not provided it, the Marines would be the 9–1 force instead of the 911 force for this Nation.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I first want to commend the CATs. I guess that is permissible for a dog to do because their budget enforcement mechanisms are something that I totally support. I think they are right on target and I think their criticisms of the base bill are right on target and we agree with them.

We look at their defense numbers. They are making a move in the right direction there, and I appreciate the fact that they are talking about Social Security in a much more honest and realistic way than most folks have talked about it today.

My concerns with their budget stem from their funding for agriculture at the committee level. I believe that is totally inadequate, given the problems of rural America and agriculture, and I happen to disagree with that.

I also disagree in the area of veterans. As the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) so eloquently explained the Blue Dog position on military retirees and veterans, I happen to believe the CATs are inadequate in that area, but there again we can do as we have been doing all day. We can nitpick around.

That is not nitpicking. That is serious. My primary opposition to their budget stems again in the area of the tax cut and the size of it. Here again, I commend them because they are honest in saying that theirs is $270 billion over the next 5 years, which amounts to something like over a trillion dollars over 10, and that is an honest presentation and they are very honest in coming forward with that and they believe in that.

I happen to not believe in that, for a fundamental reason and it goes back to Social Security. I have joined with the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD), I have joined with the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and others in working in a bipartisan way on a long-term Social Security reform bill, and anyone that has spent any amount of time whatsoever knows that every year we delay in fixing Social Security for the long-term, every day we delay it makes it that much more difficult. 2014 is the magic day. That is when the surpluses we are all wanting to give away tonight, that is when they no longer are surpluses and that is when somebody in the Congress in 2014 is going to have to deal with it.

That is why I think it is fiscally irresponsible. With all due respect to those that believe otherwise, it is fiscally irresponsible to give back money today that we are going to need in the Social Security system in 2014, particularly since we are talking about projected surpluses.

How many times have we heard it, both sides of the aisle tonight, people talking about these surpluses like they are real? They are projected. They may or may not occur in 2006.

If they pass their budget and it becomes law and we do have a tax cut that benefits today, the people today that we are now in the longest peacetime economic expansion in the history of our country, people are doing well, they are paying taxes, but what if that stops in 2006?

More importantly, I ask all of my colleagues to start looking at the numbers of 2014. My primary opposition tonight to their bill is the 2014 problem that comes with tax cuts in the area of a trillion dollars over the next 10 years, which they advocate.

Anyone that has spent any time looking at the long-term problems of Social Security know we really cannot afford that. That is why with all due respect, I say to those who advocate tax cuts in this area that we are talking about tonight, in my judgment it is the most fiscally irresponsible thing that we could be doing.

They disagree. I respect that. I commend them for the things in their budget. They are honest. They are going at it. I just cannot bring myself to vote for this kind of a tax cut for two reasons. Their names are Chase and Cole, mine and Cindy's 4½ year old and 2½ year old grandsons. I resolved four and a half years ago that I did not want them to look back 65 years from tonight and say if only my granddad would have done what in his heart he knew he should have done when he was in the Congress we would not be in the mess we are in today.

That is why I would strongly oppose the CATs resolution on that one issue. I commend them on the other areas where they are very honest, and am offering some potential bipartisan support.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I certainly thank the gentleman for his supportive words about many elements in our budget, and I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, tonight we will talk about this and we will vote a little after midnight. A lot of my colleagues have their minds made up. So what can I say tonight to perhaps change their minds and have a realistic picture of this budget?

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), Mr. DAVIS, and others on this side talk about these huge tax cuts. Let us get real. This is $270 billion over 5 years. What is that, 20-some-billion a year? And we are spending $2 trillion a year.

The spending alone is going up at 9 percent. Last year, between 1999 and the year 2000 budget we spent 9 percent with emergency supplementals. The people in this House should be embarrassed that spending is increasing at 9 and 10 percent a year, with emergency supplementals, and we are talking about a tax cut, a tax cut of $24 billion a year.

Let us look at what Federal Reserve Chairman Greenspan said, appointed FBI Clinton administration, ''My first priority would be to allow as much of the surplus to flow through into a reduction of debt to the public. If that proves politically infeasible, I would opt for cutting taxes. And under no condition do I see any room in the

longer term outlook for major changes in expenditures.''

''I would opt for cutting taxes.'' This is an objective individual who is trying to say reduce spending.

Now this budget by the CATs is the only budget that we are going to vote on tonight that has 302(B) allocations restraint. It actually puts restraints. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) was kind enough to acknowledge that.

I hope everybody in the House realizes that the CATs budget is going to restrain spending. If spending is not restrained around here, it is going to continue at 9 percent; 9 and 10 percent means that in 7 years this budget is going to double. Instead of $2 trillion we are talking about $4 trillion.

The other last point I want to make is our Nation's seniors would benefit because it repeals the 1993 tax increase on Social Security. So those who are going to vote against the CATs budget are going to vote with the Clinton administration on the tax increase on Social Security.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, what concerns me, and I think many on my side of the aisle, about this proposal is that it looks a lot like 1981.

First of all, what we have is an enormous tax cut, $270 billion over 5 years, bigger than anybody has yet proposed for this period of time.

We have shown earlier today how if one tries to fit a $200 billion tax cut over 5 years into the other numbers assumed in the Republican budget resolution, the base bill, it goes into deficit. In 2003, the surplus vanishes. In 2004 and 2005, the budget is in the red. This would go even deeper.

It avoids the deficit only by having enormous cuts in nondefense discretionary spending. Right out of the box, this particular resolution, the CATs resolution, proposes an immediate cut of $16 billion; $16 billion between this year and next year in nondefense discretionary spending.

Look at last year and ask if that is realistic. Look at 1998 and ask if that is realistic. Look at the entire period of the 1990s. Just 1996, since the Republicans have been in control of the House, we have had an annual rate of increase in nondefense discretionary spending of 2.5 percent real increase.

So what is being assumed here is an abrupt, radical about face, a cut of a magnitude in one year we have not been able to achieve in any recent year that I can recall. The whole surplus is being bet. All of this that we have worked to accomplish and achieve and have finally been able to succeed on, it is all going to be bet on a big tax cut and very unrealistic discretionary spending cuts.

If those discretionary spending cuts are not attained politically here on the House Floor in the Congress, because of presidential vetoes or for whatever reason, we are in the red again, big time and in a hurry. That is what is scary about this resolution.

It promises a lot, sure. I would like to go home and talk about $270 billion in tax relief over the next 5 years, but I could not realistically tell my people that we could make those cuts when I have been here 18 years and I have not seen the Congress, Democrat or Republican Congress, muster the will to make cuts of that magnitude.

I think this is a very risky venture. I think extremely thin ice is being skated on, and I think the budget that we have worked so hard to get in the black is being put back in the danger zone, back in the zone where we are likely to be in deficit. Once we go into deficit, we are right back into the Social Security trust fund. That is where this resolution leads us.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD), who understands that only in Washington and only in a Democrat budget is repealing taxes on Social Security beneficiaries called spending.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, with that lead-in, I will simply pick up on the Social Security portion and I would say to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) in particular has been magnificent in his leadership on Social Security. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) touched on just a moment ago the issue of Social Security and personal accounts, and that is what personally gravitates me towards the CATs budget, what it does to get us off dead center, a dead center that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), I will not say on the left by any means, but on the Democratic side has been what the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and others have been on the Republican side, and that is how do we get off dead center on Social Security?

To this budget's credit, it moves us forward because it begins this process of personal accounts. It is a sense of Congress, which is a small start, and it is a point of order for personal accounts but that is, again, a step in the right direction that we very, very much need.

Last year Washington borrowed $100 billion from Social Security and they did it without a lot of fanfare. Most of the folks back home I talked to do not even know that it happened and those that did, at most they wrote a letter to their Congressman or their Senator but they did not march on Washington. We had truckers in town last week. We had farmers in town last week, all protesting different things going on in Washington and yet this is sort of the quiet secret that is kept under the rug. It is something that I think would be brought about with simple private property rights.

The only thing that will in the long run protect Social Security balances are private property rights. So what this budget does is it sets up for the first time a move toward a system of personal accounts wherein, for instance, Social Security money, surplus Social Security money, would be rebated back to the people paying Social Security taxes to begin their own personal Social Security savings account, and by doing so would protect it because it would be out of Washington.

I think that that is a very small step but important step that we have to take in this debate.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, you will recall that two years ago this House failed to adopt a concurrent budget resolution. It was the first time in the 26-year history of the Budget Act that Congress failed to adopt a budget.

It disrupted the appropriations process and made it much more difficult for the entire House to complete any of its legislative business in an orderly way.

Then again last year we adopted a budget but it was an unrealistic budget. It was shot full of holes with gimmicks and blue smoke and mirrors. It treated things like the decennial census, that has been going on since 1790, as an emergency. We did not complete action on the appropriations bills until well after the fiscal year had begun. We failed the American people again.

Now again this budget resolution is equally unrealistic.

□ 2200

It is so filled with assumptions that we know will not be met that it is not fair to the American people to even propose it, never mind pass it, on the floor of the House.

We know it is not a real budget. We know that what this is is not serious legislation, but political expediency. We would probably be better off doing what we did in 1998 without a budget resolution; whether it be the Republican leadership budget or the CATs budget, which are not all that substantively different. These Republican budgets start with the wholly unrealistic assumption that we will be able to hold non-defense discretionary outlays to $114 billion below inflation over the next 5 years. That is not going to happen.

Next year alone, as the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) suggested, we will have to cut nearly $20 billion below the level needed just to keep level with inflation. Yet we know that the Congress has increased nondefense appropriations faster than inflation every year since 1996. Who are we kidding?

If we were honest with the American people, we would admit that we have no intention of cutting Federal law enforcement or education or environmental programs, or veterans care. You name it, we are not going to cut it. We are going to do what our constituents demand that we do, and at least keep these programs level with inflation.

Who are we kidding? Ourselves? Why are we proposing a budget that we know we are not going to hold to? Maybe we are planning on putting all this money into the supplemental, hiding it, shifting it from fiscal year 2001 to fiscal year 2000. Maybe that will be this year's gimmick. But it is not right to the American people to be deceiving them in this way. The main problem is that to accommodate a tax cut in the range of $200 billion, whether it be the Republican leadership budget or the CATs budget, we know that we are putting in place a situation where we are going to be cutting revenue by almost $1 trillion over 10 years.

Those tax cuts are not fair. They are not fair to the American people. But, most importantly, they are not fair to our children. We have an opportunity today to pay off the debt that we incurred in the 1980s, to pay down that debt, to eliminate that debt by the year 2013. As well as the quarter of a trillion dollars in interest we have to pay every year on that debt. If we do not, our children have to pay off that debt. What could be more immoral than to pass that debt on to our children? What could be worse than to say to our children that they are going to have to pay for our retirement and our health care when we retire? We would not do that to our own children. Let us not do it to America's children. Oppose this budget.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to emphasize that only in Washington do people fail to realize that improving performance by 1, 2 or 3 percent per year is not just realistic, but it is expected, year after year after year. Those that say it is unrealistic to achieve any reduction at all in overall government spending are the same ones that said we could not balance the budget in 1994, the same ones that said we could not pass welfare reform in 1996, the same ones that said it was unrealistic and unattainable to set aside every penny of the Social Security surplus. They have been proved wrong time and again.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN).

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today as a member of the Committee on the Budget who believes we can meet not only spending caps, but we can pay down public debt, and we can do better for our defense as well as provide for tax relief to our working families.

This substitute provides enough tax relief to eliminate the marriage penalty, to provide greater access to health care, to expand choice in education, to give seniors relief by repealing the 1993 tax increase on Social Security benefits, and to give small businesses tax relief to keep our economy moving forward and to end the unfair death tax that penalizes savings.

Unfortunately, there are those on the other side that would like to call this risky and irresponsible. I ask them to talk to the hard-working people of my district in Kansas who believe that they should have relief, and ask them also to tell this to the hard-working people in their district who deserve to have some additional tax relief.

As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I have also seen the effects on morale caused by the years of neglect of our fine military personnel by this present administration. We have military families that are on food stamps; one family member is often deployed throughout the world on endless peacekeeping missions, with little time to spend at home. And there has been a failure to provide new equipment and spare parts as well as quality health services. This resulted in a dangerously low readiness, as well as serious problems with regard to recruiting and retention. We should never, never forget that providing for the common defense of our country is our first duty.

For those who say this substitute cannot be done, I say you have not tried hard enough. I urge my colleagues to support the CATs substitute.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from South Carolina for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, my friends who offer this budget have done a great public service, because I think they have shed some light upon the underlying dilution of the majority's Republican resolution that is the base bill. The base bill says that we are going to bring in $171 billion more over the next 5 years than we take in. Then it proceeds to spend $268 billion more than we take in, a $97 billion gap.

What they say to the American public is we can reduce your taxes by $200 billion and provide a prescription drug benefit under Medicare, and we can increase defense spending and increase some other spending, all to the tune of $268 billion. So, see, your surplus is $171 billion, but your additional giveaways are $268 billion.

To the credit of the alternative of the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU), you do not do that. The Sununu alternative tells the truth. It says in order to do those things, to have the prescription drug benefit and pay down the debt and cut taxes, one has to make very significant cuts in the budget. That is an honest proposition with which I disagree.

The proposition of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and the proposition of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) are honest. They say that to pay down the debt you basically have to leave taxes alone and leave spending alone and that will work.

The underlying bill is a repetition of the dilution of 1981. It says you can have your cake and eat it too; you can have your cake and bake it too; you can have your cake and give it away too, that you can increase Medicare, increase defense, cut taxes, and spend more money than you bring in. I think the priorities of this resolution are wrong in the CATs budget, but they are internally consistent.

The truth is the way to pay down the debt is to essentially leave spending alone, the way the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) does, to leave taxes alone, the way the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) does, not rely upon rosy scenarios, and pay down the national debt. I oppose this, but support the alternative of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), who understands leaving spending on autopilot and taxing at a higher level than ever in the history of our country is no way to run the Federal Government.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, among the many other positive aspects of the Conservative Action Team budget that I am up here to applaud and support is something that is a little less sexy perhaps than tax cuts, a little less easy to understand perhaps than increases in defense appropriations or anything else; but it is something, nonetheless, that we need to address, and this CATs budget does, in fact, address it for the first time in a long time, the first time, as far as I know, ever, and that is the practice of providing funds, authorizing every single year, year in and year out, money for unauthorized programs.

There is a process in this House that we are supposed to go through. The rule says that we cannot fund programs that are not authorized. Yet, year after year after year this has happened. Republicans, Democrats, it does not matter. This is not the way to provide fiscal responsibility. It is shirking our responsibility, if anything.

For example, of the programs that we have been appropriating for but are not authorized, I just bring these few to your attention. The National Endowment for the Arts, $98 million funding received this year. It has not been authorized for 7 years. The National Endowment for Humanities has not been authorized for 7 years. The Federal Communications Commission, for 9 years. Family planning programs have not been authorized for 15 years. Power Marketing Administration, 16 years.

Some of these are wonderful programs. They may be the most important things we do. But the fact is, unless we let the authorizing committees review what they are supposed to do, review them every few years, and unless we allow them to do it, we will never know.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, once again, we are debating a budget that does not strengthen social security or Medicare. In fact, none of the non-Social Security surplus is earmarked specifically for Medicare. The American people have made themselves heard loud and clear: they want Congress to save Social Security and Medicare, add a voluntary prescription drug program to Medicare, help our schools and help our children. Instead, we once again are seeing a bill that will provide tax cuts for the wealthy and cuts spending for programs that help our children.

How can Republicans claim to be pro-education when they will eliminate Head Start for more than 40,000 children and their families by 2005? We already have a long waiting list for families wanting to get their children into Head Start and this budget will only lengthen that list. Additionally, this budget would deny college access to 316,000 low-income students by 2005. In my district, Pell Grants are what enable many students to continue on to college.

Another area of concern to me in the Republican Budget is the cut to the LIHEAP program. As we all know, it has been a cold winter and with oil prices rapidly increasing, many families and especially senior citizens, are being forced to choose between heat and food.

In my district, one building that house senior citizens had no heat for 3 days before they contacted my office and we had the heat turned back on. At a time when oil prices are climbing higher, we must not cut LIHEAP assistance, as the Republican budget does, to 164,000 low-income families.

There are several Democratic substitutes that not only pay down the debt and shore up Social Security, but also increase funding for education programs.

My colleagues highlight their commitment to fully funding special education, yet when Democrats offered an amendment to provide full funding of the federal governments maximum authorized contribution for special education, Republicans diluted it to only a Sense of the Congress Amendment that Congress should provide this funding. If we should, why did they not vote to put it in the budget?

The Democratic Substitutes all provide a voluntary prescription drug benefit for seniors, provides targeted tax cuts to hard working families, and maintains or increases funding for non-defense discretionary programs. I urge my colleagues to vote against the Republican budget and support the democratic alternatives.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, this afternoon we talked about the Republican majority's budget resolution and some of the risks that it would pose. Their $200 billion tax cut in the first 5 years would take us into the red by 2004.

Well, if you are worried about that risky venture, just look at this CATs budget. It proposes a $270 billion tax cut in the first 5 years. Still not as much, I must say, as George W. Bush's proposed tax cut, which our Republican friends refused to vote on, but still $270 billion in the first 5 years, enough to eat up the entire non-Social Security surplus and to require renewed borrowing from the Social Security surplus. So the proposed tax cut is reckless. It bets the store on doubtful projections, which I think are simply not risks that our country ought to take.

Secondly, we talked this afternoon about the unrealistic assumptions about our domestic obligations and how the Republican budget assumes devastating and unrealistic declines in domestic investments, in education, in law enforcement, across the board.

Well, if you are worried about that set of cuts, look at this CATs budget. It goes even deeper. In fact, $16.5 billion deeper in 2001 alone.

I invite my colleagues to contrast the Democratic budget substitute, which is reasonable, which is balanced. It will provide a targeted, affordable tax cut. But it will also extend the solvency of both the Medicare and the Social Security trust funds. It will mandate the addition of a prescription drug benefit to Medicare. And it will use not only the entire Social Security surplus to buy down the publicly-held debt, but in fact will apply over $300 billion of the non-Social Security surplus to that same critical purpose.

Support the Democratic substitute.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

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

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time. I want to thank my colleague from New Hampshire for his hard work on the CATs budget. He has put in tremendous effort and drawn up what I believe is by far the best budget presented here tonight.

But I also want to begin by addressing this notion that appears to exist in Washington, D.C., and nowhere else in the world. Every single business in America and every single business in the world understands that each year you must do more with less. They also understand that the way you can do that is through improvements in efficiency and productivity. Indeed, every single report which now analyzes productivity in America shows that we as a society are becoming more productive, year after year after year.

In the last 2 years alone, we have grown more productive by 3 percent per year. That means that Ford Motor Company or General Motors or Motorola produces a better product year after year at a lower cost. Yet in government, nowhere else in all of the world do we say Oh, no, we can't do more with less, we have to do less with more. So you hear our colleagues on the other side decry the budget and say it cannot be done.

I would again compliment my friend from New Hampshire for pointing out that the people who say this cannot be done, that we can never deliver more government services because of improvements in efficiency or productivity, are the same people who said we could not balance the budget, the same people who said we could not accomplish welfare reform, and the same people who say the American people do not deserve a penny of tax relief.

Let us talk about what this budget does. Number one, it protects 100 percent of the Social Security surplus.

Number two, as the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) just pointed out, it provides the reform for Medicare by providing individual retirement accounts.

Let us talk about what it does for defense, since that is the number one priority of the government. It provides the strongest national defense of any of the budgets.

But, most importantly, and I want to compliment my friend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), it does what is critically important: It contains real budget enforcement. We cannot continue to pass budgets which are a fraud.

□ 2215

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, we have before us a conservative budget that sets the right priorities, represents a vision of a good number, a very large portion of the Members of this House. It starts by setting aside every single penny of the Social Security Trust Fund surplus, a vision that was criticized when it was first offered 2 years ago in a conservative budget. It pays down $1 trillion in debt over 5 years. That is four times more than this budget contains in tax relief. It strengthens the national defense, and it provides support for real bipartisan reform of both Social Security and Medicare. Finally, it offers unprecedented support for paying for the unfunded mandate of special education that burdens cities and towns at the local level all over this country; unprecedented, meant to fully fund that special education mandate.

After we have done all of these things, after we have paid down $1 trillion in debt, set aside for Social Security and done real reform on Medicare and Social Security, then we do cut taxes. We could pay down more in debt if we decided not to lift the tax increase on Social Security beneficiaries. Sure, we could pay down a little more debt if we did that; but if we did that, it would be wrong. We could pay down a little bit more debt if we did not think we should eliminate the marriage penalty, but penalizing a couple simply because they choose to get married is wrong.

In the Democrat budget and in the Blue Dog budget, there was no real effort to deal with that serious problem. We could pay down a little bit more debt if we decided that individuals should not get to deduct their health

insurance costs, like big businesses can.

The final question I ask my colleagues is what hoops do the American people have to jump through to get a Tax Code that treats them a little bit more fair. I think we should support this resolution, and we should reject the notion that the American people cannot deal with their own money.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 78, noes 339, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 73]

AYES—78

Aderholt
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Boehner
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Cannon
Chabot
Chenoweth-Hage
Coburn
Collins
Cox
Cubin
Cunningham
Deal
DeMint
Dickey
Dreier
Ewing
Gekas
Gibbons
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Hansen
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hunter
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kingston
Largent
Latham
Lewis (KY)
Manzullo
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Miller, Gary
Myrick
Norwood
Nussle
Paul
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Radanovich
Riley
Rohrabacher
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sessions
Shadegg
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Tiahrt
Toomey
Vitter
Whitfield
Young (AK)

NOES—339

Abercrombie
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickett
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—17

Ackerman
Archer
Bonilla
Crane
Dixon
Greenwood
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Lowey
Martinez
McCollum
McDermott
McHugh
Porter
Quinn
Royce
Schakowsky
Vento

□ 2239

Mr. KASICH and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. STUMP and Mr. GRAHAM changed their vote from ''no'' and ''aye.''

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in Part B of House Report 106–535.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. SPRATT

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Part B Amendment No. 5 in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. SPRATT:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

**SECTION 1. TABLE OF CONTENTS.**

Sec. 1. Table of contents.
Sec. 2. Special rule.

TITLE I—BUDGETARY PROVISIONS

Sec. 101. Concurrent resolution on the budget for 2001 and covering 2000–2010.
Sec. 102. Recommended aggregate levels and amounts.
Sec. 103. Major functional categories.
Sec. 104. Reconciliation directives; social security and medicare solvency.
Sec. 105. Social security lockbox.
Sec. 106. Allocations to the Committee on Appropriations.
Sec. 107. Applicability of adjustments.

TITLE II—SENSE OF CONGRESS PROVISIONS

Sec. 201. Sense of Congress on discretionary caps.
Sec. 202. Sense of Congress on asset building for the working poor.
Sec. 203. Sense of Congress on access to health insurance and preserving home health services for all medicare beneficiaries.
Sec. 204. Sense of Congress regarding medicare+choice programs/reimbursement rates.
Sec. 205. Sense of the Congress regarding the stabilization of certain Federal payments to States, counties, and boroughs.
Sec. 206. Sense of Congress on the importance of the national science foundation.
Sec. 207. Sense of Congress regarding skilled nursing facilities.
Sec. 208. Sense of Congress on the importance of special education.
Sec. 209. Sense of Congress on a Federal employee pay raise.
Sec. 210. Sense of Congress regarding HCFA draft guidelines.
Sec. 211. Sense of Congress on corporate welfare.

**SEC. 2. SPECIAL RULE.**

In this resolution, all references to years are fiscal years and all amounts are expressed in billions.

## TITLE I—BUDGETARY PROVISIONS

**SEC. 101. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR 2001 AND COVERING 2000–2010.**

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for 2000 is hereby revised and that the concurrent resolution on the budget for 2001, including the appropriate budgetary levels for 2002 through 2010, is hereby set forth.

**SEC. 102. RECOMMENDED AGGREGATE LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.**

(a) ON-BUDGET LEVELS (EXCLUDING SOCIAL SECURITY AND THE POSTAL SERVICE FUND).—

For purposes of enforcement of this resolution, the following budgetary levels are appropriate for each year 2000 through 2010:

[In billions of dollars]

| | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New budget authority | $1,475.2 | $1,541.9 | $1,578.2 | $1,634.3 | $1,696.2 | $1,762.4 |
| Outlays | 1,459.2 | 1,496.5 | 1,555.9 | 1,610.4 | 1,672.2 | 1,739.2 |
| Revenues | 1,465.5 | 1,512.3 | 1,564.8 | 1,620.4 | 1,680.0 | 1,744.9 |
| Revenue change | 0.0 | −2.6 | −6.5 | −9.1 | −12.6 | −19.2 |
| Surpluses | 6.3 | 15.8 | 8.9 | 10.0 | 7.8 | 5.7 |
| Publicly held debt | 3,472.3 | 3,312.1 | 3,131.3 | 2,942.0 | 2,740.8 | 2,524.0 |

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New budget authority | $1,815.1 | $1,873.4 | $1,947.4 | $2,022.0 | $2,102.4 |
| Outlays | 1,786.8 | 1,841.6 | 1,920.4 | 1,995.4 | 2,077.9 |
| Revenues | 1,819.5 | 1,896.9 | 1,980.7 | 2,072.5 | 2,169.3 |
| Revenue change | −23.0 | −25.7 | −29.3 | −34.0 | −39.0 |
| Surpluses | 32.7 | 55.3 | 60.3 | 77.1 | 91.4 |
| Publicly held debt | 2,265.2 | 1,967.7 | 1,650.2 | 3,102.2 | 926.8 |

(b) UNIFIED BUDGET SURPLUSES AND REDUCTION IN THE PUBLICLY HELD DEBT.—Congress declares that on-budget surpluses and the surpluses in the Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Trust Funds (Social Security trust funds) shall be devoted exclusively to reducing the debt held by the public. The cumulative ten-year on-budget surpluses of $365.0 billion set forth in subsection (a), combined with the estimated cumulative ten-year off-budget (Social Security) surpluses of $2,265.8 billion, will retire 73 percent of the publicly held debt by 2010 and all of it by 2013.

**SEC. 103. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.**

The Congress determines and declares that the following are the appropriate levels of new budget authority and budget outlays for each major functional category for each year 2000 through 2010:

(a) National Defense (050):

| | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New budget authority | $288.9 | $305.3 | $309.0 | $315.4 | $323.1 | $331.4 |
| Outlays | $282.5 | $297.2 | $301.6 | $309.1 | $317.3 | $327.8 |

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New budget authority | $340.1 | $349.0 | $358.2 | $367.6 | $377.3 |
| Outlays | $332.4 | $338.2 | $351.7 | $361.4 | $371.0 |

(b) International Affairs (150):

| | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New budget authority | $20.1 | $20.3 | $20.2 | $20.3 | $20.6 | $21.3 |
| Outlays | $15.5 | $17.6 | $1‘6.6 | $16.7 | $17.0 | $17.2 |

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New budget authority | $21.7 | $22.2 | $22.5 | $22.9 | $23.2 |
| Outlays | $17.4 | $17.9 | $18.4 | $18.9 | $19.4 |

(c) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

| | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New budget authority | $19.3 | $20.8 | $20.4 | $20.6 | $20.8 | $21.1 |
| Outlays | $18.4 | $19.6 | $20.1 | $20.3 | $20.8 | $20.8 |

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New budget authority | $21.5 | $21.9 | $22.3 | $22.8 | $23.2 |
| Outlays | $21.1 | $21.5 | $21.9 | $22.3 | $22.8 |

(d) Energy (270):

| | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New budget authority | $1.1 | $1.7 | $1.3 | $1.5 | $1.5 | $1.5 |
| Outlays | $0.6 | $0.2 | $0.2 | $0.2 | $0.1 | $0.2 |

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New budget authority | $1.6 | $1.4 | $1.8 | $2.0 | $2.0 |
| Outlays | $0.1 | $0.1 | $0.2 | $0.4 | $0.5 |

(e) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

| | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New budget authority | $24.3 | $25.8 | $26.2 | $26.8 | $27.4 | $28.0 |
| Outlays | $24.2 | $25.3 | $26.0 | $26.6 | $27.0 | $27.4 |

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New budget authority | $28.7 | $29.4 | $30.1 | $31.3 | $32.1 |
| Outlays | $28.0 | $28.7 | $29.3 | $30.5 | $31.3 |

(f) Agriculture (350):

| | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New budget authority | $36.7 | $19.3 | $18.8 | $18.0 | $17.4 | $16.4 |
| Outlays | $34.3 | $17.2 | $17.0 | $16.3 | $16.0 | $14.8 |

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New budget authority | $15.7 | $15.1 | $15.1 | $15.3 | $15.6 |
| Outlays | $14.1 | $13.5 | $13.4 | $13.8 | $14.2 |

(g) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

| | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New budget authority | $7.5 | $6.6 | $8.8 | $9.5 | $13.7 | $13.8 |
| Outlays | $3.1 | $2.4 | $4.9 | $4.8 | $8.7 | $9.7 |

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New budget authority | $13.7 | $12.3 | $12.4 | $12.8 | $17.3 |

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Outlays | $9.3 | $8.0 | $8.0 | $8.3 | $12.0 |

(h) Transportation (400):

| | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New budget authority | $54.3 | $59.5 | $57.8 | $59.5 | $59.7 | $59.9 |
| Outlays | $46.6 | $51.1 | $52.9 | $54.6 | $54.9 | $55.4 |

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New budget authority | $60.8 | $61.3 | $61.8 | $62.3 | $62.8 |
| Outlays | $56.8 | $57.6 | $58.6 | $60.0 | $61.4 |

(i) Community and Regional Development (450):

| | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New budget authority | $11.2 | $11.9 | $12.0 | $12.2 | $12.4 | $12.7 |
| Outlays | $10.7 | $11.1 | $11.4 | $11.3 | $11.5 | $11.6 |

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New budget authority | $13.0 | $13.2 | $13.4 | $13.7 | $13.8 |
| Outlays | $12.0 | $12.2 | $12.5 | $12.7 | $12.9 |

(j) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):

| | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New budget authority | $57.7 | $76.7 | $77.8 | $78.8 | $80.0 | $81.8 |
| Outlays | $61.4 | $69.7 | $77.2 | $78.4 | $79.4 | $81.0 |

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New budget authority | $83.5 | $85.4 | $87.2 | $89.2 | $91.1 |
| Outlays | $82.6 | $84.3 | $86.2 | $88.1 | $90.5 |

(k) Health (550):

| | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New budget authority | $159.3 | $171.0 | $182.0 | $194.6 | $210.2 | $228.4 |
| Outlays | $152.4 | $168.2 | $180.8 | $194.0 | $209.8 | $227.3 |

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New budget authority | $247.7 | $266.8 | $286.8 | $309.2 | $333.0 |
| Outlays | $246.4 | $264.7 | $284.8 | $307.3 | $331.7 |

(l) Medicare (570):

| | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New budget authority | $199.6 | $217.7 | $225.0 | $247.5 | $267.5 | $293.9 |
| Outlays | $199.5 | $218.0 | $224.9 | $247.2 | $267.7 | $293.9 |

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New budget authority | $303.6 | $332.0 | $356.6 | $384.6 | $413.7 |
| Outlays | $303.4 | $332.2 | $356.5 | $384.3 | $413.9 |

(m) Income Security (600):

| | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New budget authority | $238.4 | $254.8 | $265.8 | $276.4 | $287.5 | $298.0 |
| Outlays | $248.0 | $255.6 | $267.2 | $277.7 | $288.4 | $298.9 |

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New budget authority | $312.0 | $316.1 | $331.1 | $341.8 | $353.4 |
| Outlays | $312.9 | $316.9 | $331.8 | $342.2 | $353.6 |

(n) Social Security (650):

| | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New budget authority | $11.5 | $9.7 | $11.6 | $12.3 | $13.0 | $13.8 |
| Outlays | $11.5 | $9.7 | $11.6 | $12.3 | $13.0 | $13.8 |

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New budget authority | $14.7 | $15.7 | $16.8 | $18.0 | $19.2 |
| Outlays | $14.7 | $15.7 | $16.8 | $18.0 | $19.2 |

(o) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):

| | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New budget authority | $46.0 | $48.2 | $49.4 | $51.0 | $52.2 | $55.6 |
| Outlays | $45.1 | $47.7 | $49.2 | $50.9 | $52.0 | $55.3 |

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New budget authority | $55.3 | $54.8 | $58.1 | $59.6 | $61.1 |
| Outlays | $54.9 | $54.2 | $57.8 | $59.2 | $60.7 |

(p) Administration of Justice (750):

| | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New budget authority | $27.4 | $29.1 | $29.4 | $30.2 | $31.0 | $31.7 |
| Outlays | $28.0 | $28.7 | $29.5 | $30.0 | $30.6 | $31.4 |

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New budget authority | $32.5 | $33.3 | $34.2 | $35.1 | $35.9 |
| Outlays | $32.2 | $33.0 | $33.8 | $34.7 | $35.5 |

(q) General Government (800):

| | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New budget authority | $13.9 | $13.4 | $13.6 | $13.8 | $13.9 | $14.1 |
| Outlays | $14.7 | $14.0 | $13.7 | $13.8 | $13.8 | $13.7 |

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New budget authority | $14.6 | $15.0 | $15.5 | $16.1 | $16.5 |
| Outlays | $14.1 | $14.6 | $15.2 | $15.6 | $16.1 |

(r) Net Interest (900):

| | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New budget authority | $284.6 | $288.6 | $290.4 | $286.6 | $282.4 | $278.2 |
| Outlays | $284.6 | $288.6 | $290.4 | $286.6 | $282.4 | $278.2 |
| | | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
| New budget authority | | $274.6 | $270.1 | $266.0 | $261.1 | $256.0 |
| Outlays | | $274.6 | $270.1 | $266.0 | $261.1 | $256.0 |

(s) Allowances (920):

| | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New budget authority | $8.5 | $0.4 | $0.0 | $0.0 | $0.0 | $0.0 |
| Outlays | $13.4 | $−7.0 | $2.0 | $0.3 | $0.1 | $0.0 |
| | | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
| New budget authority | | $0.0 | $0.0 | $0.0 | $0.0 | $0.0 |
| Outlays | | $0.0 | $0.0 | $0.0 | $0.0 | $0.0 |

(t) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

| | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New budget authority | $−34.1 | $−38.4 | $−41.3 | $−40.7 | $−38.1 | $−39.2 |
| Outlays | $−34.1 | $−38.4 | $−41.3 | $−40.7 | $−38.1 | $−39.2 |
| | | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
| New budget authority | | $−40.2 | $−41.6 | $−42.5 | $−43.4 | $−44.8 |
| Outlays | | $−40.2 | $−41.6 | $−42.5 | $−43.4 | $−44.8 |

**SEC. 104. RECONCILIATION DIRECTIVES; SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE SOLVENCY.**

(a) SUBMISSION OF BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than June 22, 2000, the following House committees shall submit legislation changing current law within their jurisdictions to the House Committee on the Budget in the specified manner and amounts.

| | 2000 | 2001 | 2001–2005 | 2001–2010 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Agriculture—increase outlays | $6.000 | $0.676 | $9.015 | $23.365 |
| Armed Services—increase outlays | 0.000 | 0.437 | 5.400 | 16.324 |
| Banking and Financial Services—decrease outlays | 0.000 | 0.367 | 1.035 | 1.170 |
| Commerce—increase outlays | 0.000 | 2.270 | 48.983 | 193.696 |
| Education and Welfare—decrease outlays | 0.000 | −0.001 | 0.040 | 0.128 |
| Government Reform and Oversight—decrease revenues | 0.000 | 0.071 | 0.473 | 1.157 |
| Resources—decrease outlays | 0.000 | −0.026 | 0.057 | 0.230 |
| Transportation and Infrastructure—decrease outlays | 0.000 | 0.065 | 0.001 | −0.159 |
| Veterans' Affairs—increase outlays | 0.000 | 0.259 | 0.548 | 0.568 |
| Ways and Means—increase outlays | 0.000 | 2.174 | 40.441 | 156.022 |
| Ways and Means—decrease revenues | 0.000 | 0.012 | 1.413 | 4.412 |

(b) POLICY ASSUMPTIONS.—(1) Within the framework of this budget resolution, which provides for the extension of the solvency of the social security and medicare trust funds, the policy of this resolution is that there shall be gross tax relief of $5.6 billion and net tax relief of $2.6 billion in 2001, gross tax relief of $77.8 billion and net tax relief of $50.0 billion over fiscal years 2001 through 2005, and gross tax relief of $263.3 billion and net tax relief of $201.0 billion over fiscal years 2001 through 2010, including by illustration and not limitation provisions that—

(A) mitigate the marriage penalty on middle-income families and the application of the individual alternative minimum tax to middle-income taxpayers;

(B) expand the earned income credit to mitigate the marriage penalty on low-income households and to increase the credit for families with three or more children;

(C) facilitate financing of school construction and renovation;

(D) increase credits and deductions of tuition for post-secondary education;

(E) expand deductions and credits for medical insurance and the cost of long-term care;

(F) provide patient protections contained in the Dingell-Norwood Patient's Bill of Rights Act;

(G) foster community redevelopment and combat urban sprawl;

(H) reduce estate taxes, especially on decedents owning small businesses and family farms;

(I) encourage and expand retirement savings accounts; and

(J) extend credits that promote employment opportunities for welfare beneficiaries and low-income workers.

(2) The resolution assumes that $7.0 billion over fiscal years 2001 through 2005 and $14.6 billion over fiscal years 2001 through 2010 of the revenues forgone as a result of these new tax provisions may be offset by reinstating Superfund taxes; $9.8 billion over fiscal years 2001 through 2005 and $24.2 billion over fiscal years 2001 through 2010 may be offset by repealing or restricting some of the unwarranted deductions, credits, exemptions, and exclusions whose repeal or restriction were proposed by the President in submission of his budget for fiscal year 2001; and $11.0 billion over fiscal years 2001 through 2005 and $23.5 billion over fiscal years 2001 through 2010 may be offset by provisions restricting abusive tax shelters and other provisions proposed by Mr. Rangel in the motion to recommit H.R. 3832.

(3) The resolution also assumes $40 billion over fiscal years 2001 through 2005 and $155 billion through fiscal year 2010 for a medicare prescription drug benefit and cost-sharing protections. The resolution assumes voluntary prescription drug coverage for all Americans age 65 or older, in which not less than 50 percent of the cost of the benefit, based on the price of the prescription drugs, is borne by the Government. Beneficiaries also will pay monthly premiums. Beneficiaries with annual incomes below 150 percent of poverty ($12,525 for a single person; $16,875 for a couple) will not pay premiums, and those with annual incomes below 135 percent of poverty ($11,273 for a single person; $15,188 for a couple) are protected from the plan's cost-sharing requirements.

(c) FLEXIBILITY FOR THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—If the reconciliation submission by the Committee on Ways and Means alters the Internal Revenue Code in ways that are scored by the Joint Committee on Taxation as outlay changes, as through legislation affecting refundable tax credits, the submission shall be considered to meet the revenue requirements of the reconciliation directive if the net cost of the revenue and outlay changes does not exceed the revenue amount set forth for that committee in subsection (a). Upon the submission of such legislation, the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget shall adjust the budget aggregates in this resolution and allocations made under this resolution accordingly.

(d) EXTENDING THE SOLVENCY OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE TRUST FUNDS.—

(1) The purpose of this subsection is to extend the solvency of Social Security by at least 15 years and to extend the solvency of Medicare by at least ten years.

(2) Not later than June 22, 2000, the Committee on Ways and Means shall submit legislation to the House Committee on the Budget providing for the annual transfer from the General Fund of the Treasury to the Hospital Insurance (Medicare Part A) Trust Fund of an amount equal to $300 billion from 2001 to 2010. Such funds shall be derived from the on-budget surplus over that ten-year period.

(3) Not later than June 22, 2000, the Committee on Ways and Means shall submit legislation to the House Committee on the Budget providing for the annual transfer from the General Fund of the Treasury to Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, starting in 2011, of an amount equal to the reduction in unified budget Net Interest outlays in 2010 below the level of unified budget Net Interest outlays in 2000. Under this resolution, that reduction is expected to equal $148.9 billion.

(4) Provisions of legislation that only carry out the requirements of paragraphs (2) or (3) shall not be considered extraneous to a reconciliation bill under section 313 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(e) REPORTING OF RECONCILIATION BILL.—After receiving the legislation submitted under subsections (a), (b), and (d), the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

**SEC. 105. SOCIAL SECURITY LOCKBOX.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) under the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the social security trust funds are off budget for purposes of the President's budget

submission and the concurrent resolution on the budget;

(2) the social security trust funds have been running surpluses each year for seventeen years, and until this year, these surpluses have been borrowed to fund the operations of the Federal Government;

(3) this resolution balances the Federal budget without including the social security surpluses in each year from 2000 through 2010;

(4) balancing the Federal budget exclusive of the social security surplus will strengthen the Nation's financial condition so that it is better prepared to ensure the long-term solvency of the social security program.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any revision to this resolution or a concurrent resolution on the budget for any fiscal year between 2001 and 2010, or any amendment thereto, or conference report thereto, or any reported bill or joint resolution or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon that sets forth or causes an on-budget deficit for any fiscal year.

**SEC. 106. ALLOCATIONS TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS.**

(a) TREATMENT OF OASDI ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—In addition to amounts in this resolution, allocations to the Committee on Appropriations shall include the following amounts, which are assumed to be used for the administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration, and those allocations shall be considered to be allocations made under section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974:

| | 2000 | 2001 |
|---|---|---|
| New budget authority ..... | $3.175 | $3.400 |
| Outlays ..... | $3.202 | $3.370 |

(b) SPECIAL ALLOCATION FOR LANDS LEGACY INITIATIVE.—

(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), $1.4 billion in discretionary new budget authority and $1.0 billion in discretionary outlays included in this resolution shall not be allocated to the Appropriations Committee for 2001.

(2) Prior to consideration by the House of Representatives or the Committee of the Whole of any appropriations measure, amendment, or motion providing $1.4 billion in new budget authority for 2001 for: Federal land acquisitions; conservation-related grants to states, tribes, and localities; and ocean and coastal conservation programs, the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget shall increase the allocation for 2001 of the House Committee on Appropriations by $1.4 billion in new budget authority and by the outlays flowing therefrom.

**SEC. 107. APPLICABILITY OF ADJUSTMENTS.**

Section 314(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall apply as though the adjustments described in sections 104(c) and 106(b) were adjustments under section 314(a) of that Act.

## TITLE II—SENSE OF CONGRESS PROVISIONS

**SEC. 201. SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT CONGRESS AND PRESIDENT AGREE ON DISCRETIONARY CAPS BASED ON REALISTIC LEVELS.**

It is the sense of Congress that Congress and the President adopt discretionary caps based on the levels set forth in this resolution in order to control spending, establish sound budgeting projections and policies, and avoid budgeting gimmicks.

**SEC. 202. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ASSET BUILDING FOR THE WORKING POOR.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) 33 percent of all American households and 60 percent of African American households have no or negative financial assets;

(2) 46.9 percent of all children in America live in households with no financial assets, including 40 percent of Caucasian children and 75 percent of African American children;

(3) in order to provide low-income families with more tools for empowerment, incentives which encourage asset-building should be established;

(4) middle and upper income Americans currently benefit from tax incentives for building assets; and

(5) the Federal Government should utilize the Federal tax code to provide low-income Americans with incentives to work and build assets in order to escape poverty permanently.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the provisions of this concurrent resolution assume that Congress should modify the Federal tax law to include provisions which encourage low-income workers and their families to save for buying a first home, starting a business, obtaining an education, or taking other measures to prepare for the future.

**SEC. 203. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ACCESS TO HEALTH INSURANCE AND PRESERVING HOME HEALTH SERVICES FOR ALL MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES.**

(a) ACCESS TO HEALTH INSURANCE.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) 44.4 million Americans are currently without health insurance, and that this number is expected to rise to nearly 60 million people in the next 10 years;

(B) the cost of health insurance continues to rise, a key factor in increasing the number of uninsured; and

(C) there is a consensus that working Americans and their families will suffer from reduced access to health insurance.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON IMPROVING ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE INSURANCE.—It is the sense of Congress that access to affordable health care coverage for all Americans is a priority of the 106th Congress.

(b) PRESERVING HOME HEALTH SERVICE FOR ALL MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 reformed Medicare home health care spending by instructing the Health Care Financing Administration to implement a prospective payment system and instituted an interim payment system to achieve savings;

(B) the Medicare, Medicaid, and SCHIP Balanced Budget Refinement Act, 1999, reformed the interim payment system to increase reimbursements to low-cost providers and delayed the automatic 15 percent payment reduction until after the first year of the implementation of the prospective payment system; and

(C) patients whose care is more extensive and expensive than the typical Medicare patient do not receive supplemental payments in the interim payment system but will receive special protection in the home health care prospective payment system.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ACCESS TO HOME HEALTH CARE.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(A) home health care for seniors and disabled citizens is vitally important;

(B) Congress and the Administration should work together to maintain quality care for patients whose care is more extensive and expensive than the typical Medicare patient, including the sickest and frailest Medicare beneficiaries, while home health care agencies operate in the interim payment system; and

(C) Congress and the Administration should work together to avoid the imposition of the 15 percent reduction in the prospective payment system and ensure timely implementation of that system.

**SEC. 204. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING MEDICARE+CHOICE PROGRAMS/REIMBURSEMENT RATES.**

It is the sense of Congress that the Medicare+Choice regional disparity among reimbursement rates is unfair, and that full funding of the Medicare+Choice program is a priority as Congress deals with any medicare reform legislation.

**SEC. 205. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE STABILIZATION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL PAYMENTS TO STATES, COUNTIES, AND BOROUGHS.**

It is the sense of Congress that Federal revenue-sharing payments to States, counties, and boroughs pursuant to the Act of May 23, 1908 (35 Stat. 260; 16 U.S.C. 500), the Act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 963; 16 U.S.C. 500), the Act of August 28, 1937 (chapter 876; 50 Stat. 875; 43 U.S.C. 1181f), the Act of May 24, 1939 (chapter 144; 53 Stat. 753; 43 U.S.C. 1181f–1 et seq.), and sections 13982 and 13983 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 (Public Law 103–66; 16 U.S.C. 500 note; 43 U.S.C. 1181f note) should be stabilized and maintained for the long-term benefit of schools, roads, public services, and communities, and that providing such permanent, stable funding is a priority of the 106th Congress.

**SEC. 206. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE IMPORTANCE OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress Finds that—

(1) Recognizing the importance of the National Science Foundation, during the Budget Committee markup, the Holt amendment was offered which would have increased budget authority by $675 million in fiscal year 2001 and by $3.9 billion over five years and increased outlays by $170 million in fiscal year 2001 and by $2.8 billion over five years in Function 250 (General Science, Space and Technology) to reflect greater funding for the National Science Foundation;

(2) recognizing the National Science Foundation's importance during the markup, the Committee accepted a modified Holt amendment which succeeded in increasing the Chairman's mark for Function 250 by $100,000,000 in budget authority for 2001;

(3) further recognizing the National Science Foundation's importance and the wisdom of the original Holt amendment, the Rules Committee approved a substitute which changed the budget resolution, as approved by the Budget Committee, to increase budget authority for the National Science Foundation by an additional $.5 billion in 2001 and $3.0 billion over five years and to increase outlays by $0.1 billion in fiscal year 2001 and by $2.2 billion over five years to reflect increased funding for the National Science Foundation;

(4) even with the increases approved in the Rules Committee substitute for function 250, the outlays levels in this Democratic concurrent budget resolution are still above the levels in the House Republican budget resolution, as modified by the Rules Committee substitute, by $200 million for fiscal year 2001 and $1.3 billion over five years (2001–2005);

(5) the National Science Foundation is the largest supporter of basic research in the Federal Government;

(6) the National Science Foundation is the second largest supporter of university-based research;

(7) research conducted by the grantees of the National Science Foundation has led to innovations that have dramatically improved the quality of life of all Americans;

(8) because basic research funded by the National Science Foundation is high-risk, cutting edge, fundamental, and may not produce tangible benefits for over a decade, the Federal Government is uniquely suited to support such research; and

(9) the National Science Foundation's focus on peer-reviewed, merit-based grants represents a model for research agencies across the Federal Government.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the function 250 discretionary levels assume an increase for National Science Foundation that is sufficient for it to continue its critical role in funding basic research, cultivating America's intellectual infrastructure, and leading to innovations that assure the Nation's economic future.

**SEC. 207. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING SKILLED NURSING FACILITIES.**

It is the sense of Congress that the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission should devote particular attention to the medicare skilled nursing benefit to determine if payment rates are sufficient to provide quality care and to determine if reforms in payment are required. If reforms are recommended, Congress should pass legislation expeditiously to assure quality skilled nursing care.

**SEC. 208. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE IMPORTANCE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) all children deserve a high quality education, including children with disabilities;

(2) the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act provides that the Federal, State, and local governments are to share in the expense of educating children with disabilities and commits the Federal Government to pay up to 40 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure for children with disabilities; and

(3) the discretionary levels in this concurrent resolution for function 500 (Education) are above the levels in the House Republic Budget Resolution by $4,800,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 and by $20,600,000,000 over five years (fiscal years 2001 to 2005).

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the higher discretionary levels for function 500 (Education) in this budget resolution compared with the Republican resolution recognize the importance of special education by allowing Congress to provide sufficient increases for special education while also funding the President's other top educational priorities.

**SEC. 209. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON A FEDERAL EMPLOYEE PAY RAISE.**

It is the sense of Congress that the pay increase for Federal employees in January 2001 should be at least 3.7 percent.

**SEC. 210. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING HCFA DRAFT GUIDELINES.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) on February 15, 2000, the Health Care Financing Administration in the Department of Health and Human Services issued a draft Medicaid School-Based Administrative Claiming (MAC) Guide; and

(2) in its introduction, the stated purpose of the draft MAC guide is to provide information for schools, State medicaid agencies, HCFA staff, and other interested parties on the existing requirements for claiming Federal funds under the medicaid program for the costs of administrative activities, such as medicaid outreach, that are performed in the school setting associated with school-based health services programs.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) many school-based health programs provide a broad range of services that are covered by medicaid, affording access to care for children who otherwise might well go without needed services;

(2) such programs also can play a powerful role in identifying and enrolling children who are eligible for medicaid or for the State Children's Health Insurance programs;

(3) undue administrative burdens may be placed on school districts and States and deter timely application approval;

(4) the Health Care Financing Administration should substantially revise or abandon the current draft MAC guide because it appears to promulgate new rules that place excessive administrative burdens on participating school districts;

(5) the goal of the revised guide should be to encourage the appropriate use of Medicaid school-based services without undue administrative burdens; and

(6) the best way to ensure the continued viability of medicaid school-based services is to guarantee that the guidelines are fair and responsible.

**SEC. 211. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CORPORATE WELFARE.**

It is the sense of Congress that the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate should hold hearings on H.R. 3221, the Corporate Welfare Commission Act of 1999.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 446, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and a Member opposed each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we have considered a number of budget resolutions today. Naturally I think the one we are now presenting is the best of the lot. I want to give the Members of the House five strong reasons that this resolution is the best of the lot.

First of all, prescription drug coverage, a gaping hole in Medicare for many years, we need to close it. We provide reconciliation instructions and $40 billion to the Committee on Ways and Means with the directive to do it. We provide seniors with prescription drug coverage.

Education, the difference between our resolution and the base resolution is clear and distinct, $20.5 billion more for education over the next 5 years.

Debt reduction. Our resolution would lead to debt reduction cumulative surpluses of $48 billion over the next 5 years, $364 billion over the next 10 years.

Social Security and Medicare solvency, the two are directly related. We extend the solvency of Social Security, and we extend the solvency of Medicare. The base bill does not.

Finally, the clear distinct and very important distinction, civilian and military retirement. We provide $16.5 billion to keep the promises we have made to military retirees, particularly those reaching the age of 65 who have not been able to use their Medicare benefits at military treatment facilities.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. WEYGAND), going to the first aid that I mentioned, prescription drugs, a distinct difference between us and the base bill.

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

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, Paul and Judy came to me about a year and a half ago. They were both retired. He was 70. She was 66. About 4 years ago, when they retired, they thought their small pension and their Social Security check would be enough for them. They both had open heart surgery. They both had high blood pressure problems.

Now, after 4 years of retirement, Paul is going back to work part time, and his wife is going back to work part time to pay for their $8,350 a year of prescription drugs. They need relief now.

There are seniors that are in New Jersey, California, Washington, Rhode Island, wherever it may be. There are seniors across this country that want relief now for prescription drugs.

□ 2245

Our plan clearly does that. We reconcile it. We direct Ways and Means to come up with a plan. We put aside, truly, $40 billion over the next 5 years for prescription drug coverage. The Republican plan does not do that. It is elusive, it is smoke and mirrors, it puts it in a reserve fund that is dwindling as we speak today because of a $20 billion error in the way they reconciled their own bill.

Paul and Judy need that relief now, not smoke and mirrors. They need the Democrat alternative that truly addresses the problem, sets aside the money, and comes up with a solution now for Medicare. This takes leadership. This takes courage. This takes bringing us into the 21st century, rather than keeping us in the 20th century.

If we are to make a difference for our seniors, this is the way we can start today. This is a budget proposal that has teeth, has leadership, and will provide the seniors the kind of relief they need. If we are serious about this, no matter what side of the aisle we are on, this is the alternative and this is the plan that will get us to that solution.

I implore my colleagues, forget about the bias between one plan or the other, think about the people in our districts that are truly like Paul and Judy and resolve the prescription drug plan today with our alternative.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I want to applaud the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) on putting together a budget, but I want to talk about what the base budget does, the goals we are accomplishing here.

First, we are protecting 100 percent of the Social Security surplus. We protected Social Security last year, we are going to do it again, and we are going to do it ad infinitum. We are strengthening Medicare by adding a prescription drug benefit to it; $40 billion to Medicare. We are retiring the entire public debt by the year 2013. We are promoting tax fairness for families, farmers and seniors. We are restoring

America's defense capabilities. And we are strengthening support for education and science.

But I want to talk about Social Security. What are we doing on Social Security? Well, last year the President said on Social Security, let us take 38 percent out of the trust fund and spend it on other government programs and dedicate just 62 percent to Social Security. That was not good enough. And we countered last year by saying lock away 100 percent of Social Security funds for Social Security.

Guess what? That is what we achieved this year. This Congress achieved the stop on the raid of the Social Security Trust Fund for the first time in 30 years. That is what we are accomplishing here. The reforms in the underlying bill, in the budget resolution on Social Security are real reforms.

The reforms in the Spratt budget on Social Security, and on Medicare, for that matter, are phony reforms. They are simply nothing more than adding more paper IOUs to the Social Security and Medicare trust funds. It is kind of like having a credit card, but our income does not change. We do not get more money on our FICA taxes, we do not get more money on our paycheck; but our credit card limit goes up.

That is what the Spratt budget does for Social Security. It simply says increase the limit on the credit card, but do not increase the income to the beneficiary. It does not add one extra penny to Social Security or Medicare. It just transfers IOUs to the two programs to give us the illusion that we are reforming Social Security and Medicare. It lulls us into thinking we are actually making a difference in Social Security and Medicare. My fear is that it will delay the important reforms to Social Security and Medicare that we so dearly need.

Mr. Chairman, the underlying budget, the Republican budget resolution, is the serious plan. It is the plan that locks away Social Security for now and future generations. It is the plan that pays off the entire national public debt in 13 years, a trillion over the next 5 years. It is the plan that lets people continue to keep more of their hard-earned money if they still overpay their taxes. It is a plan that fixes our problems in education and science. It is the plan that puts money back into our vital national defense interests. It is the plan for America's future for the 21st century.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, no challenge faces our country like the challenge of education. We, in our budget resolution, rise to that challenge. We pay down the debt, we provide for tax cuts, but we also provide for priority spending on things like education, which we believe the American people want.

What is the difference between our resolution and the base bill? $20.5 billion more in our resolution for education.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), who was a college professor at Duke University before coming here; and to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY), who was a high school teacher before coming here, to talk about the difference between our resolution and the base bill.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and the gentleman is certainly correct that there is no greater area of contrast in these two budgets than in the area of education.

This is a time when we need to be renewing our commitment to public education, our investments in public education so it becomes an engine of opportunity for all of our people. And what do our Republican friends do? Well, they freeze most education programs for a period of 5 years in this budget. They have a small increase for special education, which is mainly budget authority that cannot be spent. It is a kind of a hollow promise. And then the rest of the education budget is basically frozen.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, one of the things we talk about all the time is how important education is. And what this budget does, the Democratic substitute, is actually put money where our mouths are. That is the most important investment we can make, is in our children.

One of the things I find ironic about the Republican budget is that they cut 40,000 children out of Head Start, for example. And yet all the research shows us that that is the vital age for children to learn, and it is so important for them to have a good start.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Reclaiming my time, the gentlewoman is absolutely correct.

If there were ever a successful program in getting children ready to learn it is Head Start. Why over the next 5 years we would want to actually cut that program escapes me.

Then we look at the other end of the educational spectrum, Pell grants, these cuts would require that 316,000 fewer students receive Pell grants.

Ms. HOOLEY or Oregon. If the gentleman will continue to yield, again this is one of those areas where we say that to succeed with the new technologies and the new kind of markets that we have, it is vitally important that we provide a higher education and some training, and yet again the Republican budget cuts 316,000 students out of the opportunity to go to college.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Again reclaiming my time, I would point out that, by contrast, our Democratic alternative makes room for as much or more for special education, that is, education for disabled and handicapped children. It lets us get going on school construction in low-income and high-growth areas with an innovative tax plan, and it lets us proceed to hire these 100,000 new teachers, skilled teachers to get class size down in the early grades.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. And the reason it is so important to hire 100,000 new teachers is because they are for kindergarten through third grade. And we know if children have smaller classroom sizes, they learn better and it follows them all the way through.

So let us put our money where our mouths are and vote for a budget that funds education.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE).

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

It is interesting. I would like to focus on this prescription drug benefit and Medicare benefit that the Democrats are now rushing in at the last minute and providing. Interestingly enough, Paul and Judy, just a few months ago, I would say to my friend, did not get squat from the President. Did not get squat. In fact, when the President came here, Paul and Judy did not get a prescription drug benefit.

The President promised that, but it did not start until the fourth year. And the ultimate is that Paul and Judy's hospital probably had to close because of the provider cuts that went in order to fund this so-called prescription drug benefit that the President put into his budget.

So what did the Democrats do at the last minute, last night? They rushed in and said, oh no, we cannot do that. So, me too, $40 billion, just like the Republicans put into their plan. And now they come in and say, but we have a reconciliation protection.

Do my colleagues know what that means? That means that the committee is instructed to do the work. But if it is not done, the Democrats can spend that $40 billion anywhere they want. The Republicans have a reserve fund for their $40 billion. It has to be spent for Medicare reform with a prescription drug benefit.

Those are the facts. They can run as fast as they want from the President's budget, but the President did not provide a prescription drug benefit that was real. It included provider cuts that were real. And now they run from that, but they run in here with a weaker proposal.

Let us support the Republican plan that gives Paul and Judy and the people across this country the opportunity to have a real prescription drug benefit and a real Medicare reform that not only makes sure that prescription drug benefits are available but makes sure that our hospitals and our doctors and our health care providers are able to keep giving them quality health care.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to

tell my colleagues that the third thing we would emphasize about our budget is debt reduction; that we provide for a Medicare prescription drug benefit; that we provide $20.5 billion more for education, but we also reduce spending and we save $48 billion in cumulative surpluses over the next 5 years. $364 billion.

This side has said repeatedly they are paying the debt down by $1 trillion. So are we. We are all going to use the Social Security surplus, $976 million over the next 5 years, to pay down debt held by the public. But we have $48 billion more in debt reduction over the next 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) to talk about the difference between our budget and the base budget when it comes to debt reduction.

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, there is a big difference between the Republican and the Democratic budgets, and one of those big differences is the amount of debt that is paid down. The Republican budget does not use one cent of the on-budget surplus to pay down the national debt, whereas the Democratic budget uses 40 percent of the projected on-budget surplus to pay down the national debt, on top of the Social Security surplus, which both budgets, to be honest, propose paying down the debt.

But then there is a key difference as well, and that is that the Republican budget is predicated on unsustainable cuts in domestic discretionary spending that the Republican Congresses themselves, since 1995, have failed to make.

The Congressional Budget Office, in its most recent report, found that the Republican Congresses had increased nondefense discretionary spending above the rate of inflation, which is contrary to what they have in their budget. Therefore, combined with the trillion dollar tax cut that is in here, the Republican budget would end up not only eating through the on-budget surplus but would also go into the Social Security surplus. So, actually, they are paying down far less debt than what we propose in the Democratic budget.

I am glad, quite frankly, that the Republicans have come around to this way. When we had the budget markup last year, I proposed we dedicate all the surplus, both on-budget and off-budget to paying down the debt, and I was told that was not a good idea. And in 1998, the Republicans proposed using, I think it was either 10 or 20 percent of the Social Security surplus for a tax cut and then dedicating the rest of it.

It is a little bit like a tent meeting and everybody has gone and gotten religion now and they have come back and they want to pay down the debt. But the bottom line, when we compare the two, the Democrats pay down far more than the Republicans in debt.

□ 2300

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU).

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, let us be clear about where we really were a year ago and who was making statements about setting aside the surplus, setting aside 100 percent of the Social Security Trust Fund surplus. It cannot possibly be more clear.

The President's budget, which we had a vote on on this very House floor, only received two votes because he was spending 38 percent of the Social Security surplus. And it was the Republican budget that, for the first time ever set aside every penny of the Social Security surplus. This year we are going to do it again for a historic third year in a row, set aside every penny of the Social Security surplus, create a reserve fund for Medicare, not just prescription drug coverage, but honest reforms, as well.

We are going to retire a historic level of the public debt, a trillion dollars over 5 years; promote a much fairer Tax Code; and make essential investments in defense, in veterans' health care, and in education.

But the previous speaker spoke a little bit about retiring debt, and they are talking about this budget being reckless. Well, let us take a look and see how reckless this budget is and how reckless Republican budgets of the past several years have been, paying down over $50 billion in debt 2 years ago, 1998; in 1999, paying down over $80 billion of the public debt.

Fiscal Year 2000, we are in the midst of it, we will pay down over $160 billion in debt. And in the budget we have brought to the floor here today, we are paying down over $170 billion in debt. $450 billion in debt retirement. And this is what the other side would term ''reckless''?

I do not think this is reckless. This is historic. This is an unprecedented commitment to paying down debt. A trillion dollars in debt relief over 5 years in this very budget. This is reckless? I do not think this is reckless. This is an historic commitment to reducing public debt. And that means lower interest rates for every American on home mortgages and car loans and student loans.

One to two percent lower interest rates on $100,000 home mortgage is $10,000 or $20,000 over a 20-year mortgage, $30,000 over a 30-year mortgage, money that never has to get sent to Washington, that the electorate never has to ask for us to return it back to them because we are in a charitable mood.

Lowering interest rates, tens of thousands of dollars of savings for average American families. I do not think this is reckless at all.

I think, instead, it is reckless to oppose tax fairness as the Democrat proposal has done; to oppose eliminating the marriage penalty; to oppose giving individuals health insurance deductibilities so that they can have a fair playing field with large corporations, that is reckless; to oppose repealing the Social Security earnings limit; to oppose expanding opportunities for retirement savings or education savings. That is reckless when we want to trap a family into leaving their child in a family school.

This is a budget of responsibility. It sets the right tone on debt retirement and it strengthens our country.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, there is a very significant difference between our bill and the base bill. We have something in our bill that there is no semblance of in the base bill, and that is $16.3 billion to provide for military retirees' health care at military treatment facilities.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, there are two groups I want to talk about. It is easy to beat up on Federal employees. After all, we are their bosses and they really cannot fight back. And maybe that is why they have had to contribute over $200 billion in the last few years toward deficit reduction. But at 3 a.m. last night, it was decided to require Federal employees to pay another $1.2 billion toward their retirement costs.

But worse than the way we treat Federal employees is the way we treat military retirees in this bill. It is wrong. We have brochures that are as current as 1991 that promise free lifetime quality health care if they will contribute 20 years of their life serving their country, defending their country.

And they took that promise. And now when they turn 65, they are out in the cold, no health care coverage, they get at the back of the line.

Well, the Democratic budget brings them in from the cold, provides full Medicare coverage, provides the same kind of prescription drug coverage that we provide enlisted personnel and their families.

I have got to tell my colleagues, if they vote for the Republican budget, they had better be willing to look in the face of our military retirees and explain why a politically appealing tax cut was more important than keeping their promise to them.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am a combat veteran and a veteran. I support the Republican budget, and so do other veterans.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Connecticut for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard all throughout the day and actually for several years now this recurring theme from the people on the other side about reckless, exploding, risky tax cuts for the rich.

Well, let us talk about the tax relief that is in our bill and let us let the American people decide just how risky or reckless and how much this really is for the rich.

We are talking about ending the marriage penalty tax. We believe fundamentally it is wrong to say they ought to pay extra taxes just because they have a marriage license. We think that is wrong.

We think it is wrong that Social Security recipients have this earnings limit and have to pay among the highest tax rates of any working people in America.

We think it is wrong that families have to visit the IRS and the undertaker in the same week.

We think it is wrong that we have a confiscatory tax of 55 percent on estates we have been paying taxes every year.

We think it is wrong that we are not making it easier for expanded education savings accounts. We want to increase the health care deductibility for self-employed for farmers, small business people.

We want to provide tax relief and breaks for poor communities. And we want to strengthen private pension plans.

Now, if those are tax cuts for the rich, if those are risky schemes, well, then let us have more of it.

Let us compare our plan to the Clinton-Gore plan. In the first year, the Clinton-Gore plan actually increases net taxes by $10 billion. We provide $10 billion of tax relief.

If we look at over 5 years, we are talking at least $200 billion in tax relief. We hope to increase that as additional surpluses go up. The President provides $5 billion in tax relief for the first 5 years.

This is not a risky plan. This is a common sense plan. But it is really a debate between those who believe in tax relief for working families; and ultimately, at the end of the day, it is a debate between two world views. It is a debate between those who believe that we know best and can spend the people's money smarter than they can and those of us who believe that they know best and they can spend their own money smarter than we can.

This is a common sense budget. The tax relief that is contained in this budget is really common sense. I think once the American people understand it is not just about numbers, it is about basic fairness.

I would ask my colleagues on the other side which of these tax relief provisions do they want to take away, the marriage penalty tax, the death tax, education savings accounts, health care deductibility, community renewal, or pension reform? Which of those is so unfair? How do they benefit the rich?

They are going to have to answer those questions if they vote against this budget. Because it is a common sense budget and the tax relief that is contained in here is common sense.

I think once the American people understand what we have put into this bill, they will demand the Republican budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the fifth point that we would make about our budget as opposed to the base budget deals with Social Security and Medicare.

There is a distinct difference, indeed there is a chronic difference, between the way we deal with Social Security and Medicare and the way they deal with it.

First of all, our budget protects, preserves, and defends the Social Security Trust Fund. Over the next 5 years, we are going to rack up $48 billion in surpluses under our budget. What do these ensure? They ensure that the Social Security Trust Fund will remain intact and untouched.

The Republican resolution, on the other hand, puts the budget back in the danger zone, on thin ice, close to the edge.

We have been talking about this chart all day long. The numbers can be argued over, but we have run the numbers different ways and the chart stands uncontradicted.

□ 2310

To begin with, to do what they propose, to achieve this surplus that they claim of $17 billion, $110 billion over the next 5 years, they have got to do $117 billion in real reduction in discretionary spending over the next 5 years. That has not been done over the last 10 when we had deficits. It is not likely to be done over the next 5. And if it is not done, if that assumption is not met, the budget is back in the red again. It is that simple.

Secondly, even if that unlikely assumption were somehow met, if you claim a drug benefit for Medicare which you have got on all your posters, if you claim it, you have got to count the cost of it. That is $40 billion. And if you claim that you are going to do a $200 billion tax cut, then you have got to calculate in your calculation of the surplus the $200 billion tax cut.

And when you put the $40 billion for Medicare prescription drugs and the $200 billion tax cut over 5 years into this budget, the surplus is wiped out in 2003 and you are in the red, back into Social Security in 2004 and 2005. Our budget stays out of Social Security, it stays in the black; it has a $48 billion cushion over that 5-year period of time. That is the first reason ours is better for Social Security.

By the way, we would also buy back Treasury bonds. With the surplus built up in Social Security, we would pay down debt held by the public. We will pay down $976 million of debt just as you will with your proposal, so long as you stay out of Social Security; and over 10 years we will pay down $2.3 trillion in debt, and by the year 2013 we will wipe out the public debt if we abide by the budget that we are proposing.

Now, there is a second, more important, reason that our budget is better for Social Security, Medicare and distinctly different from the base budget. The Republican budget does not add a dime to Social Security or Medicare over the next 5 years or 1 day to the solvency of either program. Over the next 10 years, our budget contributes $300 billion out of the surpluses that we will accumulate. It takes $300 billion from the general fund and puts that money into the Medicare trust fund.

I have heard this talk over here about IOUs. If anybody has a government bond lying around that is an IOU and he would like to put it somewhere, I will be glad to receive it. It has a lot of value to it. It gives you secured status. We are going to put $300 billion in government bonds into the Medicare trust fund paid for, a net addition to national savings out of the general fund. And in 2011, we propose to calculate how much we have saved in the way of debt service on the last year and take that amount of money and transfer it into the Social Security Trust Fund. As a result, we extend the solvency of Medicare by 10 years and the solvency of Social Security by 15 years. These are profound differences and good reasons to vote for our substitute over the base bill.

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 seconds to point out that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle had 40 years to spend the Social Security surplus and this side of the aisle ended that practice. In the very footnotes of the chart just referred to, Democrats admitted they interpolated and they extrapolated to get their figures. In other words, they guessed.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) from the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the base budget bill. As one of the few classroom teachers in this body, who ran a chapter 1 program for 3 years in an urban school district, I am strongly in favor of this budget because of what it does for education. We focus on teachers. We focus on kids. We do not focus on bureaucracy. I am proud of what this budget does in terms of Social Security and Medicare, what it does to pay down the public debt. But I am most proud of what this budget and what this part of the Congress and the House has done for our defense.

The other side talks about rebuilding our defense. Over the past 5 years, Mr.

Chairman, it has been this side who has increased defense spending by $43.1 billion over the President's request. Even the former Clinton Secretary of Defense, Bill Perry, just 2 months ago acknowledged if we had not done that, we would be in a devastating position right now as this President tries to recapture a $15 billion increase and that is not enough.

This President has committed our troops to deployments 34 times in 8 years, versus 10 times in the previous 40 years. None of those 34 deployments were budgeted for. All the money for those deployments came out of an already decreasing defense budget. Our morale has never been lower. Our retention rates for pilots in the Air Force and Navy is hovering at 15 percent. Our ability to recruit young people, except for the Marine Corps, is going unmet by all the services. We are sending aircraft carriers into harm's way with five and 600 sailors short.

We have military personnel on food stamps. That is the legacy of this administration even though we have increased defense spending by $43 billion over the past 5 years. This budget reinvests in defense and makes a commitment to our military. But it does something else, Mr. Chairman, that no one has talked about tonight in any of the budgets and is not even mentioned in the budget that my good friend and colleague is offering tonight on behalf of the minority.

We talk about police and both budgets spend billions of dollars on law enforcement. We buy vests for police. We talk about teachers; 100,000 new teachers. What does your budget do for the 1.2 million men and women who are domestic defenders, our fire and emergency services personnel? What statement does your budget make about the 32,000 fire and EMS departments that have responded to every flood, every tornado, every earthquake, every disaster our country has? Your budget has zilch, zero, nada, nothing. Our budget for the first time ever recognizes the brave heroes of America who respond to our domestic problems, the 1.2 million men and women, 85 percent of whom are volunteers, in every one of your congressional districts, that day in and day out supports the job of protecting our American people. Even though we lose 100 of these people a year, you say nothing. We provide support for them.

For that reason, I say vote for the Republican base budget bill.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself enough time to answer one question the gentleman put to me with respect to fire personnel and emergency personnel. This budget, the base budget, cuts FEMA, the account in which FEMA is included, function 450, by $2.8 billion between this year and next year, and over 5 years by $18.3 billion. That is what you are cutting out of function Community and Regional Development.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRATT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would know anything about FEMA, none of that money goes to local fire and emergency response. None of it. Not one dime of it. The gentleman needs to get his facts straight.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 90 seconds to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

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

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, the Democratic budget does many things. It is both prudent and caring. Certainly it pays down the debt by the year 2013 and certainly it protects Medicare, it protects Social Security; and yes, it does a sufficient amount of investment in our military and our retirees who have served our country well. But in addition to that, it invests in education. It also does something that the Republican budget does not do. It cares about its most vulnerable people, those people who are left out of the bountiful plenty of prosperity that we are enjoying. It cares about legal immigrants. It cares about the poorest of the poor trying to get day care going to work. It invests in after-school programs. It invests and brings up the shelter and provision caps for food stamps. It makes it even for all States.

Not only is the Democratic budget a prudent one, but it says American prosperity should be for everyone. I invite my colleagues to make sure that everybody is included in this prosperity. The Democratic budget does that.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my great friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA).

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, what does the Republican budget mean for you and your family? It means a debt-free Nation for our children. In education it means more dollars for our classrooms and more dollars for our children instead of dollars for bureaucracy and redtape.

□ 2320

The distinction could not be more clear. The Democratic alternative wants to force on our local schools programs and mandates that do not work. They want to build our schools, hire our teachers, buy the technology, feed our kids breakfast, dictate the curriculum, teach our kids about sex, teach them about drugs, teach them about art, feed our kids lunch, and then they want to test them. Other than that, they believe in local control.

And then they are going to move all of those programs and move those decisions for each one of those areas into a department in Washington that for 2 years has failed its financial audits, has told the American people give us $35 billion per year, but we are not going to take the time or the energy to be able to account where that money is spent. That is wrong.

The alternative is providing resources to local schools to tailor solutions to meet the needs of our local school districts, to meet their particular needs, a vision that gives decision-making and discretion to local administrators, to parents and teachers, the people that know our kids' names and know their needs. The differences could not be clearer.

Are we going to move decision-making to the Department of Education here in Washington, or are we going to leave the decision-making at the local level? It is time to support the Republican budget. It increases spending and investment in education, but it preserves and builds educational excellence through local decision-making, not through decision-making based here in Washington.

Support this budget. It is the right thing to do. It builds on what we know works and walks away from that which we know that does not work.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I ask the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) if I could borrow one of his charts.

This is the chart I wanted to hold and borrow, because I think throughout this debate the gentleman sort of indirectly unwittingly complimented us. The only thing the gentleman got wrong on this whole chart is a GOP plan, because if the gentleman goes down the items on this chart, the gentleman will see that our budget resolution does everything the gentleman says, except we do it better.

It protects 100 percent of the Social Security surplus. I just explained that. We have a $48 billion cushion that keeps you out of Social Security, strengthens Medicare with prescription drugs. We have reconciliation. We do not say report a bill that has structure reforms and then you can have the $40 billion. We say just do prescription drugs, get it done. Retire the public debt by 2013, we do it. Promote tax fairness, give us a break. We have got a $50 billion net tax cut. Read the language of it.

We have the AMT correction in it. We have mitigation of the marital penalty in it. We have deductibility of college tuition in it. We have tax fairness and tax relief for families. Restore America's defense? Come on. There is one-tenth of 1 percent over the 5 years difference between what the gentleman is providing for defense than what we are providing for defense.

Add in the $16.3 billion that we are providing for retiree health care, and we are way ahead of the gentleman. Finally, strength and support for education and science. We match you in science. And we are $20.5 billion ahead of you in education. You ought to vote for us.

I rest my case and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Ohio has 3 minutes remaining to close.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to make sure we have another one of these charts made so we can present it to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) tomorrow.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP) for his closing comments.

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

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding the time. It is an honor to come and close this debate today. I know later tonight as we close up this great debate on the budget this year that we are going to give proper recognition to the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman KASICH), but I think over the last 15 years, as many have labored in the fields for a more responsible approach on the Federal level, there is not a person in the United States Congress that deserves more credit for bringing us to a balanced budget than the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH).

He is a genuine man, and everyone in this institution I think respects and appreciates the gentleman. Do not take too much of my time. We are going to do this again a little later on. We are going to do that again.

I admire the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), but I have to tell you, I spent the first half of my life as a Democrat for 20 years. And I spent the second half of my life as a Republican, and I joined the Republican party in 1980 because I felt like the Federal Government was growing too big and out of control in some respects, and we needed to restore more accountability to Washington, D.C.

I would say as a member of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations that this majority has hit its stride in balance, fairness. And I think this budget is the best product that we have come up with in the 5½ years that we have had an opportunity to present our way.

My 13-year-old son is in the Chamber tonight. He will be 13 Sunday. And I really believe that this issue, I have heard reckless tax cuts all night long, but let me tell you when I was in born in 1957, the American people paid less than 10 percent to the Government at all level combined. And today it is almost half.

When my son is at my age, at the current pace, three-fourths of what he makes is going to go to the Government at some level, and that is reckless. That is the truth.

We need to bring more accountability to this process of where we are going to restrain government growth. That is what this budget does. Greenspan knows it. He says it, the economy is the goose laying its golden egg. And we have to restrain the growth of spending.

The Democratic substitute here actually grows discretionary spending at twice inflation. We cannot continue to do that. Tax fairness, ladies and gentlemen, time has come, and Democrats and Republicans are agreeing that we need to reduce the tax burden on working families in this country. And I am proud of this budget, because it is fair and reasonable.

I come from sort of the center here to say that it is time that we all come together around this budget, live within our means, fuel the economy, save Social Security, protect 100 percent of it, strengthen Medicare, do all we can with that prescription drug benefit, retire that public debt in a bipartisan way, give some tax relief to the American families while we can. If we do not do it now, with unprecedented surpluses, we will never do it. We have to do it now. Let us come together.

Yes, we are not restoring America's defense. We need to do more, I say to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT). We need do a lot more, because we got people spread all over the world overdeployed, underpaid, ill-equipped. We need to do more, but a billion dollars is at least a step in the right direction and invest in education and science.

Let us pass this budget tonight.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Democratic substitute to the budget resolution.

I want to commend the ranking member, Mr. SPRATT for working to make the Democratic substitute a plan that pays down the debt, protects the future of Social Security and Medicare, and helps our low-income families.

During this period of economic good times, it may be difficult to comprehend that across America, 28 percent of families with three or more children are living in poverty.

But the fact is, poverty rates for families with three or more children are much higher than for smaller families.

By providing them with an increased tax credit, this expansion of the EITC for families with three or more children recognizes the economic difficulties of raising a large family today.

Expanding the earned income tax credit for these larger families is a common-sense tax policy; a policy that will directly benefit 7.7 million kids whose hard-working parents are struggling to climb the economic ladder out of poverty.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, today we have a choice between the Republican budget, which gambles away the surplus on risky tax cuts and jeopardizes crucial programs such as Social Security and Medicare, or the Democratic substitute, which protects these programs and gives a boost to millions of hard-working American families.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the Democratic substitute and invest in the future of all Americans.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, as the Ranking Democrat on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I rise to express my strong support for the substitute budget resolution offered by the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. SPRATT, the Ranking Democratic Member of our House Budget Committee. The Spratt budget resolution for fiscal year 2001 is a strong pro-veteran proposal. It deserves the support of every Member of the House.

The budget authored by Congressman SPRATT provides more discretionary spending in fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) than either the budget proposed by the President or the budget resolution reported by the Committee. With these additional funds, VA can better meet the medical care needs of our nation's aging veterans population. Specifically for fiscal year 2001, the Spratt alternative provides $22.3 billion in appropriations for veterans' programs, $100 million more than the Republican plan and $200 million more than the President's request. Over five years (2001–2005), the Spratt alternative provides $1 billion more than the Republican proposal.

Significantly, the Spratt proposal also increases the basic monthly education benefit veterans will receive under the Montgomery GI Bill (MGIB). Educational benefits provided under the MGIB are mandatory spending. This increase in the basic monthly education benefit for veterans who have honorably served our nation in uniform and then pursue post-secondary education is an important first step in restoring our commitment to provide veterans a readjustment benefit for education which is worthy of their service to our nation.

Under the Spratt proposal the basic educational benefit for veterans will increase from the current $536 per month for 36 months to nearly $700 per month. This is a well-deserved and much needed 25 percent increase in MGIB education readjustment benefit for veterans. As the gentleman from South Carolina knows, I believe the MGIB benefit should be increased more than has been proposed in the resolution which he has authored. This proposed increase, however, is a strong, positive step to achieving the goal of providing a more meaningful education benefit for our nation's veterans than is provided today.

MIGB enhancements are long overdue. I strongly agree with the report of the Congressional Commission on Servicemembers and Veterans Transition Assistance, which concluded ". . . an opportunity to obtain the best education for which they qualify is the most valuable benefit our Nation can offer the men and women whose military service preserves our liberty." I applaud the Commission's bold, new plan for the MGIB. This proposal, however, must be further strengthened and enhanced if the MGIB is to fulfill its purposes as a meaningful readjustment benefit and as an effective recruitment incentive for our Armed Forces. Since the implementation of the Montgomery GI Bill on July 1, 1985, there have been significant economic and societal changes in America that mandate revisions in the structure and benefit level of this program.

In the House, MGIB legislation has been introduced by Mr. STUMP, Chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, and together with Mr. DINGELL, I introduced my own bill, H.R. 1071, the Montgomery GI Bill Improvements Act of 1999, to provide benefits for two tiers of service members, those who enlist for a minimum of 4 years (Tier I) and those who enlist for less than 4 years (Tier II). Benefits for Tier I would pay for full cost of tuition, fees, books and supplies, plus provide a subsistence allowance of $800 per month of full-time college studies for up to 36 months. Tier II would increase the basic benefit under the MGIB to $900 per month.

According to an analysis performed by the Congressional Research Service last year, the

mean earnings of workers 18 years or older in 1998 were $23,320 for high school graduates, $27,618 for those with some college or an Associate's degree and $43,255 for those with a Bachelor's degree. The analysis then calculated the average federal income tax for these workers, using 1999 tax rates for single taxpayers, and using the standard deduction of $4,300 and the personal exemption of $2,750. These figures are listed in the table below.

This information confirms our common sense understanding of the importance of education. Education is of benefit to individual servicemembers and veterans and to American society in general. Servicemembers and veterans who have earned through their honorable military service a meaningful readjustment benefit which provides the opportunity to obtain a higher education will be more productive, earn more and based on their increased earnings pay higher taxes.

| | High school graduate | Some college or associate's degree | Bachelor's degree only |
|---|---|---|---|
| Average Annual Earnings | $23,320 | $27,618 | $43,255 |
| Average Federal Income Tax | 2,441 | 3,086 | 6,796 |

The economic impacts are compelling. Servicemembers and veterans who attain a Bachelor's degree pay back 36 percent more in federal tax revenues each year. If the policy rationale for an MGIB benefit increase is not a strong enough argument on its own, it is obvious that an increase would, in essence, be self-funded as well. These calculations, unfortunately, are not given commensurate weight when Congress evaluates cost under pay-as-you-go requirements.

As illustrated by the Congressional Research Service, the amount of education that individuals receive has an important influence on their experience in the labor market. For example, those who have completed more years of schooling typically experience less unemployment than other workers do. In addition, workers' earnings generally increase as their level of education increases. These relationships have held up over time, and in some instances, have intensified. Workers with a bachelor's degree are much better off today, compared to less-educated workers, than they were some two decades ago. The average male college graduate earned about 50 percent more than the average male high school graduate during the latter half of the 1970s. In contrast, the premium paid to males with college degrees in 1998 was 92 percent. The average wage advantage of female college graduates over female high school graduates grew from about 41 to 76 percent.

Of immediate concern is the ineffectiveness of the MGIB as a readjustment program for servicemembers making the transition from military service to a civilian society and workforce. While costs of higher education have soared, nearly doubling since 1980. GI Bill benefits have not kept pace. In fact, during the 1995–96 school year, the basic benefit paid under the MGIB offset only a paltry 36 percent of average total education costs. A disappointingly low usage rate of 51 percent for 1998 confirms the inadequacy of the current program's benefit levels.

Young men and women who serve in our Armed Forces have the option of enrolling in the MGIB when they enter the military. This includes their agreement to a $100 per month pay reduction during the first twelve months of service, for a total contribution of $1,200. Once their initial term of service has been honorably served, a veteran is eligible to receive the basic monthly educational benefit of $536 each month he or she is enrolled in full-time college study. The benefit continues for up to 36 months. Assuming he or she is enrolled for a typical nine-month academic year, the veteran's total benefit for that year is $4,824. With this modest amount he or she is expected to pay for tuition, fees, room and board.

The average annual cost of tuition and basic expenses at a four-year public college is $8,774 for commuter students and $10,909 for students who live on campus according to the College Board. Not surprisingly, the same annual costs for four-year private colleges are even higher: $20,500 for commuter students and $23,651 for residents. The disparity between these ever-increasing costs and a veteran's ability to pay for them is clear. This disparity recently prompted key military and veteran organizations to join together with organizations representing colleges to form the ''Partnership for Veterans' Education.'' The coalition launched an energetic campaign calling for Congress to at least increase the basic benefit under the MGIB to $975 per month, enough to cover the $8,774 average annual cost of attending a four-year public college as a commuter student.

HIGHER EDUCATION ANNUAL COSTS: 1999–2000 SCHOOL YEAR

| | 4 year private institutions resident students | 4 year private institutions commuter students | 4 year public institution resident students | 4 year public institution commuter students |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Tuition and Fees | $15,380 | $15,380 | $3,356 | $3,356 |
| Books and Supplies | 700 | 700 | 681 | 681 |
| Room and Board | 5,959 | | 4,730 | |
| Board Only | | 2,324 | | 2,213 |
| Transportation | 558 | 907 | 658 | 1,005 |
| Other | 1,054 | 1,189 | 1,484 | 1,519 |
| Annual Cost | 23,651 | 20,500 | 10,909 | 8,774 |
| Per Month Cost for Nine Months | 2,628 | 2,278 | 1,212 | 975 |
| Four Year Cost (36 months) | 94,604 | 82,000 | 43,636 | 35,096 |
| Current Benefit (36 months) | 19,296 | 19,296 | 19,296 | 19,296 |
| Current Benefit Percent of Cost | 0.20397 | 0.23532 | 0.4422 | 0.5498062 |

Source: Trends in College Pricing, The College Board, 1999.

In addition to inadequate benefit levels, the unsatisfactory usage rate is also a result of the inflexible structure of the present program. Under today's law, benefits are generally paid only on a monthly basis and may not be used for specialized courses, such as computer training; provided by for-profit and nonprofit entities that do not meet the current definition of ''educational institution.'' As a result, veterans' education and training choices are limited, and they are not permitted to use their GI Bill benefits if they want to take advantage of the many excellent technology-related courses sponsored by companies like Microsoft or Novell. This is precisely the type of training that is important now and will be even more important in the future.

The current structure of the MGIB served the veterans during the second half of the 20th century very well. However, the MGIB must now be re-examined in the context of a January, 1999 report by the Departments of Commerce, Labor, and Education, the Small Business Administration, and the National Institute for Literacy. This report, entitled ''21st Century Skills for 21st Century Jobs,'' has important implications for veterans entering the civilian workforce. Emphasizing the importance to the nation of investing in education and training, the report concluded changes in the economy and workplace are requiring greater levels of skill and education than ever before. It predicted eight of the ten fastest growing jobs in the next decade will require college education or moderate to long-term training, and jobs requiring a bachelor's degree will increase by 25 percent. The report also noted workers with more education enjoy greater benefits, experience less unemployment and, if dislocated, re-enter the labor force far more quickly than individuals with less education. It also reports that, on average, college graduates earn 77 percent more than individuals with only a high school diploma. If America's veterans are to successfully compete in the challenging 21st century workforce, they simply have to have the ability to obtain the education and training critical to their success. As noted by the Transition Commission, ''. . . education will be the key to employment in the information age.'' Although the current GI Bill provides some degree of assistance, it is a key that opens very few doors, and it is my belief that all the doors of educational opportunity must be open to our veterans.

According to the 1997 Department of Defense report entitled ''Population Representation in the Military Services,'' 20 percent of the new enlisted recruits for that year were African American, 10 percent were Hispanic, 6 percent were other minorities, including Native Americans, Asians, and Pacific Islanders, and 18 percent were women. The report further notes that, although members of the military come from backgrounds somewhat lower in socioeconomic status than the U.S. average, these young men and women have higher levels of education, measured aptitudes, and reading skills than their civilian counterparts. These young people, most of whom do not enter military service with financial or socioeconomic advantages, have enormous potential, and it is in the best interests of the nation they be given every opportunity to achieve their highest potential. Access to education is the key to achieving that potential. It is also

important to remember that, through the sacrifices required of them through their military service, this group of young Americans—more than any other—earns the benefits provided for them by a grateful nation.

Of equal concern to me as a member of the Armed Services Committee is the MGIB's failure to fulfill its purpose as a recruitment incentive for the Armed Forces. Findings of the 1998 Youth Attitude Tracking Study (YATS) confirm that recruiters are faced with serious challenges, and these challenges are likely to continue. This survey of young men and women, conducted annually by the Department of Defense, provides information on the propensity, attitudes and motivations of young people toward military service. The latest YATS shows the propensity to enlist among young males has fallen from 34 percent in 1991 to 26 percent in 1998, in spite of a generally favorable view of the military. In addition to a thriving civilian economy, which inevitably results in recruiting challenges, the percentage of American youth going to college is increasing and the young people most likely to go to college express little interest in joining our Armed Forces. Interestingly, these same youth note that if they were to serve in the military, their primary reason for enlisting would be to earn educational assistance benefits.

The study concluded the propensity to enlist is substantially below pre-drawdown levels and, as result, the services would probably not succeed in recruiting the number of young, high-ability young men and women they needed in FY 1999. High-ability youth, defined as those who have a high school diploma and who have at least average scores on tests measuring mathematical and verbal skills. The Department of Defense tells us about 80 percent of these recruits will complete their first three years of active duty while only 50 percent of recruits with a GED will complete their enlistment. GAO notes that it costs at least $35,000 to replace a recruit who leaves the service prematurely. The report states these findings underscore the need for education benefits that will attract college-bound youth who need money for school, a segment of American young people we conclude are now opting to take advantage of the many other sources of federal education assistance. The current structure and benefit level of the MGIB must be significantly amended if these high quality young men and women are to be attracted to service in our Armed Forces.

The Army missed its enlistment goals in FY 1998 and 1999. Additionally, for the first time since 1979, the Air Force missed its goal in FY 1999, and will likely miss again this year. Although the Navy and Marine Corps are currently meeting their objectives, it is getting more difficult each year. The continuing recruiting and retention challenges necessitate our taking quick and effective action. Even though the Army and Navy are recruiting more GED holders than in the early 1990s, all Services are meeting or exceeding the DoD recruit quality benchmarks of 90 percent high school diploma graduates and 60 percent scoring above average on the enlistment test. But this quality does not come inexpensively. The Services have increased their enlistment bonus and advertising budgets and added additional recruiters to meet the challenge. The cost to recruit has grown by over 50 percent in just the last five years.

Percent of Objective

| Service | 1998 | | | 1999 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Actual | Objective | Percent | Actual | Objective | Percent |
| Army | 71.8 | 72.6 | 99 | 68.2 | 74.5 | 92 |
| Navy | 48.4 | 55.3 | 88 | 52.6 | 52.5 | 100 |
| Marine Corps | 34.3 | 34.3 | 100 | 33.7 | 33.7 | 100 |
| Air Force | 31.7 | 30.2 | 105 | 32.7 | 34.4 | 94 |
| DoD Total | 186.2 | 192.3 | 97 | 187.2 | 195.1 | 96 |

Many factors have come together to create what may soon become a recruiting emergency. First, our thriving national economy is generating employment opportunities for our young people. Additionally, young Americans increasingly understand a college education as the key to success and prosperity. In 1980, 74 percent of high school graduates went to college but, by 1992, that percentage has risen to 81 percent and is increasing. As a result, the military must compete head-to-head with colleges for high-ability youth. As I have mentioned already, the percentage of young Americans who are interested in serving in the Armed Forces is also shrinking. Make no mistake about it—the strength of our Armed Forces begins and ends with the men and women who serve our nation. Just as education is the key to a society's success or failure, it is also key to the quality and effectiveness of our military forces—and the MGIB increases included in this substitute budget resolution are a step in the right direction toward providing that key.

Veterans are not using the MGIB benefits they have earned through honorable military service, and high-ability, college-bound young Americans are choosing not to serve in the Armed Forces. Significant changes in the MGIB readjustment program will increase program usage and will enable the military services to recruit the smart young people they need. Accordingly, several bills have been introduced in both the House and the Senate during the 106th Congress that would significantly improve the MGIB. The Senate has twice passed legislation that included numerous changes designed to enhance educational opportunities under the MGIB. In the House, MGIB legislation has been introduced by Mr. Stump, Chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. Together with Mr. DINGELL, I introduced H.R. 1071, the Montgomery GI Bill Improvements Act of 1999.

The brave men and women who serve in America's Armed Forces deserve, and have indeed earned, far better than the inadequate educational assistance program now available to them. I strongly urge my fellow colleagues to support this substitute budget resolution and the policy it represents of demonstrating a continued national commitment to our veterans.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Democratic Substitute to the Budget Resolution for FY 2001.

Once again, the Republicans have presented a budget that would betray middle-class working families. Instead of supporting our communities, their proposal would make deep cuts in investments in education, healthcare and veterans programs. They even fail to include a Medicare prescription drug plan for all seniors.

At a time when America's farm economy is suffering, the Republicans have cut discretionary spending for agriculture, making the agriculture programs impossible to administer. If the field office staff cannot do their jobs, farmers do not get their money. The Republican plan, if adopted, could mean that fewer and fewer farmers will actually get the help they need and that Congress has approved in a timely fashion. The Democratic Substitute does not forget the farmers who work so hard to keep America prosperous.

The Democratic Substitute also extends Social Security and Medicare solvency while paying down the national debt. We care about the future of these important programs not just for the present, well into the future. Instead of ignoring a growing need in our country, Democrats also include a prescription drug benefit for all Medicare recipients beginning in FY 2001.

The Republican proposal would provide Pell Grants to 316,000 fewer low-income students by 2005 and eliminate Head Start for 40,000 children and their families by 2005. Why are the Republicans giving tax breaks to the wealthy and penalizing families who need help the most?

As the Ranking Member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I am appalled that the Republican resolution does not provide any funding over the next five years to improve health care for military retirees over the age of 65, not even funds to pay for prescription drug coverage. However, the Democratic Substitute provides funds to improve health care for military retirees and directs the Armed Services Committee to provide prescription drug coverage and better access to the DoD health system for Medicare-eligible military retirees. It also includes a well deserved increase in funding for the Montgomery G.I. Bill, which will help us recruit and retain high quality personnel for our armed forces. I applaud Ranking Member SPRATT for including this at my urging.

I ask my colleagues to reject the misguided Republican proposal. Vote for the substitute that helps working families—vote for the Democratic substitute.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, just about a month ago, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Henry Shelton, testified that guaranteeing life-time health care is not only important to keeping the promises made to those who have dedicated their careers to military service, but also to attract and retain quality personnel today. This issue is tied to the readiness of our Armed Forces, and will be one of the top defense issues Congress will have to address this year. In truth, I was

surprised to see that the Republican budget resolution does not provide any funding over the next five years to improve health care for military retirees over the age of 65, not even funds to pay for prescription drug coverage. The Democratic alternative budget, however, does not dodge this issue.

Currently, military retirees 65 or older lose guaranteed access to the Department of Defense (DOD) health care system. The Democratic budget funds two major initiatives the Republican resolution ignores: a permanent and nationwide expansion of Medicare Subvention, and a guarantee that these retirees have access to the Department of Defense's prescription drug plans. These are the major provisions of H.R. 3655 that are geared to Medicare-eligible military retirees. H.R. 3655 is a comprehensive military health care bill introduced by Representatives NEIL ABERCROMBIE, IKE SKELTON, and GENE TAYLOR.

The Democratic alternative directs the Armed Services Committee to write legislation to improve health care benefits for Medicare-eligible military retirees, and includes mandatory funding for both initiatives: $10.9 billion over ten years for Medicare Subvention, and $5.4 billion over ten years for prescription drug coverage. The prescription drug initiative is treated as an entitlement so it will not have to compete every year with other defense priorities for discretionary funds.

The Military Coalition, which represents many different uniformed services and veterans' organizations and more than 5.5 million current and former members of the Armed Forces and their families, supports H.R. 3655 and has commended the Democratic budget for including this funding. The Military Coalition states that the military retiree health care provisions of the Democratic Alternative ''are important steps toward fulfilling the commitment of health care for life that was promised uniformed services retirees as an inducement to dedicate themselves to careers in uniforms.'' The entire text of their letter is included for the record.

If the Democratic budget resolution is passed by the House, the following is the report language which will accompany our reconciliation directive to the Armed Services Committee:

REPORT LANGUAGE TO ACCOMPANY SEC. 104 OF THE DEMOCRATIC ALTERNATIVE BUDGET RESOLUTION

Section 104 issues a reconciliation directive to the Armed Services Committee for $16.3 billion for the 2001–2010 period. The Budget Committee assumes that the additional funding made available will be used to extend and improve the Department of Defense health care system to Medicare-eligible retirees. The year by year amounts are as follows:

For fiscal year 2001, $437,000,000;
For fiscal year 2002, $699,000,000;
For fiscal year 2003, $990,000,000;
For fiscal year 2004, $1,426,000,000;
For fiscal year 2005, $1,848,000,000;
For fiscal year 2006, $2,069,000,000;
For fiscal year 2007, $2,126,000,000;
For fiscal year 2008, $2,184,000,000;
For fiscal year 2009, $2,243,000,000; and
For fiscal year 2010, $2,301,000,000.

The Budget Committee believes these amounts are consistent with the provisions of H.R. 3655 that apply to Medicare-eligible military retirees. H.R. 3655, which was introduced by Reps. Neil Abercrombie, Ike Skelton, and Gene Taylor, is a comprehensive bill that addresses the health care needs of active duty personnel, military retirees, and their families. The active-duty provisions of this legislation that are funded within the President's budget are also accommodated within the budget resolution. Specifically, $10.9 billion is consistent with the funding required to meet the bill's provision to extend Medicare Subvention nationwide by January 1, 2006. In addition, $5.4 billion is to meet the bill's provision to provide access to the Department Defense's prescription drug programs for all retirees, including Medicare-eligible retirees. All of the funds are mandatory expenditures.

The $10.9 billion is displayed in Function 570 (Medicare) and the $5.4 billion is displayed in Function 550 (Health). While the amounts provided by the Budget Committee conform with the major provisions of H.R. 3655, the Armed Services Committee has sole jurisdiction over this legislation, and may provide the benefits in the manner and function(s) it thinks best.

Last year, even though the Democratic alternative did not pass, it provided the impetus to increase funding for veterans' health care by $1.7 billion. Win or lose, the Democratic alternative is a strong message to retirees and a strong step forward for the Abercrombie-Skelton-Taylor legislation. As a cosponsor of H.R. 3655, I hope the Democratic alternative will spur Congress to pass this important legislation.

ALEXANDRIA, VA.
*March 23, 2000.*

Hon. JOHN SPRATT,
*Ranking Minority Member, House Budget Committee, O'Neill House Office Building, Washington DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SPRATT: The Military Coalition, a consortium of nationally prominent uniformed services and veterans organizations, representing more than 5.5 million current and former members of the seven uniformed services, plus their families and survivors, would like to express its gratitude for the proposed budget alternative that you introduced this week. We appreciate your leadership in proposing an additional $16.3 billion over the next ten years to improve access to military health care for the most aggrieved group—Medicare-eligible uniformed services beneficiaries.

Although the Coalition would have preferred the House Budget to completely fund health care for life for retirees as provided for in H.R. 2966, we recognize that your budget proposal will provide for immediate and demonstrable progress toward this goal by providing funding for the TRICARE Senior Prime program and making the military BRAC pharmacy benefit available to all Medicare-eligible retirees. These are important steps toward fulfilling the commitment of health care for life that was promised uniformed services retirees as an inducement to dedicate themselves to careers in uniform.

Again, thank you for your strong support, for which we are most grateful. It's our hope that you and other members of Congress will not stop with these first, substantial steps, but will continue to address this issue next year, and every year thereafter, until full equity is achieved for those retired members who have done so much to protect the democracy that their countrymen enjoy.

Sincerely,

THE MILITARY COALITION.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the alternative budget resolution offered by the Ranking Member of the Budget Committee, Mr. SPRATT, and in opposition to H. Con. Res. 290. The Spratt alternative, in contrast to the majority plan, extends the solvency of Social Security and Medicare; pays down more publicly held debt; provides targeted tax relief for working families; and makes a real commitment to providing prescription drug coverage for senior citizens. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support the Spratt alternative and to oppose H. Con. Res. 290.

The Spratt alternative saves 100 percent of the surplus generated by Social Security for Social Security. The majority plan, if you assume that the so-called reserve funds for additional tax cuts and Medicare are spent, actually drains more than $60 billion of the Social Security surplus over the next ten years. Even if you assume that the reserve funds are not spent and that Social Security surplus is not tapped, the Republican budget still fails to extend the life of either Social Security or Medicare by even one day. In contrast, the Spratt alternative extends Social Security by 15 years by crediting the trust fund with the interest savings generated by the Social Security surplus. With regard to Medicare, the Republican resolution adds nothing to the solvency of the program while the Spratt alternative adds ten years by reserving $300 billion of the on-budget surplus for Medicare.

The Spratt alternative makes debt reduction the top fiscal priority rather than exploding tax cuts. The Chairman of the Federal Reserve and countless other economists have advised Congress that paying down the debt is the best thing we can do to maintain our strong economy. Eliminating the debt and lowering interest rates is also the best thing Congress can do for working families. Lower interest rates cut mortgage payments by $2,000 for families with a $100,000 mortgage. The cost of care loans and student loans would also be reduced. Paying down the debt is effectively a large tax cut that also lifts a financial burden from our children and grandchildren.

In addition paying down the debt and extending the life of Social Security and Medicare, the Spratt alternative provides targeted tax relief for working families. The Spratt budget allocates more than $210 billion for tax cuts that would allow Congress to enact marriage penalty relief, estate tax relief for family farmers and small business people, full deductibility of health insurance for the self-employed, and tax credits for higher education. By targeting resources to families trying to make ends meet, the Spratt alternative is able to deliver significant tax relief while protecting other key priorities.

When it comes to prescription drugs, the Spratt alternative makes a hard commitment of $40 billion over the next five years to provide Medicare prescription drug coverage for all senior citizens. The Spratt alternative will not only allow prescription drug coverage for all senior citizens, it will protect low-income seniors from any cost-sharing requirements. The majority plan, on the other hand, does not actually dedicate resources for a new prescription drug benefit. Rather, the resolution creates a $40 billion reserve fund that depends on improved future budget projections.

Finally, the agriculture function in the Spratt alternative is superior to the majority plan. The Spratt budget provides $6 billion in farmer income assistance for fiscal year 2000 and $7.2 billion to reflect the House-passed crop insurance. Unlike the GOP resolution, which freezes discretionary agriculture spending for the next five years, the Spratt budget provides a responsible increase so that critical agriculture research, trade development and marketing programs may continue. The Spratt

budget also ensures that USDA will have sufficient administrative resources to deliver key farm programs such as crop insurance as well as income and disaster assistance.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Spratt alternative and oppose H. Con. Res. 290.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 233, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 74]

AYES—184

Abercrombie
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Coyne
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
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
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sawyer
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shows
Sisisky
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—233

Aderholt
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bono
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
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)
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCrery
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stark
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Upton
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—17

Ackerman
Archer
Bonilla
Crane
Dixon
Greenwood
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Lowey
Martinez
McCollum
McDermott
McHugh
Porter
Quinn
Royce
Schakowsky
Vento

□ 2348

Mr. PHELPS changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. GEORGE MILLER of California, SANDLIN, and BORSKI changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

□ 2350

(Mr. SPRATT asked and was given permission to speak out of order.)

LAST BUDGET RESOLUTION FOR REPRESENTATIVE JOHN KASICH

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, this is the last budget resolution that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) will bring to the House floor after many years. As he leaves the House, he leaves a large void.

I came here with him in 1983. I can speak from personal experience because I served on the same committee with him from the day we first arrived here. As a matter of fact, the reason I am on the Committee on Armed Services is that, when the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) did not get on it, he went to Bob Michael, raised hell, they went to Tip O'Neill, and Tip and Bob Michael agreed to enlarge the committee by two people. I got one seat. The gentleman from Ohio got the other.

I have enjoyed his company. I have enjoyed his friendship. I have admired his commitment to public service, his energy, his effervescence, that infectious boyish smile that, after all these years, has not gone away. In fact, with the addition of twins, it has really blossomed back again. We are going to miss him on the floor, in the gym, committee room, and everywhere.

I can say this genuinely, no one that I know of in the 18 years I have been here brought more fervor to the support of an issue and yet less spite than the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH). No one in my recollection has been better in the well of the House, somebody one always wanted to have on one's side, better on his feet particularly extemporaneously than the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH). Nobody has been better liked in the 18 years I have been here on both sides of the aisle.

He has made a great contribution to this House, one of the great institutions of the republic, and to this country. I am sorry to see him leave after this term. He is not gone yet. I do not want to write his obituary too soon.

I am sorry to see him leave, and I am assuaged to some extent by the feeling I do not think I have seen the last of him in public office.

It has been a pleasure working with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) and serving with him, and we are going to miss him.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, the hour is late. But on this side of the aisle, there are some of us who remember 1989 and the first budget of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH). He had 29 Members who supported him. But he never gave up. He never gave up. He did it in such a fresh way.

This is the last budget of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH). What a

legacy he has left us. What a legacy he has left his wife and his daughters, Emma and Reese. The gentleman from Ohio dealt with a lot of numbers, but numbers were never important to him. It was people, the friends he has here, the people he cares about in this country.

I know the gentleman from Ohio has a dream to transfer the power and the money and the influence out of Washington back home to local communities. I think he set us on our way. We love the gentleman from Ohio a lot.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). A final period of general debate is now in order. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I would waive my time, but I will save 30 seconds just in case I have to answer something that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) may have to say. I have no purpose in using the 5 minutes time.

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

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it is with a fond memory that I do look back to 1989 when I first announced to my staff, after sitting through one of those contentious budget fights that, yes, I think we have got to write our own budget. We came here to the floor and I offered the budget and we got 30 votes.

I remember walking back to my office, and everybody had their heads down. I walked in, and I said, Can you believe how great we did? We had 29 other people in this House think that we had a budget worth voting for.

Every year, we fought; and we got more and more support. All we were trying to do then was to reduce the deficits, something everybody in this House was concerned about, because we all care about what is going to happen to our children. We want our children to have a great opportunity to have the kind of life that we have.

Tonight is pretty amazing. We spent, what, I guess almost 12 hours fighting. We were fighting about a lot of detail. We should be doing a little bit more celebrating for what we have been able to achieve as Republicans and Democrats alike.

I mean, we are going to bring up a budget tonight, and we are going to pay down over the next 5 years about a trillion dollars of the publicly held debt. That is a trillion dollars that we are not going to have on the backs of our children when we all leave here. It is astounding when we think about it.

Working together, we decided we were going to keep our hands off of Social Security. We struggled to get there. The President laid out his plan. We laid out ours. We fought with one another a little bit. At the end of the day, where are we? We are not raiding Social Security.

I want to give a number of my colleagues on the Democrat side of the aisle some credit for their fight on Medicare prescription drugs. But I also want to give people on my side of the aisle the credit for also developing innovative and creative and imaginative programs on Medicare.

What is going to happen by the end of this year, we will have a prescription drug program for the neediest of our seniors. No senior citizen should be so poor as they get older in life to not be able to get the magic of modern medicine today to extend their lives and so that their children can celebrate their life as they get older. We all deserve a quality life at the end, and we are going to be able to do that.

As much as we squabble about tax cuts, we did pass the earnings test on this floor unanimously, I believe, where we said that seniors should not be punished for working extra hours and trying to have some independence.

I think, frankly, our seniors are perhaps our greatest untapped resource because they have the wisdom. Many of them have the energy to use the wisdom to make for a better country.

Would it not be great to combine our seniors with our young children who are often neglected? We need to think about a program like that.

At the same time, we are also going to make an effort with the gentleman from California (Mr. CONDIT) and his efforts with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) to try to cut the penalty on people who have small businesses and family farms. It is the right thing to do.

At the same time, we are going to spend more money on education and try to rebuild our Nation's defense.

But I hope that all of us will work to better define America's interest throughout the world. The Cold War is over. We have got to be more innovative and creative in foreign policy and with our national defense.

For the future, we are going to have a new President very soon. It is going to be a new President in a new millennium. What an opportunity.

I think we ought to take the opportunity to put aside a lot of our partisan differences for this reason. We have a generational problem, do we not, so many baby boomers getting to retire and not enough children to work to pay all the bills.

We have health care crisis in this country. I believe that we have got to adopt more market-oriented solutions to the problems of health care and Social Security.

I also think we have got to make this government more effective, more efficient so that we can have respect and regard for it so that what it does it can do well, like our National Institutes of Health which are a real gem, and not just in the United States but, frankly, for the whole world.

□ 2400

I also believe that the greatest civil rights issue of the 21st century is the education of our children, and I think we have to search our hearts to make sure that our children are set free. No child should have to walk through a bunch of drug dealers in this country to get a decent education and to be safe, and we have to do it together.

Then, finally, finally, my colleagues, we have to continue to provide the incentives for savings and investment. And I say to my colleagues that we are on the edge of an incredible revolution, and I hope we will embrace the new economy, not inhibit it.

One final word, my colleagues, and that is this: if you are a Member here and you believe something, and we have a lot of dreamers, we could start with the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), who we just saw not long ago when he recelebrated walking across that bridge in Selma, Alabama, that was his dream. But we are all dreamers here. That is why we are here. I just leave you with one thought. If you dream, if you believe, if you have passion, if you have to stand alone, so be it. If your cause is just, a crowd will form and you can change the world. Go for it.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) having assumed the chair, Mr. LAHOOD, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 290) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2005, pursuant to House Resolution 446, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

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

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 211, nays 207, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 75]

YEAS—211

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aderholt | Bass | Boehner |
| Armey | Bateman | Bono |
| Bachus | Bereuter | Brady (TX) |
| Baker | Biggert | Bryant |
| Ballenger | Bilbray | Burr |
| Barr | Bilirakis | Burton |
| Barrett (NE) | Bliley | Buyer |
| Bartlett | Blunt | Calvert |
| Barton | Boehlert | Camp |

Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
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
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
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
McCrery
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Saxton
Scarborough
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
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—207

Abercrombie
Allen
Andrews
Baca
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)
Callahan
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
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)
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
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
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
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
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
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
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—17

Ackerman
Archer
Bonilla
Crane
Dixon
Greenwood
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Lowey
Martinez
McCollum
McDermott
McHugh
Porter
Quinn
Royce
Schakowsky
Vento

□ 0019

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded:

□

## COMMUNICATION FROM DISTRICT DIRECTOR OF HON. LOIS CAPPS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) laid before the House the following communication from Sharon Siegel, District Director of the Honorable LOIS CAPPS, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*March 14, 2000.*

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
*Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a hearing subpoena for testimony issued by the Superior Court for Santa Barbara County, California.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

SHARON SIEGEL,
*District Director.*

□

□ 0020

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 290, the concurrent resolution just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

□

## PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT FRIDAY, MARCH 24, 2000 TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 7, EDUCATION SAVINGS AND SCHOOL EXCELLENCE ACT OF 1999

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means have until midnight, Friday, March 24, 2000 to file a report on H.R. 7, the Education Savings and School Excellence Act of 1999.

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

There was no objection.

□

## ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 27, 2000

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

□

## HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, MARCH 28, 2000

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, March 27, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, March 28, for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

□

## DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

□

## CLINTON-GORE FAILED ENERGY CRISIS

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Companies, or OPEC, in its capacity as an oil cartel or monopoly, has been a

critical factor in driving prices of oil from approximately $11 a barrel in 1998 to a high of $30 a barrel last month. These are levels that we have not seen since the Persian Gulf War.

Foreign countries that export oil to the United States have been engaged in a price-fixing scheme which has driven the average price at the pump to almost $2 in some parts of this country. Yet, the Clinton-Gore administration has done nothing to stop this, even with the OPEC strategy of price control. Even Energy Secretary Bill Richardson admits his administration, his department, was ''caught napping.''

Once again, the leadership in the White House has been lax, and foreign nations have taken advantage of our apparent weakness.

We passed a plan yesterday with Republican leadership. So I urge the administration to adopt our plan and fight this oil cartel.

LA BELLA MEMORANDUM

Mr. Speaker, last week, someone at the Justice Department leaked the La Bella memo to the press. The La Bella memo is a 94-page document calling on the Attorney General to appoint an Independent Counsel to investigate the White House. The memo also spells out all of the ways that Janet Reno and her political advisors avoided any thorough investigation of the 1996 campaign fundraising scandal. A year after he was brought in to head the campaign fundraising investigation, La Bella concluded that Janet Reno and her political advisors had used ''gamesmanship'' and ''legal contortions'' to avoid a thorough investigation. He also concluded that the result was a double standard for the President, the Vice President, the First Lady and Harold Ickes, protecting them from any real investigation.

There is something seriously wrong at the Justice Department when career prosecutors are not allowed to follow the facts wherever they lead. The result is an investigation that has no credibility. There are numerous examples of the failed investigation:

The President and Vice President were never thoroughly questioned. Can you imagine—the Justice Department failed to ask the President a single question about James Riady and foreign money. They didn't ask the Vice President any questions about the Buddhist Temple fundraiser. Unbelievable!

The Justice Department has apparently never asked the White House to turn over hundreds of thousands of e-mails that have never been reviewed.

Central figures in the scandal, like John Huang and Charlie Trie, have received light sentences without giving up useful information to the Justice Department.

Mr. Speaker, we have a right to know whether the Justice Department has done a thorough and credible job investigating the 1996 campaign fundraising scandal. The Justice Department has already leaked the La Bella memo to the press. They should now turn it over to congress, so that we can see if Janet Reno has allowed her career prosecutors to do their job.

□

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ACKERMAN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for March 21 and the balance of the week on account of official business.

Mr. VENTO (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for after 5 p.m. today and the balance of the month on account of health reasons.

Mr. QUINN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for after 3 p.m. today until March 31 on account of medical reasons.

Mr. MCHUGH (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for after 2 p.m. today on account of medical reasons.

□

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 21 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 27, 2000, at 2 p.m.

□

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6741. A letter from the Administrator, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Food Additives for Use in Meat and Poultry Products: Sodium Diacetate, Sodium Acetate, Sodium Lactate and Potassium Lactate [Docket No. 99–028DF] received January 28, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6742. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agriculture Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Vidalia Onions Grown in Georgia; Increased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV00–955–1 FR] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6743. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida and Imported Grapefruit; Relaxation of the Minimum Size Requirement for Red Seedless Grapefruit [Docket No. FV99–905–6 FIR] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6744. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Field Study; Definition, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6745. A letter from the the Comptroller General, the General Accounting Office, transmitting an updated compilation of historical information and statistics regarding rescissions proposed by the executive branch and rescissions enacted by the Congress through October 1, 1999; (H. Doc. No. 106—217); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6746. A letter from the Executive Director, Emergency Oil and Gas Guaranteed Loan Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Loan Guarantee Decision; Availability of Environmental Information (RIN: 3003–ZA00) received February 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

6747. A letter from the Executive Director, Emergency Steel Loan Guarantee Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Loan Guarantee Decision; Application Deadlines (RIN: 3003–ZA00) received February 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

6748. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 13–291, ''Tax Conformity Temporary Act of 2000'' received March 22, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6749. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–290, ''Closing of Public Alley in Square 6159, S.O. 98–125, Act of 2000'' received March 22, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6750. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–289, ''Recreation Volunteer Background Check and Screening Act of 2000'' received March 22, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6751. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–287, ''Long-Term Care Insurance Act of 2000'' received March 22, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6752. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–273, ''Muhammad Mosque No.4 Equitable Real Property Tax Relief Act of 2000'' received March 22, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6753. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–272, ''Victory Memorial Baptist Church Equitable Real Property Tax Relief Act of 2000'' received March 22, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6754. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–271, ''Compensating-Use Tax Act of 2000'' received March 22, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6755. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–270, ''Bread for the City & Zacchaeus Free Clinic Equitable Real Property Tax Relief Act of 2000'' received March 22, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6756. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–269, ''University of the District of Columbia Board of Trustees Residency Requirement Amendment Act of 2000'' received March 22, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6757. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–268, ''Litter Control Administration Amendment Act of 2000'' received March 22, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6758. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–267, ''Underground Facilities Protection Amendment Act of 2000'' received March 22, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6759. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–266, ''District of Columbia Uniform Disposition of Unclaimed Property Amendment Act of 2000'' received March 22, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6760. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–265, ''Child Helmet Safety Amendment Act of 2000'' received March 22, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6761. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–264, ''School Proximity Traffic Calming Act of 2000'' received March 22, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6762. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–288, ''Medicare Supplement Insurance Minimum Standards Amendment Act of 2000'' received March 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6763. A letter from the Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Endangered Status for Sidalcea keckii (Keck's checker-mallow) from Fresno and Tulare Counties, California (RIN: 1018–AE30) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6764. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 620 of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 000119015–0015–01; I.D. 012700E] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6765. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 000119015–0015–01; I.D. 012800B] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6766. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Red Snapper Management Measures [Docket No. 991210334–9334–01; I.D. 112399A] received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6767. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300–600 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 95–NM–150–AD; Amendment 39–11580; AD 2000–03–20] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6768. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737–100, -200, -300, -400, and -500 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–150–AD; Amendment 39–11584; AD 2000–04–02] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6769. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Compliance Monitoring and Miscellaneous Issues Relating to the Low-Income Housing Credit (RIN: 1545–AV44) received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

□

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 1605. A bill to designate the United States courthouse building located at 402 North Walnut Street and Prospect Avenue in Harrison, Arkansas, as the ''Judge J. Smith Henley Federal Building''; with amendments (Rept. 106–536). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 938. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 290 Broadway in New York, New York, as the ''Ronald H. Brown Federal Building'' (Rept. 106–537). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 1279. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States post office located at 223 Sharkey Street in Clarksdale, Mississippi, as the ''Aaron E. Henry Federal Building and United States Post Office''; with amendments (Rept. 106–538). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 277. Resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby (Rept. 106–539). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2412. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 1300 South Harrison Street in Fort Wayne, Indiana, as the ''E. Rose Adair Federal Building and United States Courthouse'' (Rept. 106–540). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 278. Resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the 19th annual National Peace Officers' Memorial Service (Rept. 106–541). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 279. Resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the 200th birthday celebration of the Library of Congress (Rept. 106–542). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 280. Resolution authorizing the 2000 District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run to be run through the Capitol Grounds (Rept. 106–543). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 281. Resolution authorizing the use of the East Front of the Capitol Grounds for performance sponsored by the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts (Rept. 106–544). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 910. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers and in coordination with other Federal agency heads, to participate in the funding and implementation of a balanced, long-term solution to the problems of groundwater contamination, water supply, and reliability affecting the San Gabriel groundwater basin in California, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106–545). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

□

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. LEACH):

H.R. 4067. A bill to repeal the prohibition on the payment of interest on demand deposits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. PEASE:

H.R. 4068. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to extend for an additional 3 years the special immigrant religious worker program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BASS (for himself, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. BENTSEN, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. BONO, Mr. BOYD, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. COBURN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOK, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. DANNER, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Ms. DUNN, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. FROST, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. KING, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MCNULTY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NADLER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHAFFER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SPENCE, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 4069. A bill to extend the authority under which postal patrons may contribute to funding for breast cancer research through the voluntary purchase of certain specially issued United States postage stamps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Commerce, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BOYD (for himself and Mr. SCARBOROUGH):

H.R. 4070. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to correct a map relating to the Coastal Barrier Resources System Unit P31, located near the city of Mexico Beach, Florida; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 4071. A bill to expand the Federal tax refund intercept program to cover children who are not minors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLINS:

H.R. 4072. A bill to prohibit the transfer of F–16 aircraft to the Government of the United Arab Emirates; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. CONDIT (for himself, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. CLYBURN, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 4073. A bill to amend the Poultry Products Inspection Act to include pigeons that are distributed in commerce for use as human food; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. DUNN:

H.R. 4074. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat State Developmental Disabilities Endowment Programs as tax exempt organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FATTAH (for himself, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. CARSON, and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 4075. A bill to require each State to provide a minimum level of access to health care to all citizens of such State as a condition for participation in Federal health care funding programs; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma):

H.R. 4076. A bill to provide for the effective punishment of online child molesters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODE (for himself, Mr. RILEY, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Ms. DANNER, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. WU, Mr. NEY, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. ENGLISH):

H.R. 4077. A bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to extend the benefit period for trade adjustment assistance for those adversely affected workers enrolled in training programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.R. 4078. A bill to reduce the risk that innocent persons may be executed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOEKSTRA (for himself, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. KASICH, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. EWING, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. COBURN, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. HAYES, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. PITTS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. WAMP, Mr. CAMP, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. WELLER, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. DELAY, and Mr. COLLINS):

H.R. 4079. A bill to require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a comprehensive fraud audit of the Department of Education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HOEKSTRA:

H.R. 4080. A bill to require the Secretary of Labor to issue regulations specifying the application of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to home office employment to foster 21st Century telework opportunities, to maximize public participation in the formulation of such regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. WU, Mr. ROEMER, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. HOLT, Mr. FORD, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. STENHOLM, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LARSON, Mr. SANDLIN, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mr. GONZALEZ):

H.R. 4081. A bill to establish a program that improves achievement through the integration of technology into curriculum; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma (for himself, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. COBLE, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. HAYES, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. TERRY, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, and Mr. HUTCHINSON):

H.R. 4082. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and the Federal Home Loan Bank Act to provide for the payment of Financing Corporation interest obligations from balances in the deposit insurance funds in excess of an established ratio and, after such obligations are satisfied, to provide for rebates to insured depository institutions of such excess reserves; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM:

H.R. 4083. A bill to ensure that schools implement adequate safeguards before distributing certain prescribed medications to students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 4084. A bill to amend the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 to prohibit the use of community development block grant funds for activities involving acquisition of church property, unless the consent of the church is obtained; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 4085. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide that decennial census questionnaires be limited to requesting only the information required by the Constitution; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. RYUN of Kansas (for himself, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. POMBO, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. BUYER, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. PITTS, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. HERGER, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. COBURN, Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. CANNON, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. DELAY, Mr. HAYES, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Ms. DANNER, and Mr. ORTIZ):

H.R. 4086. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to require that property owners be compensated when certain railbanked trails are developed for purposes of public use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 4087. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for payment of claims by health care providers against insolvent MedicareChoice organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 4088. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny any deduction for certain gifts and benefits provided to physicians by prescription drug manufacturers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 4089. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny any deduction for certain gifts and benefits provided to physicians by prescription drug manufacturers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. HILLIARD, and Mr. SANDERS):

H.R. 4090. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to achieve full funding in fiscal year 2001 and fiscal year 2002, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. LEE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. WYNN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. HILLIARD, Ms. CARSON, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD):

H.R. 4091. A bill to provide debt relief and reconstruction aid to Mozambique and the other countries severely damaged by the recent flooding in southern Africa; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WEINER:

H.R. 4092. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to prohibit the commercial operation of supersonic transport category aircraft that do not comply with stage 3 noise levels; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. OSE, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. TURNER, Mr. HORN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. LARSON, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. BARCIA, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Ms. LEE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. FORD, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. COBURN, Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE, Mr. CRANE, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. METCALF, Mr.

BALLENGER, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. ROGAN, Mrs. BONO, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. KING, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. COBLE, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. REYES, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. FROST, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. EVANS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. OLVER, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. WU, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. RIVERS, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. POMBO, Mr. PORTER, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. COOK, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. BENTSEN):

H. Con. Res. 293. Concurrent resolution urging compliance with the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. DOOLEY of California (for himself and Mr. POMEROY):

H. Res. 447. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require that a Chaplain be elected by the House after having been nominated by the Speaker, the Majority Leader, and the Minority Leader, acting jointly; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma):

H. Res. 448. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives in continued sympathy for the victims of the Oklahoma City bombing on the occasion of the 5th anniversary of the bombing; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Ms. LEE):

H. Res. 449. A resolution congratulating the people of Senegal on the success of the multi-party electoral process; to the Committee on International Relations.

□

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 7: Mr. ROGAN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. DEMINT.

H.R. 175: Ms. NORTON, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, and Mr. COOKSEY.

H.R. 357: Mr. SISISKY.

H.R. 371: Mr. ROGAN and Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 406: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 443: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 460: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 387: Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 515: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.

H.R. 534: Mr. SPENCE, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MINGE, Mr. REYNOLDS, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. POMBO, and Mr. GUTKNECHT.

H.R. 566: Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 583: Mr. GREENWOOD and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 612: Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 632: Mr. VITTER.

H.R. 648: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 728: Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 762: Mr. TURNER and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 860: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1021: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 1032: Mr. MCINTOSH.

H.R. 1044: Mr. HAYWORTH and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 1046: Mr. MOORE and Mr. BOEHNER.

H.R. 1168: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. SMITH of Mississippi, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. HAYES, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, and Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 1182: Mr. SCHAFFER.

H.R. 1187: Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. DICKS, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. RYUN of Kansas.

H.R. 1205: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1293: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 1322: Mr. PORTMAN and Mr. CAMPBELL.

H.R. 1349: Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 1366: Mr. RAHALL and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 1388: Mr. SANDLIN and Mr. DREIER.

H.R. 1459: Mr. LAMPSON.

H.R. 1509: Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. KLINK, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Ms. STABENOW.

H.R. 1592: Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 1621: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. SNYDER.

H.R. 1667: Mr. NEY.

H.R. 1681: Mr. STARK and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1705: Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 1708: Mr. COYNE.

H.R. 1732: Mr. FORD.

H.R. 1824: Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 1839: Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 1870: Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 1926: Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 2000: Mr. WISE, Mr. HOLT, Mr. FROST, Ms. DANNER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. DICKS, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. WELLER, Mr. SHERWOOD, and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 2121: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BACA, Mr. COOKSEY, and Mr. SANFORD.

H.R. 2149: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 2264: Mr. WELLER.

H.R. 2265: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2267: Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 2545: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 2595: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 2596: Mr. SHOWS, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. SUNUNU.

H.R. 2631: Mr. FORBES, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 2640: Mr. MINGE and Mr. HILLEARY.

H.R. 2696: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 2697: Mr. GRANGER.

H.R. 2749: Mr. HAYES and Mr. LAMPSON.

H.R. 2772: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

H.R. 2790: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 2814: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2867: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H.R. 2870: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 2894: Mr. SALMON, Mr. KIND, and Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 2900: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. SANCHEZ, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. VELAZQUEZ Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Ms. CARSON.

H.R. 2934: Mr. EVANS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 2962: Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 2966: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 2982: Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. FROST, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2987: Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 2991: Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. CANADY of Florida, and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 3034: Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 3044: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 3058: Mr. DEUTSCH.

H.R. 3087: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.

H.R. 3091: Mr. CALLAHAN and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 3171: Mrs. FOWLER.

H.R. 3235: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 3293: Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. COYNE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. LAZIO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. RIVERS.

H.R. 3299: Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H.R. 3519: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 3571: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 3573: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 3590: Mr. COX.

H.R. 3591: Mr. SNYDER.

H.R. 3594: Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 3608: Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 3634: Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OWENS, Ms. LEE, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 3652: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 3673: Mr. ROGAN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. COOK, Mrs. THURMAN, and Mr. COOKSEY.

H.R. 3675: Mr. RYUN of Kansas.

H.R. 3688: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 3695: Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 3697: Mr. ROGAN, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. FROST, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 3698: Mr. OXLEY, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. ROGERS, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. BALDACCI, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 3707: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 3710: Mr. EVANS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 3732: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MOAKLEY, and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

H.R. 3806: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 3825: Mr. BONIOR and Ms. RIVERS.

H.R. 3836: Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 3842: Mr. EVANS, Mr. KING, and Mr. PHELPS.

H.R. 3859: Mr. RADANOVICH.

H.R. 3872: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GILCHREST, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. GOODE.

H.R. 3880: Mr. FROST, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 3885: Mr. CRANE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. EWING, Mr. KLINK, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. PORTER, Mr. WELLER, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 3895: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 3896: Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. FROST, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, and Mr. NEY.

H.R. 3900: Mr. LAZIO and Mr. HULSHOF.

H.R. 3911: Mr. GALLEGLY and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 3916: Mr. SALMON, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. EHRLICH.

H.R. 3928: Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. BISHOP, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 3981: Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. CLAYTON, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 3983: Mr. FORD, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. HOUGHTON.

H.R. 4003: Mr. STARK, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. CAMP, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. PORTMAN.

H.R. 4011: Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. TALENT, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. Pomeroy.

H.R. 4022: Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mrs. FOWLER, and Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 4029: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 4033: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. FROST, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. BAKER, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. WISE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. MCCATHY of Missouri, Ms. CARSON, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HAYES, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 4040: Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 4042: Mr. BROWN of Ohio and Mr. BALDACCI.

H.R. 4051: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. DELAY, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. TANCREDO, Mrs. WILSON, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. BLILEY.

H. Con. Res. Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. KING, and Mr. BISHOP.

H. Con. Res. 77: Mr. SPENCE.

H. Con. 119: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H. Con. Res. 229: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H. Con. Res. 233: Mr. SOUDER.

H. Con. Res. 252: Mr. GANSKE, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. CALVERT.

H. Con. Res. 253: Mr. HASTERT.

H. Con. Res. 256: Mr. MINGE.

H. Con. Res. 265: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. EVANS.

H. Con. Res. 269: Mr. REYES, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H. Con. Res. 271: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H. Con. Res. 276: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mrs. THURMAN, and Mr. SHAYS.

H. Con. Res. 285: Mr. MORAN of Virginia and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H. Con. Res. 286: Mr. NADLER.

H. Con. Res. 292: Mr. STUMP, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. DELAY, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. COOKSEY, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mrs. BONO, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. COX, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. GILCHREST, Ms. DUNN, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. LARSON, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. PORTER, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H. Res. 347: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H. Res. 414: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. EVANS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H. Res. 420: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut and Mr. HOEKSTRA.

H. Res. 430: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H. Res. 437: Mr. KING, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. BORSKI, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Ms. DEGETTE.

H. Res. 443: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PICKETT, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.

□

## DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 7, by Mr. SHOWS on House Resolution 371: Bruce F. Vento and Maxine Waters.

Petition 8, by Mr. STARK on House Resolution 372: Bruce F. Vento and Maxine Waters.