

what a difference these young people and their adult chaperones can make.

Parents involved and adults involved with children make all the difference in the world because they really are on the frontline of the common-sense solutions that we are searching here and across the country.

Our children's safety ought not to be about partisan politics. It ought not to even be about differences. It really ought to be what we can do jointly together in Congress at the State and local level, in the private sector, and in our communities to make our schools the safest place that our children attend.

We need to support early intervention and prevention. There is no question about that. We need to put resources there. We have to recognize and acknowledge and work toward parents as the first teachers. There is no question about that. But a lot of parents do not know how to be good teachers, and we need to help them. We need to do better jobs of that.

Certainly, we need to fund Head Start and Smart Start, make sure that children have the kind of care and services that they need to grow up to be productive and good citizens. It will save a lot of money later on and make a big difference when these young people get to be teenagers and adults.

We heard today about character education. It is the moral lens, in my opinion, that we look at right and wrong. In North Carolina, we call it North Carolina values, because we instituted character education a number of years ago. I will talk about that a little more in a minute.

Certainly where we need them, we need resource officers in our schools for the protection to make sure they are safe; and that means we ought to have zero tolerance for violence, and it must be enforced.

But I want to commend the young people in my district who are participating in these conferences these 2 days. Anna Tomaskovic-Devey of Garner is a student at Enloe High School in Raleigh, North Carolina. She is doing an excellent job. I had a chance to talk with her. She is participating in the conference. Sunay Shah, a Southeast Raleigh High School junior is making a contribution, and he will take this back to his community, as will George Moore, Jr. of Coats, a Triton High School senior in Dunn.

I want to thank, this evening, the chaperone, Pam Callahan. She also serves as SDA advisor to the school and has been involved in the school life for many years.

Finally, let me just read a couple of the recommendations that these chaperones have made from across the country. Florence Wethe from Walnut Creek, California, she said, "We need to teach core values. It must be taught to our young people in schools. They need to know the difference between right and wrong. Many times, they do not have that, and right and wrong, such as

respect, responsibility, decision making, diversity, sharing, and appreciating the differences that we share." I think she is absolutely right.

Here is another one from Annabelle Blackstone from St. Louis, Missouri. She says, "Invest your money in our children. Their schools, their teachers, their communities. They are angry. They are miserable because they believe adults do not really care anymore."

What Annabelle is saying is, where we put our resources is what we value. If we really value our children, we need to put our resources there.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I will read one last card Kim Minor of Pennsylvania. "Class sizes matter in all grades. Teenagers need to know and be heard by teachers as much as first graders." Kim, you are absolutely right.

NO TAX INCREASES OR RAIDS ON SOCIAL SECURITY, JUST FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to start off reading a letter that I received in my office from a couple, and I am just going to say Julia and Walter L. from Minneapolis, Minnesota. They actually were not writing me, but they carboned me on it. They were writing their own Representative.

It said, "Dear Congressman, We are Social Security recipients, and we vote. Despite the assurances of politicians, we are anxious about the safety of the Social Security Trust Fund. Specifically, we would appreciate your reply to the statement by Congressman JACK KINGSTON of Georgia today on the House floor.

"Mr. KINGSTON stated that President Clinton wants to spend 30 percent more on foreign aid and to fund that increase entirely from the Social Security Trust Fund. We would like you to respond to Representative KINGSTON's statement on the House floor."

Well, I am not sure if this particular Representative did respond or not, but I would like to respond to Julia and Walter L.'s letter myself and say here is the situation that we are in with the budget, and foreign aid happens to be the first bill that the President has vetoed and required more spending of. Now, he has also vetoed the Washington, D.C. budget, but I think that is because he wanted to have some more abortion language put in there or some other social reasons. So, really, it was not that much that related to money.

But the situation that we are in really started in 1997, 1997 when the Democrats and the Republicans passed a bipartisan budget agreement. This 1997 agreement said that we are going to spend X amount of dollars each year until the budget is balanced, and then

we are going to continue on that and pay down the debt.

It is one thing, Mr. Speaker, to wipe out one's deficit which is one's annual shortfall, but it is another thing to actually go out and pay down the debt.

The easiest way to envision that is to just think about one's MasterCard. Most Members have a MasterCard or a Visa. Most people do. Imagine if, each month, one were in the red on that, and one could not quite pay it off. But, finally, one month, one paid it off. Well, that does not mean that one is going on a spending spree because the bank is still saying, "Glad you paid it off this month, but what about the 3 previous months? You have got to go back and pay that amount."

Well, Congress has one heck of a credit card, and we have run up the national debt of well over \$5.4 trillion. That is trillion. That is an inconceivable amount of money if my colleagues think of one of the things that Mr. Larry Burkett said in the book called *The Coming Economic Earthquake*, that if one stacked thousand dollar bills up one on top of each other, to get to \$1 million, it would come to about 4 inches high. About that high, Mr. Speaker.

But if one stacked thousand dollar bills on top of each other, to get to \$1 trillion, it is 33 miles high. That is the difference between \$1 million and \$1 trillion as depicted by thousand dollar bills.

So we have this \$5.4 trillion debt. So we should not go on a spending spree. Regardless of what the President wants to spend it on, it is not good to go on a spending spree. Now, we know that he has done that in Bosnia. We have already spent \$12 billion in Bosnia. Our troops were originally supposed to be there for, I think, a year, maybe 2 years. Now, 5 years later, we are still in Bosnia and in the Balkans and Yugoslavia and everywhere else, \$12 billion and 5 years later.

Well, so now we have got this 1997 historic bipartisan budget agreement. Now the question is: Do we stick with it? To me, when one makes an agreement, one knows down home in Georgia, and I know it is this way in Minnesota, one sticks with one's agreement.

Now, unfortunately, we do not do that many agreements on a handshake anymore. We put things in writing. We call them contracts. This thing was actually in writing. Should it now be up to one party to enforce that agreement? Should the Democrats alone be responsible because they voted for it? Should they? Or should the Republicans alone be responsible because they voted it? No. Both parties should be responsible, Democrats and Republicans. Yet, sadly, it seems that the White House has forgotten all about this agreement, and they do not want to participate in it anymore.

So here we are in a budget crisis. Now we have got three choices. The President wants to spend more money

in foreign aid, more money to North Korea, more money to Iran, more money to Iraq, more money to Russia, more money to the former Soviet States.

We can get money from three ways around here, or we can balance the budget in three ways. Number one, we can cut spending in one program to put it into another. Number two, we can raise taxes. Well, today on the House floor, we gave the President and his liberal allies a chance to raise taxes.

As my colleagues know, the President's tax increase proposal was for \$19.2 billion, and he has said many times he wants to increase the tax on cigarettes. That was in there. There were all kinds of user fees. So on this \$19 billion tax and fee increase package that the President of the United States sent to Congress, we had a vote on it. Today that vote failed 419 to zero. That is right. On a bipartisan basis, all the Democrats and all the Republicans who voted voted against the President's tax increase proposal. So that eliminates that.

So if we do not want to cut spending, we do not want to raise taxes, then the last pot of money in this town is to raid the Social Security Trust Fund. That is why we are saying that the President is willing to raid the Social Security Trust Fund to spend more money on foreign aid.

Now think about this, Mr. Speaker, grandmother, grandfather sitting around the breakfast table, reading the newspaper, sipping a little coffee, writing a letter to the grandchildren, commenting on the morning news. They happen it see, "Hey, look at this, honey. The President wants to increase foreign aid, 30 percent increase. We are spending \$12.7 billion going to foreign countries, money that was raised on the backs of hard-working taxpayers in America. We are already spending \$12.7 billion on foreign countries. The President wants to spend more."

So the grandmother may turn to the grandfather and say, "Honey, where would he get that money?" Well, it looks like he is going to get it out of our Social Security because his \$19 billion tax increase package has failed. One can blame that on Congress, but all the Democrats voted to kill his tax increase. Well, maybe the President will cut spending elsewhere.

Well, do my colleagues know what is funny? I read here that Speaker HASTERT and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) met with the President today at the White House, and he said, "No, we are not going to cut spending." Well, that leaves Social Security.

We have a huge Social Security surplus right now. But we have said in the Republican side, we do not want to spend one dime of Social Security on any reason except for Social Security. This is a profound change of culture in this town.

Let me show my colleagues a chart that was prepared by the gentleman

from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) of the Committee on Appropriations. I hope I am holding this still. I hope I am putting it in the eye of the camera. But this is spending from the Social Security Trust Fund. It starts out at the far end of the column, and it shows that, from 1980 to 1984, the way we did our accounting, no money for general operating purposes came out of the Social Security Trust Fund.

So here is the chart. Spending from the Social Security Trust Fund, 1980 to 1984, zero money. That is actually an accounting reference. It is not truly accurate. But do my colleagues know what? I was not in Congress in 1984, and there may have been some good things that happened. There may have been some bad things that happened in the budget that year. But I am not going to worry, for practical purposes, about the 1980 to 1984 budget.

□ 2000

But look what happened in 1984. Money started coming out of the Social Security Trust Fund for general operating expenses. In 1985 about \$10 billion. In 1986, \$20 billion. Here in 1989, we are up to \$50 billion coming out of the Social Security Trust Fund. And then here it dips. And I am glad it dipped, although I am not exactly sure why. And then it goes back up.

And, sadly, I want to say that this has happened under Democrat and Republican control. This part of the chart, Democrat controlled; this part is Republican controlled. But now, in a drop, a change in the culture in this town, in the year 2000 we have not spent one nickel out of the Social Security Trust Fund. This is an extremely important and extremely historical fact that we have to really pound over and over again; that this is not speculation, this is not rhetoric, this is truth.

Now, I am going to go back to the desk and I will read a paper on that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Budget Office, and we are all used to hearing, and we loosely throw the term around, the CBO. That is the Congressional Budget Office. It kind of sounds like a bunch of pointy-head, bean-counting accountants. And maybe they are a little bit over there. But I have a lot of respect for accountants and number crunchers. People who can look at numbers 8 hours a day have to be very smart. Well, we sent a letter down to those folks and we asked them under our budget, for the last year, have we spent any money out of the Social Security surplus? And they wrote back to the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT).

Now, remember, this is a nonpartisan group. These people are true to the numbers only. They cannot be manipulated one way or the other. On September 30, 1999, Dan Crippen, who is the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, he wrote the Speaker of the House back and said, "You requested that we estimate the impact on the fis-

cal year 2000 Social Security surplus using CBO's economic and technical assumptions based on a plan whereby net discretionary outlays for fiscal year 2000 will equal \$592.1 billion. CBO estimates that this spending plan will not use any of the projected Social Security surplus in the fiscal year 2000."

So let me repeat that, because there is a little accounting jargon in here. Basically, the important part for my colleagues and I to concentrate on and be proud of is that the CBO, again the Congressional Budget Office, estimates that this spending plan will not use any of the projected Social Security surplus in fiscal year 2000.

This is so important, because we have finally likened this to the guy who has been bobbing around out in the sea and finally gets on to the beach. That does not mean he is guaranteed survival, it just means he is not going to drown any more. He is safely on the beach. So we have finally gotten to the point where we are not spending Social Security surplus funds. And, now, what will happen?

Well, now the President is putting pressure on us and wants to break the budget agreement and wants to spend Social Security. Again, I am saying that because the political will to raise taxes is not there. The vote today, 419 to 0. Every single Democrat, every single Republican said no to the President's \$19.1 billion tax increase. So we are saying no to that and the President is saying no to less spending. So the conclusion of any logical person is that he wants to take the money out of Social Security. I hope that he will reconsider that position.

It is really not the President who is worried about it. I think it is the Vice President. Because a recent article in The Washington Post says that Vice President GORE's plan is to take money out of Social Security; that that is part of Vice President GORE's budget. This might be one reason why Bill Bradley is doing so well. I do not know, and I do not want to get into the politics of that, but if I were the Bradley folks right now, I would pay real close attention to that.

So let us talk about the Republican budget plan in general. We have basically a triangle, and the top of that triangle is we want to save and protect Social Security. Republicans do not want to use any of that money for any purposes except for Social Security. But if we go back into where we were 10 months ago, we know that the President of the United States 10 months ago, the Clinton-Gore people, proposed spending 40 percent of the budget surplus and \$344 billion of Social Security on more government programs.

The President stood in that well right in front of the Speaker of the House and said that we should protect 60 percent of the budget surplus. Well, why 60 percent? If we were to put money in a retirement account, it should be there for our retirement.

Imagine working for X, Y, Z Wigits. Let us say we work for a shoe company, and we worked hard for that shoe company for 25 years on the factory line, and we put money into the retirement account. And then, lo and behold, the day came to retire and the boss said, well, guess what, I needed some new production equipment a couple of years ago, so I put that retirement money into that. But, hey, do not worry, it was well spent. And then later I needed a little money for a raise for another worker, for somebody else, and so I gave some of that money for that. And then, of course, the new sign on the shoe factory, we needed to get that paid for, so I took that out of the retirement fund, too.

If that happened to an American worker, he or she would sue and wind up owning that shoe factory, because that is the law of the land. But in Congress we can take grandmother's Social Security money and spend it on roads and bridges and congressional salaries and departments and bureaucrats all day long and there is no problem with it.

But we have stopped that. And that is the very big significance between the Democrat and the Republican Party, is that for the first time in history we have said no to spending the Social Security surplus on anything but Social Security. It is the first point of our budget, 100 percent of Social Security, and we put it in what we call a security lockbox. And the security lockbox just says that not only are we not going to spend it by voting not to spend it, but we are even going to create an accounting mechanism to make sure that the trust fund is safely locked away.

So we did that. We called it a lockbox, and it passed here on an overwhelming basis. It went over to the Senate and, lo and behold, the Senate, under the direction of the Clinton-Gore team, has said no to the lockbox. So now it is stuck over there. But I call on the liberals in the Senate to please, please do what they can do to get this thing done, because it is very important. Again, it had bipartisan support on the floor of the House.

Well, we took another step in our budget. We went to debt reduction. We do not talk about debt reduction around here, we talk about wiping out the deficit, the annual debt, but we do not talk about paying down the debt. Our budget pays down \$2.2 trillion in debt, and that is real important for my small children. Little 8-year-old Jim Kingston would love to live in a debt-free America one day, and I am going to do everything I can to make it happen.

These are the main points of our budget, Mr. Speaker. We do not want to spend Social Security money. We want to protect and preserve it. We want to stop the raid on it. I think it is a very important proposal, and I certainly hope that the President and the Vice President will work with us. Because it is important not just for

America's seniors, not just for the next election, but for the next generation.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2125

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SESSIONS) at 9 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2670, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-401) on the resolution (H. Res. 335) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2670) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2, THE STUDENT RESULTS ACT

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-402) on the resolution (H. Res. 336) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2) to send more dollars to the classroom and for certain other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of family health emergency.

Mr. WISE (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today after 3:00 p.m. on account of personal business.

Mrs. FOWLER (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today after 3:00 p.m. on account of personal business.

Mr. CAMP (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of the birth of his daughter.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. CAPPS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CAPPS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ETHERIDGE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CLYBURN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of North Carolina) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, on October 26.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for 5 minutes, today and October 20.

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. WILSON, for 5 minutes, October 20.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE, for 5 minutes, today and October 20.

Mrs. MORELLA, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 659. An act to authorize appropriations for the protection of Paoli and Brandywine Battlefields in Pennsylvania, to authorize the Valley Forge Museum of the American Revolution at Valley Forge National Historical Park, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 71. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On October 18, 1999:

H.R. 3036. To restore motor carrier safety enforcement authority to the Department of Transportation.

H.R. 2684. Making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

H.R. 356. To provide for the conveyance of certain property from the United States to Stanislaus County, California.

On October 19, 1999:

H.J. Res. 71. Making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes.