

□ 1115

SENSE OF CONGRESS THERE BE NO INCREASE IN FEDERAL TAXES TO FUND ADDITIONAL GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 208) expressing the sense of Congress that there should be no increase in Federal taxes in order to fund additional Government spending.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 208

Whereas Federal taxes are at their highest peacetime level in history, taking 20.6 percent of the gross domestic product;

Whereas the typical American family pays 36 percent of its income in Federal, State, and local taxes—more than it spends on food, housing, and clothing combined;

Whereas in 1999 governments at all levels will collect \$10,298 for every man, woman, and child in the United States;

Whereas since 1989 the Federal per capita tax burden has increased 27 percent;

Whereas the Congressional Budget Office forecasts that the productivity of American workers—and controlled Federal spending—will create a non-Social Security surplus of \$996,000,000,000 over the next 10 years;

Whereas the House of Representatives voted on May 26, 1999, to protect Social Security and Medicare by passing the Social Security lock box by a vote of 416 to 12; and

Whereas Congress must protect Social Security and Medicare by controlling Federal spending, rather than by increasing taxes on any Americans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that there should be no increase in Federal taxes in order to fund additional Government spending.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 208.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here today to speak in favor of House Concurrent Resolution 208.

I would like to commend my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) for introducing this important legislation that forces us to focus on the choices we need to make in order to maintain fiscal discipline.

As my colleagues know, House Concurrent Resolution 208 expresses the sense of this Congress that we should not raise taxes in order to fund additional Federal spending.

Indeed, as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, it is the sentiment of this common-

sense, conservative majority in this House through another legislative vehicle later on our Calendar to propose that we work to realize a savings of 13 cents for every \$10 of Federal spending, because we need to keep in mind the bigger picture here. Taxes are at their highest peacetime level in the history of our country. The average American family pays more in taxes than in food, shelter, and clothing combined.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot continue to burden working Americans with higher and higher and higher taxes. We must be willing to find savings by reducing wasteful Washington spending so that we can maintain fiscal discipline without asking the American people to hand over more of their hard-earned money to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and that he be permitted to yield further blocks of time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is stupid. An issue like this should either be brought to the floor by leadership for discussion, or someone ought to take a course in Economics 101.

Now, I know the difficulty it is to count when they are trying to put together a budget. It is something like what is, is; and how many months in a year; and what is an emergency. I know the difficulty they are having. But it cannot be so bad that they are going to make a mockery out of the entire legislative process by asking this floor to feel good by saying that we are not going to raise Federal taxes in order to fund additional Government spending.

There are only three things to do if they are going to spend. If they are going to have additional spending, for whatever purpose, they have to go to the majority. Now, I know it does not feel comfortable being in the majority, but they are the majority. They are the leadership. And so, they have to find out what they want to spend. And I guess they would go to the Committee on Appropriations. But we do not spend here in the minority. Majority spends.

So what is the solution? The solution is that they either increase taxes, which the resolution they are dictating to the Speaker and to the Republican leadership that they cannot do that, they go into the Social Security Trust Fund. And then they put on commercials on TV that they are not doing that, even though the Congressional Budget Office says that they are.

Or the third thing that they do is come to the floor and say, I never put my hand in the cookie jar in the first place.

This is no way to deal with the problems that we face as a Nation. We do

not come on the House of Representatives floor with a sense of Congress. We legislate in this House. We send these issues to the respective committees. We have hearings. And we do something about it.

If, on the other hand, they are in a continuous resolution mode and they are not involved anymore in legislation and they just want the President to be their partner so that the Government does not close down, then go to the White House and tell him what to put in the bill. Because clearly, the President is going to have issues in the omnibus bill that has never come out of the committees that have been set up in this Congress.

So I know maybe they want to have something to vote on. And who knows, maybe the public really thinks this is on the level. Maybe they really think that we are coming down here voting against Federal taxes. Normally they wait until April 15 to do something this stupid. But, no, now they are saying here on the brink of the Government about to close down because of the inability to pass the appropriations bills that they are going to take the Suspension Calendar, which says that it is noncontroversial, and then we are going to mandate and see who has the nerve to vote against something which says that we are not going to have an increase in Federal taxes.

Do my colleagues not know that, if we could do this, nobody in the United States would ever have to pay taxes? We should have 435 Members on the floor every day passing resolutions that we do not need any taxes. We can pull up the Code by its roots, just pass the resolution. We can stop spending tomorrow. Pass a resolution.

But one thing they will not do, they will not come up with any concrete ideas to cut back spending or any ideas how we can avoid having Social Security be a problem in the future.

So, Mr. Speaker, there are so many things that we should be doing, individual minimum tax, increases in minimum wage, even the extensions which are so important to the American people, questions of education, patients' bill of rights, a variety of things. But in lieu of a press release, we are now going to use the Suspension Calendar to say we do not want any further increases in Federal taxes to fund additional Government spending.

Mr. Speaker, I want other people to make some type of observations on this historic piece of legislation that has now come before the House of Representatives, even though I wish the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means was here so that we could have an exchange as to how we could deal with these tax issues. But I will deal with the Committee on Rules until we can find out how we are going to do this.

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

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for adding to the civility of the discourse in the House.

But, Mr. Speaker, later this week, in all probability, we will pass the 13th and final appropriations bill for this year. And when we do so, we will have spent in those bills all the non-Social Security funds that the Federal Government will take in next year but not one dime of the Social Security funds themselves. We will have a balanced budget, and we will not have raised taxes.

Unfortunately, the President has already vetoed three of those bills and he may veto more because he thinks we are not spending enough money in them.

Mr. Speaker, if the President wants to spend more money, as he does, for instance, in the foreign aid bill, he has to show us where he is going to cut spending somewhere else. Because the only alternatives are to spend part of the Social Security fund or to raise taxes, and neither of those alternatives is acceptable. We have made it clear in this body that we will not tolerate spending Social Security money.

Today I believe we must send the President a clear message that we will not raise taxes to pay for his new additional spending, either.

Now, when we talk about Federal taxes, it is useful to consider the overall context of the Federal budget, the national economy, and just a little bit of history.

This first chart illustrates that Federal discretionary spending is higher than it has ever been; and, thus, the Federal Government is bigger than it has ever been.

The second chart shows that Federal taxes are higher than they have ever been in our Nation's peacetime history, consuming almost 21 percent of our Nation's entire economic output.

Now, even after we set aside all of the Social Security funds for Social Security and debt retirement, as this third chart will show, we still have unprecedented surpluses projected as far as the eye can see. The administration's budget forecasts that. The congressional budget forecasters show that.

Now, when taxpayers are paying more than it takes to fund the biggest Federal Government in history and, in addition to that, taxpayers are paying more than it takes to pay Social Security benefits over the next 10 years and another \$2 trillion more and all of that surplus is going to reform Social Security or to pay down the national debt, when taxpayers in fact are paying an additional trillion dollars before and beyond that, it is obvious to me that taxes are too high.

For the President to propose adding to this record Federal tax burden is outrageous. We need to lower taxes and restore to working Americans their freedom to decide how they want to spend their money. And make no mis-

take about it, when the Federal Government takes money away from the people who earn it, it is taking part of that freedom away as well.

The money this Government takes from hard-working Americans is money those hard-working folks will never be free to spend for themselves as they see fit. The money this Government takes from working Americans takes time for these folks to earn that money. That is time people cannot devote to things they would rather be doing than working for the Federal Government, such as spending time with their children, caring for an elderly family member, volunteering in their community, or just enjoying some leisure time.

At a time of already record-high Government spending, record-high Federal taxes, unprecedented surpluses, it is just unconscionable to consider taking even more money away from the people who earn it. And that is all this resolution says, that there should be no increase in Federal taxes in order to fund additional Government spending.

Mr. Speaker, America's taxpayers are counting on this Congress to protect them from the President's very large appetite for their money. I urge my colleagues to send a clear message to the President: No tax increases, restrain Federal spending. Vote "yes" on House Concurrent Resolution 208.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the tax writing committee.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I come out here today, I have never seen such a weighty piece of legislation in my entire 29 years in Government. In the State legislature, they do not even come up with things as stupid as this. But here we are. And there is a pattern. There is a pattern.

One week ago, the leadership sent a bunch of freshmen out here with a silly bill with the President's tax increases in it and nothing that it was going to be spent on; and, lo and behold, we slapped it down. And then they went down that afternoon to the White House, having insulted the President with that, and said, see, the House does not want to raise taxes. So today they are going down again to balance the budget this afternoon, and we come out and we find this kind of nonsense in front of us.

Now, I do not know who the brain trust is over there, but I know that the one that was put in House Concurrent Resolution 197 had a provision in it that had to do with the tobacco tax. And they were against that tobacco tax, by God. Boy, they were really against it.

Now in the one that is before us now, House Resolution 208, they have taken it out. And I think, I say to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), what they are doing is setting the

stage to raise the tobacco tax. Because if they were against it yesterday when they filed it, what has changed? Why have they come up here without it?

I think they are going to use it. Yes, sir, they are getting ready to fix this budget. Does that make sense to my colleagues?

□ 1130

One of the fascinating things about this, you have always got to be careful when you put numbers in here. In paragraph 2, it says, "Whereas Federal taxes are at their highest peacetime level in history, taking 20.5 percent of the gross domestic product."

Do my colleagues know what the percentage was when the Republicans took over the House of Representatives? 18.6. Under their tutelage, under their great management, under all this great stuff they have done, including that tax break last year, people are now paying almost 2 percent more taxes than they paid when they started. Now, what they have done, of course, is they have shifted all the income to the people on the top and they are paying more taxes. So their proposals actually worked. They have shifted all the money in the country up, under their tax bills, and we are paying more taxes in this country because of Republican policies.

It is a wonderful thing to sit here and contemplate what the thinking must have been in the room. They said, well, we do not want to raise taxes to pay for programs. What other reason would there be to raise taxes? I mean, why else would a Congress come out here and raise taxes? Because they did not have anything else to do? No, that would not be it. Well, maybe, I know what it was. The only other reason would be to punish the rich, right, people who have got money. That is the only reason they would raise taxes, to take it away from them.

Now, this is the kind of thinking that has led us to this impasse. They came out here earlier in the session and had a \$792 billion tax break. Thank God that died, because they cannot balance the budget. They were going to give away \$729 billion, and they cannot balance the budget. They cannot get us out of here. We are here on our second continuing resolution, and by God I will bet my colleagues we will have a third continuing resolution because they cannot figure out how to bring this thing to a close. Yet 3 or 4 months ago, they were willing to give away \$800 billion. It makes no sense. It makes about as much sense, I guess, as this one.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU).

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by making clear that no matter how strongly we feel about issues of substantive disagreement whether it is tax increases or tax relief or spending or cutting spending, I do not think that the rhetoric, the language using the

words like "stupid" or "silly" to characterize the behavior of other Members is ever appropriate to use on this House floor, whether you are a senior ranking member of a committee or whether you are a new Member of Congress like the principal sponsor of this legislation. I do not think I have heard so much hot air released at once since the Hindenburg went down.

I would like to get back to the substance, to the process that brought us here in the first place. At the beginning of this year, President Clinton in good faith brought forth a budget proposal. He said we are going to set aside 60 percent of the Social Security surplus and we are going to spend 40 percent. And he laid out his priorities in that budget and he said, "We're going to increase taxes." His tax increase was approximately \$240 billion over 10 years. It was a detailed budget, as the President submits every year to Congress.

The Republican Congress said, "That's not right." And we put together a budget proposal that members of the minority did not support and that is their prerogative, but it was a budget proposal that said for the first time in 40 years we are going to set aside every penny of the Social Security surplus and we are going to do it while cutting taxes. And again the minority disagreed with that proposal, and the gentleman from Washington tried to describe some of the reasons they were against tax relief. Well, that is fine, too. But we advanced that tax relief proposal, to eliminate the marriage penalty, eliminate death taxes, give full health insurance deductibility for those that are buying health insurance and are self-employed, increase access to health insurance and the President vetoed that bill, as is his prerogative. But now we are at the end of the budget process and Republicans are holding firm to their commitment not to spend Social Security. We did it last year. We balanced the budget for the first time in 40 years without using Social Security. We can and we must do it again this year. That causes heartburn for a lot of members of the minority, feeling the pressure of having to control spending. We have talked about reducing spending across the board by 1 percent, allowing agency heads and department heads to root out waste and abuse, just 1 percent, one penny on every dollar, in order to balance the budget in 2000 without using Social Security. I believe we can do that. And the administration has indicated that they want to balance the budget without using Social Security, too. So we might have some common ground here. We will work with the administration to fund priorities if they can reduce spending elsewhere in the budget.

But what about taxes? The administration has waffled on tax increases. The President seems to have backed off his proposal to raise taxes by \$240 billion over 10 years. We had a vote, a legislative vote in this House last week

where his tax proposals received zero votes. I think that was an important statement for the House to make. But today we can go on record as saying no tax increases for new government spending, no spending the Social Security trust fund, no tax increases. It is a simple, clear message to the American people. We have been firm in our commitment as the majority party to protect Social Security since the very beginning of this budget process. With the passage of this resolution and the continued statement on a bipartisan basis from all Members of the House that we should not be increasing taxes, I think the fiscal responsibility this year and next year will continue to result in a growing economy and a better quality of life for hard-working Americans.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. If I have offended anybody, then I apologize. I just would want to say that it is extremely frustrating for a legislator to come to this floor and to believe that we can decrease, or not increase, Federal taxes or not have additional spending by putting a bill on the suspension calendar. It is frustrating to see that the tax writing committee is not dealing with taxes, the appropriating committee is not dealing with bills, but that the Committee on Rules is still pushing out bills under suspension.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a member of the tax writing committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, I believe one thing that is very obvious to anyone who has been observing this Congress is that we would not be here today debating this resolution or debating anything else if our Republican colleagues had done their job. They have not done their job. They are desperate for distraction. So I expect we will have more resolutions. This is not the last one. There will be more of these kind of resolutions to distract from the simple fact that they have failed utterly and completely to do their work during this past fiscal year. They are a competitive group. They are competing with themselves. We thought last year's Congress set the standard for doing little. It certainly was the least productive Congress since the days of Harry Truman. But they are competing with that record and I think they are winning. I believe they will have an even less productive and even more do-nothing Congress than they did during 1998.

That incredible record reminds us that today we are entering week four of the new fiscal year, and they still have not done last year's work. It is incredible that almost a month after the end of the Federal fiscal year, the bill that funds all of the Federal assistance to education, the bill that funds all of our health research in this country to try to cure dreadful diseases like Par-

kinson's, cancer, diabetes, that bill has never been presented on the floor of this House. That is what I mean by do-nothingism. It is the failure to do your work and to present for debate on the floor of the House that very fundamental bill. I know the Republicans, some of them still want to abolish the Department of Education, but at least they could bring that bill to the floor and let the House debate it.

Let me give my colleagues a second example since we are talking about taxes. On September 24, all the members of the Committee on Ways and Means were called into an emergency meeting directly across the hall from this Chamber in which we gather today. We were told that unless we rushed through a bill, the tax forms could not be prepared by the Internal Revenue Service. It had to be done by October 7 or the forms would not be ready. That bill was a very important one to people in central Texas, because it continued the research and development tax credit. That is a tax credit established by a Democratic Congress. It is true that under Speaker Gingrich it was allowed to expire and our technology companies were denied the benefit of that tax credit in 1995, but we saw an opportunity to extend it and continue it. Well, where is that bill? It has never been brought to the floor of the House. October 7 is past; we are approaching November 7, and they have never brought the research and development tax credit, the §127 and other so called "extenders," employer provided education assistance, they have never brought these to the floor of the House to be considered. That is why a number of people are concerned that the Republican do-nothingism may jeopardize this tax credit and cause its loss for research and development. This credit expired on June 30, and we must not lose it again as happened under this Republican leadership with Newt Gingrich in 1995.

I do think it is important to note one important improvement in this resolution, and that is the deletion of the attack on a tax on tobacco. The only thing this Republican Congress ever did about tobacco usage and the fact that 3,000 of our young people get addicted each day to nicotine, the only thing they ever did was to provide a \$50 billion tax credit to the tobacco lobby. When the public found out about it, Republicans got so scared about it that they withdrew that credit after it had been approved by the House. But it is at least worthy to note that while the sponsors of the pending resolution initially attacked the tobacco tax, they have removed that language from this resolution. And that happens to be the only significant tax increase the President has proposed. It is certainly better to tax tobacco than to take money from Social Security.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA).

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

Mr. FOSSELLA. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, let us bring it back into focus again. There are only three things you can really do with taxes. You can cut them and bring relief to hardworking taxpayers. That is what this Congress did, and the White House vetoed, so we deprived the opportunity of American hardworking taxpayers to keep a little more money in their paychecks or at the end of the year so they can put more food on the table or they can buy some clothes for the kids when they go to school or they could put a little money away for their child's college fund. That was deprived because of a veto from the White House and for those who chose to vote against that bill.

We can keep taxes exactly where they are, which hopefully is the worst we can do this year. Or we can do what the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) says, is not increase taxes, that is all, to pay for additional spending. What is so wrong about that? If you feel committed, if you do, fine. But if you feel committed that we need to raise taxes to pay for additional spending, then you should not have the problem, Mr. Speaker, of coming down here and voting for it.

I happen to believe that the people that I represent in Staten Island and Brooklyn are working too hard right now, sometimes two and three jobs, trying to put their kids through college, trying to just get enough money to buy that second car. They are working too hard for us to come down here and say, "You know what, we don't think you're being taxed enough. We think we should be taking a little more out of your pocket." No, I would rather go home, Mr. Speaker, and look those folks in the eyes and tell them, you know what, we are doing all we can to provide more freedom and opportunity to you and your families and we are doing all we can in Washington to ensure that we are not going to take more money out of your pocket, we are not going to take more money out of your home because that is where we believe that money belongs.

If you feel so strongly that this government should be getting bigger and larger because the Federal Government should be taking more of the taxes, then come right down here and say it. But in the meantime, people like the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I believe he speaks for the vast majority of Americans, are saying, you know what, we are taxed too much, do not do it. Spend the money appropriately and responsibly.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY MILLER).

(Mr. GARY MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. We are talking about the people of the United States. It is their money. It is not our money. I congratulate my freshman colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) for bringing this forward today.

The rhetoric today is incredible. One of my colleagues said we have not done our job, the Republicans have not done our job. It reminds me of the story of the farmer who hooked a horse up to one side of a wagon and a mule up to the back pulling in the opposite direction.

□ 1145

The reason we do not have a budget is because our colleagues will not do their job and vote for it.

We believe we can live within our means. Our colleagues are doing nothing to help us on this. They are laughing. That is the attitude we have from that side of the House. When we deal with a serious issue, we get laughter. As my colleagues know, actions speak louder than words.

We bring forward appropriations bills that spend within our means, and the Democrats vote no. Why? Because they say it does nothing for Social Security. Well, it has nothing to do with Social Security. They vote no because we will not spend more money, which means spending Social Security money.

With the President actions speak louder than words. All we heard last year is: We need to save Social Security. What did he do in his budget proposal? He spent \$58 billion of Social Security, this money, this year on new programs, and he said we need to save Medicare and Medicaid in 5 years. He was proposing to cut \$11.9 billion out of the programs. That does not save anything.

The President said: We need to save Social Security. We saved the first bill this year for the President to come forward with his reform for Social Security, and guess what that bill is doing? Doing nothing. He has not made a proposal to save Social Security.

I know when I was a young man I was raised with my grandparents. We were poor, and I started a business off in the construction industry, and I had an old van that used more oil than it did gas, and I was willing to sacrifice, and I built a company. I want my kids to have that opportunity, and I even want my colleagues' kids to have that opportunity. But they want to tax them to death. 20.5 percent of GDP is in taxes; they ought to be ashamed of themselves.

What we are trying to do here is make a statement: "Put your actions where your words are." We have heard enough rhetoric. We have watched them vote no. We have watched the laughter and the childishness on the floor, and that is fine, Mr. Speaker. I respect these individuals. Some are trying to do what is right, some are trying to be political.

Let us protect the American people. Let us let people keep more of their hard-earned money, we do not need it. Government has grown to be a fatted calf and a fat hog. We do not need to spend our constituents' money. They earned it, they should keep it; we are trying to make that statement. If we are going to save Social Security, let us stop spending money. If we are going to help the American people better their lives, let us stop taxing them and spending their money.

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

Mr. Speaker, it would be very sad if the majority did not understand their responsibility. I am going to try to run this by just one time because the gentleman who just got finished speaking said the mule and the horse are working against each other.

The majority sets the agenda. The majority sets the budget. The majority sets the spending level. The majority sets the amount of taxes that are going to be made there. So I do not know why we need to have a resolution because would they be changing anything in their resolution that if they were going to say that expressing the sense of Congress that the Republican majority should not increase federal taxes? The Republican majority should not fund additional government spending. The congressional Republican majority for some reason omits now cigarette taxes or whatever they are going to do. Just put in there "majority," and then we would know what we are voting for because everyone agrees with them. It is just that this is not the process that we control taxes and spending, by using the suspension calendar.

If they want to say, let the committees do it, then do it. My God, they did not ask for help on the Patients' Bill of Rights. We had to pull teeth to get some votes out of them where the minority provided the leadership. They did not ask for help in cutting back the number of teachers the President requested and the number of policemen. They sure did not ask for help when they decided they wanted to cut taxes by \$792 billion, and they are asking for help by having a continuing resolution, and I assume they will be running down to the White House trying to get some help from the President of the United States.

All I am suggesting is: If they got the majority, they do not come to the floor and say it is a sense of Congress, they do it. They set the authorization, they set the spending and they set the taxes.

So, if it makes them feel better in coming here with sense of Congresses, we are going to help them. We are going to support it, and we are going to say we all do not want Federal increases in spending, and we do not want increases in taxes and we will have prescription drugs even if we, as the minority, have to provide the leadership for our aged and for our sick people, and we will pay for it, Mr. Speaker, but we believe in legislating

and not just bringing something up on the suspension calendar.

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

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

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that I welcome the support of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle in resisting any increase at all in Federal taxes whatsoever, and I hope that they will pass that message on to the President, who has not apparently come to the same conclusion. He obviously does have a considerable say in this budget process as well as the Republican majority does, and I would simply remind my colleagues that at a time when there is already record high level of government spending, record high level of Federal taxes and unprecedented surpluses it would be unconscionable to consider taking even more income away from the American people who earn it, and that is what this resolution is all about. It is very simple. It simply says:

There should be no increase in Federal taxes in order to fund additional government spending.

I urge my colleagues to send this clear message to the President: No tax increases, restrain spending.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, this Congressional Resolution is stupid. It is a truly a type of "con"—designed to make a political statement without any real thought for the future.

Between now and 2030, the number of Americans on Medicare will double, from 39 million to about 80 million. How will we pay for the retirement and health of the Baby Boomers.

We can cut benefits in half as the number of enrollees doubles, thus holding spending fairly steady. But that would mean just transferring costs to people in their old age and when they are sick.

We can cut what we pay doctors and hospitals in half, but who would then provide quality care to seniors?

Or we could consider some tax increases.

Actually, to save Medicare will take a combination of the three options I have just listed.

To pass a Resolution like this to take one of those options off the table. Do we really want to do that? Instead of having an intelligent debate on how to provide for our citizens in the future, this Congress is just passing slogans—slogans which if taken literally would destroy our ability to meet the future needs of the Nation.

That's why I'm voting "no" today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 208.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the

Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

REAUTHORIZATION OF JUNIOR DUCK STAMP CONSERVATION AND DESIGN PROGRAM ACT OF 1994

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2496) to reauthorize the Junior Duck Stamp Conservation and Design Program Act of 1994, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2496

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

SECTION 1. REAUTHORIZATION OF JUNIOR DUCK STAMP CONSERVATION AND DESIGN PROGRAM ACT OF 1994.

Section 5 of the Junior Duck Stamp Conservation and Design Program Act of 1994 (16 U.S.C. 719c) is amended by striking "for each of the fiscal years 1995 through 2000" and inserting "for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005".

SEC. 2. EXPANSION OF PROGRAM TO INSULAR AREAS.

The Junior Duck Stamp Conservation and Design Program Act of 1994 is amended—

(1) in section 2(c) (16 U.S.C. 719(c)) by striking "50 States" each place it appears and inserting "States";

(2) by redesignating section 5 (16 U.S.C. 719c), as amended by section 1 of this Act, as section 6; and

(3) by inserting after section 4 the following:

SEC. 5. DEFINITION OF STATE.

"For the purposes of this Act, the term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, American Samoa, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and any other territory or possession of the United States."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) and the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2496.

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

There was no objection.

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

I am pleased that we are considering H.R. 2496, a bill introduced by our friend and colleague from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ). This measure will reauthorize the very popular Junior Duck Stamp Conservation and Design Program Act. This innovative program allows thousands of children from kindergarten to high school to participate in a nationwide wildlife art contest. It also provides students with a broad exposure to migratory water fowl and encourages activities to motivate students to take

an active role in conserving these species.

In 1998, 42,337 students participated in this nationwide art contest. The first place national winner received a \$2,500 scholarship, and his winning design appeared in the Federal Junior Duck Stamp for that year. This legislation does not make any major changes to the underlying law. It simply extends the authorization of appropriations, which is \$250,000 for an additional 5 years. By doing so the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will continue to license and market junior duck stamps and use stamp proceeds to support conservation, education and hopefully to expand the junior duck stamp design competition to hundreds of additional students.

At our full committee markup the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) offered an amendment to expand the coverage of this program to include American Samoa, the District of Columbia, Guam and the Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. I strongly support his amendment and hope that thousands of additional students from places like Tom's River to Pago Pago will have an opportunity to win this art contest in the future.

I urge an aye vote.

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

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

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased that this legislation has now been brought before the floor for consideration, and I certainly want to commend my good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), the chairman of our Subcommittee on Fisheries and Oceans, for his leadership and for bringing this legislation for the Members' consideration.

Mr. Speaker, the Junior Duck Stamp Program has matured over a relatively short period of time into a valued conservation and education program that is enjoyed by thousands of schoolchildren nationwide. Merging conservation education with the arts has proven to be an effective strategy to increase knowledge and appreciation of migratory bird and their habitat within our schools. The Junior Duck Stamp Program has enhanced public awareness of the critical need to protect and preserve our Nation's diverse waterfowl and their essential wetland habitats. Moreover, this innovative program has helped promote a conservation ethic among America's young people which will be absolutely critical to ensure healthy wildlife and a healthy environment in the future.

Mr. Speaker, an added benefit to the Junior Duck Stamp Program has been that it has also extended appreciation for wildlife and wetlands far beyond