



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE **106th** CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 25, 1999

No. 48

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

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

We are grateful, O God, that You have made the heavens and the Earth and have breathed into us the very breath of life. As we express our petitions this day may we do so with humility and wisdom as we face the decisions that affect the lives of others. We earnestly pray for peace in our troubled world, and may Your spirit, gracious God, be with all those who face danger and suffering. May Your blessings surround all people, may Your grace be sufficient for every need and may Your love ever bind us together. In Your name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TRAFICANT 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 had passed without amendment bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 774. An act to amend the Small Business Act to change the conditions of participation and provide an authorization of appropriations for the women's business center program.

H.R. 808. An act to extend for 6 additional months the period for which chapter 12 of title 11, United States Code, is reenacted.

H.J. Res. 26. Joint resolution providing for the reappointment of Barber B. Conable, Jr. as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

H.J. Res. 27. Joint resolution providing for the reappointment of Dr. Hanna H. Gray as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

H.J. Res. 28. Joint resolution providing for the reappointment of Wesley S. Williams, Jr. as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET—FISCAL YEAR 2000

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 131 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 131

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. 68) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2009. 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 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. The amendment specified in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The concurrent resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. No further amendment shall be in order except those printed in part 2 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 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. All points of order against the amendments printed in the report are waived except that the adoption of an amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment. 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, as amended, to the House with such further amendment as may have been adopted. 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 2000.

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

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 131 is a structured rule providing for consideration of H. Con. Res. 68, the budget resolution for fiscal year 2000.

H. Res. 131 provides for three hours of general debate with two hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, and one hour on economic goals and policies 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. The rule also considers the amendment printed in part one of the Committee on Rules report as adopted upon adoption of the rule. The rule also makes in order only those amendments printed in part 2 of the Committee on Rules report to be offered only in the order specified, only by the Member designated, debatable for 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by a proponent and an opponent, and 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 as adopted, it is not in order to consider further substitutes. This is a very important point, because Members need to know that there will not be any king of the hill or queen of the hill procedures used here today. There are no free votes.

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

The rule also provides and permits the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to offer amendments in the House to achieve mathematical consistency pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Budget Act. Finally, the rule suspends the application of House rule XXIII with respect to the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 131 is a conventional rule for consideration of the budget resolution and provides for the consideration of a number of substitutes, including the Blue Dog budget offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE), the Democratic substitute offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), and President Clinton's budget. It strikes me as odd that the Committee on the Budget Democrats would not offer the President's budget for consideration, and that as a result, Members on our side of the aisle had to offer it to get it considered.

Mr. Speaker, this budget takes advantage of this historic opportunity to save Social Security by ensuring that 100 percent of the money destined for the Social Security Trust Fund re-

mains in the trust fund. That is \$1.8 trillion over the next decade for retirement security. The President's plan only sets aside 62 percent of the funds destined for the Social Security Trust Fund, about \$100 billion less than the Republican plan. Our budget strengthens Social Security and ensures that big spenders can no longer raid the fund to pay for their big government spending programs.

Mr. Speaker, after saving Social Security and Medicare, the real question is, what should we do with the remainder of the surplus? We say, give it back. When previous Congresses could not figure out how to run the government, they turned to the American people for more taxes. Now that we have a surplus, the big spenders do not want to give the people a refund. They want to spend it on new, wasteful, bureaucratic programs.

I welcome this debate because it will speak volumes about the differing opinions on the role of the Federal Government in the lives of the American people.

A few months ago, we received a preview of this debate when the President said, and I quote, we could give it all back to you and hope you spend it right, closed quotes. But the President then proceeded to explain that he really should not give back the surplus because Federal Government bureaucrats could make wiser choices with your paychecks than you could.

That is the ideological conflict we are dealing with today. Our budget is designed to provide more freedom and more power to the American people. The President's budget is designed to keep taxpayer money controlled inside of the Washington, D.C. bureaucracy.

The Republican budget expands upon our efforts to provide every American with as much personal freedom and liberty as possible. We simply believe that individuals make much better choices about their lives than bureaucrats do.

The President's position on taxes illustrates his belief that the government makes wiser choices with the paychecks of the American worker. In a budget that weighed 12 pounds and was 2,800 pages long, the Clinton budget did not contain any real tax cut. In fact, his budget proposal actually included billions of new taxes and fees.

Today, your tax rate is about 2 percent lower than it was 2 years ago because Congress provided the first Federal tax cut in 16 years. Yet Federal tax revenues still comprise a record percentage of Gross Domestic Product. In fact, Americans pay more in taxes than for food, clothing and shelter combined.

The President responded to this growing tax burden by stating, "Fifteen years from now, if the Congress wants to give more tax relief, then let them do it."

Well, if waiting until the year 2014 to get a tax refund does not appeal to people, they will be pleased to know that

the Republican budget states that the surplus does not belong to government. The Republican budget will provide \$800 billion in tax relief, including \$10 billion to \$15 billion in the first year. It is a reaffirmation of our belief that the American people know best how to spend their money.

The President's budget, which the Democrats would not even offer today, spends \$341 billion of the Social Security surplus over 10 years, it breaks the balanced budget caps, and proposes \$30 billion more in outlays than allowed under the law in just the first year.

It should be noted that despite the President's rhetoric, his budget actually cuts Medicare by \$11.9 billion over 5 years. The Republican budget rejects the President's Medicare cuts, including those he proposed for certain prescription drugs.

Even the President's own Comptroller General, David Walker, has criticized the Clinton Medicare proposal for essentially doing nothing to alter the imbalance between the program's receipts and benefits payments. The President's \$11.9 billion cut in Medicare and his fiscal shell games are endangering the quality of our seniors' health care.

Conversely, our budget locks away all of the Social Security trust fund surpluses for the Nation's elderly to save, strengthen and preserve Social Security and Medicare.

This budget continues our determined efforts to provide more security, more freedom, and less government to the American people. In its entirety, our budget is a common sense plan to provide security for the American people by preserving every penny of the Social Security surplus, return overtaxed paychecks to those who earned it, pay down the national debt, rebuild our Nation's defense, and improve our public schools.

Mr. Speaker, this Republican budget reaffirms our belief in the Ronald Reagan adage that it is not the function of government to bestow happiness upon us. Rather, it is the function of government to give the American people the opportunity to work out happiness for themselves. That is why this budget resolution is written in such a way to provide more freedom to American families and communities by returning money, power and control back to them.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fair rule. I urge my colleagues to support it so that we may proceed with the general debate and consideration of this historic budget resolution and the substitute resolutions.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me the customary half hour, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, people are starting to get their hopes up with this budget. With the new surplus and the new millennium, it looks like anything is possible. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, they

are in for a huge disappointment. Last week's unveiling of my Republican colleagues' new budget proved to be more of the same: All bad ideas.

Despite predictions of Medicare and Social Security catastrophes looming on the horizon, the Republican budget does nothing to extend the life of either Social Security or Medicare for even one day. But it still manages to siphon \$775 billion into tax cuts for the richest Americans, instead of investing in education, health care, to prepare this country for the next century.

□ 1015

Like Nero, Mr. Speaker, the Republican budget fiddles while Social Security and Medicare burn.

The chief actuary of the Social Security Administration has said this budget will have virtually no effect on the date that Social Security becomes insolvent. It will just make sure that it goes broke on schedule. That is not me speaking, Mr. Speaker. That is the chief actuary of the Social Security Administration.

In contrast, the Democratic budget has a lock box which will protect Social Security until the year 2050 and protect Medicare until the year 2020. My Republican colleagues propose a plan that is less secure than the Democrats', and Treasury Secretary Rubin recommended that the President of the United States veto it.

Because in reality, Mr. Speaker, the Republican lock box is more of an open till. The differences do not stop there.

The Democratic budget reduces the debt more than the Republican budget every year that it is in effect. The Democratic budget provides \$40 billion more for veterans' health care over the next 10 years than the Republican budget. Mr. Speaker, we made our veterans a promise. We must keep that promise. America's fighting men and women risk their lives for this country. They deserve the very best health care, the best services we can give them. But my Republican colleagues will not allow a vote, will not even allow a vote on the Clement veterans' amendment.

The Democratic budget provides more for defense spending over the long run than the Republican budget because, in the later years, my Republican colleagues had to choose between defense spending and tax cuts. What do my colleagues think, Mr. Speaker? They chose the tax cuts.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, the Democratic budget still manages to provide some balanced tax cuts and keep our economy from slipping back into deficit. The Republican budget, on the other hand, will create a whole new deficit by the year 2014.

The Democratic budget does more to reduce class size and modernize our schools than the Republican budget, which will cut spending for Head Start, cut spending for Pell Grants, and cut money for work study.

The Democratic budget protects important programs like WIC, which the

Republican budget cuts by so much that 1.2 million women, infants, and children will lose their benefits next year; 16,400 of them live in my home State of Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, the WIC program provides essential nutrition and education during the early years of the children's development in order to make sure that they start school ready to learn. If we do not give them good nutrition when they are very young, we lose our chance forever.

Some of my Democratic colleagues tried to make sure that we got that chance. But this rule does not make in order the DeFazio amendment on the progressive budget, the Clement amendment on the veterans budget, or the Mink amendment on education.

This rule does make in order the Shadegg-Coburn amendment which some people are equating with President Clinton's budget. They say it reflects some CBO comparison. Mr. Speaker, I want to make something perfectly clear. The Shadegg-Coburn amendment looks as much like President Clinton's budget as I look like Gwyneth Paltrow.

Looking at this budget, we would think that my Republican colleagues have very sharp memories when it comes to bad habits that gave us the budget deficits in the 1980s and the tripling of our national debt. Now that our budget finally is in the black, we should be very, very careful about repeating those mistakes.

So I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, we will make in order the Clement amendment to take care of our American veterans. Our veterans deserve every bit of care we can give them. This country made them a promise. This country should live up to that promise.

Yesterday's U.S.A. Today says, "If your Member of Congress comes home this weekend bragging about having adopted a responsible Federal budget, don't you believe it."

So I urge my colleagues to defeat the Republican budget. Today's vote gives us an unprecedented chance to protect Social Security, to protect Medicare for the next generation. Mr. Speaker, let us not let that chance go by.

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the 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, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Atlanta for yielding me this time and appreciate his fine leadership in this effort.

This morning, as the House opened, since we did not go through one minutes, a lot of us were here to listen to the prayer delivered by the Chaplain.

The Chaplain said, "One of the things that we have to do here is face the challenge of those decisions that will affect the lives of others." This issue of the budget is a very serious one, and it cannot be taken lightly. That is why I am extraordinarily proud of, not only the process that we have gone through for consideration of these different budgets, but the budget itself that is the underlying effort that was put forward by the Committee on the Budget.

When we think about the impact on lives of others, we think about retirees and those who are looking towards retirement. We are making history today when we do in fact pass the committee's budget, which I believe we will do.

We are locking away Social Security money for Social Security and ending what has been at least a 3½ or 4 decade long practice of raiding Social Security for other spending.

I have got to enter into the RECORD at this point, Mr. Speaker, a letter that has come from the AARP, the American Association of Retired Persons. In it is made very clear that there is a high level of support and recognition that our plan to lock away Social Security does in fact provide the greatest opportunity for us to address the needs of retirees.

The letter is as follows:

AARP,
March 24, 1999.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: AARP believes it is important to protect Social Security's growing reserves and is pleased that the House Budget Resolution provides that protection. Over the next ten years, Social Security is projected to contribute \$1.8 trillion of the unified surplus. Preserving Social Security's reserves not only allows our country to better prepare for the impending retirement of the baby boom generation, but also gives us greater financial flexibility to enact long-term reform in both Social Security and Medicare once the options have been carefully considered and their impact understood. In the meantime, maintaining Social Security's trust fund assets helps reduce the publicly held debt, further strengthening the economy.

We are also pleased that the Resolution does not call for reconciliation in the Medicare program. Much work remains to be done to strengthen and modernize Medicare—work that must be taken on judiciously and on a bipartisan basis. Currently, however, the program is still absorbing the impact of the changes enacted in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. Until such changes are fully understood, we should move cautiously in making additional changes to the program.

The Association remains concerned that the constraints on domestic discretionary spending will place an inordinate burden on low-income programs such as elderly housing and home energy assistance. Inevitably, these caps will lead to difficult choices in providing for appropriations for these important programs and may need to be reconsidered in light of pressing needs.

The Resolution now before the House continues to move this year's budget process forward in a constructive manner. AARP is committed to working with the House on a bipartisan basis to achieve a Budget Resolution that takes advantage of the opportunities that come from a surplus and at the

same time continues the course of fiscal discipline that our nation has worked hard to achieve.

Sincerely,

HORACE B. DEETS.

Our budget actually devotes \$100 billion more than the President's budget to save, strengthen, and secure and preserve Social Security and Medicare. Unfortunately, the President's budget cuts Medicare by \$11.9 billion. We maintain the spending discipline that brought us the balanced budget while, unfortunately, the President's package exceeds the caps by \$30 billion.

After locking away the Social Security and Medicare funds, we returned the rest of the surplus to the American people in tax relief. That is something I think is very important to recognize, that we have an overcharge that has taken place, and that overcharge should in fact be provided as a rebate, and that is exactly what we do.

On the other side, the President's budget in fact raises taxes by \$172 billion. In fact, the President has said that Congress should not even consider providing tax relief for over 15 years.

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

Mr. DREIER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), my chairman, my very dear friend, keeps alluding to the President's budget. We did not propose the President's budget. The gentleman's Members proposed the President's budget so he is using the President's budget as a straw man. We do not want any part of the President's budget.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think the gentleman from Massachusetts has made an extraordinarily wonderful point when he says he does not want to have anything to do with the President's budget.

We made the President's budget in order for consideration when we move ahead for debate for a very important reason; and that is, I believe that the President was very serious when he submitted his budget to the Congress.

I find it very interesting that the budget of the President's had to be offered by Republicans. Why? Because not one single Member of the President's party chose to step forward and endorse, support, and propose this budget that I am proudly talking about and juxtaposing to the proposal that has come from the Budget Committee.

So I will continue, if I can, to talk about more reasons why Democrats do not even want to offer the President's budget.

Our budget actually pays down \$450 billion more in public debt than the administration's budget does. For those on the other side of the aisle who have looked back to the days of liberal rule of the Congress and budget deficits which went as far as the eye can see, we are making in order, as I said, this old-fashioned tax-and-spend last budget that the President submitted for this Congress, the 20th Century.

I think it is unfortunate that the President chose to do that. But we have to take seriously what the President has submitted to us. That is why our Republican colleagues, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) will in fact be offering that.

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

Mr. DREIER. I am happy to once again yield to the gentleman from South Boston, Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, as I said, the chairman and I are very friendly.

Mr. DREIER. And we agree on a lot of things, too.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a letter from the director of OMB, and I would just like to read a couple statements. It says, "As you know, Congressmen SHADEGG and COBURN will be offering a substitute amendment as the budget resolution on the House floor today. This amendment is being characterized as the President's budget. The administration has not been consulted in the development of this amendment. It is our understanding that it is based on a set of assumptions and is quite different from those presented in the President's budget. Therefore, this is not the President's budget."

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), my friend, for his very valuable contribution.

I hope that the spirit that was raised as a question from the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Budget earlier this morning to me will be recognized, and I am trying to give time over to the other side of the aisle because I know that the gentleman said that he wanted to have, in fact, longer than the 40 minutes. Although I have got to tell my colleagues, as chairman of the Committee on Rules, I have had Democrat after Democrat who has come up to me and said, "Gosh, don't you think, after 10 hours of debate, maybe tonight we could complete this budget process?" That is exactly what we are trying to do.

Frankly, I do not have to leave here tonight or first thing in the morning, but I have got so many Members on the other side of the aisle who are urging us to complete this. Let me say, I know that there is great time. I have tried to yield as generously as I can to the ranking minority member.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DREIER. If there is one question, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, it is down the gentleman's alley. I would like for him to elaborate, to explain this so-called trust box that my colleagues are

proposing. It is my understanding that the basic protection is a rule of order here on the House floor. As the gentleman knows, as the chairman of the Committee on Rules, he is in the business of waiving points of order every day of the week.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, we have no intention of waiving that one, I should say, and we do plan to have in fact this locked up. It is the first time in history that we have ever attempted to do that. That is what this Congress is doing.

So I hope that, if my colleagues look at the litany of proposals that have been put forward, I am very happy that we have got the President's budget, we made the Spratt budget alternative in order, and we made the Blue Dog budget in order.

Of the alternatives that we are going to have, all three of them were authored by Democrats. So I have got to say that I think we are being very fair, very balanced, and I look forward to a vigorous debate on that.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the President is not reputed for his accounting. I remember a Bush budget that was offered word for word that only got 30 votes.

I am going to vote "no" against everything. I will tell my colleagues why. We have an approaching \$200 billion trade deficit, and there is still no address to the critical negative balance of payments.

Number two, neither party secures Social Security. My colleagues can waive rules. They can take lock boxes and throw them out windows. I submit a little bill that says we should amend the Constitution that says it is illegal to touch Social Security. We did it for limiting President's terms. We did it to allow popular vote for Senators. We in fact prohibited alcohol in this country. What is more important than Social Security?

So I will listen to the debate. But, quite frankly, the Republicans should have offered word for word President Clinton's budget, and it would have been soundly defeated.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that President Clinton's budget was put on the Senate floor yesterday and defeated 97 to 2.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), a member of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me the time, and I rise in support obviously of this very good rule to bring the budget forward.

□ 1030

First, though, Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for all my colleagues when I say good luck, Godspeed, and we are behind our young men and women who are overseas today doing the very hard work of this Nation's national security in their mission in Yugoslavia. We are all praying for their success, for a safe mission and a quick return home.

Mr. Speaker, as has been described, this rule is a fair and balanced approach to the very important debate we are about to have for the Nation's fiscal year 2000 budget. I know that some of our colleagues will be disappointed this rule does not allow for every proposed amendment. But what we have tried to do is craft a rule that allows for several different approaches to be debated so that all the major issues, all of the major issues, can be addressed today. I think we have succeeded on that point, as we will hear in the 10 hours of debate that will ensue.

In addition, I point out to my colleagues who have expressed specific concern about the need to boost defense spending levels, even beyond what the Committee on the Budget has provided, that we have in fact taken that advice and this rule will incorporate an enhancement of defense spending in the base text of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the budget brought forward today by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, is a positive blueprint for where we should be headed as we assess our Nation's finances in the new millennium. The budget outlines our unwavering commitment to preserving Social Security and Medicare, living within budget caps, caps we set for ourselves in 1997, and providing real tax relief to the American people.

We know there is a great temptation among some who see the term "surplus" and who conclude that we should be boosting the budget of all sorts of government programs. But we are committed to maintaining discipline, even in the face of that kind of temptation, by first meeting our obligation to ensure the retirement security and the national security of the American people. They are counting on us and we are doing it.

Once we have accomplished those goals, we propose to give something back in the form of tax cuts to the American people. With all the numbers we will be hearing today, and all the rhetoric and spin that will come forward, to me, once again, this debate here in Congress boils down to fundamentally different competing visions of where America is headed in the millennium.

We propose less government and more control by American families of

their own hard-earned resources. The administration, and some of our Democrat colleagues across the aisle, propose ever more government and ever more taxes, and we will hear it here today. It is really just that simple.

This is a healthy debate for us to have, and this rule allows for plenty of opportunity for all voices to be heard. I congratulate the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), for bringing this rule forward, and my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER), for his beautiful support for it today, and I urge the support of all my colleagues for this rule and the underlying resolution.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to the comments made by my friend who just left the microphone and to the claim that we are to have 10 hours for debate. I wish someone would explain. I count 5 hours, if we do not count the rule. We get 5 hours of debate after the debate on the rule is finished.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, we did a calculation, and my guess is we will be out of here about 8 o'clock tonight. I suspect we are not doing anything else today, so I assumed it would be about 10 hours.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Does vote time count as debate time; is that what the gentleman is telling me?

Mr. GOSS. I think some of the better debate takes place during the vote time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Well, I think if the gentleman wants to look at the record, we have 5 hours for debate, not 10 hours of debate, after the rule is completed.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, I will correct my statement to say that we will be applying 10 hours of our day today to this subject.

Mr. MOAKLEY. It is still not a correct statement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, for all Americans, we are now in the "Goldilocks economy". It is not too hot, not too cold, just right, everywhere but on the Republican side and their CBO numbers. Over there it is the "Mamma Bear economy". It is always too cold.

So their CBO numbers right now have the American economy growing at 2.3 percent for this year. Forget the fact that the economy grew at 6.1 percent for the first quarter. Forget the fact that everybody else in America is projecting 3 or 4 percent growth. And guess what that means? That means we have to cut back on how much we can help out on Medicare, how much we can help out on education, how much we can help out on the environment.

The CBO was off by \$100 billion in 1997. They were off by \$75 billion in 1998. And they are off by at least \$50 billion this year. And in July of this year, when the money shows up, guess where it is going. It is going for a tax break for the rich. This money is in something which the Republicans, Senator DOMENICI, is calling right now, he is calling it a tax reduction reserve plan.

That is the Republican plan, a skeleton key for their lock box this July that will take \$50 or \$60 billion for tax breaks for the wealthy. No money for Medicare, no money for education, no money for the environment, but money for those tax breaks. That is the secret plan. That is what this is all about.

They continue to have the remarkable ability to harness voluminous amounts of information to defend knowingly erroneous premises. This debate is a fraud.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). All Members will be reminded that references to Members of the other body are prohibited by House rules.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to point out that it was President Clinton who said on this floor in his first State of the Union that he wanted to use CBO numbers, much to the applause of all the Democrats in this Chamber.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear that this Republican budget has many and serious deficiencies. It is also true of the rule.

The rule, for example, will not allow us to direct our attention to the needs of American veterans. The rule does not allow us to have an amendment come to the floor which will allow us to debate the issue of health care for American veterans. The rule does not allow us to provide very drastically needed additional funds to provide for the health care for the men and women who went to war for this country.

Why do the Republicans refuse to allow us the opportunity to provide adequately for American veterans? It is a tiny amount of money that is needed. It will not disrupt the budget.

Please, I implore my colleagues, make in order as part of the rule an amendment which will allow us to debate the issue of veterans' health care and finally allow us to provide the funds that are necessary to provide for the health care of American veterans at veterans' hospitals across this country.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

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

The question before the House is how do we safeguard Social Security, increase military spending, cut taxes for

the wealthy, and balance the budget without devastating cuts in everything else that is important to many Americans, from veterans' programs to education to law enforcement? The answer is we do not, and we cannot honestly.

On the Republican side they have revived with gusto the magic asterisks of the Reagan years, which are so-called undistributed cuts, meaning we do not know what to do, we are punting, and we will figure it out later, but there will probably be a whole bunch more cuts or we will not deliver on these promises. One or the other has got to give.

Unfortunately, the other budget alternatives before us also come up short in those areas. I tried to offer a progressive budget alternative that was balanced, did not offer tax cuts to the wealthy, protected those programs important to Americans, with modest reductions in the military, and it was not allowed.

It was an honest budget and it was not allowed. It did not have any magic asterisks that say we do not have the slightest idea how we are going to do this, we will just put something in that says we will figure out how to cut later.

This is a dishonest budget with a dishonest debate without a progressive alternative.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. CLEMENT).

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me this time, and I thank the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the rule and to this budget resolution for many reasons, but I want to concentrate on the veterans. Veterans are very important to us because we know how much they have sacrificed in order for us to be free.

I offered an amendment in the Committee on the Budget, as well as an amendment in the Committee on Rules, asking for \$1 billion for the veterans for fiscal year 2000 over and above what the Republicans had requested, which was only \$900 million. What I requested was exactly what the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP), the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, recommended to the Committee on the Budget that was adopted but rejected by the Committee on the Budget. They went with the lower amount.

It is interesting, when I asked the question in the Committee on the Budget, "Why did we go along with the lower amount?" "Well, the uncertainties of the veterans' programs in the future," was the answer.

Well, we know what is happening in Kosovo right now. We also know that a lot of people could get hurt and killed in Kosovo. We know about all the regional and ethnic conflicts in the world that will continue in the future as well,

because we know about our civilization and we know about the struggles for freedom and for fairness. And we also know that we have an obligation to our veterans to do everything we possibly can to help them in time of need. But are we? The Republican budget ignores this recommendation.

In fact, the resolution actually decreases veterans' funding over the next 10 years by \$3 billion. This is simply wrong. In an era with budget surpluses, it is unconscionable to deny our veterans the funds they so desperately need. Yes, we are going to increase the defense budget, which I strongly support, but we are going to deny our veterans.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Paralyzed Veterans of America, Disabled American Veterans, and the American Legion have expressed their strong support of both my amendment as well as opposing the rule. These groups represent millions of veterans across our country who are suffering because their hospitals do not have adequate funds to provide the quality care that they deserve.

For 4 consecutive years the veterans' budget has been essentially stagnant. This means the same inadequate funding for health care, more reductions in full-time employees, and new initiatives without new funding to pay for them. Veterans are growing older and sicker each year and cannot survive on a flat-line budget. The pattern has to end. Vote against the rule, help the veterans of this country once and for all.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the minority whip of the Democratic party.

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

Mr. Speaker, I came back from Hershey, Pennsylvania and I said to myself, I am going to try to work together to keep my anger from spilling over on the floor. And I think I have done a good job this week. But I cannot, on this issue, stand by and not express my extreme displeasure on the way the veterans of this country have been dealt with in this budget.

There is no reason why the Clement amendment should not be made in order; why it was treated the way it was in the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and throughout this whole process. I came here 22-plus years ago, and the Vietnam veterans back then could not get a decent hearing on anything; on Agent Orange; they could not get a decent hearing in this Congress on outreach counseling.

We put together a group called The Vietnam Veterans in Congress and we went to work on that stuff, and we finally got some things and justice done for those veterans. And we are back at the same old game here today: \$3 billion in cuts in the Republican budget. And I might say, while I am talking about their budget, the President's budget is not much better. They are both lousy in terms of our veterans.

We have people in this country who have sacrificed, who have put their lives on the line day after day, month after month, year after year, fighting right now in Kosovo and in Serbia, without the knowledge that they are going to have the benefits that they need in health care and other things when they get out of the service.

Over the top of the building which houses the Department of Veterans Affairs are written the words "To care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan." Those words are meaningless if we do not put our dollars and our hearts behind those words, and we are not doing it. We are not doing it, and it is wrong.

There is a crisis in health care for our veterans in this country. If my colleagues talk to the people who run these hospitals anywhere in America, they will hear that the veterans are not getting the service they deserve. And it seems to me it is only just and right that we vote down this rule so the committee can go back and do its work, and not cut veterans' benefits by \$3 billion while we increase Star Wars and all these other things, while we provide tax benefits for the wealthiest people in this country.

It is not right, it is not just, and I hope my colleagues on this side of the aisle and on that side of the aisle will reject the President's budget on this and the Republican budget on this.

□ 1045

The veterans' organizations are in agreement with us on this. The DAV, the VFW, the Paralyzed American Veterans, AmVets, the organization that I belong to, Vietnam Veterans of America, say "no" on this rule.

Vote "no" on this rule so we can get a decent budget for the people that are fighting for our country right now.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and in opposition to this budget and in support of our Nation's veterans.

This rule does not even allow the veterans of America to have a vote on the budget that they recommended to us to take care of their health needs, to take care of the cemetery needs, to take care of all of the issues which have been left up in the air in the last few years' straight-line budget.

The Democrats in the Committee on Veterans' Affairs could not even have their amendment to raise the budget by \$3.2 billion, which is what the veterans advocate. We were not even allowed a vote in our committee. We went to the Committee on Rules to ask for a vote on this on the floor. The Committee on Rules did not give us a vote.

The veterans of this Nation fought for our country's democracy, fought for

freedom of speech, fought for the right to be heard. And yet their budget is not even allowed to be heard on any committee or on the floor of this House.

Reject this rule. Reject this budget. Vote "yes" for American veterans.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, let us be clear. This budget is a disaster for American veterans and this rule is a disaster for veterans. And that is why this rule is being opposed by almost every major veterans organization in the country, including AmVets, the Blinded Vets, the DAV, the Paralyzed Vets, the VFW, and the Vietnam Vets.

The truth is that the President's budget for veterans is totally inadequate and the Republican budget for vets is even worse. It is unacceptable to me that in a time when some Members of this body want to give tens of billions of dollars in tax breaks to the wealthiest people in this country, we cannot come up with \$3 billion to protect medical care for veterans all over this country.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, by a unanimous vote, the Senate did the right thing and they raised the amount of money available to vets. We need to defeat this rule, send it back, so that we can join in the Senate and say "yes" to our veterans and make sure they get the medical care to which they are entitled.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) has 10½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) has 11 minutes remaining.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that the consideration of this budget has gotten so partisan. Because I tell my colleagues, this area of veterans' health care is an area where we ought to be able to reach bipartisan agreement, as the other body did in a 99-0 vote last night.

We ought to be improving the President's budget in the area of veterans' health care, and instead the Republican budget makes it worse. Over the next 5 years it would cut discretionary spending for veterans, which primarily goes to health care, a total of \$400 million below nominal 1999 levels.

Long-term care issues are going to be increasingly important as our veterans population ages. Making the Adult Day Health Care program permanent could be unobtainable if this resolution is passed.

I fought hard on the Committee on Appropriations for increases to the VA medical research budget, increases that could not be maintained if the Repub-

lican budget passes. Mental health services that are funded through our veterans' centers and which need to be expanded would have to be cut back if the Republican resolution is adopted.

The majority leadership owes this House the opportunity to have a vote on this critical funding. The gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. CLEMENT) deserves a vote on his amendment. Vote against this rule. Vote for the Democratic substitute.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER).

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule, and I also rise in support of the Republican budget.

Listening to the rhetoric from the other side, one would think that the Republican budget cuts veterans' funding. Actually, the Republican budget increases veterans' funding by \$1.1 billion. It is the Clinton-Gore budget that cuts veterans' funding, particularly veterans' health care funding.

Why I support the Republican budget is pretty simple. The Republican budget reflects Republican values of good schools, low taxes, and a secure retirement. It is interesting, when we compare the Clinton-Gore budget with the Republican budget, this is really an historic day.

The Clinton-Gore budget raids the Social Security Trust Fund by \$341 billion, cuts Medicare by almost \$12 billion, cuts veterans' health care, whereas the Republican budget does something that the folks back home have asked for for almost 30 years. We wall off the Social Security Trust Fund.

How often have I heard in a town meeting or in a senior citizens center folks saying, "When are the folks in Washington going to stop dipping into the Social Security Trust Fund for other purposes?" Our budget puts an end to that. We wall off the Social Security Trust Fund and say hands off.

The President wants to spend over \$300 billion in Social Security Trust Fund surpluses on new government spending, not Social Security. We protect Social Security in this budget. We do provide for small tax relief. And I believe we should eliminate the marriage tax penalty. That should be our top priority when it comes to tax relief for families.

The Republican budget pays down the national debt. We increase funding for education by over \$1 billion more than the President requests in his budget, and we provide over a \$1 billion increase in funding for veterans' health care.

I also want to point out the Republican budget rejects the Clinton-Gore cuts in Medicare that hurt our local hospitals.

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

Mr. WELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, let me first of all make the point that in both fiscal year 1998 and fiscal year 1999, the

President of the United States in his budget recommended cuts in veterans.

Many of my colleagues who—well, let me not characterize some of their comments, because I get very concerned when politicians play on the fears of people in this Nation. We have seen it exhibited on this floor in regard to Medicare. We see the administration trying to play on the fears of our seniors on Social Security and Medicare, to the point where a Democratic member of the United States Senate said that they only care about politics, they do not care about the seniors. We see the same kind of rhetoric out here today on veterans.

I wish I had heard a little bit of talk about this when the President's budget director came up to the Committee on the Budget, when it came to the issue of the veterans. For the last 2 fiscal years, the President has recommended cuts in veterans' health care. We recommended increases. Now in this next fiscal year, of course, we have increased the funding for the veterans by \$1 billion.

Now, people come down here and they make an argument there ought to be some amendment in order. I have been in the Congress now, this is my 17th year. Since 1995 we have been in the majority. I never saw amendments made in order. In fact, I did not even see the old majority let a lot of budgets in order.

The fact is, in the last 3 years, we have significantly increased funding for veterans' medical health care. I think the time has come for politicians as we head into the next millennium to stop using the politics of fear in order to scare people, in order to use it as a club.

They have this seminar down at Hershey where we are supposed to have greater comity, to be able to get along better. Well, we should. Maybe that ought to extend to the American people so that we are not beating them up every day and playing to their worst hopes and fears.

The fact is, at the end of the day we do better for veterans in this budget than the President did. And this will be 3 years in a row that we have done a better job than the President has, and at the same time will protect Social Security and Medicare and provide tax relief to the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will advise that the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) has 6½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ).

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, during recent days Members of both parties have spoken very reverently about our sailors and soldiers and Marines, showing their concern for our troops deployed overseas. And I join them. But, unfortunately, they are not doing it here today.

And unfortunately, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) left. There is not \$1 billion over Clinton's budget. There is \$900 million over Clinton's budget in their budget today. And the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) forgot to tell them the other half, that in the subsequent 4 years they eliminate \$3 billion from the budget of the veterans. He should tell them the truth.

And while he is doing that, it is not a small, modest tax break. In that budget, in the first 4 years, there is \$142 billion in tax breaks for the richest in this Nation. And in the next 5 years, they add another \$437 billion, most of which goes to the wealthiest in this Nation. Yes, my colleagues, \$779 billion in tax breaks for the richest in this Nation, and they cannot find \$3 billion for our veterans. Shame on this House.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) a member of the Committee on Rules.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of this fair and balanced rule. It provides for a full and free debate of our Nation's budget priorities.

The House will have the opportunity to debate not only the Republican budget proposal but also the President's budget, as well as two other budgets offered by House Democrats. That is right. Out of the four plans we consider today, three were written by our Democratic friends.

I would like to take a moment to recognize the hard work of my friend from Columbus, Ohio (Mr. KASICH). He is a tireless advocate of balanced budgets, fiscal discipline, and the Republican principles of smaller government and lower taxes. The GOP budget resolution embodies these values.

First and foremost, Mr. Speaker, the Republican budget is honest. It comes to terms with our Nation's true budget situation by recognizing that the surplus that everyone is talking about is really Social Security money. Instead of spending this money, the Republican budget locks away 100 percent of the Social Security surplus to be used only for Social Security benefits, debt reduction, or Medicare reform.

Secondly, the Republican budget is responsible. In 1997 the Republican Congress and President Clinton agreed to a historic balanced budget agreement that has steered our Nation down the path of economic prosperity. In the Republican budget we honor the balanced budget deal we made with the President by sticking to those limitations. Promises made, promises kept; and our country will be better for it.

Further, the GOP budget provides Americans with security today and in their future by investing in our national defense and the education of our children. We wish we could do more in these areas, and we will do more as our budget situation improves and additional resources become available.

It is today's fiscal discipline that will ensure those resources materialize in

the future. When a true budget surplus is achieved, Congress will have the flexibility to bolster our Nation's defense budget, prop up special education, and check off some other items on our wish list.

For Republicans, this wish list includes some long-awaited tax relief for American taxpayers. I, for one, am amazed that the tax rate in America is at its highest level since World War II. These high taxes have real effects on real people's lives. Am I the only one receiving mail and phone calls from students, newlyweds, and young parents who are trying to get ahead in life, only to be set back by crippling tax bills?

One man from my district who was downsized, out of his job, is being taxed at the rate of 28 percent on his severance pay. In frustration, he wrote to me asking why the government is hitting him while he is down. He is trying to put two kids through college. Meanwhile, the government is taking \$700 from him while he is unemployed.

□ 1100

I cannot explain the government's greed, but I can tell him that the Republican budget anticipates giving back some of that surplus to the people who earned it so they can spend their money as they see fit on their priorities.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule, which gives ample opportunity to debate the priorities of both Republicans and Democrats.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS) the ranking member on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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

The irony of today is that as many brave American servicemen and women are joining with our allies in a military campaign to bring an end to uncontrolled aggression, Congress is turning a deaf ear and a blind eye to the health care needs of its veterans.

The budget resolution for next year provides a modest \$900 million increase in funding for veterans' health care. This increase is one-half the increase recommended by the Republican majority of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. It is less than one-third the total increase for VA funding supported by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs Democrats.

Would Members of Congress want to rely for their health care on a health care system as underfunded as the VA's? I doubt it. But Congress apparently has a different, lower standard for health care for our servicemen and women.

Even more troublesome is the fact that its supporters tell us time and time again that it provides an unprecedented increase in funding for veterans' health care. What they fail to say is that the Republican budget provides an unprecedented decrease of \$1.1 billion for Veterans' Affairs in fiscal year 2001.

After years of inadequate funding under both Democratic and Republican administrations, a consensus exists today for the added funding needed to provide veterans with the highest quality health care and other benefits and services that they have earned.

As Republican Members of the House have said, "We must keep our promises to the veterans." I agree. Approving additional funding for veterans' health care as proposed in the Clement substitute and other budget alternatives would do that and would be an important step for this Congress to take if Congress is going to do more than simply talk the talk on veterans' issues.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this year's budget falls far short of providing the funds needed to honor our commitments to our servicemen and women. Even with the increased support last week by the Committee on the Budget, funding for fiscal year 2000 is \$2 billion short of what is needed to provide for our veterans' health and well-being.

The budget falls short in keeping up with medical inflation in our aging veterans population. As our veterans grow older, we must dedicate funds to expand health care programs, expand home and community-based services, build more veterans nursing homes and, yes, build more veterans cemeteries.

Veterans are in a budget disaster. Let me say, there is no surplus when your bills are not paid. Let me repeat that. There is no surplus when all of your bills have not been paid. The veterans have paid their bills, they have served us well. All of us, when the veterans come here, we talk a great talk. It is now time to walk that walk for the veterans.

Mr. Speaker, this year's budget falls well short of providing the funding needed to honor our commitment to our service men and women. Even with the increase voted last week by the Budget Committee, funding for Fiscal Year 2000 is 2 billion dollars short of what is needed to provide for our veterans health and well being.

This budget falls short in keeping up with medical inflation and an aging and vulnerable veterans population. As our veterans grow older, we must dedicate funds to:

1. Expanding long term care programs;
2. Expanding home and community based services;
3. Building more veterans nursing homes; and
4. Building more veterans cemeteries.

Veterans are in a budget disaster.

The Budget Committee increased the figure for veterans health care by \$1.1 billion dollars last week. Given the 3.9 percent rate of health care cost inflation, this is still a flat-line budget. Given the new initiatives VA is to be tasked with, this is still a flat-line budget. A flat-line budget is still a budget reduction.

We've all heard talk about giving away the budget surplus. There is no surplus when all

the bills have not been paid. Last week, many of us on the Veterans' Affairs Committee who see this need spelled it out in detail in our "Additional and Dissenting Views and Estimates."

This was after Mr. EVANS attempted to introduce a proposal within the Committee calling for adding 3 billion dollars to the Administration budget. That debate was not permitted.

Mr. Speaker, this was not a partisan effort. It was a simple statement of dollars and common sense. We need an opportunity to present the case to the full House for more funding for veterans programs.

Mr. Speaker, this is still not a partisan effort. In all fairness, we need a rule that allows such a discussion.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY).

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I have worked well with the Republicans since coming to Congress. I think it is important to try to work together. But what this Republican budget does is cross that line of reason. This is a bait and switch budget. Republicans are saying with one hand, look at all the good things we are doing over here and then with the other hand they are cutting programs and not telling you what they are doing.

Let me give my colleagues an example. Education. They say, "Well, we're increasing education," and they are in spots. But on the other hand they are cutting in the year 2000 \$1.2 billion of the education budget.

Democrats are extending the life of Social Security to the year 2050. The Republicans make doing nothing about extending the life of Social Security just sound good. The same is true for the Medicare budget. The life of the program is not extended one day under this bait and switch budget.

All of this so they can talk about a tax cut. Now, I support tax cuts, but I think a \$779 billion tax cut is too much while we have ignored the fact that we are not adding one day to Social Security or Medicare solvency.

Oppose the rule on this bait and switch budget.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. WISE).

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, budgets are about priorities. That is where this Republican budget falls so short. It fails to adequately protect Social Security with the guarantees that are needed. It does nothing to protect Medicare, to extend it beyond its insolvency date of 2008. And, Mr. Speaker, on veterans it falls woefully short.

I come from the State, West Virginia, with the highest number of veterans per capita in the Nation. I cannot go back and point to this budget and say that I voted for it. Today, Mr. Speaker, the next generation of veterans are being forged in the fire over Kosovo. Yet this budget does not say to them, we recognize that sacrifice. Yes, it gives an increase of \$900 million the first year, trails off and disappears in

the years to come. This is a totally inadequate budget for veterans.

So we want to talk about priorities. Bad on Social Security, bad on Medicare, woefully short on veterans. This is not about families and veterans. This is a bad priority, Mr. Speaker, and it is a bad budget. I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, every day I rise, come in and listen to people come to the well and talk about how they support the troops. Well, I think that every surviving troop becomes a veteran and that is not acknowledged in this bill.

Regardless of what is being said, even the veterans have read this bill and they understand that they have not been treated well. We have homeless veterans, we have dwindling health care being offered to the veterans. It is unconscionable that we present a budget like this that treats our veterans in the fashion in which they have been treated in this budget. There is no real future for America that is reflected in this budget, you see, because education has been cheated, Medicare has not been addressed. We have got a lock box that has a trap door. The guardians of the privilege, they are doing well in this budget. They are taking care of the rich in this budget but they are ignoring the working people of this country. This is Robin Hood in reverse.

I ask everyone to vote against this rule.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), a colleague on the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, what we are engaged in here today is the debate that always takes place in Washington, and that is over how much money can we spend, how much bigger can we make government, and then how we are going to fight to try and save this country.

The bottom line is there is no doubt that the choices today are clear. The President prefers the status quo. He prefers bigger government. And he prefers that the government be the answer or the solution to America's problems. Republicans place our faith in families, communities and the marketplace to solve our Nation's ills. This is just yet another chapter in the string of successes of what will be for this country and for the Republican Congress. Welfare reform, a balanced budget, and tax relief are all successes that this President and his party at one time or another fought vehemently and now campaign and act like they were their ideas.

The bottom line is that the Republican Party offers a simple message. There is only one way to speak honestly to the American people, and it is called discipline. It is called dedicating 100 percent of Social Security dollars for Social Security and Medicare. The

Republican plan dedicates 100 percent. The difference between 100 percent and 62 percent will be clear to the American public. There is one thing that Democrats do do and that is that they fully fund big government. Their budgets increase government spending across the board. In fact, the President's budget busts the bipartisan spending agreement that we had just 2 years ago. He increases spending by more than \$200 billion in new domestic spending, creating over 120 new government programs.

Mr. Speaker, our message is plain and simple. We will keep producing ideas worth being stolen by the Democrats, but we are going to take credit for this one. It is called discipline and doing what we said we would do.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking member on the Committee on the Budget.

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

This rule allows just 2 hours of general debate for a budget with \$1.7 trillion of spending authority. That is a travesty. Let me tell my colleagues how this kind of haste makes waste, just one way that you can mask the numbers in a debate so short about a matter so complex as the budget. This budget, as now drafted, this Republican budget resolution, means that our military personnel will not get the 4.4 percent pay raise that the Joint Chiefs of Staff asked for and the troops thought they were promised by the President and the Congress. The Republican resolution does provide extra money for defense, but nothing for an increase in military retirement benefits, nothing for extra pay raises to help retain critical personnel.

Now, we were able to ferret this out because every pay raise requires a corresponding increase in the contribution to the military retirement trust fund, function 950 of the budget. Look at function 950 in their budget, the Republican budget. There is no entry, no adjustment, no provision for these major pay increases, these major retirement reforms that have been promised. They are in ours. We followed the President's lead. We did it right, they did it wrong.

You pass this budget and everybody is on notice. Unless you do the numbers in this resolution over, you are breaking faith with our troops. You are denying them the pay raises and the benefits that they have been told were coming. This is no way to treat the armed services. The same goes for the civil service. The same mistake has been made.

I yield to the gentleman from Virginia to explain that briefly.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, not only does this Republican budget resolution not fund military pay raises, but on a party line vote they refused to treat civilian Federal employees the same as military

employees as has been done for 50 years. It breaks a precedent, it is not fair to any Federal civilian employees around the country. It is a resolution that should be defeated.

Mr. Speaker, when the budget resolution was before the committee last week I offered an amendment which would have ensured that federal civilian and military employees received equitable and fair pay raises for the next ten years as they have for the last fifty years.

I expected that the amendment would be noncontroversial and pass. After all, the President recommended a 4.4 percent increase for military and civilian employees, and the Senate recommended a 4.8 percent increase for both.

So, I was surprised by the vehement objections raised by those on the other side of the aisle. It failed on a party line vote. Yesterday, I learned why.

You see, House Republicans do not support a fair pay raise for either the civilian federal employees or the military. They did not include any funding above the baseline for either the military or civilian retirement trust funds—funding which would be required if they favored a fair pay raise.

They couldn't afford it because of their \$779 billion tax cut. Mr. Kasich admitted this yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, federal employees have contributed over \$220 billion toward deficit reduction in the last decade in foregone pay and benefits. The sacrifices made by our military personnel in the name of deficit reduction have been significant.

We have downsized more than a quarter million civilian Federal employees over the last year, so those remaining must work much harder with far fewer resources.

The time has come to restore fair and equitable pay raises for these men and women who have dedicated their careers and, for many, their lives to serving their country.

Mr. SPRATT. Function 950 of this budget is fatally flawed. That is the best reason yet to vote against the rule.

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

I urge a "no" vote on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to make in order the Clement amendment which does increase the Veterans' Affairs function by \$1.9 billion. We made a promise to our veterans and this country must keep our promise.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 131 To BE OFFERED IF THE PREVIOUS QUESTION IS DEFEATED

TO MAKE IN ORDER AN AMENDMENT TO KEEP OUR PROMISES TO OUR VETERANS

On page 2, line 23, before "..." insert the following:

"or in section 3 of this resolution. The amendment in section 3 of the resolution shall be considered before the amendments in the nature of substitutes printed in the report, may be offered only by Representative CLEMENT of Tennessee or his designee, shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment nor to a demand for a division of the question"

At the end of the resolution, add the following new section:

SECTION 3.

**Amendment to H. Con. Res. 68, as Reported
Offered by Mr. Clement of Tennessee**

In paragraph (16) of section 3 (relating to Veterans Benefits and Services (700)) increase budget authority and outlays by the following amounts to reflect fundings for veterans' medical care:

(1) For fiscal year 2000, \$1 billion in new budget authority and \$900 million in outlays.

(2) For fiscal year 2001, \$3.2 billion in new budget authority and \$2.822 million in outlays.

(3) For fiscal year 2002, \$3.283 billion in new budget authority and \$3.106 million in outlays.

(4) For fiscal year 2003, \$3.369 billion in new budget authority and \$3.283 million in outlays.

(5) For fiscal year 2004, \$3.456 billion in new budget authority and \$3.423 million in outlays.

(6) For fiscal year 2005, \$3.546 billion in new budget authority and \$3.512 million in outlays.

(7) For fiscal year 2006, \$3.638 billion in new budget authority and \$3.603 million in outlays.

(8) For fiscal year 2007, \$3.733 billion in new budget authority and \$3.697 million in outlays.

(9) For fiscal year 2008, \$3.830 billion in new budget authority and \$3.793 million in outlays.

(10) For fiscal year 2009, \$3.929 billion in new budget authority and \$2.891 million in outlays.

In paragraph (1) of section 3 (relating to national defense (050)) reduce budget authority and outlays by the following amounts:

(1) For fiscal year 2000, \$1 billion in new budget authority and \$900 million in outlays.

(2) For fiscal year 2001, \$3.2 billion in new budget authority and \$2.822 million in outlays.

(3) For fiscal year 2002, \$3.283 billion in new budget authority and \$3.106 million in outlays.

(4) For fiscal year 2003, \$3.369 billion in new budget authority and \$3.283 million in outlays.

(5) For fiscal year 2004, \$3.456 billion in new budget authority and \$3.423 million in outlays.

(6) For fiscal year 2005, \$3.546 billion in new budget authority and \$3.512 million in outlays.

(7) For fiscal year 2006, \$3.638 billion in new budget authority and \$3.603 million in outlays.

(8) For fiscal year 2007, \$3.733 billion in new budget authority and \$3.697 million in outlays.

(9) For fiscal year 2008, \$3.830 billion in new budget authority and \$3.793 million in outlays.

(10) For fiscal year 2009, \$3.929 billion in new budget authority and \$3.891 million in outlays.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I predicted in the Committee on Rules meeting yesterday that the Democrats would trot out the veterans one more time and use them as a pawn in a political battle to try and force a vote. It is even more clear that they are pawns when we see that six people who spoke on behalf of the veterans today, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr.

GUTIERREZ), the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER), the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. Brown) are all members of the Progressive Caucus which has put its own budget forth in which they are cutting defense spending by nearly \$220 billion over 5 years. In a time when 11,000 military families are on food stamps, they want to cut funding for the military even further, it seems that they are far more concerned about using the veterans as a political pawn than they are allowing our own active members of the military enough income to provide for food for their own families.

This has been trotted out virtually every year that I have been here. I have said that they would use the veterans on a vote against the previous question. I urge all Members to vote in favor of the previous question, to vote for a rule that gives a fair opportunity to be heard on several Democrat alternatives to the Republican budget.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following extraneous material for the RECORD:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON RULES,
Washington, DC, March 24, 1999.

Hon. DENNY HASTERLT,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: As you know, H. Con. Res. 68, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for FY 2000, was filed by the Committee on the Budget on Tuesday, March 23. As reported, H. Con. Res. 68 contains matters within the jurisdiction of the Rules Committee.

Specifically, Section 5 (the Safe Deposit Box for Social Security Surpluses), which establishes a point of order against consideration of a budget resolution, an amendment thereto or any conference report thereon which provides for a deficit in any fiscal year, falls solely within the jurisdiction of the Rules Committee. Although the Rules Committee has not sought to exercise its original jurisdiction prerogatives on this legislation pursuant to section 301(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Committee has discussed these provisions with the Budget Committee. It is the understanding of the Rules Committee that the Leadership has scheduled the resolution for floor consideration on Thursday, March 25. In recognition of these facts, I agree to waive the Rules Committee's jurisdiction over consideration of this legislation at this time.

Nevertheless, I reserve the jurisdiction of the Rules Committee over all bills relating to the rules, joint rules and the order of business of the House, including any bills relating to the congressional budget process. Furthermore, it would be my intention to seek to have the Rules Committee represented on any conference committee on this concurrent resolution.

Sincerely,

DAVID DREIER.

THE PREVIOUS QUESTION VOTE: WHAT IT MEANS

The previous question is a motion made in order under House Rule XVII and is the only parliamentary device in the House used for closing debate and preventing amendment. The effect of adopting the previous question

is to bring the resolution to an immediate, final vote. The motion is most often made at the conclusion of debate on a rule or any motion or piece of legislation considered in the House prior to final passage. A Member might think about ordering the previous question in terms of answering the question: Is the House ready to vote on the bill or amendment before it?

In order to amend a rule (other than by using those procedures previously mentioned), the House must vote against ordering the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, the House is in effect, turning control of the Floor over to the Minority party.

If the previous question is defeated, the Speaker then recognizes the Member who led the opposition to the previous question (usu-

ally a Member of the Minority party) to control an additional hour of debate during which a germane amendment may be offered to the rule. The Member controlling the Floor then moves the previous question on the amendment and the rule. If the previous question is ordered, the next vote occurs on the amendment followed by a vote on the rule as amended.

DEBATE & AMENDMENTS ON HOUSE BUDGET RESOLUTIONS

[Fiscal year 1990-99]

Year	Budget Res.	Rule Number	General Debate Time	Amendments Allowed	Vote on Rule	Total Time Consumed ¹
1999	H. Con. Res. 284	H. Res. 455	3 hrs. (1 HH) ²	3 (1-D 1-R)	Adopted: 216-197	6 hrs.
1998	H. Con. Res. 84	H. Res. 152	5 hrs. (1 HH) ³	5 (3-D 2-R)	Adopted: 278-142	7 hrs.
1997	H. Con. Res. 178	H. Res. 435	3 hrs. ⁴	3 (2-D 1-R)	Adopted: 227-196	6 hrs.
1996	H. Con. Res. 67	H. Res. 149	6 hrs. ⁵	4 (2-D 2-R)	Adopted: 255-168	10 hrs.
1995	H. Con. Res. 218	H. Res. 384	4 hrs. (1 HH) ⁶	5 (3-D 2-R)	Adopted: 245-171	9 hrs.
1994	H. Con. Res. 64	H. Res. 131	10 hrs. (4 HH) ⁷	Adopted: voice vote	Adopted: 251-172	16 hrs.
		H. Res. 133			Adopted: 239-182	
1993	H. Con. Res. 287	H. Res. 396	3 hrs. (1 HH) ⁸	3 (1-D 2-R)	Adopted: 392-9	13 1/2 hrs.
1992	H. Con. Res. 121	H. Res. 123	5 hrs. (2 HH) ⁹	4 (1-D 3-R)	Adopted: voice vote	11 hrs.
1991	H. Con. Res. 310	H. Res. 382	6 hrs. (3 HH) ¹⁰	4 (1-D 3-R)	Adopted: voice vote	13 hrs.
1990	H. Con. Res. 106	H. Res. 145	5 hrs. (2 HH) ¹¹	5 (3-D 2-R)	Adopted: voice vote	12 1/2 hrs.

¹ Includes hour on rule, general debate time, and debate time on all amendments. Does not include time taken on rollcall votes and walking around time.

² The 3 hours of general debate were allocated as follows: 2 hrs. Budget Committee and 1 hr. (HH) between Rep. Saxton of New Jersey and Representative Stark of California. Additional debate time on amendments was as follows: 1 hr. Neumann and 1 hr. Spratt.

³ The resolution provided for an additional 20 minutes of debate controlled by Representative Minge of Minnesota. Additional debate time for amendments: 20 min. Waters, 20 min. Doolittle, 20 min. Brown, 20 min. Kennedy and 20 min. Shuster.

⁴ Additional debate time for amendments: 1 hr. Payne, 1 hr. Orton and 1 hr. Sabo. The resolution provided for an additional 40 minutes of general debate, following the conclusion of consideration of the proposed amendments, divided and controlled equally by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Budget Committee.

⁵ Additional debate time for amendments: 1 hr. Gephardt, 1 hr. Neumann, 1 hr. Payne and 1 hr. by the minority leader. The rule provided for a final ten minute period of general debate following the disposition of the amendments.

⁶ In addition to the hour on HH, Reps. Kasich and Mfume was each given 1 hr. of general debate time to discuss their substitutes. This was followed by 5 substitutes under "king of the hill" (1 hr. Frank, 1 hr. Solomon, 1 hr. Mfume, 1 hr. Kasich, 1 hr. for the final substitute identical to the reported budget resolution).

⁷ The 4 hrs. of general debate were allocated: 2 hrs. Budget Committee, 4 hrs. HH, 2 hrs. to discuss the Mfume substitute, 1 hr. to discuss the Solomon substitute, followed by 4 substitutes under "king of the hill" (2 hrs. Kasich, 1 hr. Solomon, 1 hr. Mfume and 1 hr. Sabo (identical to the base resolution)).

⁸ Three substitutes were allowed under "king of the hill" (30 min. Dannemeyer, 1 hr. Gragdon, 8 hrs. Towns-Dellums).

⁹ Of the 4 amendments allowed, the first was a perfecting amendment by Rep. Ford of Michigan for which 1 hr. was allowed, followed by three substitutes under "king of the hill" (1 hr. Dannemeyer, 1 hr. Kasich, 2 hrs. Gragdon).

¹⁰ General debate began on April 25th under an unanimous consent request agreed to April 24th. Four substitutes were allowed under "king of the hill" (1 hr. Kasich, 1 hr. Dannemeyer, 2 hrs. Dellums, 2 hrs. Frenzel).

¹¹ Of the five amendments, one was an amendment by the Chairman of the Budget Committee, 30 mins., followed by 4 substitutes under "king of the hill" (1 hr. Dannemeyer, 3 hrs. Dellums, 1 hr. Kasich, 1 hr. Gephardt).

Source: Rules Committee Calendars (Note: HH stands for Humphrey-Hawkins debate which relates to the economic goals and policies underlying the economic projections assumed in the baseline of the budget resolution).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill because it prohibits the open and free amendment process that governs most of our budgetary and appropriations debates.

This debate that we will engage in later today is an important one for the American people. We will be deciding the future of our Social Security system. We will be deciding the fate of the Medicare system. Our constituents care about these programs, because they know just how valuable they are.

Earlier this week, I met with several senior citizens groups in my district, which resides in Houston, Texas. Without exception, each of them relayed their concerns to me that both the Social Security and Medicare systems should not have their benefits reduced in any way. They were also concerned about the longevity of both programs—and making sure that Medicare and Social Security will be here for their children, and their children's children.

This puts into proper perspective the gravity of our chore. Without a completely open rule, we cannot dissect the Republican resolution and directly address the concerns of our constituents.

Having said that, I am thankful that the rule contains provisions which allow for the debate of the Democratic substitute to this bill, sponsored by Ranking Member SPRATT. I only wish that we would have a more extensive debate on that amendment—meaning more than 40 minutes, so that my Democratic colleagues could voice their support for the measure.

I urge each of my colleagues to vote against the rule, and to vote for the Democratic substitute when it comes to the floor for consideration.

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

□ 1115

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. 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.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, 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 resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 203, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 72]

YEAS—224

Aderholt	Bonilla	Combest	Hilleary	Oxley	Tancredo
Archer	Bono	Condit	Hobson	Packard	Tauzin
Armey	Bryant	Cook	Hoekstra	Paul	Taylor (NC)
Bachus	Burr	Cooksey	Horn	Pease	Terry
Baker	Burton	Cox	Hostettler	Peterson (MN)	Thomas
Ballenger	Buyer	Crane	Houghton	Peterson (PA)	Thornberry
Barrett (NE)	Callahan	Cubin	Hulshof	Petri	Thune
Bartlett	Calvert	Cunningham	Hunter	Pickering	Tiahrt
Barton	Camp	Davis (VA)	Hutchinson	Pitts	Toomey
Bass	Campbell	Deal	Hyde	Pombo	Upton
Bateman	Canady	DeLay	Isakson	Porter	Walden
Bereuter	Cannon	DeMint	Istook	Portman	Walsh
Biggert	Castle	Diaz-Balart	Jenkins	Pryce (OH)	Wamp
Bilbray	Chabot	Dickey	Johnson (CT)	Quinn	Watkins
Bilirakis	Chambliss	Doolittle	Johnson, Sam	Radanovich	Watts (OK)
Biley	Chenoweth	Dreier	Jones (NC)	Ramstad	Weldon (FL)
Blunt	Coble	Duncan	Kasich	Regula	Weldon (PA)
Boehlert	Coburn	Dunn	Kelly	Reynolds	Weller
Boehner	Collins	Ehlers			

Whitfield
Wicker

NAYS—203

Abercrombie Hall (OH)
Ackerman Hastings (FL)
Allen Hill (IN)
Andrews Hilliard
Baird Hinckey
Baldacci Hinojosa
Baldwin Hoeffel
Barcia Holden
Barrett (WI) Holt
Becerra Hooley
Bentsen Hoyer
Berkley Inslee
Berman Jackson (IL)
Berry Jackson-Lee
Bishop (TX)
Blagojevich Jefferson
Blumenauer John
Bonior Johnson, E. B.
Borski Jones (OH)
Boswell Kanjorski
Boucher Kaptur
Boyd Kennedy
Brady (PA) Kildee
Brown (CA) Kilpatrick
Brown (FL) Kind (WI)
Brown (OH) Kleczka
Capps Klink
Capuano Kucinich
Cardin LaFalce
Carson Lampson
Clay Lantos
Clayton Larson
Clement Lee
Clyburn Levin
Conyers Lewis (GA)
Costello Lipinski
Coyne Lofgren
Cramer Lucas (KY)
Crowley Luther
Danner Maloney (CT)
Davis (FL) Maloney (NY)
Davis (IL) Markey
DeFazio Martinez
DeGette Mascara
Delahunt Matsui
DeLauro McCarthy (MO)
Deutsch McCarthy (NY)
Dicks McDermott
Dingell McGovern
Dixon McIntyre
Doggett McKinney
Dooley McNulty
Doyle Meehan
Edwards Meeks (FL)
Eshoo Meeks (NY)
Etheridge Menendez
Evans Millender-Visclosky
Farr McDonald
Fattah Miller, George
Filner Minge
Ford Mink
Frank (MA) Moakley
Frost Mollohan
Gejdenson Moore
Gephart Moran (VA)
Gonzalez Murtha
Gordon Nadler
Green (TX) Napolitano
Gutierrez Neal

NOT VOTING—7

Barr Emerson
Brady (TX) Engel
Cummings Lowey

□ 1134

Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. BISHOP changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. PICKERING, HORN, STUMP, BISHOP and JONES of North Carolina changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 73, my voting card was not operable and is now being replaced. Had the voting card worked, I would have voted "aye."

Wilson
Wolf

Young (AK)
Young (FL)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 194, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 73]

AYES—228

Aderholt	Gilman	Pease	Brown (OH)	Kind (WI)
Archer	Goode	Peterson (MN)	Capps	Kleczka
Armey	Goodlatte	Peterson (PA)	Capuano	Sanchez
Bachus	Goodling	Petri	Cardin	Sanders
Baker	Goss	Pickering	Carson	LaFalce
Ballenger	Graham	Pitts	Clay	Sandin
Barrett (NE)	Granger	Pombo	Clayton	Sawyer
Bartlett	Green (WI)	Porter	Clement	Schakowsky
Barton	Greenwood	Portman	Clyburn	Scott
Bass	Gutknecht	Pryce (OH)	Conyers	Serrano
Bateman	Hall (TX)	Quinn	Costello	Sherman
Bereuter	Hansen	Radanovich	Coyne	Shows
Berry	Hastings (WA)	Ramstad	Crowley	Stark
Biggert	Hayes	Regula	Cummings	Strickland
Bilbray	Hayworth	Reynolds	Danner	Tauscher
Bilirakis	Hefley	Riley	Davis (FL)	Snyder
Bishop	Herger	Rogan	Davis (IL)	Spratt
Bono	Hostettler	Ryun (KS)	DeFazio	Stabenow
Boyd	Boyd	Rogers	DeGette	Thurman
Bryant	Hulshof	Salmon	Dixon	Towns
Boehlert	Hobson	Ros-Lehtinen	Doggett	Traficant
Burton	Hoeckstra	Roukema	DeLauro	Taylor (MS)
Callahan	Horn	Royce	Deutsch	Thompson (MS)
Calvert	Isakson	Ryan (WI)	Dicks	McCarthy (NY)
Camp	Istook	Smith (KS)	Dingell	McDermott
Campbell	Jenkins	Sessions	Dixon	Tierney
Canady	John	Shadegg	Evans	Strickland
Cannon	Johnson, Sam	Shaw	Farr	Tauscher
Castle	Jones (NC)	Shays	Fattah	Turner
Chabot	Kasich	Sherwood	Dooley	Udall (CO)
Chambliss	Kelly	Shimkus	Doyle	Udall (NM)
Chenoweth	King (NY)	Shuster	Deutsch	McCarthy (NY)
Coble	Kingston	Simpson	Edwards	Meek (FL)
Coburn	Knollenberg	Siskiyou	Eshoo	Velazquez
Collins	Kolbe	Skeen	Etheridge	Meeks (NY)
Combest	Kuykendall	Smith (MI)	Frost	Vento
Condit	LaHood	Smith (NJ)	Gajdenson	Evans
Cook	Largent	Smith (TX)	Gephart	Menendez
Cooksey	Latham	Souder	Gordon	Farr
Cox	LaTourette	Spence	Green (TX)	McDonald
Cramer	Lazio	Stearns	Gutierrez	Miller, George
Crane	Leach	Stenholm	Hall (OH)	Waxman
Cubin	Lewis (CA)	Stump	Emerson	Weiner
Cunningham	Lewis (KY)	Sununu		Weygand
Davis (VA)	Linder	Sweeney		Wise
Deal	LoBiondo	Talent		Woolsey
DeLay	Lucas (OK)	Tancredo		Wu
DeMint	Manzullo	Tanner		Wynn
Diaz-Balart	McCollum	Tauzin		
Dickey	McCrary	Taylor (NC)		
Doolittle	McHugh	Terry		
Dreier	McInnis	Thomas		
Duncan	McIntosh	Thompson (CA)		
Dunn	McKeon	Thornberry		
Ehlers	Metcalf	Thune		
Ehrlich	Mica	Tiahrt		
English	Miller (FL)	Toomey		
Everett	Miller, Gary	Upton		
Ewing	Minge	Walden		
Fletcher	Moran (KS)	Walsh		
Foley	Morella	Wamp		
Forbes	Myrick	Watkins		
Fossella	Nethercutt	Watts (OK)		
Fowler	Ney	Weldon (FL)		
Frelinghuysen	Northup	Weller		
Gallegly	Norwood	Whitfield		
Ganske	Nussle	Wicker		
Gekas	Ose	Wilson		
Gibbons	Oxley	Wolf		
Gilcrest	Packard	Young (AK)		
Gillmor	Paul	Young (FL)		

NOES—194

Abercrombie	Hastings (FL)	Oberstar
Ackerman	Hill (IN)	Obey
Allen	Hilliard	Olver
Andrews	Hinchey	Ortiz
Baird	Owens	Owens
Baldacci	Pallone	Pallone
Baldwin	Pascrell	Pascrell
Barcia	Pastor	Pastor
Barrett (WI)	Payne	Phelps
Becerra	Pelosi	Pickett
Bentsen	Phelps	Pomeroy
Berkley	Pickett	Price (NC)
Berman	Pomeroy	Rahall
Berry	Price (NC)	Rangel
Bishop	Rahall	Reyes
Blagojevich	Rangel	Rivers
Blumenauer	Reyes	Rodriguez
Bonior	Rodriguez	Roemer
Borski	Roemer	Rothman
Boswell	Kanjorski	Royal-Allard
Boucher	Kaptur	Rush
Boyd	Kaptur	Sabo
Brady (PA)	Kaput	Sanchez
Brown (CA)	Kaptur	Sanders
Brown (FL)	Kaptur	Sandin
Brown (OH)	Kaptur	Sawyer
Capps	Kaptur	Schakowsky
Capuano	Kaptur	Smith (WA)
Cardin	Kaptur	Snyder
Carson	Kaptur	Spratt
Clay	Kaptur	Stabenow
Clayton	Kaptur	Thurman
Clement	Kaptur	Towns
Clyburn	Kaptur	Traficant
Conyers	Kaptur	Turner
Costello	Kaptur	Udall (CO)
Coyne	Kaptur	Udall (NM)
Cramer	Kaptur	Waxman
Crowley	Kaptur	Weiner
Danner	Kaptur	Wexler
Davis (FL)	Kaptur	Weygand
Davis (IL)	Kaptur	Wise
DeFazio	Kaptur	Woolsey
DeGette	Kaptur	Wu
Delahunt	Kaptur	Wynn
DeLauro	Kaptur	
Deutsch	Kaptur	
Dicks	Kaptur	
Dingell	Kaptur	
Dixon	Kaptur	
Doggett	Kaptur	
Dooley	Kaptur	
Doyle	Kaptur	
Edwards	Kaptur	
Eshoo	Kaptur	
Etheridge	Kaptur	
Evans	Kaptur	
Farr	Kaptur	
Fattah	Kaptur	
Filner	Kaptur	
Ford	Kaptur	
Frank (MA)	Kaptur	
Frost	Kaptur	
Gejdenson	Kaptur	
Gephart	Kaptur	
Gordon	Kaptur	
Green (TX)	Kaptur	
Gutierrez	Kaptur	
Hall (OH)	Kaptur	

NOT VOTING—11

Barr	Engel	Lowey
Brady (TX)	Franks (NJ)	Stupak
Buyer	Gonzalez	Weldon (PA)
Emerson	Johnson (CT)	

□ 1144

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I was unavoidably detained during rollcall Nos. 72 and 73 due to medical reasons. Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 72 and "yea" on rollcall No. 73.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 72 and 73, I was not present due to a