

Whitfield Wilson Young (AK)  
Wicker Wolf Young (FL)

NAYS—203

Abercrombie Hall (OH)  
Ackerman Hastings (FL)  
Allen Hill (IN)  
Andrews Hilliard  
Baird Hinchey  
Baldacci Hinojosa  
Baldwin Hoefel  
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 Meek (FL)  
Eshoo Meeks (NY)  
Etheridge Menendez  
Evans Millender-  
Farr McDonald  
Fattah Miller, George  
Filner Minge  
Ford Mink  
Frank (MA) Moakley  
Frost Mollohan  
Gejdenson Moore  
Gephardt Moran (VA)  
Gonzalez Murtha  
Gordon Nadler  
Green (TX) Napolitano  
Gutierrez Neal

NOT VOTING—7

Barr Emerson Stupak  
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."

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  
Archer Goode Peterson (MN)  
Armey Goodlatte Peterson (PA)  
Bachus Goodling Petri  
Baker Goss Pickering  
Ballenger Graham Pitts  
Barrett (NE) Granger Pombo  
Bartlett Green (WI) Porter  
Barton Greenwood Portman  
Bass Gutknecht Pryce (OH)  
Bateman Hall (TX) Quinn  
Bereuter Hansen Radanovich  
Berry Hastings (WA) Ramstad  
Biggart Hayes Regula  
Bilbray Hayworth Reynolds  
Bilirakis Hefley Riley  
Bishop Herger Rogan  
Bliley Hill (MT) Rogers  
Blunt Hilleary Rohrabacher  
Boehert Hobson Ros-Lehtinen  
Boehner Hoekstra Roukema  
Bonilla Horn Royce  
Bono Hostettler Ryan (WI)  
Boyd Houghton Ryun (KS)  
Bryant Hulshof Salmon  
Burr Hunter Sanford  
Burton Hutchinson Saxton  
Callahan Hyde Scarborough  
Calvert Isakson Schaffer  
Camp Istook Sensenbrenner  
Campbell Jenkins Sessions  
Canady John Shadegg  
Cannon Johnson, Sam Shaw  
Castle Jones (NC) Shays  
Chabot Kasich Sherwood  
Chambliss Kelly Shimkus  
Chenoweth King (NY) Shuster  
Coble Kingston Simpson  
Coburn Knollenberg Sisisky  
Collins Kolbe Skeen  
Combest Kuykendall Smith (MI)  
Condit LaHood Smith (NJ)  
Cook Largent Smith (TX)  
Cooksey Latham Souder  
Cox LaTourette Spence  
Cramer Lazio Stearns  
Crane Leach Stenholm  
Cubin Lewis (CA) Stump  
Cunningham Lewis (KY) Sununu  
Davis (VA) Linder Sweeney  
Deal LoBiondo Talent  
DeLay Lucas (OK) Tancredo  
DeMint Manzullo Tanner  
Diaz-Balart McCollum Tauzin  
Dickey McCreery Taylor (NC)  
Doolittle McHugh Terry  
Dreier McNinnis 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 Watts (OK) Watts (OK)  
Fowler Ney Weldon (FL)  
Frelinghuysen Ney Weller  
Gallegly Northup Whitfield  
Ganske Norwood Wicker  
Gekas Nussle Wilson  
Gibbons Ose Wolf  
Gilchrist Oxley Young (AK)  
Gillmor Packard Young (FL)

NOES—194

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

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

family emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Pursuant to House Resolution 131 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 68.

□ 1148

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution (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 fiscal years 2001 through 2009, with Mr. CAMP in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, today we offer the first budget of the next century and a new agenda for the new millennium. I think this is a great day for the House, because we have been able to move forward from an era not very long ago when, as we looked out across the horizon, the economic horizon of this country, we saw deficits as far as the eye could see.

The majority came into its position in 1995 when we first advanced the need for economic stimulus driven by tax relief, giving more power, providing more incentives for risk-taking, and at the same time a big dose of fiscal restraint; in other words, starting to get the Congress of the United States to live within its means.

The fact is that in 1995, Mr. Greenpan, the chairman of the Federal Reserve System, said that if you can offer a legitimate and credible plan to balance the Federal budget, he said that he believed that interest rates would decline by 2 points.

I must also remind Members that in 1995, as we assumed control of the

House of Representatives, interest rates had been rising, the economy had been slowing, there was concern about unemployment. The fact that we laid down a plan that would begin to put our fiscal house in order, to put us in a position where the Congress of the United States would operate really like the American family, and that we would restore some of the incentives to risk-take, I believe that has contributed significantly to the economic gains that we have had in this country.

Now today, as we stand here, as I stand here in the well, we are about to pass a budget that not only captures the surpluses of Medicare and social security, but at the same time has the on-budget surpluses that so many people have sought for years.

In other words, when we take a look at the balance sheets of the Federal Government, both in the social security and Medicare accounts and in the non-social security and Medicare accounts, we have been able to achieve not only a balanced budget, but also some huge surpluses.

Let me say, at the outset, we are doing something that the Congress of the United States has never done: We are taking all the payroll taxes that we collect every day that are related to social security and Medicare and we are locking them into an account so that the politicians, Republicans and Democrats, cannot raid those accounts for any other spending item.

That money will sit in an account, and until we enact a plan that actually saves social security, that money will be used to pay down part of the Federal debt. Last year we paid down about \$50 billion of the debt. Most Americans do not know that. This year we would anticipate paying down at least \$125 billion of the national debt.

Of course, if I was a citizen listening to somebody in the well of this House make that claim, I would greet it with great skepticism, but the fact is that what I am saying is true. Last year the publicly-held debt was paid down by \$50 billion, and in fact this year we anticipate at least \$125 billion of the publicly-held debt to be retired.

That does not allow us to rest on our laurels, by any stretch of the imagination, because we must work every day to make the power of government less and the power of people greater. We need to run America from the bottom up, so people can have control over the education for their children, so that the baby boomers and the younger generation can have hope of having a decent retirement by having more control, so Americans can have more money in their pockets.

The fact is, as it relates to social security and Medicare, we know those programs have to be transformed, and not just to protect the retirement benefits of our seniors today. I would argue that that is a given. Because of a pay-as-you-go system, we know that the baby boomers are able to carry the load of their parents, but I want the

momms and dads of this country to realize that the people who are really at risk are their children. I want mom and dad who are on social security and Medicare to realize that we are going to stand up and protect their benefits, but it is their children, their baby boomer sons and daughters, who are at risk.

We must have the courage to transform this system so that the benefits just do not accrue to our seniors today, but that our baby boomers and their children will also have retirement security. Sad to say that the President has taken a leave of absence on this. He is missing-in-action as it relates to the issue of social security and Medicare.

Just last week the Medicare Commission, headed by a member of his own party, was blunted by the action of the President. That Democrat, leader of this program to try to extend the life of social security and to reform it so it is available for the baby boomers, that Senator said last week that the administration and many in his party were more interested in using the issue of Medicare as a political weapon than they were interested in being able to transform and save Medicare, not just for today's seniors, but for the baby boomers and their children.

That is the worst of American politics, to use the threat of destroying economic security for our senior citizens to try to win votes. That is not what makes America great. What makes America great is not just to debate when Republicans and Democrats disagree, but the ability to search for a common goal, to preserve some of the vital retirement programs for this Nation, to keep the demagoguery out of this debate. Let us work together to try to extend the life of Medicare and social security.

At the same time, we are also honoring the 1997 budget agreement. The President breaks the spending caps. He breaks the discipline of the 1997 budget agreement. We will not do that. Not only will we not break the discipline of the 1997 agreement that has contributed to a stronger economy, but we will not raid the social security and Medicare trust fund the way the President does.

We have decided to save it all, and to take that and coordinate with that the 1997 budget agreement by having fiscal restraint. It is about priorities in America today. What we are saying is that the programs of defense and education ought to be top priorities in our budget.

There was a paper distributed on the floor with more misleading information about the fact that this bill does not include a pay raise for the military. That is false. That is patently false. I am beginning to believe that many people who stand in opposition to this bill are just going to ignore the facts. This is not going to be a debate about what is in the bill, this is a debate about what fictions we can create.

There will be provided for in this budget document a pay raise for our troops. The Committee on Armed Services will come to the floor and tell us that. We know that it is necessary to boost the spending for the military. That is precisely what we do in this bill. At the same time, we also believe we should emphasize education.

The fact is, in education we have provided more money than the President has, not just for defense but for education as well. As Members know, we are very interested in education flexibility, so that the school districts can manage their challenges better at the local level without having to have a bureaucrat a thousand miles away who does not even know what time zone it is in these local school districts to tell them how to manage their challenges.

In addition to all of this, Mr. Chairman, there is tax relief for the taxpayers. The fact of the matter is there are many on the other side of the aisle that bristle at the thought of a tax cut for Americans. It has become almost a philosophy, almost a mantra, to make the argument that there is something wrong with shrinking the size of the government and letting peoples' pocketbooks grow bigger.

I want to warn a number of my friends, it is not only wrong for the country but it is very bad politics to make an argument that the budget of the government ought to grow while our personal and family budgets ought to shrink, and that somehow we should pound our chests in self-righteous indignation at the notion that we want to work to cut the size of government and give more money to the American people.

□ 1200

If we are going to run America from the bottom up, if we are going to let Americans be able to pursue their hopes and dreams, Mr. Chairman, the more money that one has in one's pocket, the more one can control one's own destiny, the more power that one has. The smaller this amount becomes, the less power one has.

Power is a zero sum game. If one has less and the government has more, who has got the power? When the government has less and if one has more, who has got the power?

In our country today, as we approach the new millennium and we set the new agenda for the next century, what we do know is that the strength of America, harkening back to where our founders was, was a limited government; the dignity of the individual was to be preserved; that the individual in our society was what was most important in a Nation that recognizes that freedom is precious; and that that the future is ours.

So, Mr. Chairman, we intend not only to preserve Social Security and Medicare, we not only agree to prioritize the items of national security and education, but at the same time, we also believe that the American people ought

to be empowered, that the American people ought to have more money in their pockets in order to provide, not just for themselves and not just for their communities, but for those that may live in the shadows of their communities who have less and cannot be ignored in America.

That is the great tradition of America. More in one's pocket means more for one's family. For those who have not been so fortunate, we have an obligation to take care of them.

So at the end of the day, Mr. Chairman, I think we present a budget for the new millennium that is right in pace with where the American people want to go. The American people hunger for more control over their lives and more power in order to fix the problems, to meet the challenges that they see every day.

This budget will begin to preserve and reform and transform the programs for economic security in our senior years, at the same time paying down some of the national debt and, most important, beginning to transfer again, continuing to transfer power, money, and influence from the institution of government into the pockets of people.

We will move forward on this. We will lay down a good marker as we enter the next millennium. We will set the pace and set the direction for what can be a glorious new century for, not just Americans, but for people all over the world who have come to see us as a model and as an example of the power of freedom and individuality and compassion and caring and vision.

Vote for the budget. Reject these alternatives and, at the same time, reject the President's budget and set ourselves on the right course.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I was trying to get the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) to tell us why Function 950 of his budget resolution provides no adjustment as it is required to do to provide for the pay raise, the extra pay raise for selected pay grades and officers and NCOs and for the military retirement benefits.

The fact of the matter is, Function 950, the military retirement account, where that charge needs to be made, is absolutely unadjusted in their budget resolution. So it does not provide for the pay raise and the benefits that our troops have been promised.

Let me go to the overarching subject, the budget, and the happy occasion that we find ourselves in today. I did not ever think that I would serve to see the day where we have surpluses as far as the eye could see. I think it is worth taking just a minute to track down the trail we have followed for the last 10 years that have led us to this happy set of circumstances.

In 1990, we had a budget summit that lasted 6 months. We finally brought it to the floor. It was defeated once. Then

the Democrats put the vote up to pass President Bush's budget summit agreement. There were only 80 votes on that side of the aisle. It implemented discretionary pay caps, a pay-as-you-go rule, and the kind of disciplines that have served us well to get rid of the deficit. But it did not have any obvious effect because it was eclipsed by a recession.

In 1993, when President Clinton came to office, he found on his desk awaiting him the economic report of the President. In it, Michael Boskin, his Economic Council chief, said the deficit this year will be \$332 billion. That was the baseline from which the Clinton administration began.

From that baseline, in 1993, we reduced the deficit with the Deficit Reduction Act of 1993, which had exclusively Democratic votes in the House and the Senate from \$330 billion projected level, \$290 billion actual level in 1992, to \$22 billion in 1997.

Then our colleagues on the other side of the aisle joined with us, and we finished the job and wiped out that additional \$22 billion of deficit and lay the basis for going into the next century.

It is critically important that we did this, because until we dealt with the year-to-year deficit, we could not deal with the next problem; and that is the problem, the challenge of an aging society.

Our society is getting older and older. I am a war baby. A huge generation of young people were born, babies were born in 1946 until 1964, and they will start retiring in about 10 or 12 years. When they do, they will put unprecedented strain on the most popular, most successful program ever invented by the government, the Social Security program, so much so that they may put in jeopardy its solvency by the year 2032.

The Medicare program, which runs a close second in popularity, is in even greater jeopardy because the cost of medical care is rising along with the demographic increases, and it, too, is threatened with insolvency in the year 2008.

We have an opportunity to do something about that. We have an opportunity to take the work we began in 1990 and 1993 and 1997 and deal with the next problem, which is a daunting challenge, preparing this country and this government for the burdens of the next century cast upon us by an aging society.

Our budget, the Democratic budget, rises to that challenge; theirs does not. We are going to have other speakers who will turn to this topic, but let me just give my colleagues the highlights and tell them what is the difference between us and them. I will give it to my colleagues in a nutshell.

We protect the Social Security Trust Fund. We proposed to protect the Trust Fund so that 100 percent of the payroll taxes coming into it are spent exclusively for the benefit of that particular program for the first time probably in 30 or 40 years. We propose to do it by

directing the Treasurer of the United States to take that percentage of payroll taxes not needed to pay benefits that year and to buy down public debt.

How does that happen? That means that, when the obligations come due in 2020 and 2030, the Treasury will be in better shape than ever because it will have lower debt and lower debt service to meet those obligations.

We also, unlike the Republicans, do something about Medicare, because we see Medicare and Social Security as linked together. We extend the life of Medicare, the solvency of the Medicare program from 2020. They leave it as it is. They leave it in a lurch.

We are still opposed to huge tax cuts in the out years, \$143 billion in the first 5 years and \$450 billion plus in the second 5 years, rising to as much as a trillion dollars between 2009 and 2014, which will drain the budget dry of the funds needed to do something about the Medicare program.

Do my colleagues want to know the difference between us and them? Look at the Trust Fund account for Social Security. In our plan, Social Security will have \$3.4 trillion more money at the end of 15 years. They will add \$1.8 trillion. We are twice as good as they. With Medicare, we add \$400 billion. To their Trust Fund, they add a paltry \$14 billion.

There are significant differences. If my colleagues care about meeting the challenge in the next century, this is a budget resolution to vote for.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 14 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI).

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, Social Security is probably the most important program Americans have had over the years. It takes care of the senior citizens of America. As anybody knows, if we did not have Social Security today, half the senior population would live in poverty.

One-third of the benefits of Social Security go to families that have the bread winner disabled or perhaps dies. So many children who no longer have a mother or father who are the bread winners in that family can still go on to school and perhaps college. This is a very, very critical program.

What the budget of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) does is adds 18 more years to that program so that it will be solvent to the year 2050, 50 more years of solvency total. The Republican plan does not add one year to that solvency.

As we continue this debate, it is my hope that the Republicans respond to

the March 13 letter from the actuary of the Social Security, Mr. Harry Ballantine of which everyone bases their conclusions on.

In that letter, in the second paragraph, he says,

The proposal of the Republicans would not have any significant effect on the long-range solvency of the Social Security program under the intermediary assumptions of the Trustee's report. Thus, the estimated long-range actuarial deficit of 2.19 percent of taxable payroll and the year of combined trust funds exhaustion would not change.

So when we hear that the Republicans are saying they extend the life of Social Security by protecting the money, they do not. In fact, they can use the money for a tax cut. They can use it for a tax cut. So bear in mind what this is all about, this debate, is to protect Social Security, and the Democratic bill does that.

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

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) for yielding me this time. I particularly want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for providing us with this alternative.

When we talk so much, as both sides have, about Social Security and Medicare, the people back home are listening to us and saying, have they really given us a solution? The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has done that, and the Democratic alternative has done just that.

He has said let us take aside all of the surplus that we are getting in the area of Social Security, dedicate it to Social Security and Medicare, and make sure we come up with a fix, a solution. Set the money aside and take away the rhetoric of tax cuts and additional discretionary spending. Solve these problems first before we go home.

Medicare is perhaps one of the most aching problems that is out there, home health care, prescription drugs. People each day are asking us in both Democratic and Republican districts, how do we solve this?

It is indeed a problem back home in Rhode Island, because I know home health care agencies, the most cost effective, efficient agencies are going out of businesses. People that need the kind of home care, that is the least costly home care, are not getting it and eventually ending up in nursing homes and hospitals.

I have a couple in Rhode Island that are 66 and 70 years old. Prescription drugs is something they never thought about when they retired. But after open heart surgery and bypass surgery, both of them, at age 66 and 70, are back working part-time just to pay for the \$8,200 a year for prescription drugs they have to pay.

Seniors are doing without paying their rent, without paying for food, and sometimes not even paying for the prescriptions because the cost is so high.

That is going to come back to all of us in terms of higher taxpayer costs.

We should not leave here until we resolve this problem. The only way to do it is, as the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has suggested, lock this money aside, not use it for all those rhetorical questions that are being asked all the time about tax cuts and discretionary spending, and fix the problem.

Let us bring us to a solution rather than continuing putting us in this rhetorical oblivion that will never come to a conclusion. End this problem now. Fix Medicare.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN).

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, Medicare and Social Security have improved the lives of millions of elderly and disabled Americans. Together they provide a vital safety net which millions of Americans rely on. However, while Medicare is projected to run short of funds in just 9 years, and Social Security will run short of funds by 2032, the Republican budget resolution does nothing to extend the life of Medicare or Social Security.

The Democratic budget alternative that will be offered later today will extend the life of Medicare through 2020 in addition to extending the life of Social Security to 2050.

□ 1215

Only after this commitment is fulfilled would we propose to spend money on high priority areas like health, education and the environment.

I believe firmly that I would not be standing before my colleagues today if it were not for Medicare. Social Security and Medicare together enabled my grandmother to live independently until she was 90 years old. As her primary caregiver for the last several years, I know the role Social Security and Medicare play in making ends meet, in protecting her from making sure that a medical crisis would not lead to financial ruin.

Medicare and Social Security are not just commitments we made to our seniors, they are commitments we made to families. And it is just as important to young people that we have Medicare and Social Security as it is to our seniors, because it keeps our families and our communities strong.

We have an historic opportunity to make good on this commitment. The budget decisions we make today will have enormous consequences for decades. The Republican budget resolution squanders this opportunity before us; the opportunity to reduce public debt while protecting the existence of Social Security and Medicare.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means and a former member of the Committee on the Budget.

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

Mr. Chairman, when Franklin Delano Roosevelt proposed Social Security and worked for its passage, the Republican Party was dead set against it. When John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson said that having Social Security was not enough, if there was no health security and advanced Medicare, 90 percent of the Republicans in this Congress voted to reject it. When Bill Clinton was elected President, the Republican Party in this House elected a majority leader, my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), who said of Social Security, It is "a rotten trick;" who said of Medicare that he "resented" having to be a part of it as a compulsory government program.

So I suppose that against that backdrop the American people should take some confidence and some reassurance in the fact that Medicare and Social Security are even mentioned in this budget resolution. They are indeed mentioned in the resolution. When we look to the budget resolution to see whether there is any money to match the promises made, there is not \$1 truly set aside for Social Security and Medicare to assure solvency into the future. All that the Republican budget resolution says is that these vital programs can go broke on schedule, which is not much help to the people of this country.

The second indication that we get out of this budget resolution of where the heart of the Republican Party is on these critical issues for hundreds of millions of American citizens who either benefit from these programs today or will in the future is to look to the instructions that they include in this resolution. What instruction do they have about Medicare and Social Security? They have one reconciliation instruction, and it is "Give us our tax breaks." They say "Give us our tax breaks."

We say save Medicare and Social Security first. Do the fiscally responsible thing; pay down the debt, preserve these valuable programs, postpone the desire to help those at the top of the economic ladder to some future time, and help those Americans who want these systems preserved.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS), a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, today we have a very fundamental choice before us; we can pass the budget resolution that proposes a tax cut over 10 years of approximately \$800 billion, or we can do first things first, and that is we can take up and pass the Spratt amendment, which provides a tax cut of about \$137 billion but pays down the publicly held debt, the Federal debt, by more than \$137 billion more than the Republican budget proposal.

Now, why is that so important? The first thing is it is the right thing to do for our children and grandchildren, and not for them to have to inherit this debt.

The second thing is, as we begin to prepare for the retirement of the baby boomers, of which I am one, and funding the solvency of Social Security and Medicare, we are going to need some of those funds to pay that.

Thirdly, and perhaps most important, one of the best things we can do to protect our economy right now is to pay down the Federal debt. As Chairman Greenspan has testified before the House Committee on the Budget, it has a direct bearing on interest rates.

In my home, Florida and Tampa, where the average mortgage for a homeowner is about \$115,000, if we drop interest rates two points, down from 8 to 6 percent, that is \$155 a month in that homeowner's pocket they would not otherwise have.

Paying down the debt and providing that type of tax cut, simple and immediate, to homeowners, to people holding student loans and car loans, is the right thing to do for our children and grandchildren and, most importantly, will help preserve the solvency of Medicare and Social Security as we begin to prepare for the retirement of the baby boomers.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), a member of the Committee on Commerce and also the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, this Republican bill is a complete fraud. That is the bottom line. They have got hundreds of billions of dollars for tax cuts, mostly for the rich, but not one penny to extend the Medicare trust fund, which is going bankrupt, by the way, in the year 2008.

Let us go back to their balanced budget of 1997. The premise was that we would have to cut Medicare and home health care, those are visits made to people's homes who have Alzheimer's and Parkinson's and other chronic diseases, \$115 billion to give a \$90 billion tax break for mostly the wealthiest in America.

Now we have this huge surplus. Now, what do the Republicans say? We are going to give that money back to the Medicare recipients; we are going to give that money back to the HMO health care recipients? No, they say, we do not have enough money for those people.

Now, the problem, of course, is that the programs were cut fraudulently, using numbers that were not accurate in 1997 in terms of the problem with Medicare. It turns out today that the CBO says that in fact they have found miraculously \$88 billion more of savings in Medicare for this 5-year period, and they found an additional hundreds of billions of dollars of revenues that they did not project.

How much goes back to Medicare on the Republican side? They do not have a penny.

If we kick them in the heart over here, we are going to break our toes. They just do not want to help these old people on Medicare.

So, my colleagues, our substitute, with the effort to try to help those most vulnerable, the senior citizens within our society, intends on guaranteeing that Medicare is extended 10 extra years in solvency, so that the senior citizens in our country are going to be given the protection which they deserve.

My colleagues, the Republican substitute does nothing, nothing to help the solvency of the Medicare trust fund. Vote "no" on the Republican budget here today on the House floor.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I was elected in 1970 and spent 15 years in the State legislature and spent 10 years here, and I have never seen a budget exercise like this one.

Last year, we have to remember, the Republicans did not pass a budget. They never got a budget resolution through the United States Congress. This year they said, we are going to do it, but we are going to do it by jamming it past people so fast they can never figure out what is happening.

We listened to a wonderful stump speech by the chairman of the committee today, but when he hands the budget to us 4 hours before and gives us two pieces of paper with the numbers on it, that is all we got, two pieces of paper, to spend \$1.7 billion, I say this is a smoke and mirrors budget.

My colleagues can look at these pieces of paper and say there is anything in here. They can promise the world. They can promise veterans, they can promise old people, they can promise the National Institutes of Health, they can promise anything on these two pieces of paper, because there is no specificity. There were no hearings. It was simply, ram it through.

Now we come to the floor. We get 40 minutes on the Committee on the Budget to talk about this issue. Now, is that because we are busy tomorrow? No. People are going home. Could we have more time on this? No, the Committee on Rules said we have to be out tonight. Where are we going? I guess we are just going out for 2 weeks, yet we cannot spend another 1 or 2 hours on this issue.

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) is right. I sat on the Medicare Commission, and the Medicare Commission rightly turned down the proposal being jammed through by the Republicans to privatize Medicare, but they are going to do it here. This budget has no money in it to deal with the problems of Medicare.

What they are going to do is they are going to come in with their little voucher program. It is going to be called "premium support." They are going to try to ram that out of the Committee on Ways and Means and run it through here and leave the old people holding the bag.

This is a bad budget, and I urge Members to vote against the Republican alternative.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS).

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) may yield time.

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped we were going to come to the floor today to talk about the real facts contained in the Democrat budget versus the Republican budget, but it appears we are getting off base here. But let us look at what the actual dollar numbers are when it comes to Medicare, and here they are.

We are going to put \$1.8 trillion aside over the next 10 years to save and protect Social Security and Medicare. What does the President do? He is well below us, right down here.

These are the actual numbers, Members.

Mr. Chairman, today the House is going to consider a budget for the fiscal year 2000 that addresses the issues that matter most to American families. This budget, the first for the new millennium, safeguards Social Security and Medicare, addresses priorities such as education, defense and agriculture, and provides historic tax relief. This budget meets the challenges of the 21st century head-on by adhering to several bedrock principles, each of which is set forth right here.

First, we are going to lock away every penny of the Social Security surplus for our Nation's elderly.

We are going to set aside more money than the President to strengthen Social Security and Medicare.

We are going to create a safe deposit box to ensure that bureaucrats in Washington cannot get their hands on the Social Security Trust Fund money.

We are going to pay down more debt than the President's budget.

We are going to maintain the spending discipline that carries over from the 1997 Balanced Budget Act.

We are going to make national defense a top priority by providing additional resources for things such as pay raises which are specifically set forth in the budget.

We are going to provide the resources to train, equip and retain our men and women in uniform, who are in harm's risk as we speak today.

We are going to offer security for rural Americans by providing reforms in crop insurance and money to fund that crop insurance reform.

And we are going to enact historic tax relief. Yes, tax relief. And it is interesting that opponents of this budget would get up today and argue against tax relief. That is almost un-American, and I really cannot believe we are hearing that in the well today. But, yes, we favor tax relief, and we are going to support tax relief in our budget plan for hard-working Americans.

Mr. Chairman, this budget is consistent with the common sense conservative principles of encouraging our communities and individuals to grow

from the bottom up, not from Washington down. This is a budget Americans can be proud of, and I urge all of my colleagues to support the Republican budget.

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

When I came here, we were paying interest on the national debt equal to about \$52 billion. In the years I have been here that bill has gone up to \$252 billion. Dead weight. Produces no goods and services for anybody.

We have got a proposal in our budget resolution that will drive that debt down \$3 trillion. It is good for Social Security, it is good for the economy, it is good for the Federal budget, and it is good for our children and grandchildren.

□ 1230

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this chart shows where we were when Republicans took the majority in 1995.

For the foreseeable future, at that time, this government went deeper and deeper into debt—for as far as the economist could see. We came in, as the new majority, determined we were going to reduce and slow down spending. Look, we did it.

This is historic. I went back over the last 40 years. In every one of those years that the Democrats had control they used the surplus coming in from Social Security for other Government spending.

Please look, what we are doing now. We do not have to increase the national debt in this 5 year Republican budget. The President's plan, the Democrats' plan, has to increase the national debt. Their plan forces this country deeper into debt by \$2 trillion more than the Republican proposal.

I want to say that again to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT). Your plan goes deeper into debt by \$2 trillion more than the Republican proposal.

Nobody should just talk about the debt to the public. They have got to talk about the total Government debt. Because what we owe the Social Security Trust Fund is just as important as what we owe Wall Street.

I want to talk about the caps. The Republicans stay under the caps. The Democrat proposal does not stay under the caps. I am chairman of the Committee on the Budget Task Force on Social Security. That bipartisan task force is working very well together. But I just want to say very clearly that what we are doing for the first time in recent history, is not spending the Social Security surplus for other Government programs.

I mean, it is a giant step forward for saving Social Security. We are putting

that money aside. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) says that they are saving Social Security by adding a giant IOU to the Medicare Trust Fund and the Social Security Trust Fund. That makes us go deeper into debt. It is not honest. It is an asset for Social Security but a deficit for the general fund. In short it is a mandate for future tax increases for our kids and grandkids.

All the review of the President's proposal that suggests that we can save Social Security by adding more IOUs—conclude it is smoke and mirrors. It is!

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU).

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

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, today we are debating the budget. In putting together a budget blueprint, it is important to remember that the Federal budget is an outline of priorities. It is not a detailed specification of every single appropriation bill that we are going to pass over the next year. The Federal budget is \$1.7 trillion. The budget blueprint is intended to talk about what our priorities are as a Congress for the next year.

In trying to establish those priorities, the Committee on the Budget tried to answer three questions. First and foremost, what about Social Security and Medicare? Those on the other side have talked about these important issues; and we came back with the answer first we should set aside every penny of the Social Security surplus, every penny of that trust fund surplus, to strengthen and protect Social Security and Medicare.

As the debate goes on today, we will see time and again that we set aside more to preserve Social Security and Medicare than the President in his budget. We set aside every penny of the surplus for Social Security, not 60 percent as the administration suggested, because it is the right thing to do.

Second, we wanted to set priorities about the size and scope of the Federal Government. And we thought it was appropriate that we keep to the commitments of the 1997 Balanced Budget Act, a bipartisan agreement that set some control on the growth and scope of the Federal Government. Keeping those commitments again is an important part of the integrity of this budget resolution.

And third, what about tax relief? Right now taxes in this country are at a peacetime high. They have not been this high since 1944. And we thought it appropriate that, after we set aside 100 percent of the Social Security Trust Fund surplus, we ought to give back the additional surpluses to the American workers in the form of lower taxes.

This is about priorities, our priority of saving 100 percent of the Social Security surplus, against the administration's priority, if we can call it that, of

only setting aside 60 percent of the Social Security Trust Fund surplus. Our commitment and priority to keep to the promises we made as part of the 1997 budget agreement. The administration's budget breaks those caps by \$30 billion. Our commitment to lower taxes once we have ensured that we protect the Social Security Trust Fund surplus. The administration's commitment to raise taxes by \$100 billion. That is the wrong direction for this country.

In the end, this budget resolution pays down more debt, does more to protect Social Security and Medicare, and provides fair and honest tax relief. That is a set of priorities we can be proud of. It is a set of priorities that makes sense for the country. And that is why I am proud to support the budget resolution.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. RIVERS) and ask unanimous consent that she control the time for yielding to other Members.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in defense of fiscal responsibility and in support of the Democratic budget resolution and in opposition to the Republican budget resolution.

When I was elected to Congress, my highest priority was to balance the unified budget. We have apparently accomplished that goal. Now my highest priority is to pay down the publicly held debt and extend Social Security and Medicare solvency.

Mr. Chairman, a week ago the majority on the Committee on the Budget submitted two pages of numbers and called it a budget resolution. It is as much a budget resolution as a blank piece of paper is a Pulitzer Prize winning novel. The budget resolution is two pages, no explanation. Draconian spending cuts of \$181 billion over 10 years are hidden in blue smoke and mirrors.

This budget says we are going to increase defense spending and education and cut other programs by \$27 billion. It is not going to happen. The budget builds on the hope that the CBO can reestimate the base line just so we can put off until September either any cuts we have to make and either have a showdown or disaster like last year.

What this budget will do is bust the caps and the pay-go rules. The majority's budget resolution gives more priority to enacting an \$800 billion tax break than paying down the debt. It does not stop Social Security and Medicare from going insolvent. It locks in nearly a trillion-dollar tax cut betting on a 15-year projection that, if the

surplus does not materialize, will result in more deficits and more debt.

The Republicans say they are saving the surplus in Social Security in the trust fund, but they do nothing to honor the obligation to extending the life of Social Security and Medicare. Let us look at what Alan Greenspan has to say. He is adamantly clear that the best policy is debt reduction. Let me quote him.

"From an economic policy point of view I envisage that the best thing we can do at this particular state is to allow that surplus to run. What that means, of course, is that the debt to the public declines, interest costs on the debt decline, and in my judgment, that contributes to lower long-term interest rates."

Make no mistake, the Democratic budget resolutions retires nearly three-quarters of a trillion dollars of publicly held debt. The Republicans' do not.

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, when asked about the rough-and-tumble world of politics, Margaret Thatcher said, "Well, you don't tell deliberate lies, but sometimes you have to be evasive."

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that there is considerable evasion in this budget. Starting with the issue that the Republicans claim to put aside all of the Social Security money for Social Security, in today's Wall Street Journal, page A-28, we find a very interesting article. The Wall Street Journal tells us that their commitment is essentially toothless and can be waived by a simple majority, which is done on the floor every day. This is the Wall Street Journal.

They promise us that certain programs will be taken care of, that certain groups will get the things they need. But they forget to tell us, or they evade telling us, that \$52 billion of cuts have to be found over the next 5 years to provide what they have in their budget.

An earlier speaker talked about what was un-American. Well, I will tell my colleagues what is un-American, Mr. Chairman. What is un-American is not paying our bills, not dealing with our debts, not dealing with our existing obligations. And as a Nation, we have many: Social Security, Medicare, and a national debt that is nearing \$6 trillion.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) mentioned that Alan Greenspan said unequivocally that the best way to deal with our current situation is to pay down the debt and to use both surpluses, on-budget and off-budget. The Democratic proposal here today puts more than \$474 billion over the Republican proposal in the next 15 years.

The last piece of evasion that I want to speak to today is the suggestion that the tax cuts that are being proposed come purely from the on-budget surplus. That ignores the fact that as these tax cuts play themselves out over

the years, by the year 2013 we will be dealing with an on-budget deficit and we will have to dip into Social Security money.

Now, that comes at a time when the existing obligations I was talking about, our baby-boomers, begin to retire, and it will be the greatest strain on our budget to provide for them.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on the Budget.

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

It is so amazing. I mean, really, when it comes right down to it, both sides have done not a pretty good job of coming up with a budget. All right? I mean, there are only so many ways we can do it, with mandatory programs and discretionary programs. There are only a certain few ways we can do it.

And so what happened was the President sat down and he said, you know what? I can spend that Social Security surplus and I can have a whole bunch of new programs that I can pass out to people and make them feel good.

The Republicans sat down and said, you know what? For the first time since 1969, we are going to set all of it aside, 100 percent of the Social Security surplus, so that it is there not only for Social Security but it is there if we need to find a fix for Medicare. We set all of it aside. The President did not set all of it aside.

So what happens today? The last minute, the last opportunity, in run the Democrats, oh, but we did not mean that. We did not quite mean that. We can do better. We can do better than that. We are going to set 100 percent of it aside because they are. And so they rush in here at the last minute. Well, even their last-minute plan does not quite make it.

Let me show my colleagues something here. They are talking about debt reduction and how much they want to reduce the debt for their grandchildren and children, and we heard all sorts of speeches waxing philosophical about that. Let us look at the plan. The Republicans set aside more money so we can pay down the debt. The Democrats do not. Those are the facts. Yet they run in here and say, we can do better than that.

Let me tell my colleagues something else that is interesting here. When it comes to education, they say this is a priority. Look what we do. The Republicans, the Democrats, spend more time than the President, who stood up here for the State the Union address and said how he is going to support education.

Well, let me take my colleagues one example further. Special education. Special education. Since 1975, a program that the Democrats, to their credit, passed one of the most beautiful civil rights pieces of legislation in history, saying every American child



ought to be able to attend public school. And what did they do? They did not fund it. And they have not funded it since 1975.

□ 1245

For the first time, the Republicans are funding IDEA, special education, \$1 billion extra in our budget than the President's for special education. Plus we are saying to governors and States who are crying to Washington to give them more flexibility for education, we are letting them spend excess dollars from welfare, we are giving them the ability to transfer funds from other education programs, and we are allowing them, if we get more money at the end of the year, this surplus may grow as everyone has talked about so far, in our plan we allow special education to get a little bump up. That is not in their plan, either.

Mr. Chairman, it just is amazing to me with the Academy Awards being last week how they can continue to win more Academy Awards for this budget.

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

Could I have the benefit of the chart of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the chart he just used that showed the President commits 62 percent of the surplus and you commit 100 percent of the surplus?

Mr. NUSSLE. The gentleman did not bring his own charts today?

Mr. SPRATT. That is 62 percent of the unified surplus which he quotes, \$1.8 trillion. One hundred percent of the Social Security surplus, which is part of it, equals \$1.8 trillion. They are the same thing over a different period. Over 15 years it works out to the same thing.

Mr. NUSSLE. That is the problem, if the gentleman would yield.

Mr. SPRATT. No, I cannot yield because I do not have the time to yield.

Mr. NUSSLE. He wants to use my chart but I cannot talk about it?

Mr. SPRATT. In a little while we will answer what he just said about education.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I hope he does.

Mr. SPRATT. Because I do not think the facts will bear him out.

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute. I believe there was another problem with the charts that were just shown to us in that while the speaker, I am sure he misspoke, when the speaker said he was comparing the Republican plan to the Democratic plan on the floor from House Democrats today, I believe he used numbers from the President's proposal and not from our budget today relative to debt reduction.

Secondly, the question of IDEA, special education, is one I am very interested in, because for several years I have offered an amendment to the Committee on the Budget as well as to the Congress to deal with fully funding IDEA, making the commitment that

was passed so long ago real, to bring funding up to 40 percent of real cost. That was offered in the Committee on the Budget last week and to a person every Republican, including the gentleman from Iowa, voted against doing that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY).

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member of our Committee on the Budget for the terrific job he has done.

Mr. Chairman, if I could yield first of all to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we want to talk about education. There is a lot that is wrong with this Republican budget resolution. We need to discuss these issues in depth. The budget resolution is arguably the most important single decision we make here. It is the blueprint for how Federal resources will be used for the coming fiscal year and on into the future. So the Democratic and the Republican proposals we are considering here today need to be debated in depth. They are a study, in fact, in contrasting priorities.

The Republican budget would provide no help in extending the solvency of Medicare and Social Security. It falls short on veterans health care and crop insurance for our farmers and other critical needs. The Democratic alternative would extend the solvency of Medicare and Social Security, would provide more funding for critical priorities, would implement targeted tax relief, and would reduce the debt held by the public more than the Republican proposal.

Mr. Chairman, we want to talk especially about education, because nowhere is the contrast more stark than with education. Our Republican colleagues boast about providing some increase for elementary and secondary education, but, overall, funding for education and training would be cut by \$1.2 billion from the nominal 1999 level in the Republican budget for 2000. The result would be drastic cuts in funding for other priorities like higher education and teacher training and Pell grants and Head Start. Over 5 years, the Republican budget cuts to education and training would result in a 6.9 percent decrease in purchasing power, and over 10 years the decline in purchasing power for education would be over 18 percent.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, one of the things that I find interesting about this budget is we were told absolutely education is increased. They did increase it for elementary and secondary education. But what they do not tell us is that they are cutting it in all other parts of education. They do not say specifically where they are going to cut those budgets. But it is cut over 10 years from this level by \$36.5 billion. So they are cutting pro-

grams like Head Start and Pell grants and work-to-school programs. That is where the cuts are.

And so again it is one of those bait and switch budgets that they tell us we are doing great things over here and then they do not tell us what the other hand is doing, which is cutting education. This budget does not reflect that our school facilities are in a crisis situation. There was a study done by the engineers that said of all of our infrastructure, our school infrastructure is the one that is in the greatest need. We would not work in the schools that we send our children to.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) and the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) in a further discussion of this. It is important to get these facts out.

Is it not true that the Democratic alternative would make room for school construction? The kind of proposal that the President has made to give tax credits in lieu of interest on bonds in these low-income areas that need desperately to build or modernize facilities, or like the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) and I have introduced to target high-growth areas so that our kids are not going to school in trailers.

I come from a district where we have hundreds of trailers, thousands of kids going to school in these kinds of facilities. We need to get ahead of the curve in school construction.

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

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

Mr. HOLT. The Democratic budget does indeed provide for modernizing schools. In fact, it would provide tax credits that would allow modernizing of up to 6,000 public schools.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, one of the other things that I think is interesting to note, not only are schools in bad shape right now and we have talked about trailers. We have first graders that have to walk across an open area in Oregon where it rains all the time. This is not a wonderful thing to do to wash their hands or go to the bathroom. And some of the rooms are in such disrepair. Again, my colleagues would not work in that facility but we expect our children to learn in that facility.

The other thing that I think is interesting is there have been studies that have been done that show that, in fact, students do better in schools that reflect our society and are not in such disrepair. They do better when our schools are repaired.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Those studies are very convincing, that the students perform better when they are in first-rate facilities. It is not just an abstract issue. We have thousands of



kids going to school in these facilities. Often they are going to lunch at 10:30 because the cafeteria facilities haven't kept pace with the addition of trailers. They do not have adequate gym or restroom facilities. It simply is a misplaced priority to say that we cannot afford to do this. The Republican budget squeezes it out. The Democratic budget would make room for that kind of school modernization.

Let me ask my colleagues, also, to address the other major initiative that we are looking at in this Democratic budget: getting class size down and getting 100,000 new teachers in the classrooms of America. We made a start on that last year. What is it going to take to keep that going?

Mr. HOLT. If the gentleman will yield further, indeed, these are connected. Simple math will tell us, we cannot have more teachers and get the smaller class sizes in the early years unless we have the classrooms to put them in. And so this Democratic budget does allow for both of those, continuation of the hiring of new teachers, the 100,000 new teachers that we are calling for, we will continue down that line with the Democratic budget, in addition to providing for the loans for the construction and modernization of facilities.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. We are talking about a stark contrast in these budget proposals. The one makes room for reduced class size and for school construction and also lets us make good on what we promised last year when we passed the higher education act, opening up opportunity through Pell grants and an improved student loan program. The other budget makes a short-term increase in education over the long haul but would drastically decrease this funding.

Mr. HOLT. Unlike the Republican budget, the Democratic alternative does not cut higher education, training and social services in order to increase elementary and secondary education programs. That is a key difference.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. I used to be a teacher. I can guarantee my colleagues that smaller classroom sizes, you have much better performance by the students. Do not take just my word for it but go out and look at all of the research on this subject and you will find if we can get our classroom size to 18 and under, that students' performance goes way up. Not only does it go up, it stays up. We are trying to get it down in K through 3. But if you get it down, get that ratio down, the performance goes straight up and that performance stays up throughout their years in school.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. And the impact is the greatest in grades 1 through 3, is that right?

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Right.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the way my colleagues have chimed in here. There is no question that we are dealing with a stark contrast in many areas of this

budget, but certainly in education. In dollar terms, the Democratic alternative next year provides \$2.6 billion more for education and training, and then over the next 5 years we are talking about a \$10.2 billion gap. It is a gap that we have got to close.

Vote for the Democratic alternative.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 45 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, the bottom line is, this Republican budget locks away the entire Social Security trust fund surplus for our Nation's elderly, the entire amount. We set aside more than the President to save, strengthen and preserve Social Security and as necessary Medicare as well. We create a safety deposit box to assure Social Security trust funds cannot be raided. We pay down more public debt than the President. We maintain the spending discipline for the 1997 budget act. We provide additional resources to properly train, equip and retain our men and women in uniform. And we will enact historic tax relief after we have solved Social Security for our children and our children's children. That is what we do. The President wants to spend more. The Democrats want to spend more. We do not.

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

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, this Republican budget brings honesty back to the budget process and ends a 30-year assault on our Social Security system. For the first time, every single penny of Social Security taxes will be locked up for Social Security and Medicare. Over the next 10 years, this budget saves \$1.8 trillion for these two critical programs for our seniors and future generations.

As my colleagues can see on this chart, while the Republican budget saves every penny, 100 percent, of the Social Security surplus, the President's budget saves only 62 percent of Social Security over the next 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, saving just 62 percent of the Social Security surplus is not good enough. The President's budget spends \$341 billion of this very Social Security surplus over 10 years and provides no Social Security reforms or protections.

Mr. Chairman, not a dime of the Social Security dollars Americans pay should be used for unrelated programs. Locking up the entire Social Security trust fund will help save, strengthen and preserve Social Security and Medicare, not only for seniors today but for future generations as well. We must repair Social Security forever, not just put a band-aid on the problem. This Congress cannot allow the Social Security program to be bankrupt. We cannot stand by and allow anyone, even the President, to raid Social Security just to pay for more Washington-run programs.

Save Social Security. Vote "aye" on this Republican budget.

□ 1300

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, before yielding to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say our colleagues are attacking the President's budget; it is not even on the floor.

Our resolution is on the floor. It commits a hundred percent, puts \$1.8 trillion into the trust funds over the next 10 years as well.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I plan to yield time to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) as well because we want to address fiscal responsibility because we firmly believe that our budget is the more fiscally responsible. Mr. Chairman, what we have been presented by the majority is the baby boomer budget.

As my colleagues know, the real reason why we have this prosperity is because our parents put their lives on the line for democracy and free enterprise. That is why we live in a free and prosperous world. And now, we the baby boomer children must decide what we are willing to sacrifice for our children's future.

So what have we done with this opportunity? Mr. Chairman, one of the things we have done is to build up a \$5 trillion public debt that we are about to leave to our children.

The critical test of the baby boomer generation is, are we going to be as responsible to our children as our parents were to us? Mr. Chairman, the answer is no if we do not pay down the Federal debt. The answer is no, as well, if we do not provide for their retirement security. That is why it is important to extend Medicare and Social Security.

But the budget that we have been presented with by the Republicans says after we die, after we have exhausted Social Security, there is nothing there left for our kids. It is exhausted in terms of Medicare in 2008; in terms of Social Security, by 2032. That is it; we have used it, we are set, and then it is up to our kids to take care of their own retirement security and to pay down the Federal debt.

That is why this budget, the one we are offering, is the far more responsible one because it reduces the public debt, it provides for the retirement security of our kids, and it also provides for the investment that our kids need to be able to fulfill their potential. It puts money into education, it puts money into training, it enables them to live in a safe environment.

This is by far the more responsible budget, the one that sustains the intergenerational legacy our parents left to us.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, this is a very serious debate. We are involved

overseas in a very serious effort, and we need to be serious.

I came here in June of 1981, and I was presented with a budget on this floor which I voted against, and I voted against it because I thought it would cause high deficits and high interest rates. I, frankly, was right. The 1981 budget that we adopted, which was sold to us as a budget that would do all sorts of good things for America, created \$3 trillion in new debt, and tax cuts were enacted long before any Republican, as Dave Stockman said, was prepared to vote for the cuts to sustain the spending cuts to sustain those tax cuts, and as a result, and I heard the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) last night on the floor lamenting the fact that our grandchildren were put deeply in debt, they were by that 1981 program.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest to my colleagues that this budget is very much like that. It is very much like that in that it retreats from investments in the future, it promises tax cuts that will be unsustainable, and notwithstanding how many times our colleagues repeat they are saving Social Security commitment, it does not do what both the Blue Dogs' budget does, which I will vote for, which the Democratic alternative does, which I will vote for, and frankly offering the President's budget is simply a political charade in which we have participated in the past ourselves. And I understand that; we both have done that to one another. Ronald Reagan's budgets were presented 3 years during his presidency. Zero Republicans voted for it the first time, one Republican the second and 12 the third.

This is a serious debate, and we ought to commit ourselves to the American public to do real things. I suggest to my colleagues they ought to vote for the Democratic alternative and, as well, they ought to vote for the Blue Dogs' alternative because they do real things. They do not pretend; they do real things.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, if this was our parents making this decision, they would not be giving themselves an \$800 billion tax cut. They would be providing for the retirement security of their children, they would pay down the debt that they incurred, they would fully fund the military pay raise, they would fully fund the education of their children, they would do right for America and make sure the next generation of Americans is better off than their generation and the benefits that they incurred from their own parents.

We have a progressive legacy, let us keep it. Let us not be so selfish and give ourselves a tax cut. Let us take care of our kids first.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to comment that when the President gave his budget address, everyone on that side of the aisle thought it was terrific, and now everyone is running away from it and denying they ever liked it.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

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

As my colleagues know, somebody once said, and it may have been the Vice President, that everyone is entitled to their own opinions, but they are not entitled to their own facts, and I want to talk about the facts because we heard earlier today, and there is some revisionist history that it was the, quote, minimal tax hikes of 1993 that brought about the balanced budget that we have today.

Mr. Chairman, I am not making up the facts. This is according to the Congressional Budget Office. This is the direction we were headed in 1995. The deficit was at about \$200 billion. They were predicting that by 2009 we would have deficits approaching \$600 billion, and worse, that included the Social Security surpluses.

Now where are we today?

Mr. Chairman, thanks to some of the fiscal discipline demonstrated by this Congress since 1994, we are headed in the right direction. Again, these are not our numbers. This is according to the Congressional Budget Office.

Now one of the things that we are debating here today is whether or not there should be tax relief for the average American family. Now somebody said earlier, and it is true, and this is according to the Tax Foundation, that Americans now pay the highest tax burden since 1944. Now our budget does not specifically call for tax cuts, but it does begin to make room for tax cuts because we believe Americans are overtaxed.

Mr. Chairman, the average American family, and again not according to us, according to the Tax Foundation, a nonpartisan group, the average family today spends more in taxes than they do for food, clothing, shelter and transportation combined.

Now we happen to believe that is wrong, and we may have a difference of opinion with our friends on the left, but that is the way we see it.

Now it has also been mentioned that our Democratic friends really do not want to talk about the President's budget, and I suspect this article, again not something that we said, this is according to the Investors Business Daily; what they said was balancing the books on the backs of the poor.

But this is what Investors Business Daily said, and again the source of the Tax Foundation, that under the President's budget plan he increases taxes over the next 5 years by about \$45.8 billion. Now that is bad enough, but what is worse, almost 40 percent of those new taxes will be paid by families that earn less than \$25,000 a year.

Now it is no wonder then that our Democratic friends do not want to talk about the President's budget.

In sum, our budget does four things:

First of all, Mr. Chairman, we say that every penny of Social Security

taxes ought to go only for Social Security.

Second, we say that we are going to keep faith with the spending caps that we agreed to with the President in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

Third, we begin the process of actually paying down some of that debt. We will begin to pay off some of the debt that is owed to the public.

Finally, we make room for tax relief.

Now I know that does not sit well with some of our friends on the left, Mr. Chairman, but we believe that is important.

In sum, what this budget really does is that it ensures lower interest rates and a stronger economy well into the next century.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority whip.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, it is amazing how all we can talk about is the budget in 1981. This is 1999, and I just remind some of my colleagues that the budget since 1981 was controlled by a Democrat House and a Democrat Senate that refused to cut spending. The difference, as I answer my colleagues, is this is a Republican Congress that has brought fiscal discipline to the process. In fact, the Democrats are running as fast as they can away from the President's budget that he submitted this year. The Senate voted down yesterday by a vote of 97 to 2 the President's own budget. Why can they not even support the President's own budget? And by a vote of 99 to nothing, 99 to 0, could not even get one person to vote, the Senate rejected the President's proposal for the government to invest Social Security funds into the stock market.

Over the past 4 years, Mr. Chairman, the Republican Congress has worked very hard to balance the budget; the President took credit for it. Cap federal spending; the President took credit for it. Provide much needed tax relief to American families; the President took credit for it. The Republican budget plan for the year 2000 continues this shift to restore a solid American common sense to American government.

Now American families know how to balance their checkbooks, and they know how to stay within a budget. American families know the value of a dollar. There is no reason why this Federal Government cannot be as responsible as the average American family.

Over all, the Republican budget returns control to the American family by taking less of their money, setting very strict fiscal priorities and respecting spending caps. The Republican budget locks up 100 percent of Social Security surpluses for the first time since Social Security became a program. We are being honest about the Social Security Trust Fund. The Republican budget bolsters national defense by nearly \$10 billion, and the Republican budget plans to reduce the national debt by 1.8 billion over the next

decade. And the Republican budget cuts taxes by \$800 billion over 10 years.

Right down the line the Republican budget trumpets that fiscal responsibility is the wave of the future. This budget says loud and clear that Republicans want American families to keep more of their hard-earned money and send less of it to Washington forever.

When the Republicans took over Congress 4 years ago, the budget predictions had red ink spilled as far as the eye could see. Today, because of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 that we pushed through and the President took credit for, there are nothing but surpluses as far as the eye can see in the future.

Now some budget decisions are very difficult to do, and what we did not show with the Democrat Congress after 1981, discipline is hard, discipline is not always easy. But at the close of this century the Republican budget does it all. It cuts taxes, it reduces the debt, it saves Social Security, and it bolsters defense.

So, Mr. Chairman, if we stick to our guns, America will be freer, it will be richer, it will be safer into the next century than ever before, so I urge my colleagues to vote for the Republican budget.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, let us be very clear about what our budget does and what their budget does not do. This chart tells my colleagues what our budget does. Our budget locks away the entire Social Security Trust Fund surplus, \$1.8 trillion over the next 10 years, to save, strengthen and preserve Social Security and Medicare. We set aside \$100 billion more towards Social Security than the President does. We are creating a safety deposit box to make sure that we do not raid the trust fund in the future. We are paying down \$450 billion more in debt than the President is. We are also maintaining the fiscal discipline of the 1997 Budget Act. And the most important thing is that we are doing this honestly, we are not playing a shell game. Honest numbers are finally coming into town, into Washington. We are maintaining strong defenses, and we are recognizing a historic commitment to education.

□ 1315

What I would like to talk briefly about is our Social Security lock box, our safety deposit box. This is very important because no other budget proposal coming to the floor today, the President's proposal, the Democratic proposal, locks away Social Security.

If we take a look at this chart one moment here, we asked David Walker, the Comptroller General of the United States, to analyze the different Social Security proposals and in looking at the President's budget proposal he said, although the trust funds will appear to have more resources as a result

of the President's proposal, in reality nothing about the program has changed. The proposal does not represent Social Security reform.

Here is what we are doing. We in our Republican plan are setting aside 100 percent of all payroll taxes, plus interest, for Social Security and Medicare. We save this money to support those programs, and what is more important we implement legislation that prevents future raids on Social Security by creating a lock box. The President's plan does nothing to do that. The Democratic plan does nothing to do that.

If we look at page 41 of our budget resolution, we have section 5, which sets up a safety deposit box legislation because Congress over the last 30 years has been raiding Social Security. There was nothing to stop Congress from raiding Social Security.

We are stopping the raid on Social Security. We are saying that beginning today, there will be no more raids on the Social Security trust fund and that in the future, we are putting a point of order to require a supermajority vote in Congress that any budget resolution ever coming to Congress again has to have a supermajority vote if it attempts to dip into Social Security.

We are essentially saying, we need discipline now to stop raiding Social Security but we want to make sure that future Congresses will not raid Social Security. That is why we have meaningful legislation, meaningful changes, in this budget resolution.

Now we are told that the President is not interested in passing legislation to prevent future raids on Social Security. In fact, the President raids the Social Security trust fund by \$341 billion over the next 10 years. We raid zero dollars. We put all of it towards Social Security and Medicare.

So because we cannot get a statutory fix to stop the raid on the trust fund, because the President will not sign that into law, we are changing the rules in Congress. We are changing the rules in Congress so we will not raid Social Security, so that future Congresses will have to go after a higher threshold. If they try to bring a budget to this floor of Congress in the House and the Senate, they are going to have to take a supermajority vote to raid Social Security in the future.

Even though we cannot get a law passed by this President to prevent the raids on Social Security we are changing the rules in Congress so that Congress now and into the future will not raid Social Security.

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

Mr. Chairman, we keep having a red herring dragged across the path of this debate. The principal budgeting contention on the floor, the alternative to their budget is our budget and it commits 100 percent to Social Security, is backed up by a statute which requires the treasurer to take a certain percentage of payroll taxes to buy down public debt.

The general public probably does not understand, but points of order are honored in the breach on the House floor. We have a Committee on Rules upstairs which specializes in overriding points of order. It is a joke to say that a point of order provides any protection whatsoever.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOFFFEL).

Mr. HOFFFEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to say regrettably that the Republican budget we are considering falls far short of what the American people need and what they deserve in terms of environmental protection.

We need to prepare our country for our children and their children. We need to prepare an America that has clean and vibrant cities, that has suburban areas not choked with automobiles and strangled by shopping malls. We need an America that has rural areas that are prepared to handle the necessary but dangerous pressure of development.

Simply put, the Republican budget does nothing to preserve our environment. The House Republican resolution for fiscal year 2000 provides \$22 billion for discretionary natural resources and environmental programs. Our budget provides \$23.6 billion.

The Republican level of funding is \$1.3 billion less than this year's level of funding, and over 5 years the Republicans would cut funding \$5.3 billion below 1999 levels.

The Sierra Club estimates that the Republican budget would stop up to 135 toxic waste cleanups under the Superfund program and would eliminate funding for the clean water action program.

The Democratic proposal gives our children a chance to grow up and raise their children in cities that are clean and safe, in suburbs that have coherent development patterns and provide park land and green space instead of chaos and confusion.

A recent series in the Philadelphia Inquirer demonstrates in the Philadelphia region that one acre per hour is being lost to development. In the last 30 years, the population in the Philadelphia area grew 13 percent; development grew 80 percent.

The Democratic budget would provide the tools for better regional planning, to improve water quality, to help local governments preserve open space, to reduce traffic congestion and clean the air.

Our proposal does not promote Federal planning. It does not promote Federal zoning. It is a good proposal, and I ask for support.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address the veterans' portion of this budget for awhile. The Clinton-Gore budget has been a total disaster for veterans' health care over the last few years. It totally has neglected veterans' health care in favor of other spending priorities by this administration.

Mr. Chairman, we are the second largest employer in the Federal Government. We have 173 hospitals to maintain, over 500 outpatient clinics, and this administration did not give us one dime increase this year in the area of health care.

This budget provides \$1.1 billion in health care alone for our veterans. Their budget would require a massive layoff in VA health care and necessitate closing of some of our VA facilities that are needed to treat our needy veterans.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield just to make clear who "their budget" is, because our budget has \$1.9 billion?

Mr. STUMP. I made it clear. I made it clear. I said the Clinton-Gore budget.

This Republican budget increase has the largest increase in history for veteran VA health care. I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, and the entire Committee on the Budget, that they have always been there when we needed them for additional health care monies, which we have had to ask for every year under this administration.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST), another distinguished Member and the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 68 before us today. In contrast to other documents, most notably the President's budget, this document underscores our commitment to the recovery and long-term economic health for production agriculture.

This resolution makes available a total of \$6 billion in new agriculture funding authority over the life of the resolution. This should be viewed as nothing less than a triumph for American agriculture. They are in time of great need and we are working hard to create an adequate safety net to ensure their future.

I would remind my colleagues that the President promised crop insurance reform in his State of the Union address. Unfortunately, his budget proposed no new money or policy proposals that came forward, not one idea, not one dime, nothing.

The President has decided to turn his back on this problem so it falls to Congress to step up to the challenge, and we have.

The \$6 billion in new agricultural spending in this resolution is the first

infusion of funding for farmers in recent memory. This money will allow us to make permanent improvements in the tools farmers have available to manage the weather and price risks over which they have no control.

In addition to the \$6 billion in new agricultural funding, the budget resolution creates generous tax cuts in fiscal year 2000 over the next decade. These reductions will allow Congress to continue working to provide American farmers and ranchers with tax relief, capital gains relief, estate tax reform and the creation of farm risk management savings accounts.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members on both sides of the aisle who care about the future of farmers and ranchers to support this budget resolution before us today because it is fair and responsible.

In behalf of American agriculture, I would like to extend special thanks to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. FLETCHER), the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) for the great work that they have done on the Committee on the Budget in behalf of the American farmer and rancher.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me once again say that our budget resolution, the House Democratic resolution, provides that same \$6 billion a year but it has a special difference. Because this is a 10-year budget and we are running out the allocations for 10 years, we don't quit in 2004, 2005. Their budget stops the funding of the crop insurance program just as it is getting established. It, in effect, says to the agricultural committees, go find the necessary mandatory spending offsets in order to pay for it.

We provide \$9 billion in the second 5-year period on top of \$6 billion in the first to see that this is a 10-year commitment. The same with the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP). The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP), the excellent chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, sent to our committee a request for \$1.9 billion a year, I believe. That is what we put in our budget. The Democratic budget provides what the Republican chairman of the committee requested; \$1.9 billion a year for veterans.

Their budget gives a plus-up of \$900 million, a billion dollars the first year in fiscal year 2000. But in 2001, 2002, 2003, it disappears. It is nonrecurring. It does not carryover. So it is plussed up a billion and then dropped back down again; dropped so much that over 5 years, their budget is \$500 million for veterans below a 1999 freeze level. That is the way the numbers are being distorted out here.

Let me go back to education. In education, the budget of the gentleman

from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), which they have touted as being a big plus-up in education, is \$2 billion below the President next year; \$3.9 billion below the President in 2001; \$3.5 billion below the President in 2002; \$2.1 billion in 2003.

What they say with ESEA and IDEA is we want to give a bigger allocation but it has to come out of the hide of other higher education programs; the whole function for education and job training. It is very improbable that they are going to be able to shove those other programs aside to make the kind of increases they are not providing because the function that they are providing for education as a whole does not increase over this period of time.

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE).

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for the last half hour has been complaining about how we have been talking about the President's budget. What did he do? He got up and talked about the President's budget.

In fact, there are three budget plans sitting over on that desk over there. There is only one over here. There is one Republican plan, and one Republican plan that does a good job in these areas, but the gentleman is picking from three different numbers over there. The gentleman has to make up his mind.

I understand the gentleman does not like the President's budget but the gentleman is like a long-tailed cat in a room full of rocking chairs right now running around trying to figure out how to run away from this President's budget. The gentleman has to make up his mind, I would suggest.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG).

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

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on the Budget, I rise today in strong support of the Republican budget resolution, H. Con. Res. 68. This budget prepares our country for the challenges of the 21st Century, and I commend the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman KASICH) and the Members of this committee for putting this altogether.

Over the next 10 years, the Federal Government is projected to run a budget surplus, as we have heard before, of \$2.6 trillion. Our budget properly utilizes this windfall to strengthen the retirement security of the American people.

For the first time ever, 100 percent of the Social Security surplus, and maybe I should say that again, for the first time ever, 100 percent of the Social Security surplus will be locked away to strengthen Social Security and Medicare. Over the next decade, this will secure \$1.8 trillion, \$100 billion more than

the President's budget, to keep these two programs strong for current and future retirees. This is historic.

For years, Congress and the President have raided the Social Security trust fund to pay for wasteful government spending. With 77 million baby boomers nearing retirement, it is time to end this dishonest practice.

Our budget also provides the American people with tax relief that they need. Over the next decade, it cuts Federal taxes by \$800 billion.

□ 1330

This tax cut, the largest since Ronald Reagan's first term as president, will strengthen working families and keep our economy moving forward.

Finally, this year's budget provides the resources to improve our schools and keep our military strong. If the United States wants the United States to be the world's strongest Nation, we must do a better job of educating our children, and we must ensure that our military forces are the best-trained and the best-equipped in the world. This year's budget takes a giant step forward in accomplishing both of these goals. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Democrat budget plan. It invests in health programs to serve all Americans. Our Republican colleagues talk about their commitment to health, but I challenge them to put their money where their mouths are.

The Democratic budget demonstrates our commitment to improving quality health care and access to health care for all Americans. The Republican plan shows once again their top priority, providing tax breaks for the wealthiest in this country.

We all support groundbreaking research at the National Institutes of Health. I support that effort, and the Republican budget does provide additional funding for the NIH.

But what our colleagues on the other side of the aisle do not seem to understand is that all of the research in the world goes to waste if people do not have access to health care. Their budget would slash funding for other health programs, like the Centers for Disease Control, Ryan White AIDS grants, maternal and child health, all in order to pay for their tax breaks for the wealthiest in this country.

More than 43 million Americans today are without health insurance. They seem to have fallen from our radar screen. The Democratic budget includes measures to expand access to health care. The Republican plan ignores the problem.

Many Americans struggle with no health insurance at all. Millions who do have insurance are fighting their managed care companies to have access to the care they need. The Demo-

cratic plan includes the Patients' Bill of Rights, real managed care that would put medical decisions back in the hands of those where it belongs, doctors and their patients.

Mr. Chairman, the Democratic budget alternative recognizes a key reality. If we are to save Medicare and social security for future generations, live within our spending caps, and continue to provide funding for vital health care programs in this country, we cannot afford to give tax breaks to the wealthiest members in this Nation.

I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic plan.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, as we look to the future, and that is what a budget does, we must evaluate where we are as a Nation. It has become clear to all of us that one of the most important principles that all Americans hold dear is the idea of security: fiscal security for our Nation; financial security for us personally, individually; educational security; security from attack from foreign nations; family security; and retirement security.

We need to take care of our growing aging population, and we must also look out for our young people, securing a solid and stable future for them.

We are at a crossroads today. What will the priorities of our Nation be? Will security be one of them? If we answer yes, then we must support the Republican budget, for our elders, our baby boomers, our Generation Xers, our Y Generations, all are relying on us to save social security and Medicare.

Mr. Chairman, the most responsible way of doing this is by supporting a plan that saves all of the social security surplus. By locking away 100 percent of the social security surplus, 100 percent, we preserve approximately \$100 billion more than the President's proposal, more than the President's budget. By establishing this safe deposit box, we prevent a hungry bureaucracy from stealing from social security to pay for other programs, to ensure that retirement money is available for our elders, for our boomers, for our children, for our grandchildren. It is more than the President has offered, and we are doing the same with Medicare.

Speaking of the Democratic alternatives, the President, by comparison, does not have the trust of the Senate on his proposal. Instead of saving all of social security, the President would spend some of it. The Senate voted yesterday 97 to 2 to reject his plan. His plan of a government-run board investing social security funds in the stock market was rejected.

There is a better way. Support the Republican budget.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY MILLER).

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on the Budget, I rise to support House Concurrent Resolution 68. Our budget plan is the first ever to lock up 100 percent of social security payroll taxes and interest for the future. This is historic because over 10 years the Federal budget has been taking social security funds to pay for other spending programs.

In the year 2000, the GOP sets aside \$137 billion, that is 100 percent of social security monies, for social security. The President pledges 62 percent of that, that is \$85 billion, and \$52 billion of social security money spent for other programs.

Between the years 2000 and 2009, we set aside \$1.8 trillion for social security and Medicare. The President's budget sets aside \$1.3 trillion for social security, and earmarks about \$345 billion for Medicare. That is \$1.645 trillion, over \$100 billion less than our budget.

No matter how we add it up, \$137 billion is more than \$85 billion. No matter how we add it up, \$1.8 trillion is more than \$1.645 trillion. Two plus two does equal four.

Some on the other side who are using projections on the President's budget will save over 15 years, compared to our budget, over 10 years. That, as the saying goes, two plus two does equal five. No matter how you look at it, we are saving more for social security and Medicare than the President's budget saves over 10 years.

The President is not only missing-in-action on Medicare reform, he cuts Medicare by \$11.9 billion. He is using a very strange strategy for claiming the high ground on Medicare. One, he cuts billions from Medicare. Two, he saves less than Republicans for Medicare. Three, he single-handedly stops bipartisan Medicare reform from the Medicare Commission. Four, he leaves us with the status quo. Five, he then claims to be the champion of Medicare.

If we look at the facts, we know that the Committee on the Budget resolution does more to protect social security and Medicare than the President has ever done. Also, anyone who votes for the President's budget is doing nothing short of stealing from social security and cutting Medicare. I urge all my colleagues to vote for the GOP budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Democrat alternative. The Democrat alternative is a budget resolution that fights for families, advocates for our children, stands up for our seniors, and is responsive to rural America.

The resolution before us abandons farmers and farm families. Recruiting and training sufficient numbers of qualified teachers is difficult throughout all of America, but it is particularly difficult in rural America. Working for better health care is difficult

throughout all America, but the problem is magnified in rural America. The lack of health resources and adequate health providers are harsh realities.

Farm life is hard, and the risk of injury and death is great. Income security is difficult in many parts of the United States, but in rural America, low earnings, slow investment, low economic development, and pockets of poverty are all too often a way of life. That is why we should all make sure we take into account the special needs of our farmers and our farm families.

Small farmers and ranchers are struggling to survive in America. Most are losing money and fighting hard to stay in the farming business. That is why the Democrat alternative increases discretionary spending for agriculture.

The resolution before us cuts discretionary spending for agriculture by \$2.3 billion over 5 years. The Democrat alternative includes funding for agriculture research, education, and vital farming services. The resolution before us cuts those services.

The Democrat alternative continues crop insurance spending \$14.6 billion more than the Republicans. The Republican resolution before us ends crop insurance in 2005. The Democrat alternative puts into proper perspective the needs of farm families and their communities.

It is an alternative that requires our support. It is an alternative that deserves our support. I urge all of our colleagues, both our Republicans and our Democrats, to support the Democratic alternative.

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

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to be part of this spirited historic debate today, historic because I believe that this plan before us represents the best news to come out of Washington in a very long time.

One year ago when I announced my run for Congress, I did so because I saw a bleak situation here in Washington: social security expected to be in the red in only 30 years, the tax burden on our families the highest it has been since World War II, and a national debt long overdue.

Today I can proudly tell the folks back home that we are addressing each of those critical challenges. It has also become clear that the minority will do and say anything to obscure these accomplishments.

Mr. Chairman, the proposal before us accomplishes what too many people said for too long was impossible.

Number one, our plan ensures that social security dollars are locked away, to be used only for social security. On the other hand, the President has proposed spending \$52 billion of the social security surplus in the next year alone.

Number two, our plan allows working families to keep more of their hard-

earned cash, with tax cuts growing only as our surplus grows. On the other hand, the President's budget proposes 80 new tax increases that will raise the tax burden on our families by over \$172 billion.

Number three, and perhaps most important, this budget works to pay down our public debt, reducing it by some \$1.8 trillion. That is \$450 billion more than the President.

Some weeks back the President challenged this Congress. He challenged this Nation when he unveiled his plan. I want to offer my sincere thanks to the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman KASICH) for his hard work and guidance. The chairman has done well, we have done well, and with this plan, America will do well.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY).

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

Mr. POMEROY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a brief comment with respect to agriculture. I know that everybody has struggled with this budget, but the concern that I have is that we are currently unable to deliver the farm programs that we in Congress have identified as critical.

If we cut the Farm Service Agency any further, we are going to decimate our ability to deal with these programs, and I fear that the budget that the majority is proposing accomplishes just that.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, the words of my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, are precisely correct. There is a crisis in agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, these are desperate times on the farm. Therefore, I cannot understand why the majority's budget cuts discretionary spending in agriculture; cuts, in fact, that would amount to a reduction in more than \$300 million this year alone.

To project out, the majority's budget would reduce the purchasing power of agriculture, the discretionary money is reduced to the extent that purchasing power would be reduced for the U.S. Department of Agriculture 33 percent over 10 years, 25 percent over 5 years.

The Republican budget is also a sham. I know that my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, has worked on crop insurance. There is funding for crop insurance for 5 years, and then it goes away altogether.

Looking at this budget, we can only conclude it is a sham. They purport to prop up crop insurance, but only for a few years. Then the money is zeroed out, resulting in loss of the crop insurance program or other deep cuts in other mandatory spending areas critical to propping up farming.

For the life of me, I cannot understand, when we have people that have farmed for generations being forced off their farms this Spring, not just in the area that I represent but across the

country, we would have a Republican budget that cuts discretionary spending in agriculture, and then puts forward a crop insurance program but only funds it for a couple of years, 5 years, before the funding goes away altogether.

□ 1245

Let me tell my colleagues something, the Democratic alternative is different. We preserve funding for the discretionary account in agriculture. We are \$400 million better next year alone, and we continue the funding for the crop insurance program, not just for 5 years, my friends, but on into the future altogether.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS).

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to remind the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE) and the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY), who are my friends, when it comes to agriculture issues, that we are talking about a 5-year budget that we are debating here today. So we fund agriculture for the 5 years of that budget. Next year we will have 5 more years. We will fund crop insurance for the additional out years as they come forward.

When my colleagues talk about cuts, what we are looking at is cuts which include the supplemental on top of the budgeted baseline numbers for last year. When we look at real numbers, there are no cuts. But I would remind my colleagues that the President's budget makes cuts in agriculture to the tune of 15 percent.

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

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

I rise today, Mr. Chairman, as a member of both the House Committee on Budget and the House Committee on Appropriations to say that, yes, this budget proposal is balanced; yes, it locks away all of the Social Security revenues into Social Security for the first time in a generation; yes, we increase veterans' benefits significantly over last year and way above the President's request; yes, we increase education funding above the President's request; yes, we protect Medicare and do not cut Medicare benefits as the President's budget does.

But I want to say that the goose that lays the golden egg called the budget surplus that we are here today to discuss is not us. It is the economy. The economy must be considered as we look at the fiscal discipline that I am here to talk about today as a member of the House Committee on Appropriations.

It is going to be hard later on, no question about it. But should we exert fiscal discipline? Listen. Chairman Greenspan, the guru of the American economy, has told us time and time again that, as we exert some fiscal discipline in this Congress, the economy

continues to improve. That is the goose that lays its golden egg. We need to feed that goose, feed that goose by exerting fiscal discipline, holding the growth of Federal Government spending below inflation in the last few years for the first time since 1969. That is the fiscal discipline that we must enter into. This budget does that.

It is going to be a tough year. But let me tell my colleagues, if we show the markets that, here in Washington, we are not going to spend foolishly or blindly any longer, the economy will continue, revenues will continue to sore, the budget surplus will continue to increase, and we will have good discussions here on the House floor of where to invest in the American society as opposed to those discussions we used to have about how to reduce the deficit instead of how to invest the surplus.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. CLEMENT), and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the Republican budget resolution. This resolution ignores the Committee on Veterans' Affairs' commendation of a \$1.9 billion increase for veterans funding. As a matter of fact, it actually decreases veterans funding over the next 10 years by \$3 billion. Yes, it increases it the first year, but I think we need to make it very clear, under this budget resolution, the Republican resolution decreases it 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 that they so desperately need.

Veterans hospitals are being consolidated around the country, including Tennessee, due to the lack of sufficient funds. One of Iowa's three major veterans hospitals is threatened with closure. Florida's veterans hospitals are having to lay off employees and close some inpatient services.

I urge my colleagues on both side of the aisle to oppose this resolution.

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

THE INDEPENDENT BUDGET,  
March 25, 1999.

Hon. JOHN M. SPRATT, Jr.,  
Ranking Minority Member, Committee on the Budget, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SPRATT: On behalf of the Paralyzed Veterans of America (PVA) I am writing to offer our support for your budget alternative to H. Con. Res. 68. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) health care is

facing an emergency—without desperately needed additional dollars the health care system relied upon by sick and disabled veterans will be forced to curtail services, close facilities, and lay off thousands of health care workers. The Spratt Budget Alternative recognizes the grave condition of VA health care and takes action to provide a remedy.

The Independent Budget has estimated that VA medical care, for fiscal year (FY) 2000, must receive a \$3 billion increase over the President's budget submission. H. Con. Res. 68, although providing a \$900 million increase over the Administration's budget, an increase which is taken away in FY 2001, does not provide the resources needed by the VA this year, and over the next few years. The Spratt Budget Alternative provides \$1.8 billion over the Administration's budget for VA health care, and provides \$900 million more than H. Con. Res. 68. In addition, the Spratt Budget Alternative provides over \$2 billion more than H. Con. Res. 68 over the next four years, nearly \$10 billion more over five years.

The Spratt Budget Alternative provides more of the resources that the VA needs if we are to provide sick and disabled veterans with the health care they have earned and the health care they need.

Sincerely,

AMVETS, Blinded Veterans Association, Disabled American Veterans, Paralyzed Veterans of America, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Vietnam Veterans of America, Inc.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER), a real fighter for veterans.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, this is a shameful budget for our veterans, and veterans across the country are angry. This budget breaks our contract with our Nation's veterans. We promised health care for life. But I will tell my colleagues, those who vote for this Republican resolution, their veterans are going to have to wait for months and months for appointments in a hospital, if it stays open.

We promised to care for the disabled, but the folks in my colleagues' districts are going to have to wait years to have those claims processed. We do virtually nothing for those of our veterans who are on the streets, those who want education, those who want training.

Over the life of this resolution, we have cut veteran benefits by \$3 billion. This is shameful. This is unconscionable. I do not know how my colleagues wrote a budget resolution that says to those who have fought for us, who have fought to make this a democracy, who have fought to keep us here in the kind of condition where we have a surplus, say to them, "Thanks, but no thanks. We are through with you." Vote no on this Republican resolution. Protect our Nation's veterans.

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER) who serves on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, the budget that we are considering today is a huge number to all of us; and we are talking about Social Security, Medicare, defense. A small part of it is the veterans number, but the veterans number is not a small part of the lives of veterans.

This number, the budget number for fiscal year 2000 in the Republican budget is not adequate. The veterans know it. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs, both Republicans and Democrats, know it. The VA hospital doctors and nurses know it.

The only people who apparently do not know that this number was inadequate were the Committee on Budget members who passed this budget number out. Not only is it inadequate for fiscal year 2000, but we are voting on a 10-year budget number.

While this number has \$20.2 billion in fiscal year 2000, in 2001 it drops back to \$19.1 billion, which is less than the current fiscal year.

I think that veterans' communities and veterans around the country need to know what this long-term budget process does that the Republicans have put on to this House floor today. The number is wrong. It is wrong this year. It is wrong for next year. Vote no on this Republican budget.

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ), the ranking member on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs' Subcommittee on Health.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, during recent days Members of both parties have shown their concern for our troops deployed overseas. Yet, Republicans have betrayed the men and women who have already served our country, jeopardizing the well-being of our veterans, and ignoring the values for which they fought.

Democrats have tried to fight for a VA budget proposal for fiscal year 2000, but the Republicans, a party still apparently wedded to the idea that the wealthiest Americans deserve another tax break, want to keep their promise to them and break their promise to protect veterans health care. The Republicans continue to put their commitment to their wealthy campaign contributors above America's commitment to our veterans.

Here is what the Republicans have said no to America: no to \$475 million more for VA health care, no to \$271 million in long-term care initiatives, no to \$681 million in the Montgomery G.I. Bill.

Just so America understands, this budget is deplorable for veterans, and remember what they did today. Remember what they did today.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

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

First of all, as a veteran, I want to set the record straight. The President sent a budget up here that said zero, zero increase for veterans, and I thank my Republican colleagues for giving veterans an extra billion dollars.

But I want to talk about the overall budget. I sat on that Committee on



Budget for 6 years as a member of the minority. What a waste of time. Let me tell my colleagues, they did everything wrong, and it got us in the mess we are in.

So I am very thankful for this Republican budget today, because they do many things: preserve and protect Social Security and Medicare, they pay down the national debt, they maintain the fiscal restraint of the Balanced Budget Act, they provide tax relief, and they increase support for education and defense. That is what I want to emphasize, increased support for education and defense.

The House resolution provides \$65.3 billion in budget authority for discretionary and mandatory spending in education, training, employment, and social services. They outdo the President. His is a 1999 actual. They go up another billion two in education.

Do my colleagues know what they do? They help us do what the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and I thought we might be able to do in a bipartisan effort in that 6 years on the Committee on Budget. They really put their money where their mouth is, and they put more money, as we increase the surplus, into special education, something my colleagues passed 23 years ago. They said they would send 40 percent of the excess cost back for the 100 percent mandate they sent. They sent 6 percent until I became chairman.

Thanks to the Committee on Budget and the appropriators, we have increased that by more than \$2 billion, and they are ready to do more of that. That is what the local folks want to hear. The local folks want to hear that their property taxes do not have to go up, up, up in order to meet our 100 percent mandate in the area of special education.

So I thank the Committee on Budget. I thank them for doing something right, even though, for 6 years, I sat there as a member of the minority while they did everything wrong.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I served on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for 2½ years, and I learned a lot.

Republicans talk a lot about support for veterans; however, their support ends at the appropriations' door. This Republican budget gives a one-time increase which is not carried over into the next fiscal year. Smoke and mirrors again.

Over a 5-year period, the Republican budget resolution cuts discretionary funding for veterans by hundreds of millions of dollars. Over a 10-year period, the Republican budget resolution cuts veteran funding by \$3 billion below the 1999 level.

In the area of health care, where our veterans are facing a medical emergency, the proposed budget includes several new health care initiatives, but guess what, without providing the necessary funds to support them.

Unless the veterans' health care system receives significant increases in funding, critical services will be cut, health care will be denied, facilities closed, and dedicated employees are out of work.

I have a full-time staff person dedicated to just working on veterans' complaints. Republicans, I want them to know they cannot look veterans in the face and tell them that my colleagues care about them when all my colleagues talk about is flag burning and desecration of the flag.

My colleagues need to be talking about the real issues of whether or not veterans are being taken care of, veterans who have served their times, veterans who my colleagues say they care about, whether or not they can come forward with a budget like this where they are denying them the kind of funding that is so desperately needed.

I ask my colleagues to reject this proposal, to reject the turning of our backs on the veterans who we claim to love so much, and do everything that we can to increase their funding. They have complaints that are not adjudicated. I ask my colleagues to do the right thing for veterans. Reject this Republican budget.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to remind the gentleman from California (Ms. WATERS) that we added \$1 billion to veterans that the President did not provide.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, when I first came to Congress in 1993, the budget debate was a very different one. Under the current President, but a very different majority in Congress, we were faced with deficits as far as the eye could see.

□ 1400

The budget resolution brought before Congress then addressed these problems with a very different set of solutions. That 1993 legislation included the largest tax increase in history, significant increases in Federal spending, and it repeated the mistakes of the past by including continued annual deficits.

When the current majority took over, we inherited the same budgetary problems. Despite the 1993 tax increase, which was sold as the answer to the deficit, in 1995 the new majority still faced an unbalanced Federal ledger, escalating spending and future deficits stretching out as far as the eye could see.

But we proposed a very different set of solutions to those problems. We introduced a balanced budget that reduced Federal spending and provided tax cuts for the American people. As a result of that legislation, today our Nation's budget is balanced. We even have a unified budget positive cash flow, and it appears certain that we will have a real "on budget" surplus this year.

The budget resolution under consideration today continues the effort we began in 1995. It is balanced, it preserves the spending caps that we established in the balanced budget agreement of 1997, it ensures that 100 percent of payroll taxes, or \$1.8 trillion, are preserved for the future of our retirement program.

It also allows the Congress to give back \$800 billion in taxes to American wage earners. That tax relief is still far less than what the President raised through higher Social Security taxes and marginal rates in the 1993 tax increase legislation.

The Joint Committee on Taxation has stated that the President's 1993 tax increase will tax the working people of this country for over \$850 billion over the next 10 years.

The budget resolution reported by the Committee on the Budget will balance the budget, it will preserve payroll taxes for the preservation of Social Security, it will hold the line on Federal spending, it will make a downpayment on repealing the President's 1993 tax increases, and it will reduce the public debt.

Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of this important legislation.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I address this body with a great deal of sadness, because last night, by a vote of 224 to 1, we pledged to support the troops. Today's budget breaks that pledge.

On this spot last night I asked Members to support the troops not just at that time but for all times, not only during deployment but during times of training and growing. Someone was not listening when the budget was put together.

The priority should be, is, as far as I am concerned, and will always be to take care of the troops; to take care of the young men and take care of the young women who go in harm's way for our country. This budget does not take into consideration or allow monies for the recommended and promised pay raise or change in reform of the retirement system. We have to do that. We must do that.

We cannot break our word, we cannot break our faith and trust in those young people. We must reject this budget because it does not do what we have promised. Despite some claims that the Republican budget funds the pay raise, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) said it would not.

I am pleased, however, that this morning, Mr. Chairman, the senior leadership of the House Committee on Armed Services, in a hearing, reiterated its strong support. Several of us spoke on both sides of the aisle in support of a military pay raise, and cleared up the confusion by the remarks of the chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. Chairman, this budget does not do it for the troops.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), and I say to the previous speaker that our budget does do it for the troops, and the gentleman from Texas will illustrate that point.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, there is no higher priority in this budget for me than making sure that our troops are taken care of and that there is a pay raise. For some reason, a number of opponents of this budget have come up with a variety of reasons to try to argue that it is not so.

I very much appreciate the gentleman from Missouri because I know his commitment to taking care of the troops is every bit as strong as mine. But what happens, for example, is that in some press accounts questions and answers get misrepresented.

The chairman of the Committee on the Budget, for example, was asked whether the full amount in Senate bill 4 was taken care of in this budget, and the answer to that, of course, is no. But I can tell the gentleman from Missouri, as well as all my colleagues, as well as all of those who are in the armed services, that this budget includes the pay raise for the members of the armed services. And as a member of the committee and a member of the subcommittee which has jurisdiction over that issue, there will be legislation within the next couple of months on this floor to implement that pay raise, as there should be.

I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, that this budget is so strong that some opponents of the budget have to dig pretty deep to come up with some reason to oppose it. It is clear, if we look at the numbers, that there is an extra billion dollars in here for VA; that there is money in here to take care of the crop insurance program; and that there is room in here for tax relief, which is so essential, I think, for the American people.

We have often heard it described that taxes are higher than at any point in the country's history except for the war year of 1944. Look at it another way. Under President Clinton, Federal tax revenue has gone up 52 percent faster than the personal income of this country. And in the last fiscal year it grew 70 percent faster. So what is happening is the regular middle class folks are getting squeezed. Their income is going up a little bit, but their taxes are going up far faster. They need the tax relief that is included in this budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I am very concerned about the budget resolution's promises on increases in defense. We have heard some claims of an increase of \$8 billion in budget authority over the President's request, but this

resolution provides almost no increase in outlay authority.

Now, I have served for 20 years on the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations, and I can tell my colleagues that when we are writing an appropriations budget, budget authority but no outlay to support it, we have nothing. The problem is if we do not have adequate outlays, we cannot do the 4.4 percent across-the-board pay raise and we cannot have the fix in the retirement benefits.

So I believe that this budget, that I think was presented with good intent, is fatally flawed. It is not going to do the job that the Joint Chiefs need to have done. It is not going to do the job that all of us on a bipartisan basis who support defense need to have done.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA).

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

This is really a great budget. Let us take a look at what this budget does. It allows the American people the opportunity to secure their future as we enter a new millennium.

It locks away the entire Social Security Trust Fund, the surplus that we are going to be gaining over the next 10 years, \$1.8 trillion. We save it so that we can strengthen and preserve Social Security and, as necessary, Medicare.

We set aside \$100 billion more than the President for Social Security and Medicare. We create a safe deposit box. What this means is that we prevent Congress from going and raiding those surpluses and using it for other spending.

We pay down \$450 billion of debt held by the public; \$450 billion more than the President. We maintain the spending discipline of the balanced budget agreement of 1997.

We allow the American people to secure their future by providing more for defense, by providing more for education, and providing the opportunity to enact historic tax relief.

This is the kind of plan that enables us to build on the success of the last few years and to prepare for the future. It is a wonderful budget to move forward.

The CHAIRMAN. Two hours on congressional budget debate having expired, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) each will control 30 minutes on the subject of economic goals and policies.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, in the late 1970s a law was enacted called the Humphrey-Hawkins Act, and the purpose of it was to provide, among other things, for this Congress to have oversight over budgetary policy in terms of how it may or may not have a positive, or how it may have a negative effect, for that matter,

on the economic performance in our economy.

And so I would just like to use some time, if I may, to take a break from Republicans blaming Democrats and Democrats blaming Republicans, to try to take an overall look at what has transpired to create this wonderful surplus that we have in this fiscal year and the surpluses that we are now able to anticipate in the coming years.

Let me first say that our current expansion is now the longest expansion in modern history during peacetime. I think it is well for all of us to take credit and give each other credit, to the extent that we can. Employment, income and wealth gains are impressive, and we are experiencing the lowest unemployment rates since the 1970s.

Sometimes we all like to exaggerate the impact, as if the world actually revolves around Washington, D.C. But the fact of the matter is that workers all across this country, business people, laborers, all share in being able to take responsibility for what has happened here. And our system itself, our system of free enterprise, has worked well.

Recently, in trying to take credit for some things that happened in our country, the Vice President took some ribbing for claiming that he was the inventor of the Internet, and his strong ties to the rural farmland of northwest Washington, D.C. all drew some chuckles. Well, as a matter of fact, I wish him well, but his comments and other comments suggesting that the administration invented the current economic expansion are just excessive.

Let me try to say what, after much study, the members of the Joint Economic Committee have concluded has happened. Yes, the Republicans can take credit for being the initiators of tax cuts. That started back in the 1980s. And with the exception of 1990, during the Bush administration, and 1993, during the current administration, taxes have been kept quite low. And, yes, we can give ourselves some credit around here for helping to control spending.

Those have been important factors but not, in my view, the primary one. I think I may surprise my colleagues when I try to give at least some credit, and maybe the majority of the credit, for what has happened to an institution that is not directly associated with the Congress of the United States. Of course, all my colleagues know I am referring to the Federal Reserve.

□ 1415

As a matter of fact, the key reasons for the expansion are not generally very well understood, and that is why I want to take this time, under the provisions of Humphrey-Hawkins, to at least express this view for the consideration of my colleagues.

One of the most important explanations for this record-setting and sustained expansion is the anti-inflationary monetary policy being pursued

by the Federal Reserve. Pursuing anti-inflation policy or price stability policy in a gradual, sustained manner has worked to lower inflation.

Who would have thought a decade ago that we could stand here today and say to America, inflation is almost zero? That is an impressive accomplishment brought about by the Fed. And interest rates have followed inflation downward and it has fostered economic growth.

This chart here to the left of me shows how inflation and interest rates have come down together. And anyone who tries to deny the positive effects of this on the economy has simply not got it straight. This is an extremely important factor. And I believe that, along with other policies, this has been a major stimulus to the growth that we have seen.

We have observed not only a lower rate of inflation, but also a lower rate of unemployment and healthy economic times all at the same time. As a matter of fact, during the last several years we have gone a long way to diffuse or to disprove an old theory that in the circles of economics is referred to as the Phillips curve.

This second chart demonstrates something that is perhaps not a new phenomenon, and perhaps there were a minority of people who believed that this could happen over time. But throughout recent economic history, there was a common belief among lawmakers and a common belief among some economists, perhaps many economists, that we could not have long-term, sustained economic growth without inflation. This period of economic growth has disproven that theory.

This chart shows that the unemployment rate, which is a by-product, of course, of good economic growth, has gone down, as inflation has, so that we now have historic low rates of unemployment and historic low rates of inflation. And again, we have to look across the street or downtown to the offices that house the members of the Federal Reserve to understand how this happened.

The Federal Reserve has simply pursued policies through monetary policies to gradually squeeze inflation out of our economy. And so, while it is neat for us to be able to say that we have done this through the budgetary process, and we have contributed to it some, and while it is very encouraging that we have been able to over the last two decades reduce the impact of taxes, the fact of the matter is that most economists today agree that this policy of squeezing inflation out of the economy, which has fostered lower interest rates, has been an extremely important factor.

Let me make four points. First, lower inflation works to lower interest rates. We have already demonstrated that here on our charts. Both long-term and short-term interest rates have declined and have done so with this lower inflation and with expecta-

tions that there is no inflation around the corner. While long-term rates recently have picked up some, they are not far from their historic lows as compared to interest rates over the last 30 years.

Interest-sensitive sectors of the economy, like housing and investments, have performed exceptionally well during this period because of low interest rates, again brought about by Fed policy on price stability and inflation.

The second point that I would make is that price stability works to calm financial markets and this helps to create long-term growth. Lower inflation fosters less volatility, less uncertainty and, therefore, more stability in financial markets. As a result, market participants tend to become more confident and more willing to invest and take risks and to innovate. And so we see this as an important factor.

Point number three: Lower inflation acts like a tax cut. Anytime we give more money or provide an opportunity for investors to have more money to invest and consumers to have more money to consume and savers have more money to save, we provide economic stimulus which works to create long-term growth. And in this case, lower inflation reduces the rates of interest rates and again we have seen a positive result.

Point number four: Lower inflation enables the price system to work better by reducing the noise and distortions in the pricing system. In other words, expectations of prices tomorrow being about the same as they are today because there is no inflation is an important factor in creating the atmosphere that we need for long-term growth.

So, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to point this out today because, as I sat here waiting for my time to come up, I listened to both sides blaming the other for this or that or the other thing. The fact of the matter is that this Congress, both Houses, the administration, have done some things correctly during the last couple of decades. But during this decade, if one wants to single out one element in our economic structure in Washington, D.C., to give the credit to, we honestly need to look at Fed policy.

Now, I will say one other thing, and that is that this policy of controlling inflation has worked so well that there are some of us who are looking at the possibility of amending the Humphrey-Hawkins act to provide that this be the central feature carried out and the central objective carried out by the Fed. We think it is proof positive that this has worked, and we look forward to hopefully many, many more years of economic growth brought about by this policy.

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

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I come before us this afternoon as the ranking Democratic

member on the Joint Economic Committee, fulfilling a requirement outlined in the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1978 attributed to several of our great colleagues, Mr. Gus Hawkins and Senator Hubert Humphrey, who put the long-term goal of raising U.S. living standards far ahead of any of their short-term political aims. And I rise in strong opposition to the budget resolution before us.

Before I go into details as to how harmful that is, I would like to put this debate in some context, as my senior Republican from the Joint Economic Committee on the House side did just a moment ago.

We have had growth in 1998 close to 4 percent, and the economists are raising their projections for this year every day. Our economy is the envy of the world. The United States is growing two to three times faster than Japan or Germany. The unemployment rate is 4½ percent, the lowest unemployment since 1969. And the unemployment rate has been below 5 percent for almost 2 years.

This is all building up and it is continuing good news. Who would have believed we would have seen us move ahead of Japan in these measurements in our lifetime? Inflation was 1.6 percent in 1998. We would have to go back to the early 1960s to find inflation that low. Furthermore, it has remained low despite falling unemployment, which confounds many of the economists.

The once famous and now forgotten misery index, the combination of unemployment and inflation, the lowest point in 40 years. That is before the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) and I even got to this place. The economy has generated 15 million new jobs net since 1992 and 2.8 million jobs were added in 1998 alone. The average weekly take-home pay after inflation has increased by 2 percent in 1997 and 1998 after almost 20 years of stagnation. The current expansion is not just a statistical phenomena. It has improved the standard of living for many Americans.

Let us not celebrate, because this economic expansion is not yet shared by all Americans and that is not acceptable to the Democratic Party. One in seven counties in this country have twice the unemployment rate of the rest of the Nation. Some research shows that although there are fewer numbers of people receiving welfare, there is no definition as to what has happened to them. Are they working, or have they merely dropped off our statistical radar screen? And what has happened to their children?

There is still more that we need to know in order to ensure that all Americans can enjoy the quality of life they deserve. When things go well, everybody is taking credit. Somebody said, "success has a thousand parents and failure is an orphan." But it is easy to be entangled in the cause and effect. And one thing is clear: Eliminating the budget deficit has enabled interest

rates to fall, which, in turn, is considered one of the major stimulants for our economy.

Our first goal in fiscal 2000 should be to ensure that Social Security and Medicare are financially secure in order to provide health care to those who need it. The Republicans agree to wall off the Social Security Trust Fund, but their budget proposal does not do anything to address the solvency of either Social Security or Medicare. Their proposal calls for a freeze in Medicare's administrative budget over the next 10 years.

We have hearing after hearing about how we have satisfied the Medicare operators so that they can go after fraud and abuse and put these egregious profit-hungry private HMOs and hospital chains that are stealing from the Government out of business. We have the lowest administrative overhead in Medicare of any program in the country, about 2 percent, compared to 10 to 30 percent for private insurers and managed care plans. The latter figure includes overhead and profit. But we cannot continue this good work if we are unwilling in a budget to support the administrators who make it work so well.

Former Speaker Gingrich once said that Medicare's administrative agencies should "with'er on the vine," as should the program. Although no longer here, Mr. Gingrich's wishes seem to be with us, as the Republicans attempt to destroy Medicare and its ability to serve the need of America's seniors and disabled.

Let us talk about budget surplus. There is a lot of talk about it, but I did not see one. Once we take Social Security off of the table, as the Republicans suggest, we are left with about \$125 billion over the next 5 years. And without touching the Social Security Trust Fund, I do not think we find a surplus until 2002.

So if we are going to make policy based on the surplus, why do we not wait until we know there is one around and then debate it?

During 1999, defense expenditures were 13 percent greater than all non-defense discretionary spending. I wonder if this really reflects our country's priorities. Republicans go further and add billions to defense, and it calls for a cut in discretionary spending.

Now, I do not happen to think the Pentagon is optional. It certainly is not. But if the Pentagon is not optional, neither is Head Start, public health programs, education, job training, housing, veterans' hospitals, law enforcement, environmental programs, the national parks, community and economic development, rural programs, highways, energy, among a few which are being eliminated or cut severely, if the Republicans do not intend to shove us into the greatest deficit we have had since Ronald Reagan forced us into a deficit by reckless tax cuts and even more reckless military spending on things like Star Wars and other

things, which produced nothing but welfare for otherwise unemployable scientists and would-be soldiers of fortune.

I predicted that we would strike a deal to kick people off welfare, and we have. But what we have done is harm the children and the helpless in this country in the Republican effort to grab more tax cuts for 1 or 2 percent of the very rich, and that is not again what the Democratic Party is about.

My Republican colleagues did not vote for the 1993 act. Not one of them voted. They are taking credit for it. But it has not stopped them from bragging about it. Eliminating the deficit was the single largest explanation for the current health of this economy, and we must not jeopardize it again.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this budget resolution, send them back to the table to bring one that will help the economy for the long run and help all Americans.

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

CRISIS FACING HCFA & MILLIONS OF AMERICANS

The signatories to this statement believe that many of the difficulties that threaten to cripple the Health care Financing Administration (HCFA) stem from an unwillingness of both Congress and the Clinton administration to provide the agency the resources and administrative flexibility necessary to carry out its mammoth assignment. This is not a partisan issue, because both Democrats and Republicans are culpable for the failure to equip HCFA with the human and financial resources it needs to address what threatens to become a management crisis for the agency and thus for millions of Americans who rely on it. This is also not an endorsement of the present or past administrative activities of the agency. Congress and the administration should insist on an agency that operates efficiently and in the public interest.

Over the past decade Congress has directed the agency to implement, administer, and regulate an increasing number of programs that derive from highly complex legislation. While vast new responsibilities have been added to its heavy workload, some of its most capable administrative talent has departed or retired; other employees have been reassigned as a consequence of reductions in force. At the same time, neither Democratic nor Republican administrations have requested administrative budgets of a size that were in any way commensurate with HCFA's growing challenge.

The latest report of the Medicare trustees points out that HCFA's administrative expenses represented only 1 percent of the outlays of the Hospital Insurance trust fund and less than 2 percent of the Supplementary Medical Insurance trust fund. In part, these low percentages reflect the rapid growth of the denominator—Medicare expenditures. But, even accounting for Medicare's growth, no private health insurer, after subtracting its marketing costs and profit, would ever attempt to manage such large and complex insurance programs with so small an administrative budget. Without prompt attention to these issues, HCFA will fall further behind in its implementation of the many significant reforms mandated by the Balanced Budget Act (BBA) of 1997. In the future the agency also has to cope with a demographic revolution that it is ill equipped to accommodate and with changes in medical technology that will increase fiscal pressures on the programs it administers.

As the Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare grapples with the problem of reshaping the Medicare program for the next millennium, it would do well to consider two important reforms concerning HCFA's administration. First, the commission should recommend that Congress and the Clinton administration endow the agency with an administrative capacity that is similar to that found in the private sector. Second, the commission should consider ways in which the micromanagement of the agency by Congress and the Office of Management and Budget could be reduced. Congress and the public would be better served by measuring the agency's efficiency in terms of its administrative outcomes (such as accuracy and speed of reimbursement of various providers), rather than by tightly controlling its administrative processes. Only if HCFA has more administrative resources and greater management flexibility will it be able to cope with the challenges that lie ahead.

The mismatch between the agency's administrative capacity and its political mandate has grown enormously over the 1990s. As the number of beneficiaries, claims, and participating provider organizations; quality and utilization review; and oversight responsibilities have increased geometrically, HCFA has been downsized. When HCFA was created in 1977, Medicare spending totaled \$21.5 billion, the number of beneficiaries served was twenty-six million, and the agency had a staff of about 4,000 full-time-equivalent workers. By 1997 Medicare spending had increased almost tenfold to \$207 billion, the number of beneficiaries served had grown to thirty-nine million, but the agency's workforce was actually smaller than it had been two decades earlier. The sheer technical complexity of its new policy directives is mind-boggling and requires a new generation of employees with the requisite skills.

HCFA's ability to provide assistance to beneficiaries, monitor the quality of provider services, and protect against fraud and abuse has been increasingly compromised by the failure to provide the agency with adequate administrative resources. Even with the addition of \$154 million to its administrative budget that Congress included in its latest budget bill, the likelihood that HCFA can effectively implement all of its varied assignments is remote. The Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 assigns many new regulatory responsibilities to HCFA, but a far larger task is implementing the BBA of 1997. The BBA has more than 300 provisions affecting HCFA programs, including the Medicare+Choice option, which will require complex institutional changes and ambitious efforts to educate beneficiaries.

Medicare spending accounts for more than 11 percent of the U.S. budget. Workable, effective administration has to be a primary consideration in any restructuring proposal. Whether Medicare reform centers on improving the current system, designing a system that relies on market forces to promote efficiency through competition, or moving toward an even more individualized approach to paying for health insurance, Congress and the administration must reexamine the organization, funding, management, and oversight of the Medicare program. During anything less is short-changing the public and leaving HCFA in a state of disrepair.

Stuart M. Butler, Heritage Foundation; Patricia M. Danzon, University of Pennsylvania; Bill Gradison, Health Insurance Association of America; Robert Helms, American Enterprise Institute; Marilyn Moon, Urban Institute; Joseph P. Newhouse, Harvard University; Mark V. Pauly, University of

Pennsylvania; Martha Phillips, Concord Coalition; Uwe E. Reinhardt, Princeton University; Robert D. Reischauer, Brookings Institution; William L. Roper, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; John Rother, AARP; Leonard D. Schaeffer, Well-Point Health Networks, Inc.; Gail R. Wilensky, Project HOPE.

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

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), a new member of the Joint Economic Committee.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to talk about the economic security of our country, the issue that we are now talking as we debate the Humphrey-Hawkins portion of this.

□ 1430

But as we talk about the economic security of our Nation, we do realize that an economic security for this Nation must put as its foremost goal retirement security, retirement economic security for our seniors. So that is why we have this raging debate down here in the well of the floor of the House of Representatives on how we preserve and protect Social Security.

I would like to draw our attention to the efforts under way to protect and preserve Social Security. We have been talking about these different plans. We have three plans on this side of the aisle, the President's plan and a couple of different Democrat plans, and the Republican plan on Social Security. Let us assume for a second that this podium I am standing at here is the Social Security trust fund. I have the Social Security kitty right here. For the last 30 years, our FICA taxes have been coming in from our paychecks, real money coming in from our paychecks. We then deposit it in the Social Security trust fund. But what they have been doing over the last 30 years has been raiding that money. They have been taking this money out of the Social Security trust fund and spending it out on other government programs and putting in place of it IOUs, putting IOU after IOU coming off of our FICA taxes into the Social Security trust fund.

Now, we have asked the Comptroller of the United States Government to analyze the President's plan, which virtually resembles the Democrat plan being considered here as a substitute. David Walker, who is the Comptroller General of the United States, took a look at the President's plan and said, "Although the trust funds will appear to have more resources as a result of the President's proposal, in reality nothing about the program has changed. The proposal does not represent Social Security reform."

What does that mean? What does it mean when he says, "Although the trust funds will appear to have more resources as a result of the President's proposal, in reality it does nothing"?

What that means is the President's plan and the Democratic substitute we are talking about here today simply does this: They print up more IOUs and stick it in the Social Security trust fund, more IOUs in the Social Security trust fund. It does nothing to extend the solvency of Social Security. If we take a look at this chart here, here is what we are talking about. The Democratic substitute and the President's plan are double-counting the surpluses. Same old smoke and mirrors, same old gimmicky accounting. We are dedicating all of FICA taxes plus interest to Social Security to pay down publicly held debt.

But the Democratic bills say that they are putting \$4.3 trillion to Social Security to extend the solvency. This \$4.3 trillion is a sham. They are simply saying \$4.3 trillion of IOUs to go into the Social Security trust fund, money that a future Congress and a future President one day will have to come up with to pay for Social Security. But it is not real reform. It is not real reform. And it does not do one thing to save Social Security. What we are doing in our budget is saying, let us stop raiding the Social Security trust fund. We have got to act as a Congress to stop the raid on Social Security.

What we do with our plan on Social Security is this: 100 percent of all payroll taxes plus interest is dedicated solely to Social Security and Medicare. We save that money to strengthen the program until we have a solution by the President and the Congress to fix Social Security on its long-term. But here is what we do that the Democrats are not doing. We are being honest with the number and we are saying it is going to require a supermajority vote in Congress to pass any future budget resolution that attempts to raid Social Security. Because the President will not sign legislation into law preventing the further raid on Social Security, we have got to do it ourselves. We have got to change the rules of Congress to do that.

Mr. Chairman, the ranking member on the Committee on the Budget says that a point of order is meaningless in the House of Representatives. In the U.S. Senate, it is not meaningless. Under our rule and under our budget, the way we change the rules, one United States Senator can go to the floor of the Senate and say, "I raise a point of order against this budget because it raids Social Security." That one United States Senator can therefore require a supermajority vote on any budget plan into the future that attempts to raid Social Security. We are trying to make it as difficult as possible for Congress to continue to raid Social Security. And we are not playing fun and games with the numbers. We are not trying to give retirees the false sense of security that we are extending the solvency of Social Security into the year 2055 as the President is doing. We are not going to print up more phony IOUs and stick them in the

Social Security trust fund. What we want to do is put real money toward the Social Security solution, put that into Social Security, that is what we want to do, by buying down our debt, by making sure we are in a better cash position to fix Social Security.

Mr. Chairman, it is important as we go through this debate on how to improve the economic security of our country that we improve the economic security for our Nation's retirees. That is why the Republican budget here today is the only budget that puts away \$1.8 trillion toward Social Security and Medicare, more than the President does, but makes sure that Congress will not renege on this deal. It really stops the raid on the trust fund, short of passing a bill by the President, because the President does not want to pass a bill stopping the raid of the Social Security trust fund because the President's budget raids the Social Security trust fund by \$341 billion over the next 10 years. We are simply saying, stop the raid on the trust fund, stop dipping into Social Security from now on. We are putting the measures in place to prevent Congress from doing so in the future. On top of it, we are going to pay down the debt so we can make sure we are in a better position to save Social Security.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) one of the leading members of the Joint Economic Committee, pending which I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Carolina, ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, in response to the last comments, the difference between now and implementation of the President's proposal and the proposal that we have put in the Democratic budget resolution is simply this: We are going to add an additional \$1.8 trillion of bonds to the Social Security trust fund over the next 15 years. That means in 2032, when the administrator of the Social Security trust funds would run out of bonds, instead, under our plan, he will still have enough bonds to cash in at the treasury that will take him to 2050.

I have here a letter from Harry C. Ballantyne, Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration, which says that this will extend the life of the trust fund, the solvency of the trust fund until 2050.

The text of the letter is as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY,  
March 12, 1999.

Hon. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC

DEAR MR. GEPHARDT: This letter addresses the potential long-range financial effects on the OASDI program of "locking away" the annual increases in the Social Security Trust Funds, as proposed by Republican leaders in the Senate and the House on March 10, 1999. The proposal would require that annual increases in the OASI and DI Trust Funds would be used solely to purchase long-term special issue U.S. government bonds. In addition, the proposal would

require that the revenue used for the purchase of these bonds would in turn be used solely for the purpose of reducing Federal debt held by the public. Of course, the net change in the Federal debt held by the public in any year would also be affected by the size of any on-budget deficit or surplus for that year.

The proposal would not have any significant effect on the long-range solvency of the OASDI program under the intermediate assumptions of the 1998 Trustees Report. Thus, the estimated long-range actuarial deficit of 2.19 percent of taxable payroll and the year of the combined trust funds' exhaustion (2032) would not change. The first year in which estimated outgo will exceed estimated tax income would not be affected and would therefore remain at 2013.

Any plan that reduces the amount of Federal debt held by the public may make later redemption by the Trust Funds of special issue U.S. government bonds easier.

Sincerely,

HARRY C. BALLANTYNE,  
*Chief Actuary.*

SOCIAL SECURITY,  
*March 15, 1999.*

MEMORANDUM

To: Harry C. Ballantyne, Chief Actuary.  
From: Stephen C. Goss, Deputy Chief Actuary.

Subject: Long-Range OASDI Financial Effects of Specified Dollar Transfers to the OASDI Program—Information

This memorandum provides the estimated effect on the OASDI program of transferring specified additional dollar amounts from the General Fund of the Treasury to the OASDI trust funds according to the following schedule. These transfers would be in addition to all revenue that will be received by the OASDI program under present law.

*Specified amounts to be transferred to the OASDI trust funds*

[Billions of current dollars]

Year:	<i>Amount</i>
2000 .....	\$108.5
2001 .....	116.7
2002 .....	123.5
2003 .....	130.1
2004 .....	137.7
2005 .....	156.2
2006 .....	182.8
2007 .....	197.7
2008 .....	207.4
2009 .....	219.6
2010 .....	224.3
2011 .....	226.8
2012 .....	226.9
2013 .....	213.2
2014 .....	203.7

The specified dollar transfer amounts were developed by the Democratic Policy Committee based on estimated budget surplus estimates from the Congressional Budget Office. These amounts represent transfers for fiscal years.

Enactment of a provision to specify the above transfers in dollar amounts would improve the 75-year OASDI actuarial balance by an estimated 1.01 percent of effective taxable payroll, from a deficit of 2.19 percent of payroll under present law to a deficit of 1.18 percent of payroll. The estimated date of exhaustion of the combined OASDI trust funds would become 2050. This is 18 years later than the date of combined trust fund exhaustion projected under present law, which is 2032. These estimated financial effects on the OASDI program are based on the intermediate assumptions of the 1998 Trustees Report.

STEPHEN C. GOSS.

It is the difference between being a secured creditor with your credit collateralized by government bonds, backed by the full faith of the government and being a political supplicant in 2032 when you run out of bonds to draw down and go to the Treasury window to ask for the money to meet benefits. That is a big difference.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I would first like to turn my attention to the presentation which was made just a few moments ago by the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey, in which he showed the decline in inflation and job loss since 1992 and 1993. That was an interesting presentation, but what it lacked was the other side of the picture. It focused only on monetary policy. As we know, fiscal policy is intertwined with monetary policy and in this particular case led the monetary policy.

When the President gave his presentation here, the budget resolution in 1993, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve sat up in that chair right in the middle there and gave his imprimatur to what the President was trying to do that year. That budget resolution was in fact responsible for driving down inflation and driving down employment and giving us the extraordinarily successful economy that we currently enjoy. The budget resolution currently before us, however, threatens to end all of that. It threatens to end it by returning to the fiscal irresponsibility which preceded public policy, fiscal policy particularly in our country prior to the passage of that budget resolution in 1993. It does so by pretending to do certain things it does not do, by pretending to protect Social Security, by pretending to protect Medicare and in fact Medicare is going to be in serious jeopardy if this budget resolution passes. It does so, also, by advancing a series of very irresponsible tax cuts which grow out exponentially in future years. Those tax cuts will threaten other essential parts of our budget process which are very important to the American people, things like Head Start, like public health programs, job training, housing, law enforcement, environmental programs, national parks will be put in jeopardy, community and economic development programs will have to be sharply reduced, rural programs, energy, agriculture, biomedical research and others will suffer if this budget resolution passes.

That is why we should defeat this resolution and pass the Democratic alternative.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to address the issue that we have been talking about here on saving Social Security that the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget was talking about. What their proposal does, and let us be very clear about what this does. It just puts

more IOUs in the trust fund. It simply says that from now until the year 2055, we have got IOUs in there, that one day a future Congress and a future President when they get around to it will honor these IOUs to save Social Security. The letter from the Social Security Administration essentially admits just that.

So the plan that the President has offered and that the Democrat substitutes offer does not give us real reform of Social Security. It simply says more IOUs in the Social Security trust fund. What we need is real money, from our FICA taxes, going to pay down debt so we are in a better position of fixing Social Security and improving its solvency.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I indicated in my opening statement here that there were some factors that were important in terms of how our economy has performed. One of the factors is certainly the way we have been able to control spending. The spending controller who is standing to my left, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, is as responsible for that as anyone.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH).

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I just would like to make a comment. The gentleman from New Jersey has been very accurate in his ability to be able to explain why this economy does so well. With the export mentality of the United States, allowing our economy to be globalized, to be in a mentality that every market has a potential for us, to be able to develop and to bring about the production of more goods in this country has certainly been one of the key components to our economic growth.

In addition to that, of course, has been the development of technology that has allowed our workers to be far more productive. I think the gentleman would agree that within the period of the last couple of weeks, the most welcome news has been not just the news about the economic growth but clearly the fact that it is reflected by very low inflation that comes from rising productivity.

One of the things we have tried to achieve in this country is the ability to have noninflationary growth. So now we have the best of all worlds, which is a strong economy, strong economic growth with low inflation that is accompanied by probably the single best ingredient of predictor to the future in terms of this economy, and that is high productivity. One of the things we also know, however, is that we certainly do not want to do anything to retard the ability of this economy to grow by letting government become too big and, in fact, this budget which allows us to preserve the Social Security and Medicare surpluses to be used to transform Social Security and Medicare for many of the baby boomers who are in this Chamber today.



We know that if we can be, in fact, progressive in the use of Social Security and Medicare, it will not only guarantee a strong program for the baby boomers and their children while preserving the program for our current seniors but at the same time by developing the proper Social Security program, it will not only serve to strengthen the Social Security program but we believe at the end of the day will increase the national savings rate. That will again lead to the continuation of low interest rates which can lead to even better technological development.

One of the major reasons why this party wants to get the on-budget surplus out of town and into the pocket of everyday Americans is not just because we want to run the country from the bottom up, so that our doorkeeper can have more control over his future, so that the future can be his so that he has more control in terms of determining his own destiny, but there is another issue about this and, that is, the last thing this party wants to do is to take the proceeds of a strengthened economy and a budget surplus to create a bigger government.

□ 1445

We came here not just to balance a budget, but to take power, money and influence from this town, sharpen the actions of the Federal Government, but get the power from here into the hands of Americans. If we were to then take the surplus and use it to grow government, it would be a boomerang effect that we would live to regret. We believe that a government that is smaller, the people that are empowered, is a key to a successful economy.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), a member of the Joint Economic Committee.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time for me and for his leadership.

For the first time in decades we are working in the black. I believe the President put it best in his State of the Union speech when he said:

Our fiscal discipline gives us an unprecedented opportunity to address a remarkable and needy new challenge, the aging of America.

In other words, protecting Social Security and Medicare, providing income and health care to the elderly who need it must be a high priority.

The majority's budget resolution, however, completely ignores Medicare, and it provides only false promises of protecting Social Security. The majority's budget fails to protect the elderly. It puts into jeopardy the surpluses and the economic benefits we have worked so hard to gain by balancing the budget.

I was elected in 1992 and came to Congress when we faced a \$290 billion deficit. I never believed that the major

debate before Congress today would be over what to do with the surplus. When I ran for Congress in 1992, Federal aid to New York City under Reagan and Bush for 12 years, it had been cut by 62 percent. Under President Clinton, aid to New York City has continually risen. In 1992, the unemployment rate was 7.5 percent. Today it is 4.4. In 1992, inflation rate was at 2.9 percent. Today it is at a phenomenal 1.6 percent. The so-called misery index, the combination of unemployment and inflation, was 10 percent in 1992 when President Clinton and I were elected. Today it is at a 30-year low of 6.1 percent. Since 1992, this economy has generated 18 million new jobs, and workers' average weekly take-home pay after inflation has increased by more than 2 percent in 1997 and 1998. And, added to that, we balanced the budget.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to put the rest of my comments into the RECORD and say we should not reverse course and go back to the 1980's that grew the deficits. Let us follow the program we are on. Vote against the Republican resolution and for the Democratic one.

The current economic expansion is not just a statistical phenomenon, it has improved living standards for most Americans.

These are all economic events which occurred since I arrived here.

And I believe that the 1993 budget which introduced fiscal discipline—a budget which cut the deficit by \$52 billion that first fiscal year—put us on the path of what is now a \$70 billion surplus—and it is growing.

And I just want to remind us all that the first budget which put us on this path was passed without a single Republican vote.

We balanced the budget, but the Majority's Budget Resolution before us today reverses course.

We all like tax cuts, but this budget resolutions cuts taxes. This is the same formula used in the 1980s. The result was astronomical deficits from which we have just begun to recover.

Are we willing to return to the days of deficits as far as the eye can see in order to finance the tax cuts?

The costs and consequences of the Republican tax cuts increase as the years go by.

It postpones the question of how to finance them into some point in the future.

But we must take responsibility for our actions today and not postpone the hard decisions to another time, far in the future when it may be too late.

Instead we must continue to pay down the debt and reap the benefits of having a budget in surplus.

This is the path which will pay off for us in the future.

A report by the Congressional Research Service, examines the surplus options.

It concludes that maintaining the surpluses and reducing the debt "are likely to contribute more than tax reduction to capital formation as well as to the government's fiscal position. Debt reduction [begins] when surpluses occur and would end when they end."

(And we must rely on real surpluses—not offsets—like the one some of my colleagues are trying to create by the supposed selling of Governor's Island—for an inflated price to people who would misuse it.)

Mr. Chairman, let us take the wise path and continue the surpluses, reduce the debt, protect Social Security and save Medicare.

Let us take that path and not the path towards a new era of deficits that will be the result of this Budget Resolution.

We learned that their method was wrong and the sound economic policy of the past six years is what will keep the economy on track.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I just want to rise in support of this budget resolution because I think it makes a lot of sense for a couple of different reasons.

One of the reasons I think would simply be that it recognizes debt is debt, and it was interesting my colleague from South Carolina got into a discussion with my colleague from Wisconsin on, well, as my colleagues know, does the President's proposal save Social Security by moving actuarial insolvency out to 2055 versus not, and I think to a degree those are academic conversations because I think what we have to stay focused on is the promise of Social Security. And the fact is we have got 70 million baby boomers who begin to march off toward retirement around 2012, and whether we have marketable security, nonmarketable security on the budget debt versus off the budget debt is irrelevant in that it is a drain on the resources of the Federal Government and has to be addressed at that time.

So, one, this recognizes that debt is debt.

Two, I think it has honest accounting in place. If we were to walk down the street; I mean it really does wall off Social Security in a way that has to be done. Do we want to set aside a hundred percent of Social Security for Social Security, which is incidentally what the President said two State of the Unions ago, or do we want to wall off 62 percent of Social Security for Social Security? Most of the folks I talk to back home say let us save a hundred percent of Social Security for Social Security because if I am taxed on something, I want that tax to go toward that thing that I am being taxed on, and in this case it is Social Security.

I say honest accounting because if we were to go down the street and see a family that had to borrow, as my colleagues know, to put gas in the car or food on the table, we would say that family was not running a surplus. In the business world if we borrowed against our pension fund assets to pay for the current operations of the company, we would go to jail based on federal law, and yet that is what we have been doing in Washington.

Mr. Chairman, that is why I think it is so important to set aside a hundred percent of the Social Security for Social Security.

I think that this budget is also important in the way that it recognizes spending caps. I mean can one have a



Power Ranger toy and a Obe Wan Kinobe toy at the same time? My 6-year-old would say yes. We go in the toy store, and he wants both. And in Washington we seem to always want both, and I think what is so important about the spending caps that this budget keeps in place is that it recognizes that we cannot have the Obe Wan Kinobe toy and the Power Ranger toy at the same time. At times we do have to make hard and difficult choices, but nonetheless choices.

Finally, I think what this budget recognizes that is so important is that right now we are at a post World War II high in terms of the amount of money that has been coming into Washington, D.C. This budget does something about that.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE), but pending that I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, to my friend from South Carolina: What the President has proposed and what we are proposing even more emphatically is that the Social Security surpluses, in our case a hundred percent of those surpluses, first be taken and used solely to buy down public debt. In return for the receipt of those excess payroll taxes the Treasury will issue, as is customary, a bond backed by the full faith and credit of the United States Government to the Social Security trustees. Then, dollar for dollar of debt reduction, the Treasury will issue another bond partly to Social Security, partly to Medicare. Over a period of 15 years, Mr. Chairman, it will double the amount of the trust fund.

So, the key factor is that, as we build up the assets of the Social Security Retirement Trust Fund and the Medicare Trust Fund in this manner, we are also paying down the debt of the United States so that when those trust funds come due in 2032, the Social Security Administration will be able to go to the Treasury window, the Treasury will be in better shape than ever financially to pay those funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE) for 2 minutes.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for having yielded this time to me.

This day is probably a day of budget overload. There is more debate on what is the budget, what should the budget be, what are the implications of different budgets, whose is best, whose is worse, whether they are accurately characterized or caricatured, and it is with some reluctance that I raise the spectre of yet another budget.

I have been working with a group of moderate to conservative Democrats called the Blue Dog Coalition, and we, too, have developed a budget proposal. We feel that our humble budget proposal is one that is not as partisan, as

spirited, as some of the others that are being discussed today, and we are not here to say that our colleagues have irresponsible budget proposals. Like the Republican budget proposal and the Democratic budget proposal, we are committed to saving a hundred percent of the Social Security surplus for savings for the Social Security Trust Fund to reduce the debt. I think that is a common theme in the discussions today. We ought to rejoice in that.

The next issue that has become quite contentious, where there certainly is far from any agreement, is what do we do with the operating surplus in the budget?

We have fortunately achieved the time, maybe we can say it is the millennium, when the Federal budget is anticipated to show a surplus even without the Social Security Trust Fund. It is a remarkable achievement. Our group is suggesting that rather than devoting this surplus to tax reduction, devoting the surplus to new program initiatives or to other ways of spending or investing it, that we split the surplus into three parts, that we devote 50 percent of it to reducing the national debt, and I submit in the first 5 years this is very similar to the Democratic proposal.

In this respect the Blue Dog proposal and the Democratic proposal are very similar, and the Republican proposal would suggest that this 50 percent ought to be used for tax reduction.

Going on, the next 25 percent, we urge that we set that money aside and invest it in priority programs: health care, education, veterans, defense, agriculture, the priority programs that Congress would agree on; and third, to take the last 25 percent and devote that to tax reduction, be the continuation of tax credits that are expiring, targeted tax credits, whatever type of initiatives we agree upon here.

I would like to emphasize that this is our proposal, and later on this afternoon we will deal with it in greater detail. But this represents a moderate way of trying to bring some consensus here in Congress as to what we should do on behalf of the American people.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, in his opening remarks the chairman of the Committee on the Budget got up and said that this was about risk taking, this was about a budget that would allow people to take risks to keep more of their money and to take risk. Unfortunately, the people that are at risk in this budget are the people who seek a better education for their children, veterans who seek better health care, communities that seek to lower class sizes, the elderly that want to make sure that Medicare is se-

cure. Those are the people who are taking the risk in the Republican budget. They want to pretend as though, if they give back a tax cut, that everything will happen and everything will turn out all right, and that is the risk, is giving back the tax cut.

No, the risk for America is in paying for that tax cut because, as we see in this budget, student loans for higher education, Pell grants for higher education all need to be cut to make room for that. The hundred thousand teachers to try to lower class sizes needs to be cut to make room for that. In fact, what we see is an across-the-board cut in education at a time when the people in this country are telling us that they recognize the kind of reinvestment that this Nation, our States, our local communities need to make in education so that our young people can compete in a worldwide economy. Those are the people at risk.

Once again what the Republicans have done is shifted the risk of their budget priorities to those who can least afford it, those who have the least ability to make up for their mistakes, those who are trying to the best of their ability to move forward in American society, in American economy.

That is where the risk is in their budget, those are the programs that are targeted, those are the programs that are cut, those are the programs that are reduced, all to make way for a tax cut that they hope for people who have simply none of the worries, none of these everyday worries, that American families have on a daily basis about themselves, their jobs and their children's education.

□ 1500

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

Mr. Chairman, I am going to conclude the contribution to the discussion of the Joint Economic Committee today by saying this: I laid out very carefully, I think, a case in which I believe very deeply, and that is that Fed has been responsible and successfully so in giving us an economy in which there is an inflation rate of darn near zero.

I think that that is primarily responsible for the growth that we have seen, along with other items that I also pointed out.

However, one of the speakers from the other side, following my presentation, suggested that the tax increase that occurred in 1993 was somehow responsible for lowering inflation and lowering interest rates. In fact, the facts do not bear that out in any way, shape or form.

I would just like to say to my friends on the other side of the aisle that when the tax increase occurred, which is now, of course, referred to as the budget arrangement that created this expansion, which I think is false, but when that tax increase occurred in 1993, it went into effect, the vertical line here indicates the time period during which that tax increase went into

effect, interest rates actually spiked upward, not downward, as one of the previous speakers indicated.

The spike upward is indicated here on the chart by the red line. As well as the Federal funds rate also went up, as indicated by the yellow line, and the discount rate went up, as indicated by the black line. So when individuals try to make the case that somehow the tax increase that took place in 1993 had the effect of lowering interest rates, quite the opposite is true. For the following 12 or 13 months after the tax increase went into effect, interest rates went up, not down.

So I think it is somewhat, I must say, misleading, to be kind, to make the claim that somehow the President's tax increase had a positive effect on economic growth.

I do not want to shift the entire credit to the Federal Reserve. I think they did a good job. I think they have squeezed and squeezed and squeezed on targeting inflation and have successfully gotten it out of our system.

It is true that restraint in government spending has played a part. As a matter of fact, in 1992, our government consumed 22 percent of GDP. Today our government consumes 19½ percent of GDP. I think that is good and good for growth.

I believe that lower marginal tax rates that remain in place today, in spite of the increases in 1990 and 1993, are good and provide a positive effect on growth. The marginal rates are lower today than they were in the fifties or the sixties or the seventies.

Investment has also worked to expand capacity. Business has been encouraged to invest and, of course, global competition and freer trade have also played a role in fostering growth.

This is the economic report of the President, and incidentally, I think it is very appropriate that the cover is red, which claimed that the tax increase in 1993 produced lower interest rates. This book does not even mention, does not even mention, the role of the Fed, when the facts claim quite conversely that the tax increase also created an increase in interest rates across the board.

I am very pleased to have been able to manage this time on behalf of the Joint Economic Committee. I hope it has been a contribution to the understanding that we all have as to what happened to the economy.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) to control.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 2½ minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time and its control to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I inquire as to the balance of the time remaining on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL).

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, it is time for Congress to recognize that uncontrolled sprawling development is an economic disaster that wastes human resources and uses human and financial capital in inefficient and wasteful ways.

Our Democratic proposal contains a livability agenda that does not promote Federal planning or zoning but embraces local control, providing Federal vision with tools to municipalities and counties and States to better prepare themselves for the 21st Century.

The Democratic budget puts greater power, more money and enhanced decision-making authority in local hands, to fight sprawl, clean up the environment and protect the legacy of our land.

Some of the tools in this livability agenda include the proposed Better America Bonds, which would allow State and local governments to borrow up to \$10 billion to preserve green space, protect water quality and reclaim brown fields.

The regional connections initiative will promote regional smart growth strategies across local jurisdictional lines. The community Federal information partnership will provide communities with grants for easy-to-use information to develop strategies for local growth; and the lands legacy initiative will provide \$1 billion to significantly expand Federal efforts to save America's natural treasures and provide new resources for State and communities to protect local green spaces.

Mr. Chairman, it is wasteful and inefficient and harmful to our economy to permit sprawling, unmanaged growth, to sit in traffic jams, to pave over good farmland instead of reclaiming and reusing brown fields.

We must save the American landscape. We must provide future generations with livable communities. We owe it to America to support the democratic proposal.

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

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Republican budget resolution and in strong support of the Democratic alternative.

Mr. Chairman, under the very able leadership of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking member of the committee, the

Democrats want to keep prosperity on track and protect the American family.

The proposal of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) would build upon past Democratic efforts and ensure continued fiscal responsibility while protecting many valuable Federal programs.

The Democratic plan would save 100 percent of the Social Security surplus and 62 percent of the total estimated unified budget surplus for Social Security, ensuring the Social Security trust fund remains solvent for many years to come.

Our plan also transfers 15 percent of these surpluses to shoring up Medicare, extending its solvency for at least a decade to grant us the time we need to fix and to develop and implement a bipartisan fix for this valuable social program.

Mr. Chairman, education, one of the most crucial underpinnings of our great country, is barely given lip service under the Republican proposal.

Many of my colleagues may ask why the Federal Government needs to become involved in school innovation and construction issues which are historically local concerns? The simple answer is that the problem has grown so large that localities and States alone do not have the resources or the programs to address the overwhelming needs.

For instance, a recent survey by the Division of School Facilities in New York City concluded that in my district alone 19 new schools were needed to alleviate overcrowding. Additionally, to bring schools in the 7th Congressional District of New York up to standards deemed fair by school facility engineers, New York City would have to fund \$218.65 million in exterior modernization projects and \$53.8 million in interior modernization projects.

Mr. Chairman, if we support the working men and women of this country and if we support our Nation's children, we must oppose this budget resolution and support the Democratic alternative.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking member on the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. Chairman, let me thank the chairman of the Committee on the Budget for giving us this opportunity to face Americans and define for them what kind of country we would like to be.

I had the pleasure of organizing the Congressional Children's Caucus, a group of about 60 Members who have committed to promoting children first in the national agenda. We look forward to hearing from Mrs. Tipper Gore, the wife of the vice president, on the

issues of mental health services for children.

Keeping that in mind, I am very concerned with the budget as proposed by the majority leadership, because our children must face the challenges of competing in a global environment and the new millennium. We have got to invest in children. This budget does not.

Children cannot learn if they are hungry, tired and improperly prepared. The majority's budget proposal reduces domestic spending in programs aimed at protecting the interests of children.

Allow me to call the roll. A program of which many Members of this House have testified that they graduated from, Head Start, is being cut \$501 million, a 10 percent cut; the WIC program that provides for women, infants and children, being cut \$425 million; Job Corps, which has allowed many inner city and rural community youth to find an opportunity out of the seat of degradation, cut \$141 million; child care, there is not a time that I go home to my district when women and men, parents who say give me the ability to work, provide child care and help me provide child care for my children, sometimes one-third of their income, \$119 million; the summer youth program, where a mother gave me the good news of her young person who had graduated through the summer youth program, now gainfully employed, cut some \$109 million; community services block, cut \$54 million; runaway and homeless youth, which I confront all the time in our community, cut \$4.7 million; Native American Head Start, cut \$3.8 million; child abuse, \$2.2 million; abandoned infants assistance, \$1.3 million.

Mr. Chairman, I can only say oppose this majority leadership budget. Realize that our children are our best investment. Let us support the Democratic alternative and invest in our children.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to FY 2000 Budget Resolution offered by the Majority's Leadership. I come in the spirit of Hershey and bipartisanship. I come to request a budget that protects the Social Security Trust Fund for America's citizens. I rise to request a budget that will protect the Medicare Trust Fund.

We must authorize a budget that will protect the Social Security Trust Fund. While women tend to collect benefits over a longer period than men because of a greater life expectancy; women on average receive lower monthly social security benefits since they have lower earnings and are more likely to be widowed or unmarried in retirement. The Majority's budget proposal does not protect women or children or the Social Security Trust Fund. Under this budget proposal—programs directed toward improving the quality of life for women and children, are the first programs to be reduced and cut—in order to give a tax break to the wealthy.

The majority is suggesting that their budget proposal will save 100% of the social security surplus but 0% of that money goes to the Social Security Trust Fund and 0% goes towards strengthening Medicare. This simply is not

true! Domestic programs are not a priority in this budget resolution offered by the Majority.

We must authorize a budget that will appropriate financial resources to reduce the average classroom size to promote a learning environment and to modernize public schools. Educating America's children should be our number one priority. Our children must be prepared to face the challenges of competing in a global environment and the new millennium. Children can not learn if they are hungry, tired and improperly prepared. The Majority's budget proposal reduces domestic spending and programs aimed at protecting the interest of our children. \$425.1 million would be slashed from the WIC budget, Head Start would be cut by approximately \$501.4 million and LIHEAP funding would be reduced by \$109 million. Nevertheless, the Majority's budget resolution reserves \$800 billion for tax cuts.

We must authorize a budget that will protect and extend the Medicare Trust Fund. This budget must ensure that patients will have access to high quality healthcare by guaranteeing important protections such as access to the specialists, coverage for emergency medical services and affording prescriptions for seniors. The Majority's budget proposal leaves the Medicare Trust Fund in a precarious position and its future in question. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that there will be a federal surplus of about \$2.6 trillion over the next 10 years. We must authorize a budget that will ensure the economic viability of Social Security, Medicare and our national defense.

We must authorize a budget that will protect America's families. Families first—America first—Children first—we must authorize financial resources to assist in expanding after-school programs. Furthermore, we must enact legislation that will increase the minimum wage and improve the quality of life for all Americans. The Majority's budget proposal does not safeguard the interest of our Children. The Summer Youth Employment program's funding will be cut by over \$94.9 million, the Community Services Block Grant Program slashed by over \$54.5 million—we must prioritize families, women and children in the FY 2000 budget.

We must authorize a budget that will provide law enforcement officers and agencies with modern technology directed at reducing crime. We must allocate financial resources to help communities put additional law enforcement officers on the street. We must authorize a budget that will protect our most valued and venerable citizens, children and seniors.

We must authorize a budget that will redirect additional income to America's families. Congress must empower families to save for their retirement and provide for quality care for older family members. We must enact legislation that will protect women, children and America's families. Congress must put families first!

We must authorize a budget that will safeguard the financial viability of American's veterans. The Spratt Amendment will add an additional \$9 Billion for veterans. We must pass a budget that will appropriate an additional \$3 Billion for agriculture over the next five years. We must pass a budget that will allocate \$10 Billion for education and \$18 Billion more for healthcare.

We must support a budget that protects America's families, seniors and children. I urge

you to vote "no" on the bill and "yes" on the Democratic substitute.

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

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

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, the Spratt Democratic budget extends the life of Social Security and Medicare. The Republican budget does not. Do not be fooled. This same Democratic Party that created Social Security and Medicare is the same party to trust when it comes to strengthening Social Security and Medicare.

Under the Democratic plan, the Social Security trust fund would have 50 percent more dollars in it than under the Republican plan. There is a \$1.3 trillion set-aside in the Democratic plan, more for Social Security than in the Republican plan; \$1.3 trillion.

For Medicare, the Republican plan does not do anything at all. The Republican plan does not add one penny of money to extend the life of Medicare or to strengthen it. The Democratic plan for Medicare will triple the amount of money put into Medicare, a move that will extend the life of Medicare until 2020. For all those who care about Social Security and Medicare and who want Social Security and Medicare to be there for our generation and our children's generation, there is only one responsible choice: The Democratic budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise against the Republican budget and in support of the Democratic alternative. The Republican Party, unfortunately, has always been hostile to Medicare. My senior citizens need Medicare, and that is why the Democratic plan strengthens Medicare.

When I talk to senior citizens in my district, they tell me that Medicare is just as important to them as Social Security. When I speak with my mother, who is my best advisor, she tells me that Medicare needs to be enhanced.

The President has proposed a prescription drug component. I believe that that is what we should have. The Republican resolution, it does not provide a long-term care benefit, nor prescription drug benefit under Medicare.

□ 1515

We need to make sure that our seniors do not choose between food and drugs. The Republican budget has no problem in proposing a \$775 billion tax break for the rich, for the wealthiest of Americans.

We cannot continue to play politics with our seniors' health. The Democratic plan strengthens social security and strengthens Medicare. The Republican plan leaves out Medicare. Medicare ought to be on the table. The prescription drug component ought to be

part and parcel of the mix. Long-term care is very, very important. Senior citizens in this country need help. The Democratic plan provides that help, the Republican plan does not.

Let us work on a budget resolution that enhances Medicare, not hurts it. We cannot ignore the problem.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the Republican budget. The majority attack on education, seniors, and this Nation's most vulnerable is becoming an annual rite of passage for the Republican Party. Just recently the stock market broke 10,000, the highest it has ever been. Despite this wealth, however, we are here inflicting pain.

What kind of message are we sending to our children when we cut funding for education by \$1.2 billion, essentially crippling Head Start and undercutting Pell Grants? What are we saying to public housing residents when this budget would put 1 million of them out on the street? Where are the compassionate conservatives now?

What is worse about this budget is that it does nothing to ensure the solvency of social security and Medicare, all in the name of cutting taxes for the wealthiest families in this country.

This budget asks too high a price of poor Americans, and breaks the promise of a better tomorrow for our children, elderly, and working poor. I urge my colleagues to oppose this budget and support the Democratic alternative.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman who just spoke mentioned how in our budget plan there are tax cuts for the rich. I have read it. It does not say that in here one place.

I had a speaker come up here today and said how we cut funds for the Ryan White AIDS research. I will jump off the Capitol dome if Members can find the words "Ryan White" in here. Look for it, it is not in here. How do they say that? How do they get away with that? Do they feel no shame, getting to the floor of the House and saying Ryan White AIDS research is cut in here? Find it for me. I will wager with them. I will be glad to do that. They cannot find it.

The other interesting thing about this is that they come to the floor and they say how they want to put money into veterans, they want to save social security, they do not want Medicare cuts.

Why did Members not make those arguments to the President? The President's plan does all of those things. Instead of making those arguments down at the Rose Garden, down with the President, at the last minute they rush in here with two, not one but two, alternatives to the President's plan.

Why are Members running away from the President? Why are they running away from the person who stood here before the Nation at the State of the Union and said how he is going to keep education as a priority, how he is going to keep making sure that Medicare and social security are a priority? Why are Members running from that plan?

I have a feeling here in the next portion of this debate we are going to get a little bit of insight into why the Democrats, instead of supporting the President, instead of even adopting a portion of his plan, have written their own in a hurry to rush in here and try and save themselves from the polls that are going south on them.

I think we are going to find out here in just a little bit, as the gentleman from Oklahoma, the gentleman from Minnesota, the gentleman from Arizona, are going to point out to us, why the President's plan has so many people running from it, and particularly people from his own party; people who we would think would at least find a few things in the budget that they could agree with.

But instead, they are saying, no, we do not want to do what the President does for social security, we are running from that; we don't want to have Medicare cuts like the President, we are running from that; we don't want to increase taxes like the President does, we are running from that; we don't want to keep the priority low on education, we are running from that; we don't want veterans' hospitals to close, we are running from that.

They are running and running and running. Mr. Chairman, they can run but they cannot hide. We are about to show them why.

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

Mr. Chairman, 6 years ago the President sent us a budget on February 17 which passed this House by 2 votes. Opponents on the other side of the aisle said it would cut the economy off at the knees and mushroom the deficit. Six years later, the economy is running strong and the deficit has dropped from \$290 billion to a \$70 billion surplus. That is the finest tribute we can pay to the Humphrey-Hawkins debate.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to both the GOP budget proposal as well as the Democratic alternative. Both budgets call for enormous increases in defense spending over the next six to ten years. I cannot vote for these exorbitant increases in defense spending—anywhere between \$112–134 billion—when the fate of Social Security and Medicare remains questionable.

The Democratic Budget Resolution, by using the President's plan for defense spending, endangers already vulnerable programs by needlessly puffing up the military. The Democratic resolution calls for over \$9 billion in undistributed cuts by the year 2000. The question is—where do we find it? Shall we do away with the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Energy? Which severely underfunded federal program will we raid first? Come the year 2000, programs that are al-

ready suffering—like federal childcare and job training programs—will be sitting ducks.

Proponents of increasing military spending claim that this money is needed to replace aging weapons systems, improve the military's readiness and training, and to attract and retain more people in the armed services through better pay benefits. Since 1996, the Congressional majority has added nearly \$30 billion beyond the Pentagon's request to help with military readiness. Three-quarters of this went to pork projects in key members' districts. The proposals before us today would commit more than \$1.8 trillion to the military over the next six years. There is no justification for increasing military spending by this amount.

These budgets propose to squander scarce resources in order to appease the defense industry and procure weapons systems not seen since the Reagan era. The U.S. alone spends more than twice that of all of its potential aggressors combined. That means Russia, China, Iraq, North Korea, Syria, Libya and Cuba combined don't even spend half of what the U.S. spends for defense.

The U.S. spends up to \$35 billion per year maintaining 6,000 nuclear weapons on hair trigger alert. The Soviet Union is no longer a threat to the U.S. The U.S. is more threatened by the technicians and technology in Russia falling into the hands of rogue states. However, yesterday, in the Supplemental Appropriations bill, my colleagues chose to reduce the funding to purchase and store the enriched plutonium and uranium used to make nuclear weapons in Russia.

The budgets before us include spending for a National Missile Defense (NMD) system on top of the billions already wasted on a futile deployment. Spending just a fraction of what the U.S. has spent, and plans to spend, on NMD could do far more to reduce the danger of missile attacks and weapons proliferation if used on verifiable arms control and disarmament.

We are marching down the wrong path. Instead of making this a more livable and peaceful world for our children, we are proposing cuts in necessary programs for life while increasing spending on weapons of destruction. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing these egregious budget proposals.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the fiscally responsible Republican budget plan that protects Social Security and Medicare while providing needed tax relief.

President Clinton has called on Congress to use part of the so-called budget "surplus" to protect Social Security, strengthen Medicare and finance a number of new spending projects. But when we hear President Clinton and other Washington politicians talk about this great "surplus" we have to remember where it comes from—the Social Security Trust Fund. The federal government borrows money from this Trust Fund—about \$99 billion last year—to finance other government spending and to mask what is, in reality, a budget deficit. In fact, if we had taken the Social Trust Fund surplus out of the federal last year, we would have been \$30 billion short of a balanced budget.

For the next couple of years it is expected that most of the so-called surplus will be due to the Social Trust Fund, which all of us pay into in the form of payroll taxes. Then, based on current economic projects, real surpluses

from the non-Social Security portion of the budget will begin to grow as taxpayers pay more than the government needs to finance its operations.

I commend my friend and colleague from Ohio, JOHN KASICH, the members of the Budget Committee and the Republican Leadership for proposing a sensible, long-overdue change to the way the Trust Fund is treated. The Republican budget stops using the Trust Fund to mask the real size of the deficit and, instead, preserves it for Social Security. This new approach to the surplus is more honest and more fiscally responsible. It also results in more surplus being preserved for Social Security than the President has proposed.

Our plan builds a wall around the Social Trust Fund—creating a “lock box” that preserves 100% of the “surplus” for Social Security’s needs. By stopping Congress and the White House from spending the Social Trust Fund, we protect current and future retirees. That’s why the American Association of Retired Persons (AARP) has given the Republican plan its endorsement.

President Clinton’s budget also calls for using 15% of the so-called “surplus” for Medicare. But in short term, he actually proposes to borrow money from the Social Trust Fund to shore up Medicare, while at the same time cutting almost \$9 billion from Medicare to pay for new government spending. This scheme is a classic example of robbing Peter to pay Paul. It also means, when the Medicare Trust Fund runs out of money in 2009, taxpayers will foot the bill.

The Republican plan also takes steps to pay down the national debt and uses honest numbers—not shady Washington accounting—to address Medicare’s financial challenges. Finally, while President Clinton’s budget proposal calls for \$100 in new taxes at a time when tax revenues are at an historic high, our plan provides tax relief beginning in 2000 that grows substantially over the next ten years to reduce the tax burden on America’s families.

With this new plan, we can finally stop raiding the Social Trust Fund to pay for more government spending. Let’s hope Congress rejects the old ways as represented in the President’s budget, and passes an honest plan to protect Social Security, preserve Medicare and let Americans keep more of what they earn.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, one of my priorities when I came to Congress two years ago was to bring good East Texas fiscal responsibility to Washington. We made great strides in balancing the budget over the past two years, and we must not stray from this path. That is why I rise tonight, in the name of fiscal responsibility and on behalf of hard-working East Texas families, in strong support of both the Democratic and Blue Dog budget resolutions.

I support tax relief. In fact, I was one of only 19 Democrats to vote for last year’s tax relief bill. Both of these budget alternatives provide for tax relief for working Americans. I would prefer to see even more tax relief, but it is important to remember that our nation still has a \$5 trillion debt. The best thing we can do with projected surpluses would be to pay down the federal debt, which would reduce interest rates for families and small businesses, prepare for the retirement of the baby boom generation, and slash the interest payments of the federal government.

We can’t fund a larger tax cut until projected surpluses have actually materialized and until

we fulfill our commitment to preserve Social Security and Medicare. Instead, we must pay down the debt, honor our promise to our nation’s seniors, and provide for targeted tax cuts, and both the Blue Dog and Democratic alternative budget resolutions do just that.

Furthermore, both these budget alternatives spend money wisely on priority areas. We can fulfill our commitment to reduce class size and hire 1000,000 new teachers. We can spend more on education to repair our crumbling schools and expand after-school learning programs in rural areas. We can provide for the health care needs of the men and women who have fought on the battlefield and risked their lives for all Americans. We can help East Texas agricultural producers and fund crop insurance reform that will provide some meaningful protections for farmers against those things that are out of their control. Finally, we can spend more for our nation’s defense, improving our nation’s military readiness and increasing military pay.

These are good budget alternatives that preserve Social Security and Medicare, pay down the federal debt, and spend money where it needs to be spent. These budget alternatives have been drafted with the fiscal responsibility I’ve spent the last two years fighting for. I urge my colleagues to support them and pass a budget that is good for American families.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my grave concern regarding the proposed veterans’ budget for Fiscal Year 2000. Currently veterans are facing a medical emergency. Unless the veteran health care system receives significant increases in funding, critical services will be cut, health care will be denied, facilities closed, and dedicated employees will be out of work.

The Republican budget provides a modest \$900 million increase in funding. However, this increase is a one-time addition that is not carried over to the next fiscal year. The Republican budget actually proposes to decrease funding for veterans. In fact, over five years, the budget resolution cuts funding for veterans by \$300 million. And over ten years, their resolution cuts veterans’ funding by \$3 billion below the 1999 level.

During consideration of this budget, while in committee and on the House floor, the majority refused an attempt to increase veterans’ funding. This important issue, which affects millions, deserves the change to be considered. Representative CLEMENT’S proposed amendment to the budget would increase veterans’ benefits by \$1.9 billion over last year’s request, and by \$1 billion above the Republican proposal. Specifically, this increase would provide: \$100 million more for mental health care to reverse the trend of eliminating psychiatric, substance abuse and other effective mental health programs; \$271 million more for long-term care initiatives to increase options for elderly and disabled veterans; and \$681 million more for the Montgomery GI Bill to increase coverage for tuition, fees and stipends to service members who are enlisted for at least three years. Over 10 years, the budget proposal offered by Democrats would provide over \$40 billion more for veterans’ programs. I support this amendment and am very upset that we were prevented from providing an increase to such an underfunded and important program.

It is our duty to provide the care and service promised to our heroes, and the proposed Re-

publican budget fails to give veterans the benefits they need and deserve. For the fourth consecutive year, the Veterans Administration budget has been essentially stagnant. This pattern has to end. To refuse consideration of an increase in funding for veterans who have given so much to their country is an outrage.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this budget resolution.

This budget, contrary to the President’s proposal, is a responsible approach to funding the Federal government without turning our backs on our 1997 Balanced Budget Agreement, an agreement that means so much to the American public and to our nation’s economic future.

And perhaps more than ever, this budget is about providing security for America’s future. We can continue to set the course for a sound Federal fiscal policy and a strong economy, or we can set up our children for a future of paying our debts—the President’s budget saddles our children with more national debt, more taxes, fewer educational opportunities, a bigger government and shaky retirement prospects.

As we vote to pass this budget, I say to my colleagues who have joined the President in criticism of our efforts, for a moment, take a step back from the podium, and imagine you are not immersed here in the politics of our nation’s capital.

For a moment, think of yourself not standing before your colleagues in debate, but rather, being with your constituents at a town meeting.

Would you still argue to enact the President’s budget, the largest in our nation’s history, a budget which grows the size of our government and breathes more life into a bureaucracy we’ve been struggling to contain? Or do you think your constituents would rather know that you have voted for a Federal budget that keeps our government in check and may possibly even shrink that once sprawling bureaucracy?

Could you speak passionately to them about the need to pass the President’s budget which only devotes 62 percent of our projected budget surpluses to preserving and protecting Social Security and allows him to spend \$146 billion of the Social Security surplus over five years.

Or might you inspire more confidence from your constituents if you told them the budget you want locks away \$100 billion more than the President to strengthen Social Security and Medicare, a total of \$1.8 trillion over a decade, with the guarantee that Washington can’t touch the Social Security surplus—your constituents’ payroll taxes—ever?

Again, the families you represent may want to know whether you support the President’s budget, or our Congressional budget plan that will pay down the national debt by \$450 billion more than the President over the next ten years.

The hard-working Americans you represent might be interested to know whether you voted for tax increases or tax cuts. The President’s budget raises taxes by \$172 billion in the next decade, but our budget provides \$800 billion in tax relief for the same period.

Would the veterans of your District salute you for passing the President’s flat-lined VA budget which raises serious questions about the quality of care our veterans receive in VA medical facilities, or do America’s heroes of

the past deserve the \$1.1 billion increase we gave them in our budget proposal?

To the young men and women in uniform who now serve our nation—what would you tell them? Could you look a young enlisted man or woman in the eye, one of our brave Americans who has joined NATO forces in Kosovo, and tell them to do their job even though you voted for the President's budget which falls \$8 billion short of the budget we propose for our nation's defense?

Improving the education of our young people is not only important to all of us, it is a critical element of our nation's ability to remain competitive in the 21st Century. For America's children, do you vote party or conscience? On your next school visit, do you tell the students you voted for the President's budget which cuts special education funding, or do you teach them that principle is above politics, and you voted for our budget which increases education funding \$1.2 billion more than President Clinton proposes. It includes more funding for Pell grants, and more flexibility for states to decide how best to spend this funding. Our budget, \$22 billion total for education, will improve the quality of elementary, secondary, and special education. Parents and children with special needs may question your vote for the President's budget because it amounts to a cut in Federal special education funding. Our budget contains a \$1 billion increase for Federal funding of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. While this is not the full funding I and 75 of my House colleagues from both sides of the aisle requested, it is a step in the right direction. In my state of New Jersey alone, if the Federal government would keep its promise to pay 40 percent of the costs associated with providing special education, \$300 million at the state level would become available each year—real money that could be used to hire more teachers, build more classrooms or reduce local property tax rates.

Our budget proposal provides security for American people and their future—retirement security, fiscal security, education security, national security and economic security. But it won't be easy to achieve these important goals, and is closing. I offer a word of caution.

Keeping within the confines of our balanced budget is our ultimate goal, and the Appropriations Committee works hard to balance the needs of our nation and our government while doing so. As a Member of this Committee, I can tell my colleagues that there will be sacrifices. We must understand this at the outset and prepare ourselves for the tough choices with which we all will be confronted. When the time comes, we will need to ask ourselves, "is a future of peace, prosperity, achievement and financial security for our children worth the sacrifice and effort today?" The answer is always "yes." We will need to remember this in the months ahead.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican budget resolution. This budget is a blueprint for another budgetary train wreck.

The Majority's budget is irresponsible. It is simply wrong to move ahead with a \$778 billion tax cut before taking action to assure the long-term financial health of Social Security and Medicare. The budget surplus gives us a unique opportunity to address these programs and we must not squander it. We should save the entire surplus until we've taken care of Social Security and Medicare.

No one believes the House can approve the appropriation bills that would be drawn from this budget template. Do we want a repeat of last year's budgetary derailment when Congress was unable to complete action on eight of the thirteen regular appropriation bills? But that's exactly where we're headed with the Majority's budget resolution.

Under the resolution, non-defense discretionary appropriations would be cut by \$46.4 billion next year, a full 16 percent below this year's funding level. Which programs does the Majority propose to cut? Energy assistance for the elderly? Maternal and child health care? Head Start? Law enforcement? The GOP budget resolution doesn't give any specifics.

The Republican budget also does nothing to shore up Medicare. All of us know that Medicare is projected to run short of funds in just eight more years. If Medicare's solvency is the price for the GOP's tax cuts, that price is too high.

I will support the Democratic substitute that will be offered by Representative SPRATT. The Spratt substitute is a responsible alternative to the budgetary gridlock that will surely follow adoption of the Majority's budget resolution. The Spratt substitute fulfills our obligations to Social Security and Medicare. It reserves 100 percent of the Social Security surplus for Social Security and extends Medicare's solvency until 2020.

I want to speak to the issue of legal immigrants. The Spratt substitute also restores vital benefits for legal immigrant that were wrongly taken away under the 1996 welfare law. I led the fight last year to restore food stamp eligibility to the children of legal immigrant as well as elderly legal immigrants who entered the country before enactment of the 1996 welfare bill. The Spratt substitute would permit states to cover legal immigrant pregnant women and children with Medicaid, restore SSI eligibility for legal immigrants who entered the country after August 22, 1996 and were subsequently disabled, and would assure food stamps to legal immigrants who were residents as of August 22, 1996 and are over the age of 65. This is a step in the right direction.

I urge my colleagues to reject this irresponsible budget resolution and support the Spratt substitute.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman. I rise to oppose the priorities as expressed in this Budget.

I strongly oppose this Republican budget because its priorities are wrong. A substantial number of us, five and a half million, are ill-housed. 42 million of us are without health care coverage. Our schools need more teachers and better-trained teachers; our school buildings need to be rehabilitated.

If we maintain the caps on discretionary spending, as proposed in this Republican budget, as well as increase the military budget, and give about \$780 billion in tax cuts, the result will be to squeeze out essential programs that effect the daily well-being of a significant sector of our society.

The Republican Budget does not adequately protect our elderly. One of our most important programs Social Security, has kept one of every two elderly Americans from falling into poverty. Social Security must be extended and protected. Likewise, Medicare is widely recognized and appreciated as an essential program by all of us because of its benefit to the elderly and the families of the elderly. Medicare must be extended and protected.

The Republican budget allocates, over a ten-year period, just \$1.77 trillion to extend Social Security, half of the Democrats' proposal, which calls for \$3.4 trillion. The Democrats' much greater investment in Social Security is essential to ensure its security.

The difference in budgetary priorities is even greater with Medicare. The Republican budget, over a ten-year period, sets \$14 billion for Part A, compared with the Democrats' proposal to invest \$397 billion in Medicare, an investment 28 times, greater than the Republicans' inadequate propositions.

This Republican budget does not protect and invest in our children. It ignores the needs of our children.

The retention of the budget cap, coupled with the \$18.1 billion increase in defense spending, means that Republicans cut Head Start by \$501 million; Republicans cut by \$425 million, they cut Job Corps by \$142 million; they cut child care funding by \$120 million; they cut low-income heating assistance by \$109 million; they cut summer youth employment by \$95 million; they cut homeless youth programs by \$4.7 million; they cut abandoned infants assistance by \$1.3 million.

These are the programs that will suffer deep cuts if this Republican budget is approved. Of course, there is no money in this Republican bill for more and better-trained teachers in America's classroom.

This budget is not a responsible, adult budget because it fails to take care of the basic needs of the nation's families. I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise with many concerns about the majority's budget resolution before us today. Because of the strong economy and prudent fiscal policies of the past few years, we are on track towards achieving our first non-social security budget surplus in a generation. When I first came to Congress in 1995, even the thought of achieving an on-budget surplus by the year 2000 or 2001 seemed completely unrealistic.

That is why I believe we must not waste this historic opportunity to ensure the long-term solvency of the social security system which will be threatened due to the large number of baby-boomers who will begin retiring in the next 10–15 years. While the majority's plan ensures that money dedicated to the social security program should go to the program, this so-called "lock box" approach does nothing more than ensure that the system will go broke on schedule. A more responsible approach would be to dedicate surplus funds to the social security system in preparation for the increased number of retirees early in the next century.

I am also disappointed that the majority's plan does nothing to reduce the federal debt. The proposal uses nearly all of the projected surplus for a yet to be specified \$778 billion tax cut that relies on future revenue projections. Economists have repeatedly stated that reductions in the public debt would result in lower interest rates which leads to increased economic growth and opportunities for all American families.

This proposal represents the type of budget gimmickry that has made the American people cynical about the entire federal budget process. I believe the American people understand they aren't being told the full truth when they hear proposals such as this which claim to cut taxes, dramatically increase defense spending,



protect social security and stay within the 1997 budget caps. Believe me, they are smart enough to realize that schemes like this just don't add up. We were elected to make the tough choices necessary to keep our fiscal house in order. I believe the American people deserve better than this type of smoke-and-mirrors budgeting that relies solely on future unreliable projections.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to reject this proposal and seize this rare opportunity to dedicate the surplus to protecting the long term solvency of social security and to paying down the federal debt.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to explain my priorities as we debate the budget resolution for FY 2000.

I am a cosponsor of a Constitutional Amendment to Balance the Budget and have introduced budget enforcement legislation in the past. As such, I am pleased that we balanced the nation's budget in FY 1998. However, we should not be complacent.

Before we talk of new spending or new tax cuts, we should keep our eye on one goal, and that is maintaining a balanced budget: a balanced budget for our current fiscal year and for FY 2000. Moreover, we should recognize that trust fund surpluses from Social Security, Medicare, the Highway Trust Fund and other federal trust funds totaled \$150 billion last year and masked our true situation by making our budgetary position appear more favorable than it really was. Hence, I feel our second priority should be to really balance the budget without the use of any trust fund surpluses.

Thereafter, I believe that we should begin to pay down the national debt, which, according to the Congressional Budget Office, has reached an all-time high of \$5.5 trillion. By using all the surplus to pay down the debt, we as taxpayers would save a significant amount of money in future interest payments. Today those payments total \$231 billion. For every \$1 billion in debt that we can retire, we save an average of \$70 million in annual interest payments. This savings would benefit every American regardless of their economic status and I believe it represents the best tax cut we can give to the American people. Furthermore, this debt retirement would provide us with more flexibility in addressing how best to secure Medicare and Social Security for future generations while maintaining our ability to also invest in solid programs that can make our economy more productive.

Several budget resolutions have been introduced which take different approaches to maintaining a surplus and allocating our financial resources. I favor the resolution proposed by a coalition of conservative Democrats, since it provides the most fiscally sound approach. It would reserve 100% of the Social Security surplus for the Social Security Trust Fund. It also pays down more debt than any other proposal before the House, thereby providing for lower interest payments in the future and more flexibility to address unforeseen problems. Conservative projections indicate that this budget would save us \$113 billion in interest payments on our debt over the next five years.

Although I am primarily concerned about maintaining fiscal discipline and believe a tax cut could be detrimental to sustaining a balanced budget, the tax cut provided for in this proposal is minimal and can be targeted

towards the hard-working middle class families who need it most.

Mr. Chairman, I close by adding that maintaining the public trust is the single most important issue we face today. I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to weigh the impact that the budget resolution will have on future generations.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to give my enthusiastic endorsement for the Democratic Substitute to the Budget Resolution offered by the Ranking Member on the Budget Committee, JOHN SPRATT.

This substitute takes a responsible approach to government. It takes the surplus from this year, and reinvests it back into Social Security and Medicare. However, what is important is the manner in which this is accomplished. Unlike the Republican Budget Resolution, this amendment takes those surplus funds and directly deposits the money into the Social Security Trust Fund and the Medicare Trust Fund. The Republicans cannot tell you they are doing that—because they are not. They swear to put 100% of the surplus aside, but they do not guarantee the American people what they will do with that surplus once the smoke clears. On the other hand, this substitute puts its money where its mouth is—back into the accounts that will extend the life of Social Security for another 18 years, and Medicare another 12.

And the Democratic budget extends these programs without a loss of benefits for the people who rely upon them. Earlier this week, I met with several groups of seniors in my district in Houston. Without exception, the most pressing concern of theirs as it related to the budget was the loss of benefits. Under the Democratic Resolution, their concerns are answered—but we cannot say the same under the Republican plan, because it set forth how Medicare and Social Security funds will be spent. We can close the door on the Republican plan of Social Security privatization today if we pass this substitute—and I urge all of you to support it.

The Democratic proposal also does more to reduce the debt than the Republican plan. This budget contains out-year debt reduction that totals over 474 billion dollars over fifteen years. The Republicans cannot tell you the same. In fact, if they can pass their budget, you will much more likely see tax cuts than debt reduction.

However, that does not mean that the Democratic budget does not contain tax cuts, because it does. Indeed, the Democratic substitute contains targeted tax cuts of the sort that bring the most relief to the American family. Those tax cuts adjust the marriage penalty, help pay for child and healthcare, and extend work opportunity credits. Do we need anything more than this? I believe that these are the tax cuts that the American people have been waiting for, and I am happy to support this budget so we can bring it to them.

This substitute simply does more for children and families than the budget offered by the Republicans. It contains funding for important programs like Women, Infants and Children (WIC), Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), Job Corps, and Head Start that are ignored in the Republican plan. At the same time, it provides a bedrock foundation so we can rebuild our schools and reduce class sizes across the country. In addition, the

Democratic plan includes the funds necessary to hire 100,000 skilled new teachers so our children will be prepared for the 21st Century.

The Democratic substitute also follows the lead of the President by increasing the funding for the Department of Defense and the Veterans' Administration. These increases go above and beyond what the Republican budget offers—by including higher-than-baseline pay raises for our service members and a repeal of the Retired Pay Repeal Act (REDUX).

I urge each of my colleagues to do what is right and vote for a balanced budget, for our seniors, for our future, and for the Democratic substitute.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise today in proud support of the Republican Fiscal Year 2000 Budget. Once again my colleagues and I will continue to give American citizens tax relief while paying down the national debt and protecting Social Security.

The simply fact is that the American people are over-taxed. President Clinton's budget calls for \$100 billion in tax increases, while our budget offers \$800 billion in tax relief over ten years. The truth is a surplus is nothing more than an overpayment by America's taxpayers. It does not belong to Washington and we should return it in the form of tax relief. In addition, our budget will continue to re-pay the debt by placing over \$1.8 trillion towards the debt over the next decade. That's \$450 billion more than the President's budget.

While the President talks about saving Social Security for the next generation, his budget actually spends 42% of the Social Security Surplus. The Republican budget will lock up every penny of the Social Security Surplus over the next ten years. The American public has made it clear that Washington has no right to spend away a surplus, which does not belong to them.

Mr. Chairman, I'm tired of Washington having their hands in the pockets of the American taxpayer. Let's pass this historic budget for the new millennium and provide a better and more prosperous future for all Americans.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the Republican budget resolution because I believe it emphasizes exactly the wrong priorities for America's future and does little to make our communities more livable. By approving this document, we are ignoring the negative effects this budget would inflict on the health of our communities, our infrastructure, and our economy for the next decade.

If I had my way, I would place more priority on paying down the debt, saving Social Security and Medicare, avoid costly new tax cuts and unnecessary. Unfocused defense spending, and develop a capital budget to account for infrastructure investments for a more livable future. However, this budget resolution doesn't extend the solvency of those trust funds by a single day, and instead of paying down the debt, offers tax cuts that primarily benefit those who need help the least. It also calls for unfocused increases in some aspects of our military spending without assurances that any of this spending will increase our overall security. An example of this is the call for new "Star Wars" spending, an unproven system on which we've already spent over \$60 billion in research with nothing to show for it.

It fails to give America's communities the tools they need to improve their quality of life. The "Building Livable Communities" initiatives



embodied in the Administration's budget offered increased choices for citizens in the areas of transportation, housing, regional planning, open space preservation, education, and crime control. The Democratic alternative recognizes the importance of these initiatives through a Sense of the House resolution. I believe we have a responsibility to do all we can to have the federal government be a better partner with communities and citizens in their efforts to improve very basic components of everyday life—getting to work and school safely, ensuring the quality of the water we drink and the air we breathe, and having economic opportunities for the future.

It should also be noted that long-term budget projections are nearly always miscalculated, and have been overly optimistic by over \$200 billion on average over the last 15 years. Even small errors and changes in the economic picture can drastically alter what the government collects and spends. A forecasting error of as little as 2% can alter the budget balance by as much as \$70 billion annually. Future military conflicts, slower economic growth, stock market fluctuations, decisions by the Federal Reserve, currency values, natural disasters, and any number of other variables can also radically alter what the government spends and takes in.

Therefore it is unwise to push massive tax cuts years down the line, when it is impossible to know what our economic situation will be. Only by remaining fiscally cautious now and investing in America's infrastructure can we make this a budget that helps make our communities more livable.

This proposed budget would be a disaster if it were implemented. It siphons nearly a trillion dollars into tax cuts paid for with painful and unnecessary budget cuts, while ignoring key investments that need to be made in education, Social Security, and health care. The good news is that it won't be adopted in this form because even the Republicans have no intention of implementing it. The bad news is that it is a license to avoid responsible budgeting. I urge my colleagues to vote no and instead strive to produce a budget that promotes livable communities and fiscal stability.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the GOP's Budget Resolution. Again, the Republicans have sent to the House floor a resolution which abandons older Americans needs by ignoring the Medicare challenge, fails to protect satisfactorily and extend the solvency of the Social Security Trust Funds, shortchanges important health care benefits and services earned by our Nation's veterans, creates an illusionary increase in education spending, drastically cuts important funding and investment in our Earth's natural resources and before the budget surplus is realized, proposes to expend it with a \$779 billion 10-year tax expenditure that will grow even larger and larger with time and could eventually eliminate the projected on-budget surplus by dipping into the Social Security Insurance revenues.

Republicans are quick to defend this budget by declaring credit for spending increases for such programs as defense and education without ever specifying the severe cuts necessary to meet their overall spending totals. In this resolution, the GOP would underfund much-needed people programs by \$27 billion for fiscal year 2000. This is completely unrealistic as it all but ensures a confrontation and

guarantees yet another disastrous appropriations fight this fall. Modest increases in elementary and secondary education are proposed while a significant reduction is exacted from post-secondary education.

This resolution fails to save the surplus for Social Security Insurance. The GOP proposed "lock-box" initiative claims to save all of the Social Security Insurance surplus to pay down government debt. The facts are clear: this proposal stipulates that the surplus could be used to set up private individual retirement accounts as a substitute for Social Security Insurance. This represents a serious threat to the future solvency of the most successful domestic program ever established. What kind of message are we sending to the baby boomers soon to retire and our older Americans who are guaranteed a defined Social Security Insurance benefit? If the resources already committed to Social Security beneficiaries under current law are diverted to private accounts, benefits will eventually have to be cut. Or, workers will be taxed double to pay for current beneficiaries insurance and again to divert to such individual accounts. In addition, the GOP's "lock-box" proposal would not ensure that the debt held by the public is reduced. Overall, all this proposal does is ensure that Social Security goes broke on schedule and not extend its solvency by one day. Advocates may well speculate that the intent is to create a crisis with Social Security benefits to justify radical privatization schemes.

While Social Security Insurance benefits are projected to be in problems by 2032, Medicare is projected to run short of funds by 2008. Given this Medicare pressing and more urgent problem, our efforts should be more focused on the stability and solvency of this much-needed Medicare program. The GOP's insistence of \$779 billion in tax cuts over 10 years would surely come at the expense of Medicare. The Administration initiated a proposal to reserve 15 percent of projected budget surpluses to address and close the long-term funding gap of the Medicare program. By ignoring Medicare, the Republicans have decided to provide a huge tax expenditure and a significant defense spending increase. Frankly, the GOP budget lyrics do not match the music and is unable to face up to the facts. The GOP budget sets in place a political document which is unworkable and unfair.

The Administration has indicated a willingness not to "recoup" the Federal share of the recent tobacco settlements if there are safeguards which ensure that Federal contributions are used for public health and awareness programs. The Republican resolution assumes the Federal Government relinquishes both the right to recoup funds from the multi-State tobacco settlement as well as the authority to direct the States how to use those funds. Frankly, I believe that the national dollars recovered ought to be directed to health care concerns, not a rebate. These are Federal funds and we have a responsibility to exact accountability.

Under the Republican resolution, discretionary veterans programs are funded at \$20.2 billion. While this represents less than a \$1 billion increase over last year's funding levels and a one-time addition. Over five years, the GOP resolution would cut veterans' funding by \$300 billion below the 1999 freeze level. This is completely unacceptable. After years of inadequate funding levels, many VA employees

and veteran service organizations in my State of Minnesota have joined a national consensus to push for a substantial funding increase for the VA, especially for the health care function. This budget does far too little in 2000 and beyond to address the understaffed VA medical centers across the nation and the hard working, underpaid VA employee's that provide veterans the health care and other benefits and services they have earned. We can not overlook this today. According to the Independent Budget group, comprised of most of the major veterans service groups recommended an additional \$3 billion more than the Administration's VA proposal. In this budget resolution, the GOP has ignored such concerns and requests. A substantial increase is critically needed to avoid deep cuts in VA's medical care budget. We owe our veterans adequate health care and services that we promised to them.

The Republicans boast that their budget blueprint has a strong commitment to education, which time and again has been promoted by the American people as a top priority for federal tax dollars. And we can all see that this resolution does increase funding for elementary and secondary education. However, in taking a closer look it is apparent that this is a true case of robbing college student Peter to pay grade schooler Paul; in order to showcase the \$1.2 billion increase over the President's request for primary and secondary education funding, this budget severely shortchanges all other education programs. Deep cuts in higher education initiatives, such as Pell Grants and Work Study, and reductions in funding for programs which help pre-schoolers, such as Head Start, is extremely shortsighted. Education is a continuous journey, therefore, the idea of focusing entirely on K-12 and ignoring the needs of students who are preparing to enter school or those who wish to continue on to higher education opportunities is shallow and illusionary. A pea and shell game without the pea. Additionally, even with the increase in funding for elementary and secondary programs, this resolution leaves no room for full funding of special education programs, unless other programs for these grade levels are cut. In addition, the Republicans have decided to do nothing on the President's and a majority of Congress's initiative of hiring 100,000 more teachers and reducing class size that will provide our young people the much needed attention and focus they deserve to succeed in school and in life.

Many of the environmental programs that our state and local governments rely on, such as grants to wastewater and drinking water plants, will receive unacceptable cuts in funding as a result of the Republican budget. America's greatest natural treasures, our National Parks, Forests, and the like, will continue their severe backslide in maintenance and upkeep. And despite Interior's efforts to cure these ills with what little money they have secured, employees will still be fired and furloughed in an effort to stay within the spending caps as proposed by the Republican majority. Many in Congress have seen a grand vision for the future in preserving greenspace, and making life for everyone in the Union more in tune with the land in which they reside as seen in the President's proposed Lands Legacy Initiative. Despite overwhelming support for this exciting program, the majority has failed to fund any initiative with this objective.

We've heard the arguments against this program, that there is too much of a maintenance backlog in our parks to further expand them, but the GOP budget blueprint has come full circle—the GOP budget has nothing for maintenance conservation and restoration of our national treasures and nothing new for the preservation of America's remaining greenspace. Such a greenspace that we are losing each passing day. Apparently only useful as rhetoric to shoot down the President's land legacy initiative.

According to HUD's estimations, the Republican budget has a negative impact on several important housing programs. The reduction of 6.8% in outlays in FY 2000 for the section 8 voucher and project-based programs means 195,000 fewer households, or 478,000 fewer individuals, will be served. In addition, the reduction in outlays for public housing will result in under-funding 86,700 units, or 201,000 needy individuals.

If these reduction initiatives are enacted, HUD projects that \$1,335 billion (83%) of HOME program's FY 1999 budget authority would have to be rescinded and the Congress would be unable to appropriate any budget authority to the program in FY 2000. HUD assumes that in FY 1999, 78,000 families, or 177,000 individuals, will be assisted by HOME funds. If we were to rescind this budget authority for HOME, however, not one of the families or individuals would be served.

Again, the Republican budget fails to provide for the growing number of homeless or near-homeless individuals. If funds are reduced as under this GOP resolution, HUD projects that \$975 million (96%) of last years funding levels would have to be rescinded. Such a reduction would freeze dollars for future investment and spending for our homeless populations. This would result in a loss of 10,000 beds in transitional housing and 7,125 permanent beds for the disabled who are homeless.

Because of the extremely slow spend-out rates in these programs, Congress would have to halt current funding and all carry-over budget authority from previous years to meet the Republicans outlay reduction target. In FY 1999, HUD expects to develop 11,300 housing units (8,000 elderly and 3,300 disabled). All of those units would be lost. Furthermore, if outlays are reduced 6.8% in FY 2000 as required under this budget, HUD projects that \$125 million of the programs' current funding levels would have to be rescinded. Again, this leaves Congress without the resources to address and meet future spending needs. This would result in eliminating aid to 42,000 persons in FY 1999 and 79,000 persons in FY 2000. As a result of this totally inadequate GOP resolution, the number of persons who would lose housing assistance is estimated to be almost 1 million Americans.

The inaction on restoring and protecting the solvency of Medicare and the Social Security Insurance systems, ignoring special and higher-education programs and reduction in class room size initiatives, shortchanging our veterans health care, all but eliminating public housing funding to needy persons, abandoning our existing commitment to much needed environmental cleanup and protection efforts of our natural resources all result from one overriding GOP priority: passing a huge package of tax expenditures. Once again, the GOP has insisted to increase an all ready

over budgeted defense department and provide an un-timely \$779 billion tax expenditure that will in reality raid the Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds. This budget does not provide adequate investment in people programs and truly undermines our existing federal commitments by underfunding much needed resources and programs by \$27 billion in fiscal year 2000.

I urge all Members to vote no on this GOP budget resolution that comes up way short of meeting the needs and investments in people programs.

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Republican budget resolution that is before us today.

This budget sets the wrong priorities for Congress. It proposes a massive tax cut, substantial cuts in domestic spending programs, and no significant action on Social Security and Medicare—whereas I believe that Congress should be taking action now to preserve Social Security and Medicare, to address the difficult problems our nation still faces, and to invest in education and other programs that will improve all Americans' quality of life in the future.

Mr. Chairman, Americans have much for which to be grateful. The economy is growing, unemployment is down, and real incomes for working families are increasing—able to do so at a slow rate. We all know, though, that these good times cannot last indefinitely. At some point, the economy will stall. At some point there will be a recession. And in a few years, the Baby Boom generation will start to retire—and place a heavy new burden on programs like Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.

Many of the Republicans in Congress are saying that now is the time for the American people to relax and enjoy the fruits of our labors. Well, no one denies that the American people work hard and deserve a break. And no one wants to turn down a tax cut. But our debate today should not focus on what we deserve, or even on what we would like to do; that would be irresponsible. Rather, today's debate should focus on what we ought to do.

Today, twenty years of deficit spending are over, and budget surpluses are projected for at least the next ten years. But our fiscal troubles are not at an end. At best, we have only a dozen or so years of projected surpluses before dramatic increases in outlays for Social Security and Medicare—to pay for the Baby Boomers' retirement—submerge the federal budget again in a sea of red ink. A good economist will tell you that we cannot even be certain that the projected surpluses will materialize at all. So I say, let's prepare for the hard times ahead—not celebrate prematurely.

What steps should we take to prepare for the future challenges that we can already anticipate? What can we do to ensure that future Americans can face the prospect of retirement with pleasant anticipation and without fear? What can we do to ensure that all Americans have access to safe, affordable health care? And what can we do to promote our country's future economic growth and provide a better standard of living for all Americans?

I believe that Congress should be taking this opportunity to restore the solvency of Social Security and Medicare, and to invest in education, infrastructure and research that will increase our productivity and improve our standards of living. Consequently, I oppose the resolution before us today.

I oppose this budget resolution because I believe that it would devastate dozens of important federal programs, programs like educational assistance, veterans' programs, crime-fighting programs, scientific and biomedical research programs, public works projects, and anti-poverty programs.

I oppose this budget because it does nothing to help the Americans who, even in these boom times, are struggling just to keep their heads above water.

I oppose this budget because it fails to invest in the programs and projects that would make America more productive and more competitive in the global economy.

I oppose this budget because it would provide unwise and irresponsible tax cuts which would be paid for with a surplus that has not yet materialized—and which in fact, may never materialize.

I oppose this budget because it does nothing to save Medicare from insolvency.

And finally, I oppose this budget resolution because it does nothing to save Social Security.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject this short-sighted, self-indulgent budget—and to work together to draft a prudent, fiscally conservative budget that addresses the American people's future needs, not just someone's misguided desires.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise against the cuts in higher education in the Republican budget resolution. While some of us are working to extend the opportunity for higher education through vital programs like Pell Grants, the Republicans have introduced a budget which cuts all non-elementary and secondary education, training and social service programs by \$16.6 billion over the next 5 years. Over the next ten years, the Republicans call for a 12.2% across the board cut for these same programs. This at a time when increasing tuition costs are burdening families nationwide.

At a time of anticipated future surpluses and significant increases in military spending already underway, it is critical that federal funding for education take its place as a national priority. Making college more affordable is one of the most important investments we can make in our country's future prosperity. This year, the maximum Pell Grant award will provide funding that only covers 35% of the average costs of attendance at a four-year state college. For a four-year private college, the Pell Grant barely covers 13% of average annual costs. Yet the Republicans want to further deny access to higher education by cutting this important program. Support access to higher education.

Vote no on the GOP budget resolution.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition of the rule to H. Con. Res. 68 which blocks a vote on Representative CLEMENT's amendment to increase funding for veterans health care.

The Republican Leadership's FY 2000 Budget fails miserably to protect our Nation's veterans. While their budget resolution provides a \$900 million increase in budget authority for veterans, this is a ONE time addition. Over the next 5 years, the Majority's budget resolution cuts discretionary spending for veterans by \$300 million. Over 10 years, veterans funding will be cut by \$3 billion below this year's funding levels. The Republican leadership should be ashamed to submit a

budget which slashes funding for the men and women who fought for our freedom.

This Republican-led Congress has flat-lined the veterans budget for the last 4 years. As our veterans continue aging, they face more medical emergencies. Unless funding for veterans' health care is significantly increased services will be cut and health care will be denied.

Mr. Chairman, how can you propose several new health care initiatives without providing the necessary funds to support them? The message you send to our veterans when the promises made to them are broken is that the sacrifices they made for our country are meaningless. Representative CLEMENT's amendment would have increased the Veterans Affairs budget by \$1 billion over the Republican increase of \$900 million. This amendment was supported by the Veterans of Foreign War, Disabled American Veterans, Paralyzed Veterans of America and the American Legion.

Give our nation's veterans what they deserve. I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule and the Republican budget.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support H. Con. Res. 68, the Budget Resolution. This resolution continues the hard work of balancing the budget and putting our fiscal house in order that we began in 1997.

#### PRIORITIES

The priorities that we should establish in this new "age of surplus." Those are providing retirement security by saving Social Security and Medicare, paying down the debt, and reforming the tax code. These reforms are essential for our future. At the same time, we must be realistic and fair about maintaining adequate support for all domestic programs, most specifically education and health care.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY

Of primary concern is Social Security. As we all know Social Security is the most popular and important program in the nation's history. It touches almost every family in America. This budget saves ALL of the Social Security Trust Fund surplus for Social Security. That is close to \$1.8 TRILLION over the next ten years. But this money must be made SAFE! Upon passage of a Conference Report on a joint budget resolution passed by both the House and Senate, we should act immediately to create a real lock box that through law saves the Social Security Trust Fund surplus. This money will be used to strengthen and secure Social Security and Medicare when bipartisan reform legislation beginning signed into law. We must protect Social Security through law not legislative shadow boxing. When it comes to Social Security, this program must be sacrificed to tax cuts or extra spending. I look forward to the day when we engage in the debate on reform with the knowledge that every cent in the Social Security Trust Fund is safe.

#### PAYING DOWN THE DEBT

Priority must be given to paying down the debt. The National debt is currently over \$5.6 TRILLION. The debt has increased by \$95 BILLION in FY 1999 alone. In 1998 we have spent about 15% of all federal revenues just on interest on the debt. That is money NOT spent on our children, on education, or health care. It is money that goes into the fiscal black hole created by our continued indebtedness. We must reduce the debt in order to spend

less money on interest payments and more on our future. We must make the commitment to debt reduction. It is immoral for us to continue to write checks that our children will have to cash.

#### TAX REFORM

Tax reform not necessarily tax cuts must be a priority over the next ten years but as I said before not at the sacrifice of Social Security. Tax reform creates a fairer, flatter, and simpler tax code that results in a lower tax burden for all Americans. Tax reform includes eliminating the marriage penalty, rewarding savings and investment so families can send their kids to school, buy a home, or start a business, and does not punish their success. A significant portion of the non-Social Security surplus must be returned to American families because they know how to spend money better than most in Washington.

#### BLUEPRINT FOR THE FUTURE

It is important to remember that this Resolution is a blueprint. It is not the endstate but the beginning of a process of what I hope is thoughtful debate on America's future. It is our responsibility, in this Congress, to ensure the visibility of worthy federal programs and to create a strong and vibrant economy in which our children and grandchildren can thrive, succeed, and enjoy the promise of what America has to offer.

There are going to be difficult decisions ahead. To stay within the budget caps will not be easy. In some cases, I believe that we should revisit those caps through the appropriations process to address priority spending investments in education, health care, and veterans. While we should not turn the surplus into a spending spree, we must be sensitive to fair treatment for all domestic programs affecting families—our children as well as our families.

The next decade will be the best opportunity for us to give our children the future we hope for them. We must be wise, judicious, and fair when it comes to spending the surplus. We must not count our surplus eggs before they hatch and we can not squander this opportunity. We must set priorities. We owe that to our children.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to strongly oppose this amendment. This budget contains a net tax increase over the next five years, a time in which we are realizing surpluses.

This tax increase comes largely from one source: regressive, excise taxes leveled on those least able to afford them. Americans are overtaxed. The government does not need more of our money to carry out its spending plans, lengthening the era of big government. Contrary to what we have been told, this era is far from over.

Nearly have of these new taxes, \$35 billion worth, come from a 200-percent tax increase on tobacco products, 55 cents on a pack of cigarettes. This tax increase hurts hard-working family tobacco farmers in my district and all of Kentucky. These taxes will take away the livelihood of these working families, who depend on their tobacco crops to pay for their farms, their homes and their children's education.

But this excise tax increase issue is not confined to states with tobacco farmers. It has a negative impact no matter what your opinion is on the use of tobacco products. This huge tax increase in all states falls most heavily on those least able to afford it.

Who will pay these new regressive excise taxes? Working families who earn \$30,000 or less will pick up nearly half the tab, even though they account for just 16 percent of total national family income. According to the Federal Trade Commission, legal adults purchase 98 percent of all cigarettes. New regressive taxes on these adult products are not acceptable in this budget.

This administration has stated it wants to help bring prosperity back to the family farm. So do I. But I do not understand how taxing our family farmers out of business will achieve this goal. I urge all of my colleagues to join with me and oppose all attempts by this administration to finance its big-government budget on the backs of tobacco farmers and other working families.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican's budget resolution. I am truly disappointed that the Majority has not put forth a more reasonable, workable proposal that could garner true bipartisan support.

Mr. Chairman, at a time when this Congress has a unique opportunity to build upon the economic success of recent years under the leadership of President Clinton, we are presented with a document that is political in its origin and regressive in its policies. At this crucial juncture in our Nation's history, we are being asked to look backwards, not forward. Rather than working together to develop and implement an economic policy for the new millennium, we are presented with a back room, cut-and-paste deal that simply can not deliver on its promises and would set us on a course which can only result in further escalating the astronomical national debt run-up during the 1980s.

Mr. Chairman, we have been down this road before and it is a dead-end. We cannot afford to take this route again.

Mr. Chairman, we should be working together to set our Nation's economic policy on a path that will ensure continued surpluses while saving Social Security, strengthening Medicare, and paying-down our debt. We have the ability to achieve a balanced budget for years to come, while still providing for the needs of our country—education, health care, and Social Security. We should not, indeed, must not, pass-up this once in a lifetime opportunity to establish a sound and lasting budgetary policy.

Unfortunately, the document before us today falls far short of these worthwhile and obtainable goals. The proposal borders on being reckless in its approach to our budgetary needs and disingenuous in its promises. Indeed, some have even referred to this measure as the "meat ax" approach to budgeting.

Mr. Chairman, we are presented with unrealistic spending levels, under-funding almost every major program in order to once again provide tax relief for the most well-off in our society. I seriously doubt that many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle realistically believe that the requirements of this proposal can be met.

Under the Republican plan, Medicare and Social Security are left unprotected. We all know that Medicare will become insolvent in 2008 and Social Security will become insolvent in 2032, if this Congress does not enact meaningful, sensible reform in the near future. This budget proposal fails to address this looming problem and seriously weakens our

ability to face the economic challenges of the next century.

At a time when we should be moving forward, looking to the future, this proposal hearkens back to the days of isolationism and poor houses. I ask my friends in the Majority, where is their oft-touted commitment to the war on drugs, to fighting crime and making our streets safe, to education, to health care, to the environment and our natural resources, to science and technology, to our men and women in the armed services, and to the so many other vital programs which seek to take care of the less fortunate and ensure a better life for the American middle class? Where is their commitment to a balanced budget and paying-down the debt?

Mr. Chairman, under the very able leadership of Ranking Member SPRATT, the Democrats want to keep prosperity on track and protect the American family. Our plan would preserve 62 percent of the total estimated budget surplus for Social Security, ensuring the Social Security Trust Fund remains solvent for many decades to come. Our plan also transfer 15 percent of these surpluses to shoring-up Medicare, extending its solvency for at least a decade to grant us the time we will need to develop and implement a bipartisan fix for this valuable social program.

Education, one of the most crucial underpinnings of our great country is barely paid lip-service under this proposal. Many of my colleagues may ask why the Federal Government needs to become involved in school renovation and construction issues, which are historically local concerns. The simple answer is that the problem has grown so large that localities and States alone do not have the resources or the programs to address their overwhelming needs. For instance, a recent survey by the Division of School Facilities in New York City concluded that, in my district alone, 19 new schools were needed to alleviate overcrowding. Additionally, to bring schools in the Seventh Congressional District of New York up to standards deemed "fair" by school facilities' engineers, New York City would have to fund \$218.65 million in exterior modernization projects and \$53.18 million in interior modernization projects.

Mr. Chairman, this budget does not ring true. It has a harsh sound that is indicative of it being out of tune with our current economic conditions and good government. I urge my colleagues to vote against this proposal. If you support the working men and women of this country, if you support our Nation's children, you must oppose this budget resolution and support the Democratic alternative.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, our Federal budget should be a statement of our national values. How we spend our money should reflect what is important to us. The budget should address our current needs and capitalize on opportunities in the future.

The budget should recognize the strength of our country, not only in terms of our military might, but also measure our strength in terms of the health, education, and well-being of American families.

I cannot think of two better measures of a budget than its attention to educating our children and improving the health status of all Americans. This budget turns away from both these urgent priorities, putting tax cuts ahead of all else.

The preschool education program Head Start is one example. Head Start is one of our

success stories. It offers early education and nutrition services to lower income children and it has been proven effective. Within 10 years, this budget would decimate Head Start, cutting funding by nearly one-third. One hundred thousand low-income children would lose Head Start services.

The Republican budget chooses a tax cut over Head Start funding.

In the area of health, the Republican budget is just as short-sighted. This country faces many challenges in health care. Forty-four million Americans are living without health insurance. And at the same time, we face tremendous opportunities to improve and extend lives with health research. It is our obligation to act on these challenges and opportunities. This Republican budget turns away from them.

The budget proposal cuts discretionary health spending by 31 percent over 10 years without spelling out what will be cut. Will it be health promotion at the Centers for Disease Control? Health care for the uninsured at the Health Resources and Services Administration? Health research at the National Institutes of Health? The answer is that all these vital areas would suffer under the Republican budget, and that would have a direct impact on the health status of people across the country.

This budget also ignores Medicare, calling for unspecified Medicare "reforms," and proposing no tangible resources to shore up the health care program on which tens of millions of seniors depend.

The Republican budget chooses a tax cut over health care and health research. This Republican budget is dangerously out of step with our values. It is short-sighted and it makes its biggest cuts where the poor will feel them most directly. I urge my colleagues to oppose the Republican budget resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment printed in part 1 of House Report 106-77 is adopted and the concurrent resolution, as amended, is considered as having been read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of House Concurrent Resolution 68, as amended by the amendment printed in part 1 of House Report 106-77, is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 68

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).*

**SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000.**

The Congress declares that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000 and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2001 through 2009 are hereby set forth.

**SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.**

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2009:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,408,500,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001: \$1,435,300,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002: \$1,456,300,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2003: \$1,532,600,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2004: \$1,584,100,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2005: \$1,651,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2006: \$1,684,400,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2007: \$1,733,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: \$1,802,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: \$1,867,500,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$0.

Fiscal year 2001: -\$9,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: -\$52,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: -\$30,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: -\$50,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: -\$59,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: -\$106,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: -\$138,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: -\$153,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: -\$178,200,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,426,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,456,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,487,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: \$1,558,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: \$1,611,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: \$1,665,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: \$1,697,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: \$1,752,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: \$1,813,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: \$1,874,400,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,408,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,435,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,455,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: \$1,532,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: \$1,583,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: \$1,638,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: \$1,666,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: \$1,715,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: \$1,781,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: \$1,841,300,000,000.

(4) SURPLUSES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the surpluses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$0.

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: \$100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: \$200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: \$12,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: \$18,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: \$17,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: \$21,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: \$26,200,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$5,627,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$5,707,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$5,791,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: \$5,875,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: \$5,954,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: \$6,019,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: \$6,075,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: \$6,128,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: \$6,168,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: \$6,198,100,000,000.

**SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.**

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and budget outlays for fiscal years 2000 through 2009 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$288,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$276,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$303,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$285,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$308,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$291,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$318,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$303,600,000,000.



- (A) New budget authority, \$5,600,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$4,300,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2009:  
(A) New budget authority, \$5,600,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$4,300,000,000.
- (10) Elementary and Secondary Education, and Vocational Education (501):  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$22,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$20,100,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$24,100,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$21,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, \$24,500,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$22,700,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$25,900,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$24,500,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$26,900,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$25,600,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2005:  
(A) New budget authority, \$26,900,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$26,600,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2006:  
(A) New budget authority, \$26,900,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$26,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2007:  
(A) New budget authority, \$26,900,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$26,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2008:  
(A) New budget authority, \$26,900,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$26,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2009:  
(A) New budget authority, \$26,900,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$26,900,000,000.
- (11) Higher Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500, except for 501):  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$43,300,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$43,500,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$41,400,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$41,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, \$41,200,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$40,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$42,700,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$41,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$43,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$42,300,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2005:  
(A) New budget authority, \$43,900,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$42,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2006:  
(A) New budget authority, \$44,600,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$43,700,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2007:  
(A) New budget authority, \$45,500,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$44,500,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2008:  
(A) New budget authority, \$46,500,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$45,500,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2009:  
(A) New budget authority, \$46,500,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$45,500,000,000.
- (12) Health (550):  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$156,200,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$153,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$164,100,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$162,400,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, \$173,300,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$173,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$184,700,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$185,300,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$197,900,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$198,500,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2005:  
(A) New budget authority, \$212,800,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$212,600,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2006:  
(A) New budget authority, \$228,400,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$228,300,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2007:  
(A) New budget authority, \$246,300,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$245,500,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2008:  
(A) New budget authority, \$265,200,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$264,400,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2009:  
(A) New budget authority, \$285,500,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$284,900,000,000.
- (13) Medicare (570):  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$208,700,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$208,700,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$222,100,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$222,300,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, \$230,600,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$230,200,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$250,700,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$250,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$268,600,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$268,700,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2005:  
(A) New budget authority, \$295,600,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$295,200,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2006:  
(A) New budget authority, \$306,800,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$306,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2007:  
(A) New budget authority, \$337,600,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$337,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2008:  
(A) New budget authority, \$365,600,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$365,200,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2009:  
(A) New budget authority, \$394,100,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$394,200,000,000.
- (14) Income Security (600):  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$244,400,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$248,100,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$250,500,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$257,400,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, \$262,700,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$267,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$277,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$276,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$286,200,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$286,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2005:  
(A) New budget authority, \$298,500,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$298,700,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2006:  
(A) New budget authority, \$304,800,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$305,200,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2007:  
(A) New budget authority, \$310,600,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$311,500,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2008:  
(A) New budget authority, \$323,900,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$325,400,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2009:  
(A) New budget authority, \$334,200,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$335,700,000,000.
- (15) Social Security (650):  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$14,200,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$14,300,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$13,800,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$13,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, \$15,600,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$15,600,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$16,300,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$16,300,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$17,100,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$17,100,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2005:  
(A) New budget authority, \$18,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$17,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2006:  
(A) New budget authority, \$18,900,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$18,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2007:  
(A) New budget authority, \$19,900,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$19,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2008:  
(A) New budget authority, \$21,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$21,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2009:  
(A) New budget authority, \$22,200,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$22,200,000,000.
- (16) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$44,700,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$45,100,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$44,300,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$45,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, \$44,700,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$45,100,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$45,900,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$46,400,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$46,200,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$46,700,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2005:  
(A) New budget authority, \$48,800,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$49,300,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2006:  
(A) New budget authority, \$47,300,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$47,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2007:  
(A) New budget authority, \$47,800,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$46,200,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2008:  
(A) New budget authority, \$48,500,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$49,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2009:  
(A) New budget authority, \$49,100,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$49,700,000,000.
- (17) Administration of Justice (750):  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$23,400,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$25,300,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$24,700,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$25,100,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, \$24,700,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$24,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$24,600,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$24,400,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$26,200,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$26,100,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2005:  
(A) New budget authority, \$26,300,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$26,200,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2006:  
(A) New budget authority, \$26,400,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$26,200,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2007:  
(A) New budget authority, \$26,400,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$26,300,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2008:  
(A) New budget authority, \$26,500,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$26,300,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2009:  
(A) New budget authority, \$26,500,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$26,400,000,000.
- (18) General Government (800):  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$12,300,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$13,500,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$11,900,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$12,600,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,100,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$12,300,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,100,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$12,200,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2004:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,100,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$12,200,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2005:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,100,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$11,900,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2006:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,100,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$11,800,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2007:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$11,900,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2008:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$12,100,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2009:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$11,900,000,000.  
 (19) Net Interest (900):  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$275,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$275,500,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$271,000,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$271,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$267,400,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$267,400,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$265,100,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$265,100,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2004:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$263,400,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$263,400,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2005:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$261,000,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$261,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2006:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$258,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$258,600,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2007:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$257,000,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$257,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2008:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$254,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$254,700,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2009:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$252,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$252,700,000,000.  
 (20) Allowances (920):  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$8,000,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$10,100,000,000  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$8,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$12,900,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$6,400,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$20,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$4,400,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$4,800,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2004:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$4,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$5,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2005:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$4,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$5,100,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2006:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$4,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$5,200,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2007:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$5,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$5,800,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2008:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$5,300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$5,900,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2009:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$5,300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$5,900,000,000.  
 (21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$34,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$34,300,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$36,900,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$36,900,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$43,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$43,600,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$37,000,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$37,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2004:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$37,100,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$37,100,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2005:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$38,100,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$38,100,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2006:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$38,800,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$38,800,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2007:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$40,100,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$40,100,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2008:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$40,900,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$40,900,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2009:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$41,800,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$41,800,000,000.

#### SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

Not later than September 30, 1999, the House Committee on Ways and Means shall report to the House a reconciliation bill that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of revenues is not less than: \$1,408,500,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 2000, \$7,416,800,000,000 in revenues for fiscal years 2000 through 2004, and \$16,155,700,000,000 in revenues for fiscal years 2000 through 2009.

#### SEC. 5. SAFE DEPOSIT BOX FOR SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—  
 (1) under the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the social security trust funds are off-budget for purposes of the President's budget submission and the concurrent resolution on the budget;  
 (2) the social security trust funds have been running surpluses for 17 years;  
 (3) these surpluses have been used to implicitly finance the general operations of the Federal government;  
 (4) in fiscal year 2000, the social security surplus will exceed \$137 billion;  
 (5) for the first time, a concurrent resolution on the budget balances the Federal budget without counting social security surpluses; and  
 (6) the only way to ensure that social security surpluses are not diverted for other purposes is to balance the budget exclusive of such surpluses.  
 (b) POINT OF ORDER.—(1) It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any concurrent resolution on the budget, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that sets forth a deficit for any fiscal year. For purposes of this subsection, a deficit shall be the level (if any) set forth in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for that fiscal year pursuant to section 301(a)(3) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. In setting forth the deficit level pursuant to such section, that level shall not include any adjustments in aggregates that would be made pursuant to any reserve fund that provides for adjustments in allocations and aggregates for legislation that enhances retirement security or extends the solvency of the medicare trust funds or makes such changes in the medicare payment or benefit structure as are necessary.  
 (2) Paragraph (1) may be waived in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members voting.  
 (c) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) beginning with fiscal year 2000, legislation should be enacted to require any official statement issued by the Office of Management and Budget, the Congressional Budget Office, or any other agency or instrumentality of the Government of surplus or deficit totals of the budget of the Government as submitted by the President or of the surplus or deficit totals of the congressional budget, and any description of, or reference to, such totals in any official publication or material issued by either of such offices or any other such agency or instrumentality, should exclude the outlays and receipts of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program under title II of the Social Security Act (including the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund) and the related provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(2) legislation should be considered to augment subsection (b) by—

(A) taking such steps as may be required to safeguard the social security surpluses, such as statutory changes equivalent to the reserve fund for retirement security and medicare set forth in section 6; or

(B) otherwise establishing a statutory limit on debt held by the public and reducing such limit by the amount of the social security surpluses.

#### SEC. 6. RESERVE FUND FOR RETIREMENT SECURITY AND, AS NEEDED, MEDICARE.

(a) RETIREMENT SECURITY.—Whenever the Committee on Ways and Means of the House reports a bill, or an amendment thereto is offered, or a conference report thereon is submitted that enhances retirement security, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may—

(1) increase the appropriate allocations for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2004 and aggregates for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2009 of new budget authority and outlays by the amount of new budget authority provided by such measure (and outlays flowing therefrom) for such fiscal year for that purpose; and

(2) reduce the revenue aggregates for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2009 by the amount of the revenue loss resulting from that measure for such fiscal year for that purpose.

(b) MEDICARE PROGRAM.—Whenever the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Commerce of the House reports a bill, or an amendment thereto is offered, or a conference report thereon is submitted that extends the solvency or reforms the benefit or payment structure of the medicare program including any measure in response to the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the appropriate allocations and aggregates of new budget authority and outlays by the amounts provided in that bill for that purpose.

(c) LIMITATION.—(1) The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may only make adjustments under subsection (a) or (b) if the net outlay increase plus revenue reduction resulting from any measure referred to in those subsections (including any prior adjustments made for any other such measure) for fiscal year 2000, the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004, or the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2009 is not greater than an amount equal to the projected social security surplus for such period, as set forth in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this concurrent resolution or, if published, the midsession review for fiscal year 2000 of the Director of the Congressional Budget Office. For purposes of the preceding sentence, revenue reductions shall be treated as a positive number.



(2) In the mid-session review for fiscal year 2000, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office in consultation with the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund shall make an up-to-date estimate of the projected surpluses in the social security trust funds for fiscal year 2000, for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004, and for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2009.

(3) As used in this subsection, the term "social security trust funds" means the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund.

**SEC. 7. RESERVE FUND FOR PROGRAMS AUTHORIZED UNDER THE INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, when the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto is offered, or a conference report thereon is submitted that provides new budget authority for fiscal year 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, or 2004 for programs authorized under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the appropriate allocations and aggregates of new budget authority and outlays by an amount not to exceed the amount of new budget authority provided by that measure (and outlays flowing therefrom) for that purpose up to the maximum amount consistent with section 611(a) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1411(a)(2)).

(b) ADJUSTMENTS.—The adjustments in outlays (and the corresponding amount of new budget authority) made under subsection (a) for any fiscal year may not exceed the amount by which an up-to-date projection of the on-budget surplus made by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office for that fiscal year exceeds the on-budget surplus for that fiscal year set forth in section 2(4) of this resolution.

(c) CBO PROJECTIONS.—Upon the request of the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall make an up-to-date estimate of the projected on-budget surplus for the applicable fiscal year.

**SEC. 8. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.**

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution for any measure shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

**SEC. 9. UPDATED CBO PROJECTIONS.**

Each calendar quarter the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall make an up-to-date estimate of receipts, outlays and surplus (on-budget and off-budget) for the current fiscal year.

**SEC. 10. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) persecution of individuals on the sole ground of their religious beliefs and practices occurs in countries around the world and affects millions of lives;

(2) such persecution violates international norms of human rights, including those es-

tablished in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Helsinki Accords, and the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief;

(3) such persecution is abhorrent to all Americans, and our very Nation was founded on the principle of the freedom to worship according to the dictates of our conscience; and

(4) in 1998 Congress unanimously passed, and President Clinton signed into law, the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998, which established the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom to monitor facts and circumstances of violations of religious freedom and authorized \$3,000,000 to carry out the functions of the Commission for each of fiscal years 1999 and 2000.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) this resolution assumes that \$3,000,000 will be appropriated within function 150 for fiscal year 2000 for the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom to carry out its duties; and

(2) the House Committee on Appropriations is strongly urged to appropriate such amount for the Commission.

**SEC. 11. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON PROVIDING ADDITIONAL DOLLARS TO THE CLASSROOM.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) strengthening America's public schools while respecting State and local control is critically important to the future of our children and our Nation;

(2) education is a local responsibility, a State priority, and a national concern;

(3) working with the Nation's governors, parents, teachers, and principals must take place in order to strengthen public schools and foster educational excellence;

(4) the consolidation of various Federal education programs will benefit our Nation's children, parents, and teachers by sending more dollars directly to the classroom; and

(5) our Nation's children deserve an educational system that will provide opportunities to excel.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that—

(1) the House should enact legislation that would consolidate thirty-one Federal K-12 education programs; and

(2) the Department of Education, the States, and local educational agencies should work together to ensure that not less than 95 percent of all funds appropriated for the purpose of carrying out elementary and secondary education programs administered by the Department of Education is spent for our children in their classrooms.

**SEC. 12. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ASSET-BUILDING FOR THE WORKING POOR.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) 33 percent of all American households have no or negative financial assets and 60 percent of African-American households have no or negative financial assets;

(2) 46.9 percent of all children in America live in households with no financial assets, including 40 percent of caucasian children and 75 percent of African-American children;

(3) in order to provide low-income families with more tools for empowerment, incentives which encourage asset-building should be established;

(4) across the Nation numerous small public, private, and public-private asset-building initiatives (including individual development account programs) are demonstrating success at empowering low-income workers;

(5) the Government currently provides middle and upper income Americans with

hundreds of billions of dollars in tax incentives for building assets; and

(6) the Government should utilize tax laws or other measures to provide low-income Americans with incentives to work and build assets in order to escape poverty permanently.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that any changes in tax law should include provisions which encourage low-income workers and their families to save for buying their first home, starting a business, obtaining an education, or taking other measures to prepare for the future.

**SEC. 13. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ACCESS TO HEALTH INSURANCE AND PRESERVING HOME HEALTH SERVICES FOR ALL MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES.**

(a) ACCESS TO HEALTH INSURANCE.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) 43.4 million Americans are currently without health insurance, and that this number is expected to rise to nearly 60 million people in the next 10 years;

(B) the cost of health insurance continues to rise, a key factor in increasing the number of uninsured; and

(C) there is a consensus that working Americans and their families and children will suffer from reduced access to health insurance.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON IMPROVING ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE INSURANCE.—It is the sense of Congress that access to affordable health care coverage for all Americans is a priority of the 106th Congress.

(b) PRESERVING HOME HEALTH SERVICE FOR ALL MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 reformed medicare home health care spending by instructing the Health Care Financing Administration to implement a prospective payment system and instituted an interim payment system to achieve savings;

(B) the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999, reformed the interim payment system to increase reimbursements to low-cost providers, added \$900 million in funding, and delayed the automatic 15 percent payment reduction for one year, to October 1, 2000; and

(C) patients whose care is more extensive and expensive than the typical medicare patient do not receive supplemental payments in the interim payment system but will receive special protection in the home health care prospective payment system.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ACCESS TO HOME HEALTH CARE.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(A) Congress recognizes the importance of home health care for seniors and disabled citizens;

(B) Congress and the Administration should work together to maintain quality care for patients whose care is more extensive and expensive than the typical medicare patient, including the sickest and frailest medicare beneficiaries, while home health care agencies operate in the interim payment system; and

(C) Congress and the Administration should work together to avoid the implementation of the 15 percent reduction in the interim payment system and ensure timely implementation of the prospective payment system.

**SEC. 14. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON MEDICARE PAYMENT.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) a goal of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 was to expand options for medicare beneficiaries under the new Medicare+Choice program;

(2) Medicare+Choice was intended to make these choices available to all medicare beneficiaries; and unfortunately, during the first

two years of the Medicare+Choice program the blended payment was not implemented, stifling health care options and continuing regional disparity among many counties across the United States; and

(3) the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 also established the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare to develop legislative recommendations to address the long-term funding challenges facing Medicare.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that this resolution assumes that funding of the Medicare+Choice program is a priority for the House Committee on the Budget before financing new programs and benefits that may potentially add to the imbalance of payments and benefits in Fee-for-Service Medicare and Medicare+Choice.

**SEC. 15. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON ASSESSMENT OF WELFARE-TO-WORK PROGRAMS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—It is the sense of the House that, recognizing the need to maximize the benefit of the Welfare-to-Work Program, the Secretary of Labor should prepare a report on Welfare-to-Work Programs pursuant to section 403(a)(5) of the Social Security Act. This report should include information on the following—

(1) the extent to which the funds available under such section have been used (including the number of States that have not used any of such funds), the types of programs that have received such funds, the number of and characteristics of the recipients of assistance under such programs, the goals of such programs, the duration of such programs, the costs of such programs, any evidence of the effects of such programs on such recipients, and accounting of the total amount expended by the States from such funds, and the rate at which the Secretary expects such funds to be expended for each of the fiscal years 2000, 2001, and 2002;

(2) with regard to the unused funds allocated for Welfare-to-Work for each of fiscal years 1998 and 1999, identify areas of the Nation that have unmet needs for Welfare-to-Work initiatives; and

(3) identify possible Congressional action that may be taken to reprogram Welfare-to-Work funds from States that have not utilized previously allocated funds to places of unmet need, including those States that have rejected or otherwise not utilized prior funding.

(b) REPORT.—It is the sense of the House that, not later than January 1, 2000, the Secretary of Labor should submit to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, in writing, the report described in subsection (a).

**SEC. 16. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PROVIDING HONOR GUARD SERVICES FOR VETERANS' FUNERALS.**

It is the sense of Congress that all relevant congressional committees should make every effort to provide sufficient resources so that an Honor Guard, if requested, is available for veterans' funerals.

**SEC. 17. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CHILD NUTRITION.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) both Republicans and Democrats understand that an adequate diet and proper nutrition are essential to a child's general well-being;

(2) the lack of an adequate diet and proper nutrition may adversely affect a child's ability to perform up to his or her ability in school;

(3) the Government currently plays a role in funding school nutrition programs; and

(4) there is a bipartisan commitment to helping children learn.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Committee on Education

and the Workforce and the Committee on Agriculture should examine our Nation's nutrition programs to determine if they can be improved, particularly with respect to services to low-income children.

The CHAIRMAN. No further amendment is in order except the amendments printed in part 2 of that report. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by the Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for 40 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment.

After conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, there shall be a final period of general debate which shall not exceed 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part 2 of House Report 106-77.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 in the nature of a substitute printed in part 2 of House Report 106-77 offered by Mr. Coburn:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

**SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000.**

The Congress declares that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000 and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2001 through 2004 are hereby set forth.

**SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.**

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2004:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,406,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,445,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,507,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: \$1,562,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: \$1,631,800,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$11,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$10,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$10,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: \$10,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: \$9,500,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,549,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,588,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,648,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: \$1,717,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: \$1,798,500,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,535,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,564,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,634,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: \$1,702,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: \$1,780,600,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$129,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$119,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$126,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: \$139,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: \$148,800,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$5,778,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$5,999,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$6,242,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: \$6,497,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: \$6,764,500,000,000.

**SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.**

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and budget outlays for fiscal years 2000 through 2004 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$280,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$283,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$300,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$285,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$302,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$293,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$312,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$303,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$321,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$313,800,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,600,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,200,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$-600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,100,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$0.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$800,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$-200,000,000.  
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$24,600,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$24,100,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$24,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$24,200,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, \$23,900,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$24,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$24,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$24,100,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$24,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$24,000,000,000.  
(6) Agriculture (350):  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$15,200,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$13,600,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$13,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$11,400,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, \$11,200,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$9,500,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$11,500,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$9,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$11,500,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$10,000,000,000.  
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$11,100,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$5,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$11,800,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$6,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, \$15,600,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$11,300,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$15,600,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$11,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$15,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$11,500,000,000.  
(8) Transportation (400):  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$54,200,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$48,100,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$545,500,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$50,400,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, \$55,600,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$50,700,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$57,800,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$52,700,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$59,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$53,800,000,000.  
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$11,900,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$10,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$9,100,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$10,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, \$9,100,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$10,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$9,200,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$10,200,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$9,200,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$9,700,000,000.  
(10) Elementary and Secondary Education, and Vocational Education (501):  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$20,800,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$20,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$22,700,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$21,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, \$22,700,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$22,700,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$22,700,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$22,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$22,700,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$22,800,000,000.  
(11) Higher Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500, except for 501):  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$46,600,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$44,300,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$46,600,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$46,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, \$46,200,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$46,400,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$47,700,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$47,700,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$48,100,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$47,700,000,000.  
(12) Health (550):  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$157,700,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$153,600,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$166,800,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$165,400,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, \$176,300,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$177,200,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$188,400,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$189,400,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$202,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$202,800,000,000.  
(13) Medicare (570):  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$207,300,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$207,300,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$220,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$220,100,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, \$228,800,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$228,400,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$248,900,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$249,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$266,700,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$266,900,000,000.  
(14) Income Security (600):  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$256,600,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$259,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$268,800,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$271,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, \$282,100,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$285,300,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$291,100,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$295,100,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$301,700,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$304,000,000,000.  
(15) Social Security (650):  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$99,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$99,100,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$84,900,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$84,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, \$107,200,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$107,200,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$106,700,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$106,600,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$126,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$126,000,000,000.  
(16) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$43,800,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$43,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$44,400,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$44,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, \$45,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$45,300,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$45,500,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$45,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$45,900,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$46,300,000,000.  
(17) Administration of Justice (750):  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$26,600,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$26,600,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$27,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$27,200,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, \$27,200,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$27,100,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$26,900,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$27,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$26,900,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$27,000,000,000.  
(18) General Government (800):  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$13,800,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$14,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$14,600,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$14,700,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, \$14,300,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$14,400,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$14,400,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$14,300,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$14,400,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$14,400,000,000.  
(19) Net Interest (900):  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$278,100,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$278,100,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$279,500,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$279,500,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, \$282,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$282,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$286,400,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$286,400,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$291,900,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$291,900,000,000.  
(20) Allowances (920):  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,400,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$3,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$2,300,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, \$6,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$4,400,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$9,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$7,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$12,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$9,900,000,000.

(21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):  
Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$ - 35,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$ - 35,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$ - 39,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$ - 39,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$ - 43,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$ - 43,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$ - 38,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$ - 38,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$ - 38,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$ - 38,500,000,000.

#### SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

Not later than September 30, 1999, the House Committee on Ways and Means shall report to the House a reconciliation bill that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of revenues for that committee is not less than: \$1,406,000,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 2000 and \$7,553,900,000,000 in revenues for fiscal years 2000 through 2004.

##### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to raise a parliamentary point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, do the rules of the House require that an offeror of the amendment be a supporter and proponent of the amendment that he offers and proposes to the House?

The CHAIRMAN. House Resolution 131 explicitly makes it in order for the gentleman from Oklahoma to offer this amendment. The Chair does not assess the attitude of the gentleman from Oklahoma toward the proposition.

Mr. SPRATT. Would it be in order to ask if the gentleman does indeed support this, or if he is offering it for dilatory purposes?

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Oklahoma rise?

Mr. COBURN. To speak in favor of my amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and a Member opposed each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

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

Mr. Chairman, the reason I am offering this amendment is because millions of dollars and nearly 1,000 people in the executive branch spent time preparing this budget. The President spoke in his State of the Union speech. He outlined the plans that he would submit.

The reason I am offering this budget is because it is fair to the President to debate his issues. It is ironic that nobody from his party would submit his budget.

There is no question I have great disagreements with many aspects of the budget, but the American people deserve to hear his budget outlined as scored by the CBO, as every other budget that will be presented on this floor, and what it actually says, because it is my contention that the budget that is presented does not go

along with what the President said in his State of the Union speech. I hope through this discussion and with the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, that we will find out where that is.

There is no intention to deceive anybody. It is an honest and sincere desire to make sure that this budget is considered. But I think it is also implicit on us to use the same scoring mechanisms, assuming all the assumptions in his budget, that we would do that.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) is recognized for 20 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

##### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Would the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) state his parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. NUSSLE. Yes. Is the gentleman who has claimed the time in opposition to this amendment opposed to the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already established that he is in opposition to the amendment. He is entitled to 20 minutes of debate.

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) is recognized.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would first like to say that we have a letter from Jacob J. Lew, director of the Office of Management and Budget, saying that he is informed that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) will be offering a substitute to the budget resolution 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 that is quite different from those presented in the President's budget. Therefore, we do not support the amendment.

While we are talking about the President's budget, though, and drawing comparisons and contrasts, let me take just a minute to point out a very significant difference between the Republican budget and the President's budget.

The President sent up early this year a request to increase defense by \$84 billion over the next 6 years, \$68 billion of which would fall in the next 5 years. As Members can see, the President has proposed a pretty robust defense budget starting this year and continuing through the 10-year time frame of the budget to the point where it reaches nearly \$385 billion.

Let me point out two factors in the Republican budget which really work against the claim, undercut the claim, that their budget is supportive of national defense.

First of all, in the first 5 years of their budget they offer \$29 billion more

than the President, \$29.6 billion in budget authority. Members can only use budget authority, as the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) earlier said, if it has outlays to back it up. Outlays are money we can spend.

In giving spending authority to the Pentagon, their budget in the first 5 years matches the \$30 billion increase in defense spending budget authority. With only \$5.2 billion, only one-sixth of the money they are putting up can actually be used in this period of time. So in the first 5 years, while they sort of beat their breast and say, look what we are doing for defense over and above the President, in truth, they pull this punch by not providing the outlays to back it up.

In the second period of time this chart very graphically shows what happens to their defense budget and where they put their preferences. Because in the year 2004 their defense budget peaks, and thereafter it is the black line on this chart, it is flat as a pancake. It never increases in the next 5 years more than \$1 billion.

What is wrong with that? That is the period when the procurement holiday is over. That is the period when the F-22 and the V-22 and the joint strike fighter and missile defense and everything else is going to be procured. That is when we need the money more than ever.

What happens in the Republican budget? It bottoms out. Why does it bottom out? Because when they were forced to choose between national defense and tax cuts, they opted clearly for tax cuts, so much so that they plotted an out year budget that is totally unrealistic.

I asked the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) on the floor the other day, when he came to speak in support of missile defense, how in the world was he going to pay for it? Because that is the time frame when he would be deploying missile defense, putting the satellites in space, the ground interceptors in place.

He said, I can say that our numbers are real. That is the thing that worries me, this is a real number. Their tax cut will make impossible any increase in defense in those years to do the things they say and purport they want to do for national defense. Their budget is a disaster for national defense compared to the President's budget.

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

Mr. Chairman, our staff was in contact with one Elizabeth Gore and outlined our plans. She had no objections to the assumptions that we made on that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important that we have this debate. As the gentleman from Oklahoma mentioned, the

President and his team spent literally \$1 million putting their budget together. I think it deserves careful consideration by the Members of this body.

□ 1530

First of all, I want to point out a chart we have used all day, and I think it is important because there are clear distinctions and differences between our plan and the President's plan.

We believe that every penny of Social Security taxes should go only for Social Security. There is a difference there between us and the President. If my colleagues look at the difference in the plan, and again these are not our numbers, these are from the Congressional Budget Office, we secure \$1.8 trillion for Medicare and Social Security over the next 10 years. The President is somewhere in the neighborhood of \$1.65 trillion.

I want to give some credit to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the Democrats and the Blue Dog budget. In fact, in some respects, we should feel honored because, in many respects, their budget looks a lot more like our budget than it does the President's budget.

But one of the biggest differences between the various budget plans that are being offered here today is we believe that, once we have saved Social Security, once we have said that every penny of Social Security taxes will only go for Social Security, and then, secondly, we say we are going to live by the spending caps that we and the White House agreed to. I was there for the bill signing, and I think the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) was there as well. It was a glorious day out on the White House lawn. We said we are going to live by these spending caps, and we are going to keep our word even if the President does not.

The President has in his budget exceeded the spending caps by about \$30 billion. Again, to the credit of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and the Blue Dogs, I think they do a better job of living by those spending caps.

But I think the biggest difference between our budget, the Blue Dog budget, and more importantly the President's budget is the President imposes about \$45.8 billion, depending on whose scoring we use, but over the next 5 years, we are looking somewhere in the neighborhood of \$46 billion in new taxes.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking member of the Committee on Budget, for doing a yeoman's job today.

Mr. Chairman, the Coburn alternative is a sham, and the Republican budget is a failure. It fails our future retirees, it fails our veterans, it fails our families, and it fails our children and their education.

The Republican budget increases military spending, yet fails to itemize veterans' pay and retirement benefits and at the same time cuts funding for Head Start and after-school programs.

What is worse, now the Republicans are failing to use the projected \$2.8 trillion surplus to extend the solvency of Social Security by even one day. Instead, the Republicans' plan gambles with the guarantee we have made to our seniors, our women, and our families by proposing tax cuts for the wealthiest in the Nation.

Do not forget, the Republican budget fails to use one red cent for Medicare, which benefits mainly the middle income folks and retirees in this Nation.

A responsible budget will save Social Security and Medicare, invest in our children and their education, support our veterans and our farmers, and give targeted tax relief to working Americans. The Republican budget fails in all of these areas and must be defeated.

Vote against the Coburn amendment. Vote against the Republican budget. Vote for the Democratic alternative.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would just make mention of the fact that, in this budget, there are no specific targeted tax cuts for anyone. To continue to speak on this House floor about tax cuts for rich people, which is not our intention in the first place, but to say that is erroneous.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER).

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

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, the Constitution was established to provide for the common defense. However, at a time when the threat of rogue nations with nuclear weapons remain strong and the administration has ordered an unprecedented number of deployments, our troops and military are not as well equipped or as well provided for as yesterday.

Consider: For the first time in decades, we are failing to meet recruitment goals. For example, in 1998, the Navy missed its recruiting goals by 12 percent. Additionally, there is a 13½ percent wage gap between civilian and military pay. In fact, many military families need the assistance of food stamps just to survive.

My colleagues may be pondering this weakened state of U.S. military forces and feel alarmed about our current level of national security, but there is hope. The same President who has overseen this tremendous decline in our military has proposed a solution to undo the devastation.

First, the President proposes defense spending over the next 6 years, which is as much as \$70 billion below the Defense Chiefs' requirements to maintain our current level of national security.

Second, the President realizes that the U.S. House, which declared that

the U.S. should deploy a national missile defense system to protect our Nation and troops, is mistaken. That must be why he would rescind \$230 million in funding for the development of a national missile defense.

To improve the financial condition of our military families, the President has slashed military construction funding, including money for military family housing, by \$3.1 billion.

For those of my colleagues who desire to improve national security by inadequately funding our armed services, by stealing pledged funds from our national missile defense program, and by severely reducing construction for our military and its families, I urge their support for the Clinton-Gore budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding me this time.

There has been a lot of complaints about the President's budget and how it treats the National Institutes of Health. As members of the committee know, I have been the author in the past of an amendment to double the size of our commitment to medical research through the National Institutes of Health. In fact, the committee defeated the amendment last year. They defeated it this year. In fact, the Republican controlled committee at one point, and the Republican House, wanted to cut the NIH by 5 percent.

Let us talk about the Republican budget that is before us today. If my colleagues look at what they have in the health function, they tell us in the very little detail they give us about their budget that they are going to double the size of the National Institutes of Health, but they actually cut the level below the baseline in the health function, which means that we are going to have to choose between community health centers, between WIC, Women and Infant Children programs. We are going to have to decide between nutrition programs and the NIH.

That is the problem with the Republican budget. They do not tell us where the cuts come from. They lock in \$1 trillion tax cut on surpluses that we do not know whether they are going to come true or not. They bust the caps because they know that \$28 billion in nondefense discretionary cuts they want to make just are not there. That is the problem with the budget.

So we can engage in theatrics today of writing up a budget that is not going to be given any real consideration because we do not want to look at the truth behind the majority's budget.

At the end of the day, we all know sometime in August or September or October we will get down to business and write a real budget. But a two-page budget like that that was put before

the Committee on Budget with no detail, and the chairman, a good friend of mine, saying my Members do not want to talk about where we are going to make the cuts right now, is not a real budget.

The Republicans' budget is not a real budget. It does not increase NIH. If we were to follow this budget, we would be cutting community health centers, we would be cutting WIC, nutrition, all those programs that a bipartisan majority of Members of this body have supported in the past.

We can engage in theatrics, but at the end of the day, we are going to have to write a real budget like the Democratic budget.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the time remaining on both sides?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) has 14 minutes remaining. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 12 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a note that, last year, NIH was increased 14.5 percent in our budget. I would also like to make a note that WIC is not in the category that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) just referred to and is not at risk at all under this budget.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I find there is much to disagree with in the Clinton budget, but I want to focus on two areas just in the 60 seconds that I have.

First of all, when the President's budget came before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of which I serve and I am chairman of the Subcommittee on Health, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), the ranking member, said it was a pack of cards, house of cards. He recognized as well as all of the Republicans and Democrats that basically it was underfunded.

The second point is that, not only was it underfunded, but the whole budget process in terms of where they thought they would get the money to pay for the items they were talking about was not really there. Smoke and mirrors.

So the Republicans on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs supported increasing the amount of money for veterans, and we proposed an almost \$2 billion increase. The Democrats on this side said they want to do \$3 billion. We thought it out, and we decided that the compromise was \$2 billion. We put forth that, and we passed it out of our committee. It passed with bipartisan support. There were about four Democrats who voted for the Republican position.

So I think the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman STUMP) and others

were courageous in their attempt to increase the veterans budget, and I am glad we did.

Mr. Chairman. I want to compliment my colleague from Ohio, Chairman KASICH, for bringing his FY 2000 budget resolution to the floor today.

Thomas Jefferson stated:

The same prudence which in private life would forbid our paying our own money for unexplained projects, forbids it in the dispensation of the public money.

These words still hold today.

I support the Kasich budget because it does what I believe needs to be done. It establishes a "safe deposit box" so that Social Security funds cannot be raided, it provides for debt reduction, controls spending while increasing defense spending, and provides much-needed tax relief. Furthermore, it increases funding for education and provides an increase of more than 1 billion for veterans health care over the President's budget.

I am troubled by the President's FY 2000 budget because it would increase domestic spending by \$200 billion, increase taxes by over \$100 billion, it would create 120 new government programs, and it would break the spending caps put in place in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. Ironically, the President, who talks a good game when it comes to education, has proposed cutting special education (title VI block grants) by \$375 million.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that passage of the President's budget would erode all the hard work and effort it has taken to cut wasteful spending and reduce the size of government.

While I find there is much to disagree with in the President's budget, I want to focus on two areas in his proposal that I find particularly intolerable.

As a veteran I find the administration's budget to be short of support for our Nation's men and women who served their country in time of need.

The President's budget is a mockery and I believe that he must be held accountable for sending us such a woefully inadequate VA budget, especially as it relates to VA medical care.

As chairman of the Veterans Subcommittee on Health, I know all too well how difficult it is to meet the health care needs of our Nation's veterans. In fact, when VA Secretary Togo West presented the administration's budget, I suggested that he might want to resubmit a new one because the one he was submitting seeks no funding increase for VA medical care above the 1999 baseline level. That makes our job even more difficult.

The President's budget doesn't address how the VA will find the money to pay for fixed cost increases of \$870 million for inflation and salaries, at least \$135 million in new costs for hepatitis, and estimated \$250 million to meet emergency care obligations, increased medication and prosthetics of \$150 million, and a shortfall of \$100 million in medical collections. I have long believed that these third party payer collections should be a supplement to and not instead of guaranteed health care dollars.

The other area of concern I have is with how the President deals with Social Security. During the last election we heard a lot about saving Social Security. The President criticized Congress for not doing enough to save the Social Security program. He pledged to and I

quote, "save Social Security first" and to dedicate 100 percent of the surplus for that purpose.

However, as is so often the case, what he says and what he does are sometimes at odds. The budget he presented to Congress uses not 100 percent of the surplus for Social Security. Not 90 percent, not 80 percent, not 70, but 60 percent of future surpluses would go to the trust fund. Now, Mr. President, which is it all of the surplus, 60 percent of the surplus, or will you change your mind again at some future date.

I don't think we should play politics with the budget, especially when it comes to our Nation's veterans and seniors. They made our country what it is today and I, for one believe we owe them a debt of gratitude. Smoke and mirrors to pay for your new programs is one thing, but breaking a pledge we made with these individuals is another.

I'm committed to making sure that our Nation's veterans and our seniors are treated with the dignity they deserve.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN).

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Chairman, I think we have to start off with a simple question; and that is, how do WE get \$778 billion worth of tax cuts if we do not have someplace to look at in the budget?

So I am reminded, probably back in 1995, that we are back at the same issue. We are hitting the very same people that lose every time; that is the veterans, that is the elderly, the children, and the disabled. The facts are there.

I just heard the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS). We are putting \$3 billion in. They are adding \$1 billion. But the fact of the matter is ours keeps the money in there, and theirs would actually cut veterans over the next 5 years.

I want to know what happened to the promise to our veterans. I simply cannot believe, also, that we are looking at low income women and children and the disabled. We are going to cut, and 1 million low-income women, infants and children would lose nutrition assistance. In Florida, we found that to be the most successful program to have healthy children.

We do welfare reform. These people have to have places to take their children. What happens? We are looking at the fact of cutting, and 50,000 low-income children will lose their child care assistance under the Child Care and Development Block Grant.

But here is one that absolutely I do not get. I spend half of my time in the district with people that come in to talk to me that are trying to apply for SSI. They want to cut administrative expenses. Let me tell my colleagues, it is taking 2, 3, 4 years for these folks already to get their claims done. These people are losing their homes. Their children cannot go to college. We ought not to be slashing administrative expenses in this area. We ought to be bolstering this area. Then on top of that, we are going to cut and reduce Meals On Wheels, congregate dining sites.

Then I just hope that my colleagues can go home and talk to their constituents about this budget.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE).

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak about a feature of the budget being offered by the Blue Dog Coalition and the budget that is being offered at this point by the majority.

The budget being offered by the majority, which is the President's budget, is using the Social Security surplus twice and claiming that this extends the life of the Social Security system to the year 2050. I am surprised that the majority would offer that type of a budget. I understand this is the President's budget. I must say that this is a point at which the Blue Dog Coalition disagrees with the President.

We feel that, if we are going to reform the Social Security system, it is incumbent upon us to do so on a forthright fashion, recognizing we have some very difficult decisions to make, and not assuming that we can extend the life of that system by simply giving it a pipeline into the general funds.

For this reason, we would like to urge that there be bipartisan support of the Blue Dog budget as opposed to the budget that is currently being advocated.

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

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding me this time, and I thank him for his outstanding leadership as we debate the budget.

This has been a very good debate because I think it highlights the differences between the two parties, and it gives the American people an opportunity to make some very fundamental choices.

On the one hand, the Democrats are saying that there are some very real and large problems in this country that need attention, problems like Social Security and extending the solvency of the Social Security program, problems like Medicare, extending solvency there, and problems like education, which needs our serious national attention.

On the other hand, the Republicans offer us the panacea of tax cuts, tax cuts that largely go to the wealthy. What happens in the Republican budget is this, the poor and the middle class count their tax breaks in terms of tens and hundreds. The wealthy count their tax breaks in terms of 10,000s.

These tax breaks that they talk about do not add to the solvency of Social Security by one day. They do not add to the solvency of Medicare by one day, nor do they address any of the education problems we have in this country. These tax cuts do not give us a single teacher. They do not give us a single additional classroom.

□ 1545

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Point of Order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I believe the speaker is off the subject at this time, and I do not believe that is proper.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Will the gentleman repeat the point of order?

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Sure. The gentleman is talking off subject.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN) will speak to the amendment pending.

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure I understand the objection. I think it is more the gentleman does not like what I am saying as opposed to the relevancy of what I am saying.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair will remind all Members that they will speak to the amendment pending.

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, could the Chair specify what is the objection of the gentleman to the statement I am making?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman must maintain a nexus to the budget amendment pending and the President's budget overall.

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, the point I was making is that in the context of debate on national policy, there must be areas of comparison and contrast. I was attempting to establish a contrast between the Democratic approach and the Republican approach.

They have now brought up a straw man and claimed this is what they are advocating, when actually they wanted to use the President's budget as a vehicle upon which to punch, a vehicle that we Democrats are not talking about. We Democrats are talking about a specific vehicle which I am in fact addressing, a vehicle that addresses Medicare, Social Security and education.

Now, I do not see how that is not relevant, but I can see how it might be disturbing to my Republican colleagues. The point is we have an important opportunity today to make a choice: a Republican approach that wants to hit a straw man and produce tax benefits for the very wealthy; or a Democratic approach that is fundamentally sound and addresses the key problems of America today.

I think we ought to opt for the Democratic approach.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

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

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the gentleman who just spoke said we are not talking about the Clinton-Gore, the President's, budget. Quite frankly, he candidly said we do not want to talk

about the Clinton-Gore budget. In reality, this is the Clinton-Gore budget and it is, in fact, what we are offering at this time on the floor.

Our position is this deserves to be discussed and to be debated. Millions of dollars were spent to develop this budget. If the Democrats do not want to offer it, we want to offer it and at least have some discussion of what is in it. So I understand the gentleman's embarrassment about not wanting to talk about the President's budget, but the facts are the facts.

So let us talk about that budget. My colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE), on the other side, pointed out that the President's budget double counts the Social Security surplus and actually spends that amount of money twice. Let us talk about what the Republican budget versus the Clinton-Gore budget does with Social Security.

We save, as my colleagues understand, I hope, by now, 100 percent of that surplus. Beyond that, the President, by contrast, as scored by CBO, spends \$158 billion of that surplus. I do not know how anyone can tell the American people they are saving it when they are spending \$158 billion of it.

The second point I want to make is that one of my colleagues who just spoke on the other side said, well, I think the Republicans are ultimately going to bury the budget caps, after all, I do not think they are really going to live within the budget that they proposed.

I simply want to make the point that he can speculate all he wants about the Republican budget. In point of fact, this chart right here shows quite clearly the Republican budget on the floor today does not break the budget cap. We entered into negotiations in 1997, and we set statutory spending caps. Our budget on the floor today does not break those caps.

So my colleagues can speculate, but the fact is the President's budget does break the caps by \$31 billion.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, there is a good bit of rhetoric being spoken here today. I think our Republican friends would understandably like to do anything other than compare straightforwardly the Democratic alternative and the Republican alternative that are before us today.

The facts are that in at least five critical aspects the Democratic product is vastly superior, and I do not think really anyone has challenged that effectively today.

First, the Democratic alternative extends Social Security solvency until 2050 and Medicare solvency to 2020. The Republican budget does not extend that one day.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. COBURN. Point of order, Mr. Chairman.



The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. COBURN. I believe the discussion is to be focused on the amendment at hand. The amendment at hand is the President's budget.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members that the President's budget is pending, however the President's budget extends to everything affecting the United States budget.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Absolutely. Every item that I am addressing is touched on by all these budget promotions, again, parliamentary maneuvers, anything to avoid a direct comparison of the Democratic and Republican alternatives that are before us.

The second point of comparison: Over 10 years the Democratic budget pays down \$146 billion more in public debt than the Republican budget.

Third point of comparison, education. Over 5 years, \$10 billion more in the Democratic alternative for education, making it possible to reduce class size, to bring on 100,000 new teachers; making it possible to get our children out of trailers. And I speak as someone from a district where thousands of children are going to school in hundreds of trailers. In low-income areas, in high-growth areas, we simply must give our children the modernized facilities, the good equipment they deserve.

The fourth area of difference, tax cuts. The Democratic budget provides for targeted tax cuts; long-term care tax credits, child care tax credits, research and experimentation tax credits, and tax credits to let local school authorities get ahead of the curve in issuing school bonds.

Fifth, Veterans and veterans' health care. We discussed that earlier today. The Republican budget makes a show of boosting veterans' health care, does it in the first year only, and then actually cuts, cuts, veterans' health care \$400 million below the freeze level over the next 5 years.

We could go on and on. There is no question the Democratic budget is fiscally responsible. There is no question it is targeted at areas of urgent national needs. It is far superior to the majority proposal, and I urge its adoption.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO  
TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair will acknowledge that the amendment pending is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), and in the future will refrain from characterizing it as the President's amendment.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY).

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

Mr. Chairman, it is clear the Democrat Members of this body do not want

to talk about the President's budget proposal, because the President's budget proposal is the proposal to increase taxes on the American people.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SPRATT. Point of Order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. SPRATT. The Chair just stated it should be referred to as the Coburn resolution rather than as the President's budget.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Members may debate the content of the amendment.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, it is no wonder that the proposal that is presented by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) that was presented to Congress on behalf of the White House—

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO  
TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) will suspend for one moment, please.

The Chair will clarify his statement. The Chair will refrain from referring to the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) as the President's budget, however, the Members have every right to do so.

Mr. ARMEY. The President of the United States is proud to say that he is trying to set money aside for Social Security and Medicare and, yes, he does try, but he tries with some reservation because of his commitment to increase taxes and spending.

The fact is the Republicans set more money aside for Social Security and Medicare than the President does in his budget. After these funds are set aside, we discover that the American people will still, over the next decade, on average, pay over \$5,000 in increased taxes beyond that which is necessary. We in the Republican Party believe we ought to give that money back to the people who earned it in the first place, but the President and the Democrats do not want to do that.

In fact, in a recent speech in Buffalo, President Clinton told us that we could, he says, "We could give it all back to you and hope you might spend it right, but," but he does not believe the American people can do that. We, however, believe the President should understand that we can spend our own money that we earn wisely and that he should not take more than what is necessary. So, after we set aside more money for Social Security and for Medicare than the President does, we think we ought to have a tax reduction.

The President says let us raise taxes, 80 different taxes, for a net of \$52 billion over 5 years. And then, on top of everything else, the President raises taxes on whom? As this chart shows, precisely on the least income-earning Americans in the country. That is to say, the President wants to build government so badly that he is willing to hold back part of the payroll taxes of

our young working Americans, who pay for the retirement security of America's seniors, so the President can instead use it for new government programs. And, in addition to that, levy \$52 billion worth of increased taxes on the poorest of these working Americans.

I must say, I must say, given this inability to in fact save Social Security taxes for Social Security, to in fact restrain the growth of government, in the face of all the liberal demands of his constituency, and to in fact cut taxes instead of raising them as he does, and indeed raising them on the poorest of Americans, given the President's inability to do something other than these compulsive things, it is no wonder my colleagues on the Democrat side of the aisle do not want to talk about the President's budget. I would not want to either.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

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

I think my friend the majority leader is a little bit confused. The President has identified some revenue adjustments. The difference is the Republicans, through their Committee on the Budget Chair, admit that the Republicans are going to have them but they are not laying out what they are in terms of the offsets and the pre-increases.

I think, however, the more fundamental point is that they have it precisely wrong in terms of, unlike the President's proposal, they do not give tools to our communities to help them build more livable communities. Their budget fails to give the tools that communities need to help improve the quality of life, like the administration's budget does when it offers increased choices for citizens in areas of transportation, housing, regional planning, open space preservation, education and crime control. The Democratic alternative recognizes the importance of these initiatives.

The proposal from the Republicans would be a disaster, if there was any chance that it would ever be implemented. It siphons off nearly \$1 trillion in tax cuts and pays for them with unnecessary and painful budget cuts, while ignoring key investments that are needed to make communities more liveable.

The good news is that it will not be adopted in this form, because even the Republicans have no intention of implementing it. The bad news is it is simply a license to avoid responsible budgeting.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and, instead, strive to produce a budget that promotes livable communities and fiscal stability.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the time on each side?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr.

COBURN) has 8¼ minutes, and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, listening to my colleague talk about tools to build livable communities, I would point out in the Clinton-Gore budget some things they do for tools for livable communities.

The Clinton-Gore budget cuts State and local law enforcement assistance by \$758 million. It reduces funding for State prison grants from \$729 million to only \$75 million.

□ 1600

It eliminates local law enforcement block grants. And here is a great one. On January 28, 1999, Vice President AL GORE announced the Department of Justice would provide \$28 million to help law enforcement agencies hire more police officers, the Community Oriented Police Services, COPS. Three days later, on February 3, President Clinton's budget, the budget we are debating right now, cut funding for COPS by \$155 million. It does not seem to me that that is going to create more livable communities.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER).

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I rise against the Coburn amendment.

It is very often in these debates we have a great number of charts and a great deal of interpretation on what we are going to call the budget and how we are going to contour its label. But, in fact, there are certain fundamental differences that I think all Americans are starting to see in this debate.

One is that the President and those of us on the Democratic side of the aisle believe that Medicare is an important Federal program that aids many seniors and it should be shored up, it should be expanded, and we should cover prescription drugs. That is what we believe. That is not what the opponents believe.

We believe that schools are important, education is important, teachers are important, new construction for overcrowded schools. That is what we believe. This is what is in our value systems. That is what we believe the other side will not speak about because it is not what they believe.

We believe that it is important to pay down, to retire some of our Federal debt because every dollar that we pay into interest are dollars we cannot spend for all of the things that all of us here support, whether it be tax cuts, whether it be defense, whether it be education or anything else. These are fundamental dividing lines between us.

And they can hold up charts all they like, but we will never see the sponsors of this amendment talk about those three fundamental issues. It makes us wonder, do they not realize that these are the issues that motivate Americans?

Right now seniors pay more out of their own pocket than when the Medicare program was created in the 1960s, more today than at that time we declared a health care emergency. That is a shame and we should reverse that.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think it is very important that the gentleman raised the Medicare issue. Because, in fact, the statements of the President in his State of the Union do not match the budget, and that is one of the reasons his budget needs to be compared to.

As a physician who cares for Medicare patients, let me tell my colleagues what the President's budget does for Medicare. It freezes inpatient hospital payments. That is the first thing it does. So what that is going to do is shift the cost for everybody that is not Medicare, raise their cost for health care. So it is an indirect tax on everybody else in the country.

The second thing it does is it reduces laboratory services payments. They are all making a ton of money. It reduces prices paid for durable medical equipment, which has already been reduced by about 50 percent over the last 5 years. It imposes \$194 million next year, \$970 million over 5 years, and \$1.94 billion over 10 years in new user fees on Medicare.

We cannot get doctors to care for a lot of our Medicare patients. Now we are going to charge them something every year if they are going to be a Medicare provider. We now are having trouble getting HMO firms to give care under the Medicare Plus Choice Plan. He has a charge, a tax on everybody that is a provider in a Medicare Plus Choice Plan.

So as we go through the things that the President said he wants to help save Medicare, in fact it is very, very different from that.

There is a total cut of \$3.3 billion in Medicare, according to the CBO, over the next 10 years. This next year \$1 billion is cut from Medicare by President Clinton through these and other things. That is not to mention the reduction in drug payments. The whole Medicare Commission failed over the fight over prescription drug benefits. And yet in his budget that he submits, which I am submitting so we can debate it, he cuts the Medicare prescription benefit that is out there. He cuts the drug payment for cancer drugs to keep people alive that are on Medicare.

So it is important that we talk about what is really in the President's budget. I understand why it was not offered, but it is still very important that we discuss what is in the budget.

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

Let me simply make clear that that is not in our budget, not in the Spratt substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I wonder why there is such a desire to

discuss the President's budget when it is not before us. I know there is no merit. I gather there is great delight in discussing irrelevant things. I cannot imagine why we would do that.

Let me tell my colleagues why I support the Democrat alternative. The Democrat alternative stands up for families, stands up for children, stands up for seniors, stands up for rural communities. It indeed cuts taxes. But it does not do what the Republican budget does. Now that is before us. The Republican budget is before us, and it cuts taxes using the greatest amount of resources to give the least amount of benefit to taxes.

We target our tax cut to make sure that we respect child care needs, we respect long-term care in terms of needing health care for our seniors. All of those are part of our targeted tax reduction. What we do in our spending and what we do in our tax laws says a lot about who we are. Our priorities for spending, our tax policy says to the world what things are important.

I submit to my colleagues that the Republican budget says it does not care for children, it does not care for schoolchildren in the way that it should, it does not care for seniors in the way it proposes to do, it does not care for rural families in the way that they claim they do.

Indeed, my colleagues should support the Democrat alternative, which does what it says, and not discuss the President's budget, which is not relevant in this discussion.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, what is amazing to me is that despite the record high taxes on the American people and unprecedented surpluses, what does the President's budget propose? More taxes, over \$100 billion in new taxes and fees. And what does he propose to do with these new taxes? More big government programs and more spending.

Now, usually I try to illustrate my points with legible charts. But I am afraid that the only way I could fit all of the President's new taxes and fees and all of his new spending programs was to do it on these charts. I ask my colleagues to do the best they can to read them.

But the point is, how does the President pay for all of this new spending? He spends over \$100 billion of the Social Security surplus during the next 5 years, eliminates or underfunds programs like special education and NIH research, reduces Medicare payments, and again proposes over \$100 billion in new taxes and fees.

In conclusion, I just want to urge my colleagues to vote against the President's budget, vote against the new spending and new programs made possible by raiding Social Security and raising taxes.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) who

wishes to rise and speak in support of the President's budget, who was the chairman of the Committee on the Budget when the Deficit Reduction Act of 1993 was passed which has brought us to this point.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding me the time.

First let me say that I think the most irresponsible budget that I have ever seen on this House floor by a majority is what we have before us today.

Secondly, I am going to vote for this misinterpretation of the President's budget for one fundamental reason. I have differences with it and many things. He is over-optimistic about what we can do in the year 2000. The budgets that we have are unrealistic for dealing with any legitimate need. But the President did put forward before us a realistic proposal to deal with the funding of Social Security and Medicare.

His program adds significantly to the reserves of the Social Security trust fund. Yes, he does. He adds significantly to the reserves for Medicare. It does not solve the problems in total, but it is an important beginning step to deal with them.

The Republican proposal adds penny zero to the Social Security trust fund, adds penny zero to the Medicare trust fund.

The President is on the right track. And as a symbolic vote for the real leadership that he has provided, I will vote for this misinterpretation of his budget.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would just add that the GAO reports the President's proposal to strengthen the hospital insurance program is more perceived than real. In reality, nothing about the program has changed.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT).

Mr. DeMINT. Mr. Chairman, as a new Member of Congress, it is refreshing today to hear some honesty. I have heard the Members of the President's own party call his budget a straw dog that we are embarrassed to even talk about.

It is embarrassing when the President talks about saving Social Security yet continues to spend the Social Security Trust Fund. It is embarrassing when he talks about saving Medicare when he cuts the Medicare budget. It is embarrassing when he raises taxes and makes promises he cannot keep.

Now, I know this does not represent the values of my colleagues. It does not represent our values. We need to call this budget what it is. Vote it down and move on to some honest debate with their budget and ours on the table.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) has ¾ minutes remaining. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has expired.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON).

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, it is easy to understand why most of my colleagues do not want to vote for this President's budget. As a veteran, I have looked at it. And the President flat-lines benefits for veterans. The Republican budget actually increases it by \$1 billion.

Let me just tell my colleagues a few things. The President's budget busts the spending caps by \$30 billion. We hold them. The President's budget raids Social Security money for more and more spending. Our budget protects Social Security and Medicare. The President's budget cuts \$11 billion in Medicare, cuts the Republican budget. The Republican budget protects Medicare. The President's budget raises taxes by \$172 billion.

To quote President Reagan, "There they go again, spending more money." In fact, the President has said Congress should not even consider providing tax relief for 15 years. Let us not let that happen. Vote this budget down.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding me this time.

We have a very hard time in agriculture today, and the fix that we need is some type of revenue insurance, some way of farmers insuring their risk. The Secretary of Agriculture came before our Subcommittee on Appropriations and said, "We cannot do it on the cheap to fix this problem."

Well, let us look at the President's budget. What does he have for crop insurance to fix the problem? A big fat goose egg. What does the Republican budget have in it? \$6 billion to help our farmers. And also, in the President's budget, the livestock producers are going to have their taxes increased by \$504 million right out of their hides.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) has ¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, it is important that the President's proposals be put forward. It is important to contrast what was stated in the State of the Union with the actual numbers coming through in his budget. It is important for us to give his budget a comparison to the other budgets on this floor. It is important for us all to remember that, while he is saying he is

saving Medicare, he cuts it \$1 billion this year, \$11 billion over the next 5 years. While it is important that he says he is saving Social Security, he spends all but 58 percent of it this next year and all but 62 percent of it the next 4 years.

Vice President GORE, in the Clinton-Gore budget, one of the things that he said in his book, and I quote from Earth and Balance, "Look at the budget where we are borrowing a billion dollars every 24 hours and in the process endangering the future of our children. Yet nobody is doing anything about it."

Well, I would propose to my colleagues that the Clinton-Gore budget does nothing about that, that in fact it increases the debt on our children \$1.5 trillion between now and the year 2005.

□ 1615

It runs a budget deficit of \$663 billion over the next 5 years. The budget of the majority runs a surplus.

If this vision for America is appealing to my colleagues, higher taxes, more debt for our grandchildren, stealing money from Social Security, cuts in Medicare, then I would encourage them to support my resolution which is the Clinton-Gore budget and vote for it. But if they want to begin easing the debt burden on our grandchildren, save 100 percent of the Social Security trust fund surplus and actually increase spending for Medicare, then I encourage them to oppose my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 2, noes 426, answered "present" 1, not voting 4, as follows:

	[Roll No. 74]	
	AYES—2	
Rush	Sabo	
	NOES—426	
Abercrombie	Bentsen	Brady (PA)
Ackerman	Bereuter	Brady (TX)
Aderholt	Berkley	Brown (CA)
Allen	Berman	Brown (FL)
Andrews	Berry	Brown (OH)
Archer	Biggert	Bryant
Armey	Bilbray	Burr
Bachus	Bilirakis	Buyer
Baird	Bishop	Callahan
Baker	Blagojevich	Calvert
Baldacci	Billey	Camp
Baldwin	Blumenauer	Campbell
Ballenger	Blunt	Canady
Barcia	Boehert	Cannon
Barr	Boehner	Capps
Barrett (NE)	Bonilla	Capuano
Barrett (WI)	Bonior	Cardin
Bartlett	Bono	Carson
Barton	Borski	Castle
Bass	Boswell	Chabot
Bateman	Boucher	Chambliss
Becerra	Boyd	Chenoweth

Clay Hill (IN)  
 Clayton Hill (MT)  
 Clement Hilleary  
 Clyburn Hilliard  
 Coble Hinchey  
 Coburn Hinojosa  
 Collins Hobson  
 Combest Hoeffel  
 Condit Hoekstra  
 Conyers Holden  
 Cook Holt  
 Cooksey Hooley  
 Costello Horn  
 Cox Hostettler  
 Coyne Houghton  
 Cramer Hoyer  
 Crane Hulshof  
 Crowley Hunter  
 Cubin Hutchinson  
 Cummings Hyde  
 Cunningham Inslee  
 Danner Isakson  
 Davis (FL) Istook  
 Davis (IL) Jackson (IL)  
 Davis (VA) Jackson-Lee  
 Deal (TX)  
 DeFazio Jefferson  
 DeGette Jenkins  
 Delahunt John  
 DeLauro Johnson (CT)  
 DeLay Johnson, E. B.  
 DeMint Johnson, Sam  
 Deutsch Jones (NC)  
 Diaz-Balart Jones (OH)  
 Dickey Kanjorski  
 Dicks Kaptur  
 Dingell Kasich  
 Dixon Kelly  
 Doggett Kennedy  
 Dooley Kildee  
 Doolittle Kilpatrick  
 Doyle Kind (WI)  
 Dreier King (NY)  
 Duncan Kingston  
 Dunn Kleczka  
 Edwards Klink  
 Ehlers Knollenberg  
 Ehrlich Kolbe  
 Emerson Kucinich  
 Engel Kuykendall  
 English LaFalce  
 Eshoo LaHood  
 Etheridge Lampson  
 Evans Lantos  
 Everett Largent  
 Ewing Larson  
 Farr Latham  
 Fattah LaTourette  
 Fletcher Lazio  
 Foley Leach  
 Forbes Lee  
 Ford Levin  
 Fossella Lewis (CA)  
 Fowler Lewis (GA)  
 Frank (MA) Lewis (KY)  
 Franks (NJ) Linder  
 Frelinghuysen Lipinski  
 Frost LoBiondo  
 Gallegly Lofgren  
 Ganske Lowey  
 Gejdenson Lucas (KY)  
 Gekas Lucas (OK)  
 Gephardt Luther  
 Gibbons Maloney (CT)  
 Gilchrest Maloney (NY)  
 Gillmor Manzullo  
 Gilman Markey  
 Gonzalez Martinez  
 Goode Mascara  
 Goodlatte Matsui  
 Goodling McCarthy (MO)  
 Gordon McCarthy (NY)  
 Goss McCollum  
 Graham McCrery  
 Granger McDermott  
 Green (TX) McGovern  
 Green (WI) McHugh  
 Greenwood McInnis  
 Gutierrez McIntosh  
 Gutmacht McIntyre  
 Hall (OH) McKeon  
 Hall (TX) McKinney  
 Hansen McNulty  
 Hastings (FL) Meehan  
 Hastings (WA) Meek (FL)  
 Hayes Meeks (NY)  
 Hayworth Menendez  
 Hefley Metcalf  
 Hergert Mica

Millender-  
 McDonald  
 Miller (FL)  
 Miller, Gary  
 Miller, George  
 Minge  
 Mink  
 Moakley  
 Mollohan  
 Moore  
 Moran (KS)  
 Moran (VA)  
 Morella  
 Murtha  
 Myrick  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal  
 Nethercutt  
 Ney  
 Northup  
 Norwood  
 Nussle  
 Oberstar  
 Obey  
 Olver  
 Ortiz  
 Ose  
 Oxley  
 Packard  
 Pallone  
 Pascrell  
 Pastor  
 Paul  
 Payne  
 Pease  
 Peterson (MN)  
 Peterson (PA)  
 Petri  
 Phelps  
 Pickering  
 Pickett  
 Pitts  
 Pombo  
 Pomeroy  
 Porter  
 Portman  
 Price (NC)  
 Pryce (OH)  
 Quinn  
 Radanovich  
 Rahall  
 Ramstad  
 Rangel  
 Regula  
 Reyes  
 Reynolds  
 Riley  
 Rivers  
 Rodriguez  
 Roemer  
 Rogan  
 Rogers  
 Rohrabacher  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Rothman  
 Roukema  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Royce  
 Ryan (WI)  
 Lucas (KS)  
 Salmon  
 Sanchez  
 Sanders  
 Sandlin  
 Sanford  
 Sawyer  
 Saxton  
 Scarborough  
 Schaffer  
 Schakowsky  
 Scott  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Serrano  
 Sessions  
 Shadegg  
 Shaw  
 Shays  
 Sherman  
 Sherwood  
 Shimkus  
 Shows  
 Shuster  
 Simpson  
 Siskiny  
 Skeen  
 Skelton  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (MI)

Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Smith (WA)  
 Snyder  
 Souder  
 Spence  
 Spratt  
 Stabenow  
 Stark  
 Stearns  
 Stenholm  
 Strickland  
 Stump  
 Sununu  
 Sweeney  
 Talent  
 Tancredo  
 Tanner  
 Tauscher  
 Tauzin  
 Taylor (MS)  
 Taylor (NC)

Terry  
 Thomas  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Thornberry  
 Thune  
 Thurman  
 Tiahrt  
 Tierney  
 Toomey  
 Towns  
 Traficant  
 Turner  
 Udall (CO)  
 Udall (NM)  
 Upton  
 Velazquez  
 Vento  
 Visclosky  
 Walden  
 Walsh  
 Wamp

Waters  
 Watkins  
 Watt (NC)  
 Watts (OK)  
 Waxman  
 Weiner  
 Weldon (FL)  
 Weldon (PA)  
 Weller  
 Wexler  
 Weygand  
 Whitfield  
 Wicker  
 Wilson  
 Wise  
 Wolf  
 Woolsey  
 Wu  
 Wynn  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (FL)

Fiscal year 2003: —\$11,900,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2004: —\$14,300,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,418,785,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001: \$1,316,307,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002: \$1,493,021,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003: \$1,546,516,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2004: \$1,608,848,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,405,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001: \$1,436,400,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002: \$1,468,250,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003: \$1,527,400,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2004: \$1,583,300,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: —\$900,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001: —\$5,200,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002: —\$28,250,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003: —\$23,700,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2004: —\$30,300,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$5,620,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001: \$5,704,800,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002: \$5,763,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003: \$5,802,400,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2004: \$5,828,600,000,000.

### SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and budget outlays for fiscal years 2000 through 2004 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$281,773,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$274,595,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$305,158,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$285,949,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$308,046,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$297,646,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$314,507,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$306,937,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$316,033,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$316,593,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,746,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$14,052,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$10,651,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$15,111,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$9,765,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$14,381,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,550,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$13,623,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,483,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$13,323,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,977,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,257,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,968,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$17,865,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,934,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$17,865,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,934,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$17,743,000,000.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Filner

NOT VOTING—4

Burton Pelosi  
 Owens Stupak

□ 1635

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, and Messrs. METCALF, CLYBURN, COOKSEY and Mrs. NORTHUP changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall No. 74. Had I been present, I would have voted "no".

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part 2 of House Report 106-77.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 IN THE NATURE OF A  
 SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. MINGE

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 in the nature of a substitute printed in part 2 of House Report 106-77 offered by Mr. MINGE:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

#### SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000.

The Congress declares that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000 and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2001 through 2004 are hereby set forth.

#### SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2004:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,405,900,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001: \$1,441,600,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002: \$1,496,500,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003: \$1,551,100,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2004: \$1,613,600,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: —\$0.  
 Fiscal year 2001: —\$3,900,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002: —\$11,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,208,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,682,000,000.  
 (4) Energy (270):  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$618,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$141,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$1,937,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$152,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$1,178,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$76,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$1,282,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2004:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$315,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$1,419,000,000.  
 (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,809,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,669,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,529,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,057,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,463,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$21,391,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,484,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,555,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2004:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,470,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$23,483,000,000.  
 (6) Agriculture (350):  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,340,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$14,251,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,294,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$12,884,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,764,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$10,893,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,233,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$11,304,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2004:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,501,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$11,851,000,000.  
 (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,848,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,103,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,573,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$5,711,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,410,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$10,166,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,540,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$10,872,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2004:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,874,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$10,438,000,000.  
 (8) Transportation (400):  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$51,744,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$45,846,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$50,992,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$47,718,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$50,807,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$47,278,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$52,248,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$46,806,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2004:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$52,278,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$46,298,000,000.  
 (9) Community and Regional Development (450):  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,407,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$10,642,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,355,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$9,111,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,288,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$7,081,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,650,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,067,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2004:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,620,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$5,475,000,000.  
 (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,302,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$63,557,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$67,338,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$65,496,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$68,386,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$66,107,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$71,053,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$68,375,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2004:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$73,543,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$70,833,000,000.  
 (11) Health (550):  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$156,176,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$152,988,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$165,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$163,179,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$174,521,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$174,884,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$186,343,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$186,830,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2004:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$201,010,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$201,317,000,000.  
 (12) Medicare (570):  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$208,663,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$208,707,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$222,115,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$222,269,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$230,604,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$230,239,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$250,754,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$250,888,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2004:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$268,569,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$268,755,000,000.  
 (13) Income Security (600):  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$246,479,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$248,070,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$248,192,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$257,020,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$264,339,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$266,555,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$276,831,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$276,147,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2004:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$285,569,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$285,429,000,000.  
 (14) Social Security (650):  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,455,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$14,556,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,134,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$14,034,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,249,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$16,149,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,335,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$16,235,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2004:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,123,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$17,023,000,000.  
 (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$45,536,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$45,693,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,289,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$46,632,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$47,236,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$47,517,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$47,987,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$48,447,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2004:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$48,363,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$48,939,000,000.  
 (16) Administration of Justice (750):  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,385,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$25,335,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,622,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$25,114,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,128,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$25,292,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,548,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$25,301,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2004:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,709,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$27,463,000,000.  
 (17) General Government (800):  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,940,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$13,148,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,946,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$12,639,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,079,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$12,328,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,093,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$12,159,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2004:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,100,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$12,147,000,000.  
 (18) Net Interest (900):  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$270,815,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$270,815,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$266,827,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$266,827,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$262,680,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$262,680,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$258,806,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$258,806,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2004:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$262,799,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$262,799,000,000.  
 (19) Allowances (920):  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$8,350,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$8,100,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$10,000,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$14,400,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$4,900,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$15,200,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$14,300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$12,800,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2004:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$7,000,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$9,600,000,000.  
 (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):  
 Fiscal year 2000:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$34,260,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$34,260,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$36,876,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$36,876,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$43,626,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$43,626,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$37,004,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$37,004,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2004:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$37,089,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$37,089,000,000.

#### SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

(a) RECONCILIATION.—Not later than September 30, 1999, the House Committee on Ways and Means shall report to the House a reconciliation bill that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of revenues for that committee is not less than: \$0 in revenues for fiscal year 2000 and \$41,600,000,000 in revenues for fiscal years 2000 through 2004.

(b) TAX CUT CONTINGENT ON SAVING SOCIAL SECURITY.—It shall not be in order in the House to consider a reconciliation bill reported pursuant to subsection (a) unless the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget has received a certification from the Board of Trustees of the social security trust funds that the funds are in actuarial balance for the 75-year period used in the most recent annual report of that Board pursuant to section 201(c)(2) of the Social Security Act.

#### SEC. 5. SAVING THE SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

- (1) under the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the social security trust funds are required to be off-budget for the purposes of the President's budget submission and the concurrent resolution on the budget;
- (2) the social security trust funds have been running surpluses for 17 years;
- (3) these surpluses have been used implicitly to finance the general operations of the Government;
- (4) in fiscal year 2000, the social security surplus will exceed \$137,000,000,000;
- (5) for the first time in 24 years, a concurrent resolution on the budget balances the Federal budget without counting social security surpluses; and
- (6) the only way to ensure social security surpluses are not diverted for other purposes is to balance the budget exclusive of such surpluses.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

- (1) the social security surplus should not be used to fund other operations within the Government;
- (2) the budget of the Government should balance without relying on social security trust funds to hide a deficit or inflate a surplus; and
- (3) surpluses in the social security trust funds should be reserved, to be used exclusively by the social security system.

(c) POINT OF ORDER.—(1) It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any concurrent resolution on the budget, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that sets forth a deficit for any fiscal year. For purposes of this subsection, a deficit shall be the level (if any) set forth in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for that fiscal year pursuant to section 301(a)(3) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. In setting forth the deficit level pursuant to such section, that level shall not include any adjustments in aggregates that would be made pursuant to any reserve fund that provides for adjustments in allocations and aggregates for legislation that enhances retirement security or extends the solvency of the

medicare trust funds or makes such changes in the medicare payment or benefit structure as are necessary.

(2) Paragraph (1) may be waived in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members voting.

#### SEC. 6. REMOVAL OF SOCIAL SECURITY FROM BUDGET PRONOUNCEMENTS.

It is the sense of Congress that any official statement issued by the Office of Management and Budget, the Congressional Budget Office, or any other agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government of surplus or deficit totals of the budget of the United States Government as submitted by the President or of the surplus or deficit totals of the congressional budget, and any description of, or reference to, such totals in any official publication or material issued by either of such Offices or any other such agency or instrumentality, shall exclude the outlays and receipts of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program under title II of the Social Security Act (including the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund) and the related provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

#### SEC. 7. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ALLOCATION OF ON-BUDGET SURPLUSES.

As reflected in this resolution, it is the sense of Congress that all on-budget surpluses should be distributed as follows:

(1) 50 PERCENT TO DEBT REDUCTION.—It is the determination of Congress that the national debt is too high. In a time of peace and prosperity, debt reduction is a top national priority. This reduction of debt will better position the Government to finance anticipated depletions of the social security and medicare trust funds. However, the Congress determines that such a reduction in debt shall not be construed as a substitute for needed substantive reforms of those programs to assure their long term financial integrity.

(2) 25 PERCENT TO TAX REDUCTION.—Congress determines that 4 types of tax reduction should be accommodated within this budget:

(A) Extensions of current temporary provision of the tax code.

(B) Targeted tax reduction in settings in which changes are needed for fairness and sound economic planning.

(C) Tax reform and simplification to eliminate complicated features of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(D) Consideration of across-the-board tax cuts.

(3) 25 PERCENT TO INVESTMENT IN PRIORITY AREAS.—Congress recognizes that the budget caps have imposed severe constraints on Government operations for fiscal year 2000, and without relief, programs may be difficult to administer in the ensuing fiscal years. As a result, investments in many priorities will be deferred or not made. The 25 percent of surplus allocated to priority programs is designed to offer opportunity to strengthen these programs in the years ahead. Congress finds that priorities include agriculture, defense, education, and veterans' programs, and others that may be from time-to-time determined.

#### SEC. 8. SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE.

It is the sense of the Congress that the Social Security and Medicare programs are vital to our nation's health and the retirement security of our citizens. Enactment of reforms to strengthen and preserve these programs must be an urgent priority.

(1) SOCIAL SECURITY.—After the Congress enacts legislation to reform and extend the solvency of the social security program, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may adjust allocations for fiscal years 2000

through 2004 to allow for general revenue transfers to the social security trust fund, subject to the following limitations: Fiscal year 2001, adjustments not greater than \$8,500,000,000; fiscal year 2002, \$16,500,000,000; fiscal year 2003, \$25,500,000,000; and fiscal year 2004, \$34,000,000,000.

(2) MEDICARE.—After the Congress enacts legislation to reform and extend the solvency of the medicare program, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may adjust allocations for fiscal years 2000 through 2004 to allow for general revenue transfers to the medicare trust fund, subject to the following limitations: Fiscal year 2001, \$2,800,000,000; fiscal year 2002, \$5,500,000,000; fiscal year 2003, \$8,500,000,000; and fiscal year 2004, \$11,000,000,000.

#### SEC. 9. UPDATING BASELINE PROJECTIONS AND PRIORITIES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000.

(a) UP-TO-DATE ESTIMATES OF ON-BUDGET SURPLUSES.—Upon the request of the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall make an up-to-date estimate of the projected on-budget surplus for the applicable fiscal year.

(b) ADJUSTMENTS.—Upon receipt of an up-to-date estimate of an on-budget surplus made pursuant to subsection (a), the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget shall adjust the aggregates of new budget authority, outlays, revenues, and the public debt as follows:

(1) Reduce the aggregates for public debt for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2001 by an amount equal to ½ of the increase (if any) in on-budget surplus projections above the amounts provided in this resolution.

(2) Increase the aggregates of new budget authority and outlays for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2004 by an amount equal to ¼ of the increase (if any) in on-budget surplus projections above the amounts provided in this resolution.

(3) Reduce the revenue aggregates for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2004 by an amount equal to ¼ of the increase (if any) in on-budget surplus projections above the amounts provided in this resolution.

#### SEC. 10. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING ENFORCEMENT.

It is the sense of Congress that before October 1, 2000, Congress should enact legislation to modify and extend the pay-as-you-go requirement through 2009, increase the discretionary spending limits set forth under section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 for fiscal years 2001 and 2002, and extend those limits to include fiscal years 2003 and 2004, to reflect the new budget authority and outlays as set forth in this resolution.

#### SEC. 11. INTENT OF THE COMMITTEE REGARDING CROP INSURANCE.

It is the intent of the Committee on the Budget of the House that function 350 for agriculture allow for the implementation of a new, comprehensive, affordable, and permanent crop and revenue insurance program. The cost of the program is assumed to be \$\_\_\_ billion in this resolution; but the program design has not been developed. When the program is developed such committee will take all steps necessary to work the crop and revenue insurance initiative into the budget resolution and budget process.

#### SEC. 12. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING THE MEDICARE+CHOICE PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the geographic disparity in payment rates for the medicare managed care program is inherently unfair;

(2) unfairness disproportionately effects rural areas and efficient health care markets;

(3) seniors in areas with higher reimbursement can receive additional benefits that are

unavailable to seniors in other areas of the country.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Medicare+Choice payment rate must be addressed to correct the current inequality, and any expansion of the Medicare program can be made only after this disparity is addressed.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognize the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE).

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

Mr. Chairman, we have spent most of today debating what budget is best for the people of the United States of America. We have had conflicting budgets presented. The President's budget, or at least how it has been perceived by the other side, has just been voted upon, the majority budget will be voted on later in the day, I expect, and the democratic substitute will be voted on.

The Blue Dog Coalition, a group of moderate to conservative Democrats, has developed a substitute budget proposal. That substitute budget proposal is summarized on the easel that is in the well, and I would like to ask that my colleagues direct their attention to this substitute summary because it is important to understand both what the differences are and what the similarities are to the other budgets that are receiving consideration today.

Most importantly, Mr. Chairman, the Blue Dog budget recognizes that we have a responsibility to the American people, a responsibility to ensure that the Social Security program is no longer treated like a regular part of the budget and used as a cash cow to finance other activities, whether they be new programs, expanded programs or tax reductions. We put that Social Security program off budget, and the money that is accumulated as a surplus is used to pay down on the debt and position this country to better handle the obligations that we will owe in future years in the Social Security program.

Secondly, we recognize that we are blessed in this country with the prospect of a budget surplus without using Social Security.

We recognize that we must be terribly responsible or we will be making terrible mistakes with respect to this anticipated surplus. We have a time of virtually unparalleled prosperity. We feel our first order of business ought to be to use at least half of this surplus to reduce the Federal debt. When the sun is shining, we ought to repair the roof. We have had leaks in the roof, we have been running deficits, we have built up an enormous debt; it is time to make those repairs.

We also urge that we spend 25 percent on investment priorities and the other 25 percent returned to the American taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman I yield 2¼ minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHN) to discuss our 5-year plan.

Mr. JOHN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me. I also appreciate the Committee on Rules for making the Blue Dog budget in order.

The title of my remarks are: Honest Projections and No Phony Bones, and that may seem a little humorous to my colleagues, but I think it is very important that we go through this exercise.

Mr. Chairman, I support wholeheartedly the Blue Dog budget for a myriad of reasons, and my remarks today are going to focus on what I think is one of the more important reasons to support the Blue Dog budget, and the issue concerns economic projections. I am referring to the fact that the Blue Dog budget is a 5-year budget with projections over 5 years, and the Republican budget is a 15-year budget.

As a new Member of the 105th Congress, I came in during the balanced budget agreement, and the debate was about tackling the deficit before we tackle the debt. We have enjoyed a very strong economy since that point in time, even though back then the projection said that we would not reach the surplus that we have until the year 2002.

While I am optimistic that the economy today will continue, we must prepare now for a downturn in our economy because it is realistically going to happen.

□ 1645

That is why I believe, the Blue Dogs believe, that it is irresponsible to rely on 15-year projections that no one really honestly believes will come to fruition.

To give an example, in 1993, before I was even a Member of this body, the CBO projected that this year, 1999, that we would have a \$404 billion deficit. I think that it is very, very important to look at these projections. It is irresponsible to go out and look at the numbers over a 15-year period.

The Blue Dog budget is about real numbers. It is no phony numbers, and I urge support for this budget because it is the fiscally responsible budget that we can deal with today.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER), a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

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

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, the President and the Republican leadership both face issues of what to do about the Social Security and Medicare programs, defense, education and the surplus, but the differences between our proposals are stark.

Last year, the Republican proposal to set aside 90 percent of the surplus for Social Security was not good enough for the President. So this year we are locking away 100 percent of the Social

Security surplus for retirement security and Medicare.

The President was not able to live up to his own demands. His budget sets aside only 77 percent. We are proud to have locked away more money for Social Security and Medicare than the President does.

The Congress and the President agreed to certain spending caps in 1997. It is a simple concept but difficult to accomplish. Our resolution keeps our promise on caps. The President's budget creates new programs and busts the caps by some \$30 billion.

His budget raises taxes by \$172 billion over the next decade, while our budget provides nearly \$800 billion in tax relief over the next 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, right now our pilots are in Kosovo carrying out a dangerous mission. I support them and pray for their safe return. We must provide adequate resources for them and to all our men and women in uniform.

It is unfortunate that the President is using questionable numbers for his defense budget. His budget boasts an increase of \$12.6 billion in budget authority but the real increase is only \$4.1 billion. The rest is primarily from funds that were already budgeted for the Department of Defense and just reshuffled around.

The Republican budget provides an honest increase of, when it is passed, it will be \$11.3 billion over fiscal year 1999. That is frankly less than what is truly needed and what the Joint Chiefs have testified they need, but it is a start and I am proud that we have taken an honest step towards reducing the undue burden on our military.

Mr. Chairman, the differences in these budgets are clear. I ask my colleagues for their support of our budget resolution.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains for each side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE) has 15¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) has 17¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, the budget we have constructed for fiscal year 2000 will be the first budget of the millennium, and under the leadership of my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), we are building a better budget than the one we received last month from the President. We are locking more than the President, locking it away for Social Security and Medicare.

For the first time ever, we are locking away Social Security money for Social Security and ending Washington's practice of raiding Social Security for other spending.

We are also maintaining the spending discipline that brought us the balanced budget.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.



The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, the debate at this point is on the budget resolution, the amendment in the nature of a substitute that is on the floor, and the debate is being addressed to matters which are not currently under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will accord Members latitude to discuss matters related to the budget.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, our budget sticks to the spending caps signed into law by President Clinton in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997; while the President's budget exceeds those caps, as does the budget we are considering on the floor, the proposal, by our Blue Dog friends.

That is the critical difference, Mr. Chairman, is that this distinguishes our budget from the President's and our budget from the one that is under consideration by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE).

The spending caps are the heart of the balanced budget both parties have worked hard to achieve in recent years, but they are also the heart of our pledge to strengthen Social Security and Medicare.

Our budget sticks to those caps and locks away 100 percent of the Social Security surplus for Social Security, off limits for new Washington spending. After locking away funds for Social Security and Medicare, and only after that, we return the rest of the surplus to the American people in the form of tax relief.

Unfortunately, it seems our colleagues on the other side are not prepared to make that kind of a commitment.

Now, do not get me wrong, Mr. Chairman. Our colleagues have every right to seek higher spending, but understand that for every dime that they spend beyond the caps is a dime that they could have locked away for Social Security and Medicare. By saying yes to higher spending, they are saying no to Social Security and Medicare.

When we get right down to it, budgets are about choices. The choice here is not between Social Security and tax cuts. The choice is between Social Security and new Washington spending.

We Republicans, we have already made our choice. We have said no to new Washington spending and we are locking away 100 percent of the Social Security surplus. We are locking away \$100 billion more for Social Security and Medicare than the President, who cuts Medicare by \$11.9 billion and spends a chunk of the Social Security surplus on new Washington spending.

Mr. Chairman, given a choice between Social Security and new Washington spending, Republicans have chosen to support Social Security and Medicare. Now it is up to our colleagues which one they will decide to choose.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, returning the debate to the Blue Dog budget, I

yield 1 $\frac{3}{4}$  minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER).

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

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Chairman, this country owes, based on past consumption, over \$5 trillion and nobody is talking about paying that back. This Blue Dog budget is the budget that if my colleagues believe, as I do, that when one borrows money as we have from our children and grandchildren, that the responsible, honorable thing to do is to try to pay it back, then my colleagues will vote for the Blue Dog budget.

There are \$3.8 trillion of debt that we pay interest on every year. Last year we paid almost \$250 billion in interest. Now where I come from, if someone owes somebody some money and they come into money, and remember all of this surplus is projected, not here yet, and they come into some money and they go buy an airplane or new car and do not pay the man that they owe, that is considered very poor form.

I think, as the Blue Dogs do, that if we save all of the Social Security surplus and pay down the debt, we save half of the real surplus, if it materializes, and pay it down on the debt, this country will be stronger, not weaker.

There are events over which we have no control. As long as we are paying down debt, whatever happens there, this country, our children and our grandchildren, will be in a better financial position to deal with those unknowns when they occur.

If my colleagues believe, as I do, that we ought to pay back some of this past consumption, then my colleagues will help us pass this Blue Dog budget today.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. FLETCHER).

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the opportunity to address this matter. I want to speak just briefly about the budget in general and then talk some about Medicare and what we face and what the differences are that we have in looking at the budgets that have been presented.

First of all, over the last several years, as I have gone around the district and talked to my constituents, one of the things I consistently heard was that we want to put away 100 percent of the Social Security surplus. We even heard the President say that last year.

This year he came and said, no, I only want to put 62 percent of that surplus for this next coming year into Social Security. We are going to do the 100 percent that he wanted that time, and I think we are going to, for the first time, put away everything; instead of just putting 62 percent we are going to put 100 percent away to save Social Security and Medicare; the first time in 40 years that we have not spent the surplus on wasteful Washington spending or larger and more government. I think this is really a change.

We have another budget here presented. It seems to be a little bit more of a me-too budget, but it still has that same philosophy of growing government. When we talk to the people across this country, they are tired of wasteful Washington spending. They want to see the end of the era of big government. They want to make sure that we provide the kind of support and security that we need, but that we also secure the future of our children; that we return as much as we can to our families so they can invest it in the best way to ensure the future of their children and grandchildren.

It may be saving for college. It may be providing other things that their children need. It may be providing or donating to community activities, but it is very important that we return as much as we can to the American people because that is what they want. It is the right thing to do.

I think the budget that we have is very good, as opposed to the President's budget and the Blue Dog budget, that we are being more conservative in spending, that we are stopping wasteful Washington spending and we are going to return as much as we can to the people back home.

Secondly, I would like to look at some of the President's cuts on Medicare. It is an issue I am very concerned about. We see possibly a quarter of the home health agencies looking at problems of possibly going out of business. In my district there are 10 counties where one home health agency provides the primary care there. That home health agency is having problems. They may go out of business here in the next few months and that will reduce the care that we can give to those individuals in that area.

Rural hospitals are having problems. The President has talked about prescription drugs and increasing there, but let us look at the cuts that he has proposed in Medicare. He has proposed cutting the prescription drug payment by \$2.3 billion. Many of these cuts are to the sickest patients. They are to those cancer treatment patients that might mean the difference between life and death.

He talks about prescription drugs but he cuts at the very heart of our sickest patients, and I am glad that we are not going to do that; that we are taking 100 percent of that budget and putting it to shore up Medicare.

Secondly, we see other things. When we look at some of the things that he is decreasing, the total decrease is \$11.9 billion. He is talking about extending these cuts in payments beyond the years that were agreed with in the balanced budget amendment.

What will that do to our rural hospitals? I have a hospital in Garrard County, Kentucky, right now. We worked with them to combine two hospitals so they could be more efficient and more effective.

□ 1700

That is not going to occur, though, for the next 6 to 12 months. In the interim, they are having to shut down the emergency room right now because they do not have the margins. We need to make sure that we have the kind of support we need, and we cannot afford to cut it \$11.9 billion.

I am glad that we have a budget that is fiscally conservative, that provides tax relief, and provides for our senior citizens.

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

Mr. Chairman, we are pleased with the presentation. We know there is a problem. We want to cut taxes. At the same time we want to promote programs. That is what the Blue Dog budget does, it is a mix.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CRAMER)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, let us return to the budget under debate here, the Blue Dog budget, no more phony debate about this other budget. If Members are serious about balancing the budget, if they are serious about debt reduction, if they are serious about focused tax cuts, if they want to support our veterans, if they want to give a commitment to the defense of this country, then this is the budget for all of us.

We have been calling for a true balanced budget excluding the social security trust fund for years. There is no phony baloney here, this is the real thing. Members should wake up. They can take all day, and we have for years, but this is the budget for us.

Finally, I want to compliment the leadership here. We have had a fair debate here today. We have had an opportunity to present this budget. I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT) for giving us this opportunity.

The Blue Dog's have been calling for a true balanced budget excluding the Social Security trust fund for several years. We are glad to see that we have finally reached a point where everyone is agreeing with us that we should balance the budget without counting the Social Security trust fund.

The Blue Dog budget sets out a responsible budgetary policy that achieves and maintains a true balanced budget without counting the Social Security trust fund.

Because the Republican budget uses virtually all of the non-Social Security surplus for tax cuts, we could have a return of deficits in the non-Social Security budget if future budget conditions are not quite as positive as currently projected.

Even if the current projections are correct, the tax cuts in the Republican budget would cause a deficit after 2010, because the exploding tax cuts would continue to grow, while the non-Social Security surpluses will be smaller.

#### RESPONSIBLE USE OF THE PROJECTED ON-BUDGET SURPLUS

Republicans want to commit all of the projected surpluses for exploding tax cuts, whether or not the surpluses actually materialize.

The Spratt budget is a little more prudent than the Republican budget by saving some of the on-budget surplus, but it uses most of the projected on-budget surpluses for new spending and some tax cuts.

The Blue Dog budget takes the position that the conservative thing to do with projected on-budget is to be conservative. The Blue Dog budget makes paying off the national debt the first priority for any projected budget surplus, dedicating approximately half of the on-budget surplus for debt reduction.

The Blue Dog budget divides the remaining half of the on-budget surplus between tax reduction and shoring up the nation's commitment to priorities such as agriculture, defense, education, health care and veterans' programs.

If CBO increases surplus projections, there will be additional funds for tax cuts and spending priorities. The Blue Dog budget provides that any increase in surplus projections be divided with the same allocation of one-half for debt reduction, one-quarter for tax cuts and one-quarter for spending priorities.

#### PAYING OFF THE DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC

By saving the entire Social Security surplus and using half of on-budget surpluses for debt reduction, the Blue Dog budget will pay off nearly one-fourth (\$857 billion) of the \$3.6 trillion debt held by the public over the next five years.

Saving non-Social Security surpluses for debt reduction will help make up for the years in which Social Security surpluses were borrowed for operating expenses instead of saving them for Social Security.

The Blue Dog budget reduces the debt held by the public by \$87 billion more than the Republican budget over the next five years.

#### STRENGTHENING SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE

The Blue Dog budget calls on Congress to enact reforms of Social Security and Medicare to strengthen these programs and reserves additional funds that could be used to help finance the short term costs of Medicare and Social Security reform.

The Blue Dog budget reserves the savings from the lower interest payments that will occur as a result of reducing the debt to be used for Social Security and Medicare reform.

Congress would have \$85 billion over the next five years that could be used as part of Social Security reform and an additional \$28 million over the next five years that could be used as part of Medicare reform.

The combination of saving the Social Security surpluses for Social Security and reserving the debt reduction dividend for Social Security and Medicare, the Blue Dog budget saves a total of \$937 billion for Social Security and Medicare—more than 90% of total projected unified budget surpluses over the next five years.

The Blue Dog budget does not contain the cuts in Medicare payments to hospitals that were included in the President's budget.

#### FISCALLY RESPONSIBLE TAX CUTS

The Blue Dog budget allocates approximately 25% of on-budget surplus for tax relief providing room for a net tax cut of \$41.7 billion over the next five years.

Limiting tax cuts to 25% of the projected surplus is a prudent step to ensure that the tax cuts do not cause deficits in the non-Social Security budget if actual budget conditions are not as good as current projections.

The tax cuts in the Republican budget will consume nearly 100% of the projected budget non-Social Security surplus over the next five years. If the current projections are too optimistic, the tax cuts in the Republican budget will result in on-budget deficits and a return to the practice of borrowing from the Social Security trust fund to meet operating expenses.

The tax cuts in the Republican budget will continue to grow after 2009, while the projected surpluses will be smaller. By 2013 or 2014, the tax cuts in the Republican budget will cause deficits.

#### A GENUINE INCREASE IN FUNDING FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Blue Dog budget equips our military commanders with the tools and resources necessary to continue to field the world's pre-eminent fighting force for years to come. It maintains a general funding mix ensuring our immediate military readiness and long-term defense procurement needs are not neglected.

The Republican budget makes hollow promises for defense, but does not give the Department of Defense the real resources to follow through on these commitments.

The Blue Dog budget includes \$13 billion more in defense funding than Republicans. The Republican budget is \$21 billion short in outlays (real expenditures) needed to support their budget authority (the amount which may be committed or obligated).

The Blue Dog budget provides for a much-needed pay raise for our troops and addresses the current retention problems by adequately funding vital personnel and quality of life programs. The Republican budget does not accommodate the pay raise, and could force the Department of Defense to shift resources away from personnel and quality of life programs.

#### MEETING CRITICAL NEEDS IN AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

The Blue Dog budget contains \$3 billion more mandatory funding for crop insurance than the Republican budget resolution. The increased funding for crop insurance in the Blue Dog budget is permanent, as opposed to the Republican budget which eliminates the increased funding for crop insurance after 2004.

The Blue Dog budget provides \$3.4 billion more budget authority for discretionary agricultural programs than the Republican budget.

The Republican budget contains 10% cut in discretionary agriculture programs in fiscal year 2000, which could force a 1500 person reduction in Farm Service Agency funding, further slowing down the delivery of vital farm programs. The Blue Dog budget does not force cuts in discretionary agriculture programs in fiscal year 2000.

#### MEETING OUR PROMISES TO VETERANS

The Blue Dog budget provides a total of \$10 billion more budget authority and \$5.1 billion more outlays than the Republican budget for discretionary veterans programs.

The Blue Dog budget increases funding for veterans health care and GI bill benefits by \$1.9 billion 2000, and continues this increased funding level with modest growth after 2000.

The Republican budget provides a one-time \$950 million increase in veterans programs in fiscal year 2000, but eliminates this increase after 2000 and cuts veterans programs below 1999 levels.

#### INCREASED FUNDING FOR PRIORITY EDUCATION AND HEALTH CARE PROGRAMS

The Blue Dog budget provides \$10 billion more total funding for education and \$8.6 billion more for health care programs than the

Republican budget does over the next five years.

These higher funding levels will allow for increased funding for rural health care programs, health research, elementary and secondary education and other priority education and health care programs without making deep cuts in other programs within these functions.

The Republican budget claims to provide increased funding for the National Institutes of Health and for some education programs, but cuts total discretionary spending for the health care and education functions below a freeze. Any promised increases for specific education or health care programs under the Republican budget would require deeper cuts in all other health care and education programs.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CRAMER) remains the great gentleman that he is.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I appreciate the opportunity to share a few thoughts that I have on the budget proposals that are before us today.

Mr. Chairman, I am thankful that we are not going to have to deal and live with the President's budget, because if we did, and he promised us that he was going to secure Medicare, but with the left hand he cut it. I am pleased that we have an alternative budget where we are saving 100 percent of the social security surplus for social security and for Medicare.

Our seniors have been misled by the President; double-speak at its best, when one talks about securing social security and Medicare when on the other hand one is actually cutting it. Prescription drug payments, hospital payment freezes.

I represent a lot of smaller rural hospitals who are struggling with red ink today. With the proposed cuts that are coming, they are possibly going to go out of business without the President's budget cuts. There is a complete lack of sensitivity to rural health care in America by this President and by this administration, when the facts are in.

It is obviously clear that rural health care in America is already in trouble because of the lower payment they receive from HCFA, from the urban and suburban centers, and we are going to cut them some more if we would follow the President.

I think it is vital, when we pass a budget later today, that it is a budget that really secures social security and Medicare and is not a phony budget, as has been presented by this administration, that says one thing on the right hand but on the left hand is actually cutting to the very heart of real health care in America, and would deprive rural Americans of the quality care they depend on.

I am pleased that we do not have to pass the President's budget.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, the Blue Dog substitute I support today is a triumph of common sense over ideology. It reduces the budget debt more than any other plan, and therefore does more to shore up social security and Medicare. By design, it protects the Nation's priority needs, which common sense dictates that we cannot abandon.

For farmers, we provide \$3 billion more for crop insurance without additional reductions in county offices and employees. For the military, we provide \$13 billion more to ensure that morale and readiness problems are addressed. For veterans, we provide \$1.9 billion more so this Nation will not renege on its promise to those who sacrificed to keep our country great.

For our children, we provide \$10 billion more for critical education programs like school construction and repair, Internet access, and smaller class size. For health care in rural areas, we provide more. Finally, the Blue Dog budget cuts taxes by \$41.7 billion over the next 10 years, and provides for tax relief to increase as the surplus grows.

Vote for the budget that will do more for America. Vote for the Blue Dog budget.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA).

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

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding time to me. I also want to compliment the Committee on the Budget, and notably the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH).

The way I look at it, it is very simple. The Republican budget resolution has set forth a very simple and straightforward concept. I think what the American people really want from Washington is straight talk. For the first time ever, we have 100 percent of social security going for social security. I know over the years it has been seen as a slush fund, but once and for all the American people are getting straight talk and honesty.

With respect to the budget caps, a couple of years ago everybody sat around here in Washington, and the President, and they smoked their peace pipe and they agreed to the budget caps. Some people think that was a game. The Republicans say it is for real. That is what the American people expect and deserve.

What are the principles we set forth? A strong defense. Taking care of Medicare. We saw what the President's budget did to Medicare. Taking care of our veterans. Needed tax relief.

That is the critical distinction here between the amendment before us and what the Republican budget resolution calls for, because every year since 1995 the President submitted his budget and the Republicans have done the respon-

sible and appropriate thing and said, let us put the brakes on. Let us spend money appropriately and be responsible, but not have a party at taxpayers' expense.

Once and for all, we are going to get that. The American people deserve that. I urge the rejection of this amendment and support for the Republican budget resolution.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LUCAS).

Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, we, the Blue Dogs, are here today to blow the whistle on partisan wrangling and to act as a budget referee.

Neither the Republican nor the Democratic alternatives have achieved a fiscally responsible approach to this budget. The Democratic budget uses most of the projected on-budget surplus for new spending and some tax cuts. On the other hand, the Republican budget will consume nearly 100 percent of the projected budget non-social security surplus over the next 5 years.

In an economic downturn, the Republican budget would result in deficits, a return to the practice of raiding the social security trust fund. That is just not right.

Our backlog budget allocates 25 percent of the on-budget surplus for tax relief, a net cut of \$41.7 billion over the next 5 years. It is time to do the right thing.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, let me just compliment my friends in the Blue Dog Coalition. They have, I think, moved this process in a very constructive way, but nevertheless, I am forced to have to reluctantly and softly oppose the Blue Dog budget for three basic reasons.

One is, in the year 2001 they break the discipline of the 1997 budget agreement. We believe it is essential to not break the discipline of the 1997 budget agreement. We just made that agreement. We ought to stay within that agreement. Unfortunately, in the Blue Dog budget, that agreement is not adhered to in 2001.

Secondly, there is \$7 billion less in budget authority than the GOP plans in the fiscal year 2000, and \$2 billion less in outlays. We do believe, as I know many of the Blue Dogs believe, that we do need to add more in the area of defense. In fact, our budget has a significantly greater amount of money in defense than the Blue Dog budget.

Finally, while I can admire the Blue Dogs' position on the issue of paying down debt, they only have \$41 billion in tax cuts over the next 5 years. I want to compliment them for that. However, the Republican budget has approximately \$150 billion in tax cuts.

I would very much like to think that we could allow money to sit around in

Washington to be used to pay down a debt. We in fact are going to pay down the largest amount of the publicly-held debt out of the money we are reserving for social security. But when this on-budget surplus comes, as sure as God made little green apples, if there is money sitting around on the table in this town, I believe it will be used to create bigger government and more spending. The single biggest way to resolve that is to put ourselves in a position of being able to cut taxes and get that on-budget surplus out of town.

I want to personally thank the Blue Dogs, and particularly the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE) for his efforts to drive the debate on taking all of the social security and Medicare trust funds off-budget. He was a pioneer in that.

I want to compliment them on their \$41 billion in tax cuts, but it falls short in the area of breaking the spending caps, breaking the budget agreement in 1997, spending too little on defense, and not providing the tax relief that Americans really need and deserve to prevent the growth of big government, to empower people, and to run America from the bottom up.

So for that reason, I must reluctantly oppose the Blue Dog substitute.

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

Mr. Chairman, we had high hopes that the chairman of the Committee on the Budget would be supporting our budget until that last statement. We obviously need to talk to them a little more.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I, too, am sorry that my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) cannot support our budget, but I am here today to support a budget that I believe in and I think the American people believe in.

This budget does what needs to be done. It gets the social security trust fund off-budget. It starts paying down the debt. It funds the priorities that we need funded in this country.

I come from a district that has a lot of problems in agriculture. This budget puts extra money into mandatory spending and into discretionary programs that we need if we are going to have any chance of pulling this agriculture economy out.

The thing I want to talk about, I serve on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Some know we have had a real commotion going on down there over the budget. All of the veterans groups came in and asked for \$3.3 billion extra to make things work. Some of us tried to get that accomplished. In this budget we have an additional \$1.9 billion for veterans, and then we extend that through the whole period.

The Republicans only have \$900 million for the next year. Then they go back to the same level as the Presi-

dent. We cannot meet our commitments to veterans. We cannot keep our contract with veterans with that kind of a budget. Support the Blue Dog budget.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. SHOWS).

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Chairman, both the President's budget plan and the Republican budget plan are disastrous for our Nation's veterans. The Blue Dog budget plan is the only budget proposal that meets the needs of our Nation's deserving veterans.

We are in critical need of more health care dollars for our veterans. We need to expand our health care to veterans suffering from Hepatitis C-related illnesses and who are needing emergency care and long-term care. We need to expand care for homeless veterans. We need to provide more outpatient centers.

Although the President acknowledges these needs, he has not provided for any new dollars in his initiatives. In fact, the VA budget freezes funded levels to what they were last year.

Meanwhile, Republicans, on the other hand, are using doubletalk. Republicans claim their budget increases funding for veterans, but anyone who looks at the budget sees that they get a \$900 million increase in 2000, but then it decreases back to the original budget of 1999 levels. What is worse, the next 5 years, they cut it \$2.4 billion. The Blue Dog budget provides over \$10 billion over this period of time in outlays of more than \$5.1 billion.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SISISKY), our defense expert.

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

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I support the Blue Dog budget. I want to take time to explain why on defense.

Last Monday, this past Monday, I was in Norfolk, Virginia, at the Norfolk Naval Station. The Admiral of the Atlantic Fleet remarked at how good they are doing now, that the Theodore Roosevelt carrier was to leave Norfolk on Friday at a 92 percent compliment. The last carrier that left there had 86 percent.

□ 1715

We have problems in defense. There is no doubt that the Republican budget is not going to solve it. Why is it not going to solve it? It all has to do with outlays versus authorization.

The Blue Dog budget is \$11 billion more than the Republican budget. It was \$13 billion, and now it is \$11 billion, and of course \$18 billion more than the President. It is evenhanded. It is mostly on outlays. That is what is important. I would ask this body, please support the thing.

I have a memo here, and we can put that in. "Conservatives should not accept this phony increase and should insist on a new program." This came from the New American Century, Bill Crystal's group.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD).

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding me this time.

First of all, I want to thank Speaker Hastert and the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman KASICH) and the gentleman from California (Chairman DREIER) for allowing us to have this open debate. We did not get that last year.

Most of the speakers that are opponents of the Blue Dog bill, the budget, have spent their time addressing a budget which received two votes about an hour and a half ago. The reason they do not talk about this budget is because they cannot. They cannot in good conscience compare it to their own.

There are three good reasons. Number one is that this budget, contrary to what the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman KASICH) said, spends \$11 billion more in defense over the next 5 years. Secondly, it spends \$6 billion more in agricultural outlays over the next 5 years. Thirdly, it spends \$10 billion more in veterans spending over the next 5 years.

I would implore my colleagues to take a good, close look at the tricks and the smoke and the mirrors and vote for the Blue Dog budget.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY).

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota for yielding me this time, and I appreciate the work he has done on this budget.

I rise today in support of the Blue Dog budget. It is an honest and fair budget. The Republicans say they want to help America's farmers. Who are we kidding? The Republican bill slashes the funding to farmers by 10 percent at the time when they need it most.

The Republican bill does nothing to pay down the national debt. It spends and spends and spends. Every last drop of the surplus it spends, driving our country further into debt, rising interest rates, bankrupting our farmers and their children.

The Blue Dog budget contains \$7 billion more for agriculture and recommends a sensible tax cut that will help our farmers. The Blue Dog budget devotes 50 percent of the surplus to deficit reduction, strengthening our economy, and saving for the future.

I challenge any Republican who votes for their leadership's budget resolution to go home, look their farmers in the eye and tell them, "I support agriculture." Do not be surprised if they do not believe you.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE) has 6 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE).

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

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Chairman, health care is a front burner issue this year, and it does not matter what one's race or age or sex or where one is from or even what one's party affiliation is. If we do not have good health care, we cannot do any of the other things that people have been up here talking about.

In the Blue Dog budget, we provide \$8.6 billion more than the Republican budget over the next 5-year period. Our budget preserves funding for discretionary programs through the year 2002 and then allows for increases after 2002, whereas the Republican budget makes deeper cuts in discretionary spending for health care. The health and well-being of our Nation cannot stand for that.

The Blue Dog budget would allow increases for research, for funding, for NIH, and make sure that our rural health care areas of concern are not left on the back burner. These higher increases are made within the context of a balanced budget and do not cut other health programs like the Republican budget does. Let us not overlook or undercut the very health and well-being of our country. Without good health, we cannot do anything else.

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

I am pleased to note that we agree with the gentleman on the other side about the importance of taking care of health care services in this country.

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

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE).

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, first I would like it start by complimenting the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE) on the budget proposal that he has put forth and the rest of the Blue Dog Coalition.

There are two budgets that will be up for consideration today that I would have to suggest to my colleagues are not phony. The Republican budget and the Blue Dog budget are very similar.

There are a couple of things where we differ. As I think the Blue Dogs will readily admit, they bust the caps in fiscal year 2001. That is where they are coming up with all of these, whether it is for health care, and out of respect, I suggest they are correct, their budget does spend a little bit more for health care, a little bit more for veterans. But they do it by busting the caps.

So we want to suggest that, do they want to do that? It is a choice. Do they want to bust the caps which got us to

fiscal discipline, got us to balance in the first place, or do they not? That is the first issue. But I commend them. They are exactly right. That is what they are doing.

The other budget, the Clinton budget, is totally phony when it double counts Social Security; and the same is exactly true for the Spratt budget. But at least we have got two budgets to consider.

The second big issue that we have got to consider today is what to do with the surplus. The surplus, I would suggest to my colleagues, it comes to us in two different ways. One is the Social Security surplus. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE) and the Republicans, the Blue Dogs and the Republicans, say set it all aside. Amen. Finally we have gotten to that point. The gentleman and I have worked on that for many years. Both budgets do that.

The real issue, though, is what do we do with the rest? What do we do with the rest? There we have a choice. It is an honest choice. Choice number one, the Blue Dogs say spend a little bit of it, and tax relief a little bit of it, and debt reduction a little bit of it. That is fine. I respect that. That is a good choice that people can decide on.

What the Republicans say is this is not our money. We always talk about Federal dollars as if they are in our pockets out here and they are like our money. They are not. People work hard every single day of the week in order to send us that money. What they know is that they have sent enough, if not too much.

What they are hoping for is that once we have done the responsible thing, once we have met the priorities of the government, once we have set aside Social Security, then and only then, which is what our budget does, only when we have set aside Social Security this year, this year do we look out and do we say the surplus ought to go back to the people that sent it here in the first place.

That is why I reluctantly oppose the budget of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE), because of that choice.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PHELPS).

Mr. PHELPS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota for the opportunity to speak today.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise to support the Blue Dog budget because it represents responsible budget policy while still providing critical funding for education and health care programs.

This budget provides \$10 billion more for education and \$8.6 billion more for health care than the Republican budget.

In my district, let me tell my colleagues, these funds are critical, not only to close the disparity gap for those disadvantaged children, but also just making the tools available for those who try to make it in the real world.

In my district, home health and rural health centers are the only point of access to health care for many people. Funding of these programs, which are included in the Blue Dog alternative, literally can mean life or death for these programs and the patients they serve.

In 1997, with the balanced budget amendment, we asked our citizens to accept cuts to put us on a fiscally secure future. Now we are fiscally responsible and we have a surplus. It is our duty to also use the surplus responsibly by investing in kids' education and providing access to necessary health care to our citizens. The Blue Dog alternative best meets these goals.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) to discuss our continuing commitment to education.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, America's working families, farmers, and businesses know that we must approach the Nation's budget the same way they approach their own, with a balanced view.

Our Blue Dog budget alternative is balanced. It protects Social Security, offers targeted tax cuts, reduces the national debt, and most importantly recommitments our Nation to educating our children.

If America hopes to maintain our status as the world's economic superpower, we cannot continue to send off our kids to schools with inadequate adequate facilities and outdated technology.

Our Blue Dog budget provides \$10 billion more for education and training than the Republican budget. It allows for an increase in elementary and secondary education without forcing cuts in other education programs. It allows for spending on discretionary and training programs to grow by an average of 3.6 percent a year through 2004.

This balanced, fiscally responsible approach to the budget is the same formula for success that American families want. I urge my colleagues to support our Blue Dog budget alternative.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding me this time.

Back in the 1980s, back home in Indiana, I saw Congress make a mistake, and that mistake was embracing the idea of supply side economics and offering a huge tax cut in this country.

Some would say that it fueled the economy but at a great expense. Back in the 1980s, the budget deficit or budget debt was \$1 billion. It grew to over \$4 trillion.

Now as a Member of this Congress, I see the Congress about ready to make another mistake and offer huge tax cuts to the people of Indiana or to the people of this country. I think this is a serious mistake in light of the fact that we have a tremendous debt to pay off.

Our priority ought to be paying off the debt first. That is what we should do as well as saving Social Security. If we do this, we will be doing the responsible thing for the people of this country, the responsible thing for our kids and our grandchildren.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE) has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), who has been an outstanding leader in the Blue Dog Coalition and worked effectively with us on budget and tax policy.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, let me sum up the Blue Dog budget this way: First, let me say that for the 21st consecutive year I have been allowed to oppose and vote against a President's budget because it spends too much, nine times with Democrats, 12 times with Republican presidents.

The Blue Dog budget before us cuts taxes over the next 5 years by \$41.2 billion. Anyone that suggests anything else is not being factual. The Blue Dog budget maintains the spending caps until we balance the budget without counting the Social Security surplus.

To those who choose to criticize us because we spend too much on defense in 2001 and 2002, be prepared to live with those numbers within my colleagues' own caucus because they will find it is going to be very difficult to do it.

Also with agriculture, be prepared to live with those numbers my colleagues advocate in criticizing our budget. If my colleagues are, they are honest, and I respect that. Be prepared to live with the veterans numbers and stay with them all the way through, if my colleagues criticize our budget for recognizing those priorities.

Now, let us talk about our main priority, debt reduction. Our budget, at the end of 5 years, produces \$85 billion less debt than the Republican budget. If we take it for 10 years, it is \$450 billion. I submit to my colleagues, the Blue Dog budget is better for our country by reducing debt than the Republican budget.

Finally, in summation, let me say the Blue Dogs give first priority to reducing the \$5 trillion plus national debt. As a result, the Blue Dog budget is not able to provide as much spending as some would like to see on both sides of the aisle.

So I ask my colleagues to join in thanking the leadership for allowing us to have this vote today. I appreciate the kind remarks that have been made by the other side recognizing the credibility. I believe what I have stated is factual and should warrant some overwhelming support from both sides of the aisle.

□ 1730

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time;

and as did the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), chairman of the Committee on the Budget, I too want to add my thanks and my appreciation to the Blue Dogs for coming forward with this budget.

As I look across the aisle there and individually see the ones coming forward to speak in support of this, most of those Members are my close friends on that side of the aisle, and they are also the same individuals that talk like I do, who, with the exception of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE), come from my part of the country. And I have a great appreciation for that fact also.

But, Mr. Chairman, I want to say a couple of things in closing here. While the Blue Dog budget takes huge steps in the right direction, I think it is flawed in a couple of areas. The two primary areas that I have concerns about are:

Number one, defense. We do spend more in both budget authority as well as budget outlay in defense. With our manager's amendment, it increases the defense spending from our original numbers. And, obviously, that is what we are talking about, the final numbers.

Secondly, the thing that really concerned me when I ran for Congress in 1994, and the thing that concerns me today, and the thing that my good friends on the other side who are supporting this budget have continually said is, we have to pay down that debt.

And what has caused that debt? What has caused that debt is too much Federal spending. The Blue Dog budget calls for 25 percent of the surplus to go to spending. I have a problem with that.

My friend, the gentleman from Arkansas, was very critical of the Ag portion of the Republican budget. I have in my hands letters from eight national farming organizations, from the American Farm Bureau Federation, to the National Cotton Council, the Farm Credit Council, the American Soybean Association, the National Peanut Council, the Southern Peanut Farmers Federation, and several others, endorsing the Republican budget.

All of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who are Blue Dogs, particularly those on the Committee on the Budget, know that when the President came out with zero dollars for crop insurance reform, Republicans led the fight to put money in the budget. I am appreciative that they followed suit with that, but for those reasons, I respectfully say that we are going to have to vote against this budget. But I do thank them, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 134, noes 295, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 75]

AYES—134

Abercrombie	Goode	Morella
Andrews	Goodlatte	Neal
Baird	Green (TX)	Oberstar
Barcia	Hall (TX)	Ortiz
Barrett (NE)	Hastings (FL)	Ose
Barrett (WI)	Hill (IN)	Pallone
Barton	Hoefel	Pascrell
Bentsen	Holden	Peterson (MN)
Bereuter	Holt	Phelps
Berkley	Hoolley	Pickering
Berry	Horn	Pomeroy
Bilbray	Hoyer	Reyes
Bishop	Inslee	Rodriguez
Blumenauer	Jackson-Lee	Roemer
Boswell	(TX)	Roukema
Boyd	Jefferson	Sanchez
Capps	John	Sandlin
Cardin	Johnson, E. B.	Sawyer
Castle	Kaptur	Scarborough
Chenoweth	Kind (WI)	Scott
Clayton	Klink	Sherman
Clement	Kucinich	Shimkus
Coburn	LaFalce	Shows
Condit	LaHood	Sisisky
Cramer	Lampson	Skelton
Crowley	Larson	Smith (MI)
Danner	LaTourette	Smith (WA)
Davis (FL)	Lucas (KY)	Snyder
Davis (VA)	Luther	Stabenow
Deutsch	Markey	Stenholm
Dingell	Martinez	Tanner
Doggett	Mascara	Tauscher
Dooley	Matsui	Taylor (MS)
Doyle	McCarthy (MO)	Thompson (CA)
Duncan	McCarthy (NY)	Thune
Edwards	McDermott	Thurman
Emerson	McIntyre	Turner
Engel	Meehan	Udall (CO)
Etheridge	Meek (FL)	Udall (NM)
Farr	Menendez	Upton
Ford	Metcalf	Visclosky
Frost	Minge	Watt (NC)
Ganske	Moore	Wexler
Gephardt	Moran (KS)	Wise
Gonzalez	Moran (VA)	Wynn

NOES—295

Ackerman	Canady	Evans
Aderholt	Cannon	Everett
Allen	Capuano	Ewing
Archer	Carson	Fattah
Armey	Chabot	Filner
Bachus	Chambliss	Fletcher
Baker	Clay	Foley
Baldacci	Clyburn	Forbes
Baldwin	Coble	Fossella
Ballenger	Collins	Fowler
Barr	Combest	Frank (MA)
Bartlett	Conyers	Franks (NJ)
Bass	Cook	Frelinghuysen
Bateman	Cooksey	Gallely
Becerra	Costello	Gejdenson
Berman	Cox	Gekas
Biggert	Coyne	Gibbons
Billirakis	Crane	Gilchrest
Blagojevich	Cubin	Gillmor
Bliley	Cummings	Gilman
Blunt	Cunningham	Goodling
Boehlert	Davis (IL)	Gordon
Boehner	Deal	Goss
Bonilla	DeFazio	Graham
Bonior	DeGette	Granger
Bono	Delahunt	Green (WI)
Borski	DeLauro	Greenwood
Boucher	DeLay	Gutierrez
Brady (PA)	DeMint	Gutknecht
Brady (TX)	Diaz-Balart	Hall (OH)
Brown (CA)	Dickey	Hansen
Brown (FL)	Dicks	Hastings (WA)
Brown (OH)	Dixon	Hayes
Bryant	Doolittle	Hayworth
Burr	Dreier	Hefley
Buyer	Dunn	Herger
Callahan	Ehlers	Hill (MT)
Calvert	Ehrlich	Hilleary
Camp	English	Hilliard
Campbell	Eshoo	Hinche

Hinojosa	Millender-	Schaffer
Hobson	McDonald	Schakowsky
Hoekstra	Miller (FL)	Sensenbrenner
Hostettler	Miller, Gary	Serrano
Houghton	Miller, George	Sessions
Hulshof	Mink	Shadegg
Hunter	Moakley	Shaw
Hutchinson	Mollohan	Shays
Hyde	Murtha	Sherwood
Isakson	Myrick	Shuster
Istook	Nadler	Simpson
Jackson (IL)	Napolitano	Skeen
Jenkins	Nethercutt	Slaughter
Johnson (CT)	Ney	Smith (NJ)
Johnson, Sam	Northup	Smith (TX)
Jones (NC)	Norwood	Souder
Jones (OH)	Nussle	Spence
Kanjorski	Obey	Spratt
Kasich	Olver	Stark
Kelly	Owens	Stearns
Kennedy	Oxley	Strickland
Kildee	Packard	Stump
Kilpatrick	Pastor	Sununu
King (NY)	Paul	Sweeney
Kingston	Payne	Talent
Klecza	Pease	Tancredo
Knollenberg	Peterson (PA)	Tauzin
Kolbe	Petri	Taylor (NC)
Kuykendall	Pickett	Terry
Lantos	Pitts	Thomas
Largent	Pombo	Thompson (MS)
Latham	Porter	Thornberry
Lazio	Portman	Tiahrt
Leach	Price (NC)	Tierney
Lee	Pryce (OH)	Toomey
Levin	Quinn	Towns
Lewis (CA)	Radanovich	Traficant
Lewis (GA)	Rahall	Velazquez
Lewis (KY)	Ramstad	Vento
Linder	Rangel	Walden
Lipinski	Regula	Walsh
LoBiondo	Reynolds	Wamp
Loftgren	Riley	Waters
Lowe	Rivers	Watkins
Lucas (OK)	Rogan	Watts (OK)
Maloney (CT)	Rogers	Waxman
Maloney (NY)	Rohrabacher	Weiner
Manzullo	Ros-Lehtinen	Weldon (FL)
McCollum	Rothman	Weller
McCrary	Roybal-Allard	Weygand
McGovern	Royce	Whitfield
McHugh	Rush	Wicker
McInnis	Ryan (WI)	Wilson
McIntosh	Ryun (KS)	Wolf
McKeon	Sabo	Woolsey
McKinney	Salmon	Wu
McNulty	Sanders	Young (AK)
Meeks (NY)	Sanford	Young (FL)
Mica	Saxton	

NOT VOTING—4

Burton Stupak  
Pelosi Weldon (PA)

□ 1752

Messrs. FOSSELLA, BECERRA, BLAGOJEVICH, HULSHOF, TOWNS, ROTHMAN, Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD, and Ms. MCKINNEY changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. WISE, DEUTSCH, SHERMAN, NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mrs. CLAYTON changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall No. 75. Had I been present, I would have voted “no”.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CAMP). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in Part 2 of House Report 106-77.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 IN THE NATURE OF A  
SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. SPRATT

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order under the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 in the Nature of a Substitute printed in Part 2 of House Report 106-77 Offered by Mr. SPRATT:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

**SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000.**

The Congress declares that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000 and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2001 through 2014 are hereby set forth.

**SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.**

(a) SPECIAL RULE.—In this resolution, all references to years are fiscal years and all amounts are expressed in billions.

(b) ON-BUDGET LEVELS (EXCLUDING SOCIAL SECURITY AND OTHER OFF-BUDGET AGENCIES.—The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2014:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,408.5.  
Fiscal year 2001: \$1,439.2.  
Fiscal year 2002: \$1,497.3.  
Fiscal year 2003: \$1,552.0.  
Fiscal year 2004: \$1,622.2.  
Fiscal year 2005: \$1,697.5.  
Fiscal year 2006: \$1,775.9.  
Fiscal year 2007: \$1,855.9.  
Fiscal year 2008: \$1,940.0.  
Fiscal year 2009: \$2,029.3.  
Fiscal year 2010: \$2,115.9.  
Fiscal year 2011: \$2,207.4.  
Fiscal year 2012: \$2,300.8.  
Fiscal year 2013: \$2,396.6.  
Fiscal year 2014: \$2,494.4.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$0.0.  
Fiscal year 2001: —\$5.9.  
Fiscal year 2002: —\$11.0.  
Fiscal year 2003: —\$11.3.  
Fiscal year 2004: —\$11.9.  
Fiscal year 2005: —\$13.4.  
Fiscal year 2006: —\$14.8.  
Fiscal year 2007: —\$15.5.  
Fiscal year 2008: —\$16.2.  
Fiscal year 2009: —\$16.4.  
Fiscal year 2010: —\$17.8.  
Fiscal year 2011: —\$17.8.  
Fiscal year 2012: —\$17.8.  
Fiscal year 2013: —\$17.8.  
Fiscal year 2014: —\$17.8.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,425.8.  
Fiscal year 2001: \$1,481.9.  
Fiscal year 2002: \$1,507.9.  
Fiscal year 2003: \$1,573.5.  
Fiscal year 2004: \$1,630.3.  
Fiscal year 2005: \$1,708.3.  
Fiscal year 2006: \$1,754.5.  
Fiscal year 2007: \$1,825.0.  
Fiscal year 2008: \$1,902.2.  
Fiscal year 2009: \$1,979.8.  
Fiscal year 2010: \$2,054.8.  
Fiscal year 2011: \$2,135.6.  
Fiscal year 2012: \$2,218.1.  
Fiscal year 2013: \$2,321.2.  
Fiscal year 2014: \$2,420.5.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,408.0.  
Fiscal year 2001: \$1,432.3.  
Fiscal year 2002: \$1,495.8.  
Fiscal year 2003: \$1,551.6.  
Fiscal year 2004: \$1,621.7.  
Fiscal year 2005: \$1,684.8.  
Fiscal year 2006: \$1,735.3.  
Fiscal year 2007: \$1,803.9.  
Fiscal year 2008: \$1,882.9.  
Fiscal year 2009: \$1,958.2.  
Fiscal year 2010: \$2,045.1.  
Fiscal year 2011: \$2,134.8.  
Fiscal year 2012: \$2,226.3.  
Fiscal year 2013: \$2,338.4.  
Fiscal year 2014: \$2,442.0.

(4) SURPLUSES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the surpluses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$0.5.  
Fiscal year 2001: \$6.9.  
Fiscal year 2002: \$1.5.  
Fiscal year 2003: \$0.2.  
Fiscal year 2004: \$0.5.  
Fiscal year 2005: \$12.9.  
Fiscal year 2006: \$40.7.  
Fiscal year 2007: \$52.1.  
Fiscal year 2008: \$57.0.  
Fiscal year 2009: \$71.0.  
Fiscal year 2010: \$70.8.  
Fiscal year 2011: \$72.6.  
Fiscal year 2012: \$74.6.  
Fiscal year 2013: \$58.2.  
Fiscal year 2014: \$52.4.

(c) UNIFIED BUDGET LEVELS (INCLUDING ALL FEDERAL PROGRAMS).—The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2014:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,876.5.  
Fiscal year 2001: \$1,927.0.  
Fiscal year 2002: \$2,003.6.  
Fiscal year 2003: \$2,079.4.  
Fiscal year 2004: \$2,172.1.  
Fiscal year 2005: \$2,274.3.  
Fiscal year 2006: \$2,377.7.  
Fiscal year 2007: \$2,484.2.  
Fiscal year 2008: \$2,594.4.  
Fiscal year 2009: \$2,710.6.  
Fiscal year 2010: \$2,826.5.  
Fiscal year 2011: \$2,948.5.  
Fiscal year 2012: \$3,073.2.  
Fiscal year 2013: \$3,201.0.  
Fiscal year 2014: \$3,331.6.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$0.0.  
Fiscal year 2001: —\$5.9.  
Fiscal year 2002: —\$11.0.  
Fiscal year 2003: —\$11.3.  
Fiscal year 2004: —\$11.9.  
Fiscal year 2005: —\$13.4.  
Fiscal year 2006: —\$14.8.  
Fiscal year 2007: —\$15.5.  
Fiscal year 2008: —\$16.2.  
Fiscal year 2009: —\$16.4.  
Fiscal year 2010: —\$17.8.  
Fiscal year 2011: —\$17.8.  
Fiscal year 2012: —\$17.8.  
Fiscal year 2013: —\$17.8.  
Fiscal year 2014: —\$17.8.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—The appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,752.9.  
Fiscal year 2001: \$1,821.4.  
Fiscal year 2002: \$1,857.6.  
Fiscal year 2003: \$1,935.8.  
Fiscal year 2004: \$2,005.7.  
Fiscal year 2005: \$2,097.8.  
Fiscal year 2006: \$2,159.2.  
Fiscal year 2007: \$2,245.6.  
Fiscal year 2008: \$2,340.5.  
Fiscal year 2009: \$2,439.3.  
Fiscal year 2010: \$2,540.2.  
Fiscal year 2011: \$2,648.4.



Fiscal year 2012: \$2,762.9.  
 Fiscal year 2013: \$2,903.0.  
 Fiscal year 2014: \$3,044.0.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—The appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,735.1.  
 Fiscal year 2001: \$1,771.9.  
 Fiscal year 2002: \$1,845.4.  
 Fiscal year 2003: \$1,914.0.  
 Fiscal year 2004: \$1,997.2.  
 Fiscal year 2005: \$2,074.5.  
 Fiscal year 2006: \$2,140.1.  
 Fiscal year 2007: \$2,224.7.  
 Fiscal year 2008: \$2,321.2.  
 Fiscal year 2009: \$2,417.9.  
 Fiscal year 2010: \$2,530.5.  
 Fiscal year 2011: \$2,647.5.  
 Fiscal year 2012: \$2,771.2.  
 Fiscal year 2013: \$2,920.2.  
 Fiscal year 2014: \$3,065.5.

(4) SURPLUSES.—The amounts of the surpluses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$141.4.  
 Fiscal year 2001: \$155.1.  
 Fiscal year 2002: \$158.1.  
 Fiscal year 2003: \$165.3.  
 Fiscal year 2004: \$174.9.  
 Fiscal year 2005: \$199.9.  
 Fiscal year 2006: \$237.7.  
 Fiscal year 2007: \$259.5.  
 Fiscal year 2008: \$273.2.  
 Fiscal year 2009: \$292.7.  
 Fiscal year 2010: \$296.0.  
 Fiscal year 2011: \$301.0.  
 Fiscal year 2012: \$302.0.  
 Fiscal year 2013: \$280.8.  
 Fiscal year 2014: \$266.1.

(d) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$3,500.4.  
 Fiscal year 2001: \$3,361.3.  
 Fiscal year 2002: \$3,219.2.  
 Fiscal year 2003: \$3,070.3.  
 Fiscal year 2004: \$2,910.7.  
 Fiscal year 2005: \$2,725.0.  
 Fiscal year 2006: \$2,500.6.  
 Fiscal year 2007: \$2,253.4.  
 Fiscal year 2008: \$1,991.7.  
 Fiscal year 2009: \$1,710.2.  
 Fiscal year 2010: \$1,426.2.  
 Fiscal year 2011: \$1,137.3.  
 Fiscal year 2012: \$847.2.  
 Fiscal year 2013: \$577.5.  
 Fiscal year 2014: \$322.4.

(e) TRANSFERS FROM THE GENERAL FUND TO THE HI AND OASI TRUST FUNDS.—

(1) AMOUNTS TRANSFERRED TO HI TRUST FUND.—The amounts to be transferred from the General Fund to the HI Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$26.2.  
 Fiscal year 2001: \$28.2.  
 Fiscal year 2002: \$29.9.  
 Fiscal year 2003: \$31.5.  
 Fiscal year 2004: \$33.3.  
 Fiscal year 2005: \$37.8.  
 Fiscal year 2006: \$44.2.  
 Fiscal year 2007: \$47.8.  
 Fiscal year 2008: \$50.2.  
 Fiscal year 2009: \$53.1.  
 Fiscal year 2010: \$54.3.  
 Fiscal year 2011: \$54.9.  
 Fiscal year 2012: \$54.9.  
 Fiscal year 2013: \$51.6.  
 Fiscal year 2014: \$49.3.

(2) AMOUNTS TRANSFERRED TO OASI TRUST FUND.—The amounts to be transferred from the General Fund to the OASI Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: \$108.5.  
 Fiscal year 2001: \$116.7.  
 Fiscal year 2002: \$123.5.  
 Fiscal year 2003: \$130.1.  
 Fiscal year 2004: \$137.7.  
 Fiscal year 2005: \$156.2.  
 Fiscal year 2006: \$182.8.  
 Fiscal year 2007: \$197.7.

Fiscal year 2008: \$207.4.  
 Fiscal year 2009: \$219.6.  
 Fiscal year 2010: \$224.3.  
 Fiscal year 2011: \$226.8.  
 Fiscal year 2012: \$226.9.  
 Fiscal year 2013: \$213.2.  
 Fiscal year 2014: \$203.7.

(3) RESULTING ON-BUDGET DEFICITS.—The on-budget deficits resulting from this resolution including the transfers under paragraphs (1) and (2) are the following:

Fiscal year 2000: —\$110.3.  
 Fiscal year 2001: —\$118.0.  
 Fiscal year 2002: —\$136.7.  
 Fiscal year 2003: —\$151.8.  
 Fiscal year 2004: —\$167.0.  
 Fiscal year 2005: —\$182.1.  
 Fiscal year 2006: —\$191.5.  
 Fiscal year 2007: —\$207.1.  
 Fiscal year 2008: —\$225.4.  
 Fiscal year 2009: —\$238.1.  
 Fiscal year 2010: —\$258.9.  
 Fiscal year 2011: —\$276.3.  
 Fiscal year 2012: —\$292.1.  
 Fiscal year 2013: —\$313.1.  
 Fiscal year 2014: —\$327.9.

(4) RESULTING OFF-BUDGET SURPLUSES.—The off-budget surpluses resulting from this resolution including the transfers under paragraphs (1) and (2) are the following:

Fiscal year 2000: \$251.8.  
 Fiscal year 2001: \$273.0.  
 Fiscal year 2002: \$294.8.  
 Fiscal year 2003: \$316.9.  
 Fiscal year 2004: \$341.9.  
 Fiscal year 2005: \$382.1.  
 Fiscal year 2006: \$429.2.  
 Fiscal year 2007: \$466.7.  
 Fiscal year 2008: \$498.5.  
 Fiscal year 2009: \$530.8.  
 Fiscal year 2010: \$554.9.  
 Fiscal year 2011: \$577.3.  
 Fiscal year 2012: \$594.1.  
 Fiscal year 2013: \$593.8.  
 Fiscal year 2014: \$594.0.

**SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.**

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and budget outlays for fiscal years 2000 through 2009 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$280.4.  
 (B) Outlays, \$273.6.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$300.2.  
 (B) Outlays, \$281.6.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$302.1.  
 (B) Outlays, \$291.7.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$312.5.  
 (B) Outlays, \$303.6.  
 Fiscal year 2004:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$321.4.  
 (B) Outlays, \$313.5.  
 Fiscal year 2005:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$326.0.  
 (B) Outlays, \$318.0.  
 Fiscal year 2006:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$330.7.  
 (B) Outlays, \$322.5.  
 Fiscal year 2007:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$335.4.  
 (B) Outlays, \$327.1.  
 Fiscal year 2008:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$340.2.  
 (B) Outlays, \$331.8.  
 Fiscal year 2009:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$345.0.  
 (B) Outlays, \$336.5.  
 (2) International Affairs (150):  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12.5.  
 (B) Outlays, \$14.8.  
 Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$12.8.  
 (B) Outlays, \$15.4.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12.0.  
 (B) Outlays, \$14.8.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$13.6.  
 (B) Outlays, \$14.4.  
 Fiscal year 2004:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$15.0.  
 (B) Outlays, \$14.5.  
 Fiscal year 2005:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$16.3.  
 (B) Outlays, \$15.1.  
 Fiscal year 2006:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$17.2.  
 (B) Outlays, \$15.5.  
 Fiscal year 2007:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$17.8.  
 (B) Outlays, \$15.8.  
 Fiscal year 2008:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$18.6.  
 (B) Outlays, \$16.3.  
 Fiscal year 2009:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19.3.  
 (B) Outlays, \$16.4.  
 (3) General Science, Space, and Technology

(250):

Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$18.0.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18.2.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$18.7.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18.4.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$18.8.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18.7.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$18.9.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18.8.  
 Fiscal year 2004:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19.2.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19.1.  
 Fiscal year 2005:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$21.7.  
 (B) Outlays, \$21.1.  
 Fiscal year 2006:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$22.4.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22.1.  
 Fiscal year 2007:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$23.3.  
 (B) Outlays, \$23.0.  
 Fiscal year 2008:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$25.5.  
 (B) Outlays, \$24.2.  
 Fiscal year 2009:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$27.7.  
 (B) Outlays, \$25.8.  
 (4) Energy (270):  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.0.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$0.7.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$0.0.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$1.8.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$0.2.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$1.2.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$0.1.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$1.2.  
 Fiscal year 2004:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$0.0.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$1.2.  
 Fiscal year 2005:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.1.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$1.0.  
 Fiscal year 2006:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.5.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$0.6.  
 Fiscal year 2007:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.7.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$0.3.  
 Fiscal year 2008:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$1.1.  
 (B) Outlays, \$0.0.  
 Fiscal year 2009:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$1.2.

(B) Outlays, \$0.1.  
 (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$24.5.  
 (B) Outlays, \$23.6.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$24.4.  
 (B) Outlays, \$24.0.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$24.4.  
 (B) Outlays, \$23.9.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$24.5.  
 (B) Outlays, \$24.1.  
 Fiscal year 2004:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$25.4.  
 (B) Outlays, \$25.0.  
 Fiscal year 2005:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$27.6.  
 (B) Outlays, \$26.5.  
 Fiscal year 2006:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$28.6.  
 (B) Outlays, \$27.8.  
 Fiscal year 2007:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$28.9.  
 (B) Outlays, \$28.2.  
 Fiscal year 2008:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$30.4.  
 (B) Outlays, \$29.7.  
 Fiscal year 2009:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$32.3.  
 (B) Outlays, \$30.6.  
 (6) Agriculture (350):  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14.7.  
 (B) Outlays, \$13.3.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14.1.  
 (B) Outlays, \$12.2.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12.4.  
 (B) Outlays, \$10.6.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12.7.  
 (B) Outlays, \$11.0.  
 Fiscal year 2004:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$13.4.  
 (B) Outlays, \$11.8.  
 Fiscal year 2005:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14.2.  
 (B) Outlays, \$12.5.  
 Fiscal year 2006:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$15.2.  
 (B) Outlays, \$13.4.  
 Fiscal year 2007:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$16.0.  
 (B) Outlays, \$14.2.  
 Fiscal year 2008:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$16.9.  
 (B) Outlays, \$14.9.  
 Fiscal year 2009:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$17.3.  
 (B) Outlays, \$15.1.  
 (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$98.  
 (B) Outlays, \$4.5.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12.0.  
 (B) Outlays, \$7.1.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$16.3.  
 (B) Outlays, \$11.9.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$16.3.  
 (B) Outlays, \$12.6.  
 Fiscal year 2004:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$16.2.  
 (B) Outlays, \$12.8.  
 Fiscal year 2005:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14.7.  
 (B) Outlays, \$11.4.  
 Fiscal year 2006:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14.6.  
 (B) Outlays, \$11.1.  
 Fiscal year 2007:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14.7.

(B) Outlays, \$10.9.  
 Fiscal year 2008:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14.6.  
 (B) Outlays, \$10.5.  
 Fiscal year 2009:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14.4.  
 (B) Outlays, \$9.9.  
 (8) Transportation (400):  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$50.6.  
 (B) Outlays, \$45.8.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$52.2.  
 (B) Outlays, \$47.7.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$52.6.  
 (B) Outlays, \$47.2.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$54.2.  
 (B) Outlays, \$48.5.  
 Fiscal year 2004:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$54.2.  
 (B) Outlays, \$48.7.  
 Fiscal year 2005:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$54.2.  
 (B) Outlays, \$50.6.  
 Fiscal year 2006:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$54.6.  
 (B) Outlays, \$53.9.  
 Fiscal year 2007:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$54.8.  
 (B) Outlays, \$55.1.  
 Fiscal year 2008:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$55.3.  
 (B) Outlays, \$56.4.  
 Fiscal year 2009:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$55.5.  
 (B) Outlays, \$56.7.  
 (9) Community and Regional Development (450):  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$8.6.  
 (B) Outlays, \$10.6.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7.8.  
 (B) Outlays, \$9.3.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$8.8.  
 (B) Outlays, \$8.8.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$8.9.  
 (B) Outlays, \$9.2.  
 Fiscal year 2004:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$9.1.  
 (B) Outlays, \$9.3.  
 Fiscal year 2005:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$10.8.  
 (B) Outlays, \$10.0.  
 Fiscal year 2006:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$11.8.  
 (B) Outlays, \$10.7.  
 Fiscal year 2007:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12.8.  
 (B) Outlays, \$11.6.  
 Fiscal year 2008:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$13.8.  
 (B) Outlays, \$12.8.  
 Fiscal year 2009:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14.8.  
 (B) Outlays, \$13.8.  
 (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services:  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$68.6.  
 (B) Outlays, \$64.3.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$67.3.  
 (B) Outlays, \$66.1.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$67.5.  
 (B) Outlays, \$66.7.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$69.9.  
 (B) Outlays, \$68.5.  
 Fiscal year 2004:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$71.8.  
 (B) Outlays, \$70.7.  
 Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$74.1.  
 (B) Outlays, \$72.5.  
 Fiscal year 2006:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$76.3.  
 (B) Outlays, \$75.3.  
 Fiscal year 2007:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$80.2.  
 (B) Outlays, \$78.4.  
 Fiscal year 2008:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$83.5.  
 (B) Outlays, \$82.5.  
 Fiscal year 2009:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$87.5.  
 (B) Outlays, \$86.1.  
 (11) Health (550):  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$157.1.  
 (B) Outlays, \$153.4.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$167.3.  
 (B) Outlays, \$163.9.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$177.2.  
 (B) Outlays, \$177.1.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$188.9.  
 (B) Outlays, \$189.0.  
 Fiscal year 2004:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$203.5.  
 (B) Outlays, \$204.2.  
 Fiscal year 2005:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$220.8.  
 (B) Outlays, \$220.0.  
 Fiscal year 2006:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$238.7.  
 (B) Outlays, \$238.7.  
 Fiscal year 2007:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$259.3.  
 (B) Outlays, \$258.7.  
 Fiscal year 2008:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$280.1.  
 (B) Outlays, \$279.2.  
 Fiscal year 2009:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$303.2.  
 (B) Outlays, \$302.2.  
 (12) Medicare (570):  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$208.8.  
 (B) Outlays, \$208.8.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$222.2.  
 (B) Outlays, \$222.3.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$231.0.  
 (B) Outlays, \$230.7.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$251.2.  
 (B) Outlays, \$251.4.  
 Fiscal year 2004:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$269.1.  
 (B) Outlays, \$269.3.  
 Fiscal year 2005:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$269.3.  
 (B) Outlays, \$295.9.  
 Fiscal year 2006:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$307.6.  
 (B) Outlays, \$307.8.  
 Fiscal year 2007:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$338.5.  
 (B) Outlays, \$338.7.  
 Fiscal year 2008:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$366.7.  
 (B) Outlays, \$366.3.  
 Fiscal year 2009:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$395.3.  
 (B) Outlays, \$395.5.  
 (13) Income Security (600):  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$245.7.  
 (B) Outlays, \$248.4.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$257.2.  
 (B) Outlays, \$258.5.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$267.3.  
 (B) Outlays, \$268.3.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$276.8.

- (B) Outlays, \$277.8.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$286.1.  
(B) Outlays, \$287.8.  
Fiscal year 2005:  
(A) New budget authority, \$300.6.  
(B) Outlays, \$301.6.  
Fiscal year 2006:  
(A) New budget authority, \$307.3.  
(B) Outlays, \$309.0.  
Fiscal year 2007:  
(A) New budget authority, \$313.8.  
(B) Outlays, \$316.1.  
Fiscal year 2008:  
(A) New budget authority, \$327.7.  
(B) Outlays, \$330.7.  
Fiscal year 2009:  
(A) New budget authority, \$338.4.  
(B) Outlays, \$341.8.  
(14) Social Security (650):  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$14.2.  
(B) Outlays, \$14.3.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$13.8.  
(B) Outlays, \$13.8.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, \$15.6.  
(B) Outlays, \$15.6.  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$16.3.  
(B) Outlays, \$16.3.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$17.1.  
(B) Outlays, \$17.1.  
Fiscal year 2005:  
(A) New budget authority, \$18.0.  
(B) Outlays, \$18.0.  
Fiscal year 2006:  
(A) New budget authority, \$19.1.  
(B) Outlays, \$19.0.  
Fiscal year 2007:  
(A) New budget authority, \$20.2.  
(B) Outlays, \$20.1.  
Fiscal year 2008:  
(A) New budget authority, \$21.4.  
(B) Outlays, \$21.4.  
Fiscal year 2009:  
(A) New budget authority, \$22.7.  
(B) Outlays, \$22.6.  
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$45.6.  
(B) Outlays, \$45.5.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$46.3.  
(B) Outlays, \$46.4.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, \$46.8.  
(B) Outlays, \$46.7.  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$48.1.  
(B) Outlays, \$48.3.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$48.4.  
(B) Outlays, \$48.8.  
Fiscal year 2005:  
(A) New budget authority, \$53.5.  
(B) Outlays, \$53.9.  
Fiscal year 2006:  
(A) New budget authority, \$52.1.  
(B) Outlays, \$52.5.  
Fiscal year 2007:  
(A) New budget authority, \$53.5.  
(B) Outlays, \$51.9.  
Fiscal year 2008:  
(A) New budget authority, \$54.7.  
(B) Outlays, \$55.2.  
Fiscal year 2009:  
(A) New budget authority, \$57.0.  
(B) Outlays, \$57.4.  
(16) Administration of Justice (750):  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$23.4.  
(B) Outlays, \$25.3.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$24.7.  
(B) Outlays, \$24.9.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, \$24.7.  
(B) Outlays, \$24.9.  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$25.9.  
(B) Outlays, \$25.7.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$27.7.  
(B) Outlays, \$27.6.  
Fiscal year 2005:  
(A) New budget authority, \$29.9.  
(B) Outlays, \$29.3.  
Fiscal year 2006:  
(A) New budget authority, \$31.2.  
(B) Outlays, \$30.2.  
Fiscal year 2007:  
(A) New budget authority, \$32.9.  
(B) Outlays, \$32.5.  
Fiscal year 2008:  
(A) New budget authority, \$34.5.  
(B) Outlays, \$34.0.  
Fiscal year 2009:  
(A) New budget authority, \$35.5.  
(B) Outlays, \$35.2.  
(17) General Government (800):  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$12.3.  
(B) Outlays, \$13.5.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$12.1.  
(B) Outlays, \$12.6.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, \$12.1.  
(B) Outlays, \$12.3.  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$12.1.  
(B) Outlays, \$12.2.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$12.4.  
(B) Outlays, \$12.4.  
Fiscal year 2005:  
(A) New budget authority, \$13.2.  
(B) Outlays, \$12.8.  
Fiscal year 2006:  
(A) New budget authority, \$14.0.  
(B) Outlays, \$13.7.  
Fiscal year 2007:  
(A) New budget authority, \$.  
(B) Outlays, \$.  
Fiscal year 2008:  
(A) New budget authority, \$.  
(B) Outlays, \$.  
Fiscal year 2009:  
(A) New budget authority, \$.  
(B) Outlays, \$.  
(18) Net Interest (900):  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$.  
(B) Outlays, \$.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$.  
(B) Outlays, \$.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, \$.  
(B) Outlays, \$.  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$265.2.  
(B) Outlays, \$265.2.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$263.3.  
(B) Outlays, \$263.3.  
Fiscal year 2005:  
(A) New budget authority, \$260.6.  
(B) Outlays, \$260.6.  
Fiscal year 2006:  
(A) New budget authority, \$257.7.  
(B) Outlays, \$257.7.  
Fiscal year 2007:  
(A) New budget authority, \$254.8.  
(B) Outlays, \$254.8.  
Fiscal year 2008:  
(A) New budget authority, \$250.7.  
(B) Outlays, \$250.7.  
Fiscal year 2009:  
(A) New budget authority, \$246.7.  
(B) Outlays, \$246.7.  
(19) Allowances (920):  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$9.3.  
(B) Outlays, -\$9.5.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$4.5.  
(B) Outlays, -\$4.4.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$4.3.  
(B) Outlays, -\$5.7.  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$4.1.  
(B) Outlays, -\$4.3.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$4.4.  
(B) Outlays, -\$4.4.  
Fiscal year 2005:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$4.5.  
(B) Outlays, -\$4.4.  
Fiscal year 2006:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$4.3.  
(B) Outlays, -\$4.3.  
Fiscal year 2007:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$4.3.  
(B) Outlays, -\$4.3.  
Fiscal year 2008:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$4.4.  
(B) Outlays, -\$4.3.  
Fiscal year 2009:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$4.2.  
(B) Outlays, -\$4.2.  
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$35.1.  
(B) Outlays, -\$35.1.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$37.9.  
(B) Outlays, -\$37.9.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$44.9.  
(B) Outlays, -\$44.9.  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$38.3.  
(B) Outlays, -\$38.3.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$38.6.  
(B) Outlays, -\$38.6.  
Fiscal year 2005:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$39.8.  
(B) Outlays, -\$39.8.  
Fiscal year 2006:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$40.8.  
(B) Outlays, -\$40.8.  
Fiscal year 2007:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$42.5.  
(B) Outlays, -\$42.5.  
Fiscal year 2008:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$43.6.  
(B) Outlays, -\$43.6.  
Fiscal year 2009:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$44.8.  
(B) Outlays, -\$44.8.  
(21) Multipurpose (970):  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.0.  
(B) Outlays, \$0.0.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.0.  
(B) Outlays, -\$19.0.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.0.  
(B) Outlays, \$10.0.  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.0.  
(B) Outlays, -\$1.0.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.0.  
(B) Outlays, \$10.0.  
Fiscal year 2005:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.0.  
(B) Outlays, \$0.0.  
Fiscal year 2006:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.0.  
(B) Outlays, \$0.0.  
Fiscal year 2007:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.0.  
(B) Outlays, \$0.0.  
Fiscal year 2008:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.0.  
(B) Outlays, \$0.0.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.0

(B) Outlays, \$0.0.

#### SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

(a) FIRST RECONCILIATION BILL.—Not later than July 1, 1999, the House Committee on Ways and Means shall report to the House a reconciliation bill that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction necessary—

(1) to ensure (A) that the surplus of all trust fund receipts over outlays of the social security trust funds is invested in special purpose bonds backed by the full faith and credit of the United States, and (B) that such funds are applied by the Treasury solely to pay off the outstanding debt of the United States held by the public; and

(2) to ensure further that the Treasury shall issue bonds backed by the full faith and credit of the United States Government to the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance Trust Funds and to the Board of Trustees of the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund in an amount specified in this resolution which equals the public debt retired through fiscal year 2014. 81 ½ percent of such bonds shall be issued to the social security trust funds and 19 ½ percent to the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund.

(b) SECOND RECONCILIATION BILL.—If the reconciliation bill referred to in subsection (a) is enacted, then, not later than the 20th calendar day beginning after the date of such enactment, the House Committee on Ways and Means shall submit its recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the House. After receiving those recommendations, the Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(1) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce revenues as follows: —\$40.1 in the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004 and —\$116.5 in the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2009.

(2) The policy of this concurrent resolution is that the bill reported under section 4(b)(1) accommodate high priority tax relief of approximately \$62 billion over five years, \$166 billion over ten years, and \$295 billion over fifteen years upon enactment of legislation that extends solvency of the Social Security trust funds until 2050 and solvency of the Medicare Trust Fund until at least 2020. Of these amounts, \$22 billion over five years, \$50 billion over ten years, and \$90 billion over fifteen years would fully offset revenues lost by closing or restricting unwarranted tax benefits. Such tax relief should—

(1) expand tax credits to alleviate the costs of child care for working families;

(2) reduce financing costs for primary and secondary public school modernization;

(3) mitigate “marriage penalties” in the tax code;

(4) ensure that working families eligible for child tax credits are unaffected by the Alternative Minimum Tax;

(5) create tax incentives for working families to establish savings accounts for retirement;

(6) extend long-supported and previously renewed tax benefits that soon will expire, such as the Work Opportunity and Research and Experimentation credits;

(7) accommodate the revenue effects of enacting the Dingell bill (H.R. 358), legislation improving rights for medical patients and providers in managed care health plans;

(8) provide tax relief to assist working families with long-term care needs; and

(9) provide tax credits to purchasers of Better American Bonds which will support State and local environmental protection initiatives.

#### SEC. 5. EXTENDING THE SOLVENCY OF SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE.

Until enactment of the legislation required by this section, none of any budget surplus shall be obligated or expended. Upon enactment of this legislation, the on-budget surplus may be used to increase programs or to offset tax reduction, subject to the discretionary spending caps and the pay-as-you-go rules as enacted by H. Con. Res. 67 (105th Congress) or as subsequently amended. It is the objective of this resolution to extend the solvency of Social Security at least until 2050 and the solvency of Medicare at least until 2020, and to prohibit obligation or expenditure of any budget surplus until these objectives are met. The Balanced Budget Agreement of 1997 set discretionary caps for fiscal years 1998 through 2002 based upon explicit funding levels for national defense (Function 050) for fiscal years 1998 through 2002. The President's budget for fiscal year 2000 requests a baseline increase in Function 050 amounting to \$84 billion in budget authority for each of the next 5 years. The purpose of the increase is to address problems of readiness and retention and to meet requirements for modernization of forces, which were not anticipated in the Balanced Budget Agreement of 1997. This request changes fundamentally the assumptions on which the agreement was made; therefore, baseline spending should be increased in order to provide sufficient funds for nondefense discretionary spending needs while meeting the President's request for additional defense spending. Therefore, upon enactment of legislation making Social Security and Medicare solvent, as required by section 4(a), the discretionary spending caps applicable to fiscal years 2001 and 2002 should be adjusted upward to reflect the additional defense spending request from the President's budget.

#### SEC. 6. UPDATED CBO PROJECTIONS.

Each calendar quarter the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall make an up-to-date estimate of receipts, outlays and surplus (on-budget and off-budget) for the current fiscal year.

#### SEC. 7. RELINQUISHING THE FEDERAL SHARE OF MEDICAID FUNDS RECOUPED AS A RESULT OF TOBACCO SETTLEMENTS BETWEEN THE STATES AND TOBACCO COMPANIES.

The resolution assumes the Federal share of Medicaid funds recouped as a result of tobacco settlements between the States and tobacco companies will be relinquished to the States. The resolution assumes that the release of the Federal Government's claim to these funds in favor of the States will be made by law, and will be subject to certain conditions and activities prescribed by law including, but not limited to, programs which improve public health, programs designed to prevent youth smoking, other health activities or education, and compensation for tobacco farmers.

#### SEC. 8. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) persecution of individuals on the sole ground of their religious beliefs and practices occurs in countries around the world and affects millions of lives;

(2) such persecution violates international norms of human rights, including those established in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Helsinki Accords, and the Declaration on the Elimination of all Forms of Intolerance and Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief;

(3) such persecution is abhorrent to all Americans, and our very Nation was founded on the principle of the freedom to worship according to the dictates of our conscience; and

(4) in 1998 Congress unanimously passed, and President Clinton signed into law, the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998, which established the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom to monitor facts and circumstances of violations of religious freedom and authorized \$3,000,000 to carry out the functions of the Commission for each of fiscal years 1999 and 2000.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) this resolution assumes that \$3,000,000 will be appropriated within function 150 for fiscal year 2000 for the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom to carry out its duties; and

(2) the House Committee on Appropriations is strongly urged to appropriate such amount for the Commission.

#### SEC. 9. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ASSET-BUILDING FOR THE WORKING POOR.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) 33 percent of all American households have no or negative financial assets and 60 percent of African-American households have no or negative financial assets;

(2) 46.9 percent of all children in America live in households with no financial assets, including 40 percent of caucasian children and 75 percent of African-American children;

(3) in order to provide low-income families with more tools for empowerment, incentives which encourage asset-building should be established;

(4) across the Nation numerous small public, private, and public-private asset-building initiatives (including individual development account programs) are demonstrating success at empowering low-income workers;

(5) the Government currently provides middle and upper income Americans with hundreds of billions of dollars in tax incentives for building assets; and

(6) the Government should utilize tax laws or other measures to provide low-income Americans with incentives to work and build assets in order to escape poverty permanently.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that any changes in tax law should include provisions which encourage low-income workers and their families to save for buying their first home, starting a business, obtaining an education, or taking other measures to prepare for the future.

#### SEC. 10. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ACCESS TO HEALTH INSURANCE AND PRESERVING HOME HEALTH SERVICES FOR ALL MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES.

(a) ACCESS TO HEALTH INSURANCE.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) 43.4 million Americans are currently without health insurance, and that this number is expected to rise to nearly 60 million people in the next 10 years;

(B) the cost of health insurance continues to rise, a key factor in increasing the number of uninsured; and

(C) there is a consensus that working Americans and their families and children will suffer from reduced access to health insurance.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON IMPROVING ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE INSURANCE.—It is the sense of Congress that access to affordable health care coverage for all Americans is a priority of the 106th Congress.

(b) PRESERVING HOME HEALTH SERVICE FOR ALL MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 reformed medicare home health care spending by instructing the Health Care Financing Administration to implement a prospective payment system and instituted an interim payment system to achieve savings;

(B) the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act,

1999, reformed the interim payment system to increase reimbursements to low-cost providers, added \$900 million in funding, and delayed the automatic 15 percent payment reduction for one year, to October 1, 2000; and

(C) patients whose care is more extensive and expensive than the typical Medicare patient do not receive supplemental payments in the interim payment system but will receive special protection in the home health care prospective payment system.

(2) **SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ACCESS TO HOME HEALTH CARE.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(A) Congress recognizes the importance of home health care for seniors and disabled citizens;

(B) Congress and the Administration should work together to maintain quality care for patients whose care is more extensive and expensive than the typical Medicare patient, including the sickest and frailest Medicare beneficiaries, while home health care agencies operate in the interim payment system; and

(C) Congress and the Administration should work together to avoid the implementation of the 15 percent reduction in the interim payment system and ensure timely implementation of the prospective payment system.

**SEC. 11. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON MEDICARE PAYMENT.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds that—

(1) a goal of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 was to expand options for Medicare beneficiaries under the new Medicare+Choice program;

(2) Medicare+Choice was intended to make these choices available to all Medicare beneficiaries; and unfortunately, during the first two years of the Medicare+Choice program the blended payment was not implemented, stifling health care options and continuing regional disparity among many counties across the United States; and

(3) the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 also established the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare to develop legislative recommendations to address the long-term funding challenges facing Medicare.

(b) **SENSE OF THE HOUSE.**—It is the sense of the House that this resolution assumes that funding of the Medicare+Choice program is a priority for the House Committee on the Budget before financing new programs and benefits that may potentially add to the imbalance of payments and benefits in Fee-for-Service Medicare and Medicare+Choice.

**SEC. 12. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON ASSESSMENT OF WELFARE-TO-WORK PROGRAMS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—It is the sense of the House that, recognizing the need to maximize the benefit of the Welfare-to-Work Program, the Secretary of Labor should prepare a report on Welfare-to-Work Programs pursuant to section 403(a)(5) of the Social Security Act. This report should include information on the following—

(1) the extent to which the funds available under such section have been used (including the number of States that have not used any of such funds), the types of programs that have received such funds, the number of and characteristics of the recipients of assistance under such programs, the goals of such programs, the duration of such programs, the costs of such programs, any evidence of the effects of such programs on such recipients, and accounting of the total amount expended by the States from such funds, and the rate at which the Secretary expects such funds to be expended for each of the fiscal years 2000, 2001, and 2002;

(2) with regard to the unused funds allocated for Welfare-to-Work for each of fiscal

years 1998 and 1999, identify areas of the Nation that have unmet needs for Welfare-to-Work initiatives; and

(3) identify possible Congressional action that may be taken to reprogram Welfare-to-Work funds from States that have not utilized previously allocated funds to places of unmet need, including those States that have rejected or otherwise not utilized prior funding.

(b) **REPORT.**—It is the sense of the House that, not later than January 1, 2000, the Secretary of Labor should submit to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, in writing, the report described in subsection (a).

**SEC. 13. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PROVIDING HONOR GUARD SERVICES FOR VETERANS' FUNERALS.**

It is the sense of Congress that all relevant congressional committees should make every effort to provide sufficient resources so that an Honor Guard, if requested, is available for veterans' funerals.

**SEC. 14. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE PRESIDENT'S LIVABILITY AGENDA AND LANDS LEGACY INITIATIVE.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(1) States and localities across the country are taking steps to address the problems of traffic congestion, urban sprawl, the deterioration of recreational areas, and the disappearance of wildlife habitat and open space;

(2) the Government should be a strong partner with States and localities as they strive to address these problems and build livable communities for the 21st century;

(3) the Government can and should also take independent actions to protect critical lands across the country and to preserve America's natural treasures; and

(4) the President's Lands Legacy Initiative and Livability Agenda represent two comprehensive proposals that advance these goals.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the President's Land Legacy Initiative and Livability Agenda should be considered high priorities by the Appropriations Committees as they make spending decisions for fiscal year 2000 and beyond.

**SEC. 15. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CHILD NUTRITION.**

It is the sense of Congress that both Democrats and Republicans understand that an adequate diet and proper nutrition are essential to a child's general well-being. Furthermore, the lack of an adequate diet and proper nutrition may adversely affect a child's ability to perform up to his or her ability in school. Because of this fact, as well as the current Federal role in school nutrition programs and the commitment on behalf of both Republicans and Democrats to helping children learn, it is the sense of Congress that the Committee on Education and the Workforce and the Committee on Agriculture of the House should examine our Nation's nutrition programs to determine if they can be improved, particularly with respect to services to low-income children.

**SEC. 16. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING STATES' FLEXIBILITY TO HELP LOW-INCOME SENIORS MEET MEDICARE'S COST SHARING REQUIREMENTS.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The Congress finds that—

(1) Congress and the States through Medicaid have established two vital programs to help senior citizens pay Medicare premiums, deductibles, and copayments through the Qualified Medicare Beneficiary (QMB) and the Specified Low-Income Medicare Beneficiary (SLMB) programs;

(2) a recent Families, USA study found that between three and four million low-income seniors are not getting the help to

which they are legally entitled, which is nearly 40 percent of those eligible for these programs; and

(3) for many senior citizens with limited means, these Medicare premiums, deductibles, and copayments can be a significant burden on their monthly budgets.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that these low-income seniors be enrolled in Medicaid by allowing the Social Security Administration to automatically assume that these seniors are eligible for Medicaid, while States make final determinations.

**SEC. 17. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON EQUITABLE REIMBURSEMENT FOR FEDERALLY QUALIFIED HEALTH CENTERS.**

The Balanced Budget Act of 1997 contained a provision to phase out Medicaid cost-based reimbursements from States to FQHC's beginning in August of 1999 and phasing out completely by 2002. It is anticipated that the phase-out of these reimbursements will put a tremendous strain on the ability of FQHC's to meet the healthcare needs of Medicaid beneficiaries and the uninsured, particularly in rural areas of the United States. It is the sense of Congress that a fair and equitable Medicaid reimbursement policy should be developed for FQHC's in recognition of their unique patient and service mix.

**SEC. 18. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING STATE'S FLEXIBILITY TO PROVIDE CHILDREN WITH HEALTH INSURANCE.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The Congress finds that—

(1) according to the 1997 current population survey data from the United States Census Bureau, 11.3 million children are uninsured and 4.4 million of them are eligible for Medicaid;

(2) under the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, States have a new option under Medicaid to grant "presumptive eligibility" to children through pediatricians, community health centers, other health providers, Head Start centers, WIC agencies, and State or local child care agencies that determine eligibility for child care subsidies; and

(3) it is more cost effective to enroll these children in Medicaid and ensure that they are receiving preventive care through a family doctor, rather than through an emergency room where children are sicker and taxpayers will end up paying more through higher Medicaid expenditures, local taxes, or insurance premiums.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that these low-income children be enrolled in Medicaid by allowing schools, child care resource and referral centers, child support agencies, workers determining eligibility for homeless programs, and workers determining eligibility for the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) to automatically assume that these children are eligible for Medicaid, while States make final determinations.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, if we were voting on final passage on the Spratt amendment, I would vote against it, because it and all other budgets before us today pretend that both parties will

make deep cuts in health, environment, education, international responsibilities, and defense that in the end neither party, in my view, will accept.

But this vote is not to pass the Spratt amendment. It is to substitute the Spratt amendment for the Republican budget, and I will vote to do that. Because, with all of its false premises, it is far less reckless, far more balanced and responsible than the Republican alternative that it amends.

Now, why do I say that? It is because I was here in 1981 and I remember the Republicans and a lot of conservative Democrats ramming the disastrous Reagan budgets through this House, which promised that we could double defense spending, provide huge tax cuts aimed at the wealthy, and still balance the budget.

Instead, those budgets tripled the deficits and tripled the national debt. And it took us some 19 years to dig out of that hole to the point where a President could finally present a balanced budget to the Congress.

I vowed never again will I cooperate in that kind of outrageous activity. But now the Republicans in their approach bring us the same patent medicine snake oil that they gave us in 1981.

The Spratt amendment does not. The Spratt amendment extends the solvency of Social Security and Medicare. It is better for veterans. It is better for education. It is better for health care. And in the future, it makes some of the investments that we will need to create greater opportunity for all of our American families.

□ 1800

But I caution all of my colleagues. After the budget resolution passes today, they will then face the appropriations process. In that process, I predict that neither party will be willing to vote for the cuts in education, in health care, in agriculture, in veterans, in environmental cleanup, in defense that all of these resolutions promise today.

I really believe that Members fundamentally misunderstand what is happening in the budget process, and I would ask this question: Does anybody on this floor really believe that in the end in the appropriations process they will cut 10 percent below current services this year, or 20 to 25 percent below current services in the coming 5 years in some of the program areas I have just described? The answer is very simple. They simply will not do it.

The budget process in my view has become fundamentally flawed and phony. It politically rewards phonies. It allows Congress to pretend that it is making cuts at the macro level, which it will never deliver at the micro program level. And we desperately need to change it if we want to bring reality back to the process and integrity back to the debate about budgeting. Unless we do that, the public will not understand a single thing we do here on budgets, and in a democracy, that is unacceptable.

And so I would simply say in closing, while I would not support the Spratt amendment if it were final passage because I believe all of these budgets before us today are fundamentally phony, this is by far the most balanced, the most equitable, the most thoughtful in terms of providing the long-term investments that we will eventually need in this country, and I would urge its adoption as a substitute to the Republican vehicle now before us.

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say, and I hope all my colleagues share this view, the gentleman from Wisconsin, who is the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations and has to deal most pointedly with the reality as opposed to the rhetoric, invariably in my opinion speaks the truth not only to us but to the American public. I voted for the Blue Dog and I am going to vote for the Spratt budget, but those of us who serve on the Committee on Appropriations know that, in the final analysis, Members are not going to pass bills within their constraints that we now have on the floor, and that is what the gentleman from Wisconsin is talking about. I want to congratulate him for his leadership, for his honesty and for his service in this institution. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman, and I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

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

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in opposition to the Spratt amendment.

I rise in opposition to the Spratt amendment and in support of the Republican resolution which secures Social Security and Medicare, and increases education. The Republican resolution is the only budget that takes the first steps necessary toward improving benefits for veterans and restoring the health of national defense.

As I stand here today, our dedicated service men and women who are deployed throughout the world, are unselfishly putting their lives at risk in support of our national security interests—in Kosovo, Iraq and North Korea to name a few.

The Subcommittee on Military Personnel, which I chair, has had very good hearings concerning pay, retirement, retention and health care. The concerns that are affecting our soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines are real!

During these investigations I received a letter, which I would like submitted for the RECORD, from a young officer in the Navy. He, like the rest of the outstanding military personnel loves what he does and takes great pride in supporting and protecting our country.

He only asks that we provide him with qualified people, tools and training to complete their mission and to pay them an honest day's wage for an honest day's work. These men and women and their families deserve better than this—there is no excuse that they do not have the proper tools and equipment, work and live in standard facilities and are paid so poorly they have to work two jobs to support their families. Our force is undermanned and overworked. The operation tempo is so high that many of these men and women have spent the last two Thanksgivings and Christmases away from their families. This is insulting to them and to this country which they so unselfishly support.

I heard one of my colleagues from across the aisle say "We have a moral obligation to support defense and that he would support the proposal that provides the most for defense." We do have a moral obligation to support defense and the Republican budget resolution with the manager's amendment takes the first steps necessary toward providing for defense. It will provide more dollars in fiscal year 2000, (3 billion more than the Spratt amendment or the President's) than any other proposal.

In addition, the Republican budget provides over \$1 billion for the veterans who have also sacrificed so much for this country.

Unlike the Spratt amendment the Republican budget resolution will fulfill our promise to veterans and work toward maintaining a strong national defense.

I strongly oppose the Spratt amendment and support the Republican budget and urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

*To whom it may concern:*

For the last 17 years I have served my country as a sailor in the United States Navy. I have seen what I believe to be the decline in discipline reach an all time low in the last 2 years. I believe that boot camp has become too lax and fails to produce sailors that could go immediately into combat and survive. We also take those same sailors and send them to Pensacola for follow on training where they live better than most senior fleet sailors. They are cuddled the whole time they are in school. They arrive in the fleet with little or no concept of discipline. After they complete training they show up at various stations around the world in live in what is little more than a slum. We always say, "if you take care of your sailors, then they will take care of you." Taking care of them may be in the form of a good ass chewing to get them back on track. If we cuddle them as airman then what is there to look forward to?

It takes a special breed of person to stay in the Navy. Sailors that stay in the Navy are, for the most part, not in it for fame or fortune. They stay in the Navy because they love what they do, pride in the hardest job in the world, well done. There is no greater satisfaction then watching the fruits of your labor launch off the pointy end of an aircraft carrier loaded with all the ordinance it can possibly carry and go take a piece of American policy to those who need it most. They stay because of camaraderie. They stay because of honor, courage and commitment.

Honor, courage and commitment are words that are often used in just. What they should say is honor the sailor and respect the job and sacrifice that he endures. Have the courage to give those who risk their life everyday in the defense of our country and democracy the proper equipment to do their job. Make the commitment to the basic human needs

that every human being, even sailors; need for themselves and their families.

Most sailors are held to an even higher standard than the people who send them to their deaths in battle. Many have a hard time living with the double standard that they are held to. If our Commander-in-Chief can admittedly lie to congress about his improprieties, then why must an active duty military person have their lives ruined and be forced from the service of his country, because he went to a convention that honors all of those who have ever landed an aircraft on the pitching deck of an aircraft carrier.

We need to provide the fleet with all the tools to maintain all our assets. Just in time manning and ramping up for deployment is ludicrous, people and assets need to be in position and onboard to benefit from the rigors of the training cycle. Sailors need to be properly trained. They need to have the proper support equipment to test the systems, be it on a ship or aircraft. They need publications that are up-to-date. They need the various hand and automated tools to actually perform the maintenance and maintain the equipment. They need adequate space to perform their maintenance and stow their gear. Recently it took us 2 days to complete what should have been a 2-hour procedure for all of these reasons: We could not get a hydraulic test stand that worked correctly. The support equipment people could not fix the hydraulic test stand because they did not have the correct publications. The publications had not been updated to reflect the new tool requirements. Nobody knew how to operate the new test equipment. If we do not have the people or tools to fix the aircraft then the aircraft can not fly. Aircrews need to fly to stay proficient. Aircrews love to fly and that is their job.

We must fulfill the basic human needs of every sailor in order for them to continue to be happy at their job. Pay them an honest days wage for an honest days work. A sailor that works on the flight deck of an aircraft carrier, the most dangerous work place in the world, gets \$3 a day (before taxes), provided the ship or squadron has enough billets to pay him. Pay them for the sacrifices that they make by providing adequate housing (when ashore), quality health care for them and their families. We need to provide affordable (pay grade based) 24 hour a day 7 days a week daycare.

Manning is probably one thing that gets pinged on the most, but just throwing a body at a problem will not fix it, if it is not the right body. It does not matter if I have 10 mechanics if I have an electrical problem. Of the 200 people assigned to the maintenance department, 25 are temporarily assigned duties out side the command. 140 people are actually assigned to production work centers. The 140 people include 7 in corrosion, 17 ordies, 5 tarpies, 3 PR's, and 28 line rats. This leaves 80 people to perform 97% of the scheduled and unscheduled, documented, direct maintenance on the aircraft. However, on any given day we lose approximately 15 of the 75 people from these work centers due to leave, school, watch, SIQ, LIMDU, appointments, etc. This all means that on an average day we have 65 maintainers performing maintenance on our aircraft. Currently the average direct maintenance man-hour per flight hour, for the F-14 is 60.5. Based on an eight-hour day, five days a week we would perform 11,960 hour of on aircraft maintenance per month. This would equate to 198 flight hours per month or 99 sorties, which would break down to approximately 16 flight hours, or 8 sorties per month for each pilot. This is not enough to stay proficient. This also does not account for any of the other "collateral" duties, administrative requirements or additional tasking these sailors

have. What do you think is not gonna be done?

I don't know what the fix is and I don't know all the answers but I will tell you I have never seen the Navy in such a sad state of affairs. I love this business and have always believed that there was honor in my chosen profession. Where else in the world can a high school drop out become an Officer and a key person in a maintenance department with \$500 million of assets. We have created most of the problems ourselves through inflated decrees of readiness and continually providing more with less, but at what cost? Sailors are ingenious and will find ways to put "hot steel on target" no matter what it takes, because that is our job. When we have to work harder to get the job done then some other program is not getting the attention it needs. In many cases those are the paper programs that the bureaucracy has created in order for someone to "cover their ass" or have a "claim to fame." So every cut back has a cost. In this case I think we cut too deep. Unfortunately we elected those bureaucrats that created those paper programs. We are WARRIORS and our job is to be prepared to fight wars.

ROCKY A. RILEY, *LTJG, USN.*

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I must confess a certain degree of confusion. Last month, the author of this amendment, this alternative budget, praised the President's budget with a glowing review. Today he proposes a budget that is diametrically opposed to and completely incompatible with the President's budget, so I am confused. I do not know in which direction my colleagues on the other side of the aisle really want to go. I suppose we will find out soon. But in the meantime, I want to urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the obvious alternative, the best budget, the Republican budget proposal.

I came to Congress just 3 months ago as a small businessman, accustomed to the discipline that the free market imposes on business budgets and frustrated by the irresponsible lack of discipline we have often seen in many government budgets. Perhaps the most egregious example of this irresponsibility has been the raid on the Social Security trust funds. I am proud to be a member of the Republican Committee on the Budget that is bringing an end to that irresponsible practice.

The Republican budgets saves 100 percent of Social Security funds, every penny of payroll taxes, every penny of interest owed to the Social Security trust fund. That is \$1.8 trillion over the next 10 years, considerably more than the President's budget. In addition, the Republican budget spends more on elementary and secondary education, more on defense, more on Medicare, and then after those priorities are addressed, the Republican budget, unlike any of the Democratic alternatives, provides meaningful tax relief for over-taxed working Americans, all of this accomplished within the context of the 1997 budget agreement.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for senior citizens, to stand up for our stu-

dents, to stand up for our soldiers and for our taxpayers. Reject the Spratt alternative and vote "yes" on the Republican budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

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

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Spratt amendment and in opposition to the Kasich bill. Our amendment provides for the next generation rather than just the next election.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend Mr. SPRATT for crafting a substitute that will save all of the surplus until we ensure the solvency of Social Security and Medicare. Congress must exercise fiscal discipline and save Social Security first.

I also want to thank committee Democrats for adding my bill, the Etheridge School Construction Act, to the Spratt Substitute. This legislation will provide critically needed help for local schools like those in my District that are bursting at the seams. As the former Superintendent of my state's schools, I call on this Congress to make the education of our children our top priority.

Despite the rhetoric from the other side of the aisle, the Kasich budget does nothing for school construction and abandons the 100,000 new teachers initiative. The Kasich budget cuts higher education by \$36.3 billion over ten years. As the first member of my family to graduate from college, I know firsthand that affordable access to a quality education is the key to the American Dream, and Congress must not cut financial aid.

This is a question of our values and our priorities. A budget should be about the next generation not just the next election. Vote for the future and the Spratt Substitute.

HOUSE BUDGET COMMITTEE DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

The Democratic alternative requires the enactment of legislation extending the solvency of the Social Security Trust Fund to 2050 and the Medicare Hospital Insurance (HI) Trust Fund for 12 additional years prior to the enactment of net new tax cuts or net new spending initiatives. If the solvency of the Social Security and Medicare HI Trust Funds is extended, the Democratic alternative provides for education, training, and social services initiatives.

REPUBLICANS DEVASTATE EDUCATION FUNDING

Despite Republican rhetoric about supporting education, the House Republican budget resolution drastically cuts funding for education, employment and training, and social service programs.

Republicans Cut Education by \$1.2 Billion in 2000—The House Republican budget cuts education funding for 2000 by \$1.2 billion below a freeze at the 1999 level.

Republicans Cut Purchasing Power by 18.1 Percent by 2009—These cuts in education funding translate into a 6.9 percent decrease in purchasing power by 2004, and an astounding 18.1 percent decrease in purchasing power by 2009.

HIGHER EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING, AND SOCIAL SERVICES

The Republicans deeply cut funding that provides higher education assistance, college preparation, social services (such as Head



Start), and job training in order to increase spending for elementary and secondary education. (The Republicans do not say which education programs they eliminate.)

Republicans Cut Higher Education and Social Services by \$16.7 Billion over Five Years—The Republican budget cuts funding for higher education, training, and social services—programs such as Pell Grants and Head Start—by \$1.7 billion for 2000, by \$16.7 billion over five years, and by \$36.3 billion over ten years compared with the 1999 freeze level.

Republicans Cut Education by 5.7 Percent for 2000, 16.2 Percent for 2009—The magnitude of cuts in the Republican budget requires an across-the-board cut of 5.7 percent for 2000 in programs other than those for elementary and secondary education. By 2009, the Republican budget cuts these programs by 16.2 percent compared with the 1999 freeze level.

#### DEMOCRATS BOOST EDUCATION FUNDING

The Democratic budget rejects the Republicans' damaging cuts in education programs. It provides \$2.6 billion more for education for 2000 than the Republican budget. Over time, the difference between the Democratic and Republican budgets gets even greater; the Democratic budget provides \$10.2 billion more than the Republicans over five years (2000-2004), and \$51.4 billion more over ten years (2000-2009).

Protect Higher Education, Employment and Training, and Social Services—Unlike the Republican budget, the Democratic alternative does not cut higher education, training, and social services to increase elementary and secondary education programs. The Democratic alternative increases the overall education budget.

Hire 100,000 Teachers—The Democratic budget increases spending by enough to continue the President's initiative to hire 100,000 new teachers over seven years in order to reduce the average class size in first through third grade. Congress funded 30,000 new teachers last year, and the Democratic alternative supports those teachers and allows the hiring of 8,000 more.

Modernize Schools—The Democratic budget includes new tax credits starting in 2000 to pay the interest on almost \$25 billion in bonds to build and modernize up to 6,000 public schools. It also continues welfare-to-work and employer-provided post secondary education tax credits.

Increase Special Education—Because the Democratic budget provides \$2.6 billion more for 2000 than the Republican budget, Democrats have more room to increase funding for special education. The Republicans increase elementary and secondary education funding by only \$500 million above a freeze. Unless they cut other elementary and secondary education programs, they can only increase funding for special education by the same amount.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Spratt amendment. I voted against the Balanced Budget Amendment of 1997 because I knew it was unrealistic. I knew that when we got to this backloaded end of this process, we would be facing absolute impossibilities in meeting the needs of this country. We are there.

The gentleman from South Carolina has written a budget within the rules. Those rules are caps on spending that Members are going to find impossible to appropriate within between now and the end of this session. I know every-

body on the other side is waiting for the June estimates from CBO, hoping that God will come with billions more dollars to spend and that suddenly we will have some relief. But the fact is that what is happening in this House, and the American people have to understand it, is that those people who want to reduce the size of government are using a very interesting technique. The technique is, erode the tax base so that there is no money and then put social programs and defense head to head. We are headed for some very serious problems.

Now, my belief was that all the mistakes that the gentleman from Wisconsin talked about were very real back in the 1980s, but now we have \$5 trillion worth of debt. The gentleman from South Carolina says, "Let's deal with Social Security, let's deal with Medicare, let's pay down the debt." The Republican alternative is, "Let's figure out some way to shuffle it around on a two-page document, smoke and mirrors, and come to the Committee on Ways and Means and give away billions of dollars in taxes again."

Now, if you will not pay your credit card debt, you deserve to lose your credit card. What is happening in this budgeting process is you have all this credit card debt that you have built up all those years, you now have a surplus, and you say, "Let's go on another spending spree." This budget that the gentleman from South Carolina has says, "We're going to take care of the essentials." What people worry about is their security when they are old, their Social Security, their Medicare. Yes, when the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) gets old, he will worry about his Medicare, too, and so will his mother and so will everybody else's mother and uncle and aunt if we do not deal with those issues.

The Republican alternative has not one single penny of additional money in the budget for dealing with the problems of Medicare. It should fail. The Spratt amendment should pass.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

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

Mr. SPENCE. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, when it comes to national security, there is no debate about which plan under consideration best provides for our men and women in uniform. Over the President's objection and under threat of veto, the Republican budgets in fiscal years 1996 through 1998 increased defense spending by more than \$20 billion over the President's budget in an effort to address some of our military's most critical unfunded quality of life, readiness and modernization shortfalls. The funds were desperately needed, but it was not enough.

Last fall, the Nation's military leadership indicated that the President's defense budget was short by at least \$150 billion in critical areas, like pay, housing, modernization, spare parts, maintenance funding and on and on and on. What was the President's response? His budget provides for only about 50 percent of what the Joint Chiefs said was needed. And even that 50 percent is explicitly held hostage to the President's domestic political agenda, while also assuming that the spending caps are broken.

The military's needs are real. The President's defense budget, which itself falls short of meeting the military's minimum requirements, is not. Under the leadership of the Speaker and with the support of our chairman of the Committee on the Budget the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the Republican budget goes a long way towards addressing the Joint Chiefs' unmet requirements. Under the leadership of the Speaker and with the support of the gentleman from Ohio, the Republican budget adds \$30 billion to the defense budget, including more than \$8 billion next year. And contrary to earlier accusations made by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the Republican budget will provide \$3 billion in additional outlays just next year alone. These extra funds will provide for everything from a 4.8 percent pay raise to better family housing, to more robustly modernized and dramatically improved readiness.

So contrary to concerns expressed by some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, again the Republican budget will take care of the troops, will take care of their families, will take care of readiness and will take care of modernization shortfalls far more effectively than the President's budget will. There is no contest.

Support the troops. Support the Republican budget.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks and express my appreciation for his leadership dealing with our national defense.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the Spratt alternative and in opposition to the Republican budget resolution.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Spratt Alternative and in opposition to the budget resolution before us because I call it the Fable of three evils.

This budget will continue and even accelerate trends away from a progressive tax system. We rely more and more on payroll and property taxes and are less dependent on a progressive income tax. This budget offers tax

relief for the rich and uncertainty for everyone else.

Secondly, only as this process moves into appropriation reality will the American people understand the basic unfairness, the cold-heartedness which lie at the base of these numbers presented here today.

This budget calls for \$200 billion dollars in discretionary cuts in future years. Imagine what this could mean for veterans, senior citizens, children, schools and hospitals.

Thirdly, this budget is built on forecasts which may or may not become real. The Congressional Budget office warns that if economic conditions change, the budget deficit or surplus projections could be off by more than \$85 billion dollars and become a political football.

This budget does not reflect the needs of my district where the median income is \$25,250. This budget cuts the heart out of senior citizens with the \$9 billion Medicare cuts and puts healthcare at risk for millions with the \$1.2 billion cut in Medicaid.

I fully support a pay raise for our soldiers in the military; solvency for the social security trust fund; food stamps for elderly immigrants, medicaid for children, pregnant women and legal immigrants with disabilities. Therefore, I support the Spratt Alternative and urge its passage.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, many American children go to school each morning in crumbling schools with poor heating in winter, leaky pipes and paint peeling off the ceiling. Our children deserve better than this.

Many American children are in classrooms with one teacher for 30, 35 or 40 students. Our children deserve better than this.

Our future is only as bright as the education we provide for our children today. I know people are used to Members of Congress talking about the importance of educating our children, but actions speak louder than words. The Democratic budget provides for 100,000 new teachers so that our children get more individualized attention in the classroom. The Democratic budget has an initiative to modernize our aging public schools. The Democratic budget invests in higher education so that everyone who earns a place in college can go to college. We Democrats believe that education needs to be a top priority.

Republicans have a different set of priorities. They cut \$16.7 billion over 5 years for higher ed and social services. They cut education by 16 percent by the year 2009. They would rather give a big tax break to someone earning \$200,000 a year or more than provide a good school for a child to realize their God-given capabilities. They would rather spend \$775 billion on a tax cut than use that money to make sure our schools provide for a world-class education. Of course it is tough to know exactly how they will fund their tax cuts for the wealthy because they do not tell us. Will it come from Head Start? From college student loans and

aid? Or maybe they will do what they first tried to do when they became the majority and eliminate the entire Department of Education.

Their budget is like playing Russian roulette with our children's future. That clearly is the difference between Republicans and Democrats, having a different vision of the future. The one that we need is the Spratt Democratic substitute. It provides for the type of vision that educates our children in the next century.

□ 1815

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY).

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

Mr. Chairman, let me just get to the point of matter. This is really very simple.

Every young Member, every young working man and woman in this country, young couple with their own children, their own family, their own hopes for their own life, is paying a very heavy payroll tax, many times on both incomes. Doing what they can to support their family but paying that heavy payroll tax; for what? For what they believe is the Social Security, retirement security, Medicare, health security of their grandma and their grandpa, and bless their hearts. These little guys, these young men and women, they make that payment. They make that payment because they believe this government is being honest. They think this government is taking that money for grandma and grandpa's retirement, and now they found out that has not been the case.

As late as 1994, the last year the Democrats were in the majority, \$100 billion of their hard-earned tax dollars did not go to grandma and grandpa's retirement security or to their health security but to other welfare programs, for all kinds of things. That is not only a betrayal of grandma and grandpa, but that is a betrayal of each and everyone of those young working men and women, these young parents that are working so hard and making such a sacrifice.

How do we change that? The first thing we did was get rid of the deficit. We reformed welfare, we saved Medicare from insolvency, we reformed five major entitlement spending programs, and today for the first time in their life we have an opportunity to tell every young working man and woman in this country that every dime that they pay in payroll taxes will go for the purpose that they pay it, to support grandma and grandpa's and then, yes, some day their own retirement security through Social Security and Medicare. The Democrats are pretending to that, but they compromise it. They cut it off. They cut back because they cannot give up their big spending programs.

But what makes this budget different that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KA-

SICH) and this Republican committee has brought to the floor is right here: \$200 billion more. To Mr. Young Working America: "Those payroll taxes that are such a burden in your family are in fact being saved for your retirement security through Social Security than what is done by the President. Two hundred billion dollars more of that money that you pay for that purpose that you are promised by this government will be used for that purpose."

It is time, Mr. Chairman, that this government get honest with the working people of this country and pay the respect to their grandmother and grandfather that they paid when they pay those payroll taxes. The one fundamental thing we must know about this, every dime of those payroll taxes goes to Social Security and Medicare. We set more of their hard-earned tax dollars aside for Social Security and Medicare than the President, and for the first time we are being honest with both the grandma and the grandpa and the young 20 and 30 year-old young parent that is struggling for their children.

This is our chance to do the one thing we never thought would get done in our lifetime. Let us do it tonight. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for having yielded the time to me.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN).

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the House budget resolution sponsored by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH). This budget is a solid step forward in the idea of limited government, of fiscal discipline and protecting Social Security and tax relief. By setting aside 1.8 trillion dollars over the next 10 years, the entire Social Security surplus plus interest, the Republican budget provides more money for the protection of Social Security and Medicare than does the President's budget. In addition, it locks this money away so it can only be used for reforming these important programs or for paying down the national debt. This is a great signal of our commitment to preserving the quality of life and income security of our Nation's seniors that they so richly deserve.

Mr. Chairman, retirement should be a time to enjoy things, the company of friends and family. It should not be spent worrying about where our money is going to come from to retire, about access to health care, about paying the rent.

The Republican budget also provides \$800 billion worth of tax relief over the next 10 years.

The Congressional Research Service recently reported that the average American family will end up paying \$5,307 more in taxes over the next 10 years than is necessary to operate government, and this is over and above the Social Security surplus. This represents a direct overpayment in taxes on the part of hard-working Americans. Incredibly the President's budget

actually increases taxes on working Americans. According to the Tax Foundation 38.5 percent of his budget, the President's tax increase, will be born by individuals who earn less than \$25,000 a year. Mr. President, how much is enough?

Mr. Chairman, I cannot think of a better way to begin the new millennium than by reestablishing trust with the taxpayers whom we represent by letting them keep more of their hard-earned dollars. I urge my colleagues to reject this alternative and accept our commitment to taxpayers, to the seniors, and support the Republican budget. It is their money; let us give it back.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding this time to me.

Our folks in the Armed Services need more ammunition, they need spare parts for readiness, they need better equipment, and they need better pay. They have told us what we need and what they need, and we should give it to them. There is not a budget here that gives them everything that they have requested for this year. Nobody's budget does that. But the Republican budget comes closer than anybody else. It gives 8 billion more in spending authority for the troops, and it gives 3 billion more in outlays.

Mr. Chairman, that means if my colleagues vote for the Republican budget, we are going to have better pay for our troops, we are going to have more spare parts, we are going to have a better chance of them coming home alive.

My colleagues should vote for the Republican budget if they care about defense.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), our Minority Leader.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the Democratic alternative and against the Republican budget, and I want to say tonight that I think we have to look at this issue from the viewpoint of people sitting around their kitchen table at home tonight looking at the issues that are involved in this budget.

It is not about charts, it is not about graphs, it is not about statistics, it is not about numbers. It is about ideas that make sense to ordinary Americans, working families who are sitting around the breakfast table or the dinner table talking about the problems that they face. What would they like to see happen in this budget?

First of all, they want Medicare and Social Security stabilized and extended, probably the two most important programs in peoples' lives. They

are popular programs, important programs on an everyday basis. The Democratic budget extends the life of Medicare by 12 years and the life of Social Security by 18 years.

We have a letter from the actuaries that say that our budget does that. They are not Republican actuaries or Democratic actuaries. They are actuaries, and their job is to give us information about ideas, and the Democratic idea they say extends the life of those two programs; in the one case, by 12; in the other case, by 18 years.

The Republican budget does not have that letter from the actuaries, so if our colleagues are worried about Medicare and Social Security, then they ought to vote for the Democratic budget.

The second thing people, I think, would like to do is pay down debt, pay down back debt so that we pass along less back debt to our children and grandchildren and we have less carrying cost or interest cost in future budgets. The Democratic budget is much better on that score.

The third thing they would like is targeted tax cuts, tax cuts that go to their problems. What are their problems? Long term care for their parents; that is a problem. We can have a targeted tax cut under the Democratic budget for that. They want tax cuts that have to do with U.S.A. accounts. I think the idea of being able to put more savings behind their Social Security so that they can have additional moneys to live on in their retirement is a very attractive idea that is in our budget.

The fourth thing that I think they are interested in is being able to have more funds available for education, for smaller class size, for more teachers, for health care, for housing, for the needs that people have on an everyday basis.

To me this whole issue is very simple. If we look at it through the eyes of ordinary American families who are out there tonight sitting around a table, if we are looking at the things that they care about, what I call kitchen table, everyday problems, this Democratic budget is far superior to the Republican budget on those issues, on those grounds.

This is a simple choice that Members have to make tonight.

I urge Members to vote for the Democratic alternative. If we get the votes to pass it tonight, it will be the budget of the United States, and I think it should be the budget of the United States because it is the budget of working families in this country.

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

Mr. Chairman, the Minority Leader summed it up very nicely. Every time that the majority has wanted a budget to target, to tackle, today, they have pulled out the President's budget and dragged it like a red herring across the path of this debate. Well, this is not the President's budget. It is like it in some respects, but different in other

respects. This is a different piece of work.

But there is a key aspect to it, the crowning aspect to it, that is like the President's budget. We Democrats created Social Security, and for the last 65 years we have been its guardians, and now that it faces the strain and stress it will face the next 25 years, we are not going to fail it.

So, if our colleagues look at our budget, by golly, we extend the life of Social Security until the year 2050, and we have a letter from a chief actuary of the Social Security Administration to prove it.

Secondly, next in pride and importance to us is one of our creations, Medicare. In 1968 we created it, and we have sustained it and protected it. The actuaries at the Health Care Finance Administration tell us it will run dry in the year 2008. The Republican budget leaves it in the lurch. Notwithstanding this warning from the actuaries, they do not put one thin dime. Out of all the billions that we see on the rise in the way of surpluses, not a nickel for Medicare. We, on the other hand, put several billions of dollars into this trust fund to sustain and extend its life until the year 2020.

That is what we do first. We do not rush into tax cuts until we have first protected Social Security and Medicare.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell my colleagues something else we do. Now that we are in the position to do it, we treat the trust funds generated, the surpluses generated by Social Security with sanctity. We do not touch them, we do not use any of the money, and we provide in our resolution reconciliation instructions that call for a real lockbox; no, a strong box; not something that rests on a thin reed of a point of order, the kind that gets overridden around here every week, they are honored in the breach. No, we have got statutory instruction to the Treasury that will ensure that this money is used only for the security and benefit of the Social Security Administration.

□ 1830

The proof of all of this is on the bottom line. There is the bottom line. If Members vote for the Republican resolution, the Social Security trust fund will have a balance of \$1.8 trillion 10 years from now. Now, that is not chump change.

Look what happens if Members vote for the Democratic resolution. Ten years from now, the trust fund will have a balance of \$3.4 trillion and it will keep growing through the year 2014.

What about Medicare? Vote for the Republican resolution and in 10 years it will be scraping bottom, \$14 billion, barely enough to operate on in the trust fund.

We will have a \$400 billion balance still left to ensure its solvency into the year 2020. Those are the differences between our budget and their budget. These are significant differences.

We have got a letter from the Health Care Financing Administration also certifying we extend the life of this program until the year 2020.

Furthermore, we spent some money doing this, but we pay down the debt more than my Republican colleagues do. Over 10 years, we pay down the debt \$146 billion more; over 15 years, by our calculation, \$474 billion more.

What does that mean? That these two programs which will depend upon a treasury not burdened with debt, not overwhelmed with debt service, will be in better condition than ever. Even though we save more, we also spend more. We understand what my colleagues on the Republican side are saying about tax cuts. We do some in our own budget and, in time, if these surpluses materialize, I think we will come back and do more tax reduction.

In this particular budget, we say we believe in people to the extent of wanting to invest in people because we think the investment in human resources and education and housing, in the environment and health is absolutely critical. If we are going to save Social Security and Medicare, when we have 2.13 people working for every person retired, then they have got to be productive citizens, and we invest in the productive citizenry.

What do my friends on the other side do? At every turn, they opt for a tax cut. Now, there is nothing wrong with tax cuts but this budget is fixated on them, and a lot of the problems that we have been able to poke holes in today arise from the fact that my Republican colleagues are so totally committed to that and nothing else. In the area of health care, they brag about plussing up NIH but in truth they diminish the function for health.

In the case of the veterans, their own chairman said they needed \$1.9 billion. The committee spurned him, gave him \$900 million one year and nothing, \$500 million less than the freeze for the next 5 years. In the case of agriculture, they set up a crop insurance program. So do we. \$6 billion a year. In the year 2004, they quit funding it. About the time it gets established they pull the pumps out. We put \$9 billion more in.

Why do my Republican colleagues do that? Why do the cuts get so big in the outyears? Because they have to make room for this enormous tax cut that keeps growing and growing and growing.

Let me say what the consequences are. This tax cut is \$779 billion over 5 years. By our extrapolation, if we extend it forward at the rate of growth in the economy, it will be \$1.11 trillion in the period 2009 to 2014.

Now, why is that period significant? That is the very time when the Social Security trust fund will start taking in less payroll taxes than it pays out in benefits, and at that point in time the budget of my Republican colleagues, their tax cut, takes its heaviest toll on the treasury, placing the treasury in jeopardy of securing these two programs.

No, my friends on the other side do not cut them. They do not cut Medicare and they do not cut Social Security but they cut taxes in a way that could very well jeopardize their future because of that huge, mounting, swelling tax cut in those outyears when the money is needed most.

Are there differences between these two budgets? We better believe there are differences. This is a better budget. We save more. We spend more. We spend it more responsibly, and we can go down our checklist to see.

We would like to put more teachers in the classrooms in the elementary years. Talking about investing in people, that is when it really pays off. I believe in that. We provide for it. We would like to build better schools, better structures, and we want to help those districts that are poor districts and cannot do it. So we put in the Tax Code some tax credits to help them float school bonds.

We think working mothers deserve better child care credit. We expand them. On down the list, this is a better budget. It is better for Democrats, better for Republicans, better for the country. I suggest everybody vote for it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to first of all compliment the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT). He is a great gentleman. He is also a very smart man and an incredible father of children who are, frankly, accomplishing more than he has accomplished here. They are doing great. They are all doctors.

Mr. SPRATT. I thank the gentleman for his compliment.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I must oppose the gentleman for about four or five reasons. Number one, it spends \$515 billion more over the next 10 years than the Republican budget. Secondly, it provides almost \$30 billion less for defense than the Republican budget over the next 5 years. It provides only \$115 billion of net tax relief over 10 years, less than a penny on the dollar, and it also breaks the caps, the spending authority, the proposal we passed in 1997 to balance the budget, by \$23 billion in budget authority and \$16 billion in outlays. It increases our national debt to about \$8.5 trillion by 2009.

So I would ask the Members of the House to oppose the Spratt budget. It spends too much. There is too little for defense, too little in tax relief for Americans. It unfortunately breaks down the discipline of the 1997 budget agreement and adds to our national debt. For those reasons, while I have great respect for the gentleman from South Carolina I would ask the Members to reject the Spratt amendment, and then we will move on to final passage in a short period of time.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Democratic Budget Alternative.

Given the great amount of time we have paid over the past several years to the critical

issues of paying down the national debt, ensuring the solvency of Medicare and Social Security, and targeting tax cuts in a fiscally responsible manner, I am pleased that the Democratic Alternative embodies these important priorities.

In my view, a comparison of the Democratic and Republican budget proposals clearly indicates who has been listening to the American people and who has not. The annual budget is meant to serve as a barometer of what our country needs to thrive and be successful now and in the future. While the Democratic Alternative provides thoughtful guidelines to keep our country on course, the Majority's proposal can be likened to an uncontrollable storm that threatens to decimate the significant amount of progress that has been made in getting our nation's financial house in order.

Let's take a quick look at some of the differences.

The Democratic Alternative provides \$40 billion in targeted tax cuts for those in need of dependent-care credits, long-term care credit, and school bond credits.

The Republican Proposal has \$143 billion in tax cuts in the next four years—and \$636 billion in tax cuts in the four years after that. In total, a whopping \$1 trillion dollars in tax cuts in ten years. These figures are so staggering that by FY 2009, these ill-advised tax cuts would become so large that they would exceed the entire non-Social Security surplus projected for those years.

The Democratic Alternative extends the solvency of Social Security to 2050 and the solvency of Medicare to 2020.

The Republican Proposal does not add one day of extended solvency to either of these critical programs.

And the Democratic Alternative pays down \$146 billion more debt than the Republican Proposal.

I also want to express my serious concerns about adequate funding for our nations veterans. I am troubled that those of us who sit on the Veterans Affairs Committee were prevented from even speaking about our alternative which included \$3.2 billion more for critical veterans programs than the Administration's funding levels. Representative Clement's efforts on behalf of veterans were treated equally as poorly by Republicans on the Budget Committee and Rules Committee. It is absolutely disingenuous what Republicans today have said about their concern for veterans, and quite frankly is a slap in the face of all veterans and a blatant slam to their intelligence.

Again, putting rhetoric aside and looking at the cold facts that the numbers illustrate—The Democratic Alternative provides an increase of \$2 billion in FY 2000 discretionary spending for veterans and \$106 billion in budget authority over 5 years. The Republican Proposal on the other hand offers our veterans the paltry crumbs of a \$900 million increase in FY 2000—which doesn't even cover the costs of inflation and pay for hard working VA employees. And then they turn around and slash funding for veterans by \$1.1 billion in FY 2001.

Mr. Chairman, the numbers speak for themselves. The Democratic Alternative reflects the priorities and needs of the American people. I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 173, noes 250, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 76]

AYES—173

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

NOES—250

Aderholt	Bishop	Cannon
Archer	Bliley	Castle
Armey	Blunt	Chabot
Bachus	Boehlert	Chambliss
Baker	Boehner	Chenoweth
Ballenger	Bonilla	Coble
Barr	Bono	Coburn
Barrett (NE)	Boyd	Collins
Bartlett	Brady (TX)	Combest
Barton	Bryant	Cook
Bass	Burr	Costello
Bateman	Buyer	Cox
Bereuter	Callahan	Crane
Berry	Calvert	Cubin
Biggert	Camp	Cunningham
Bilbray	Campbell	Davis (VA)
Bilirakis	Canady	Deal

DeFazio	Knollenberg	Rogan
DeLay	Kolbe	Rogers
DeMint	Kuykendall	Rohrabacher
Diaz-Balart	LaHood	Ros-Lehtinen
Dickey	Largent	Roukema
Doolittle	Latham	Royce
Dreier	LaTourette	Ryan (WI)
Duncan	Lazio	Ryun (KS)
Dunn	Leach	Salmon
Ehlers	Lee	Sanders
Ehrlich	Lewis (CA)	Sanford
Emerson	Lewis (KY)	Saxton
English	Linder	Scarborough
Everett	Lipinski	Schaffer
Ewing	LoBiondo	Schakowsky
Fletcher	Lucas (KY)	Sensenbrenner
Foley	Lucas (OK)	Sessions
Forbes	Manzullo	Shadegg
Fossella	McCarthy (NY)	Shaw
Fowler	McCollum	Shays
Frank (MA)	McCrery	Sherwood
Franks (NJ)	McHugh	Shimkus
Frelinghuysen	McInnis	Shuster
Galleghy	McIntosh	Stimpson
Ganske	McIntyre	Skeen
Gekas	McKeon	Smith (MI)
Gibbons	Mica	Smith (NJ)
Gilchrest	Miller (FL)	Souder
Gillmor	Miller, Gary	Spence
Gilman	Miller, George	Stark
Goode	Minge	Stearns
Goodlatte	Mollohan	Stenholm
Goodling	Moran (KS)	Stump
Goss	Morella	Sununu
Graham	Murtha	Sweeney
Granger	Myrick	Talent
Green (WI)	Nethercutt	Tancredo
Greenwood	Ney	Tanner
Gutknecht	Northup	Tauzin
Hansen	Norwood	Taylor (MS)
Hastings (WA)	Nussle	Taylor (NC)
Hayes	Ose	Terry
Hayworth	Owens	Thomas
Hefley	Oxley	Thornberry
Herger	Packard	Thune
Hill (MT)	Pastor	Tiahrt
Hilleary	Paul	Tierney
Hobson	Pease	Toomey
Hoekstra	Peterson (MN)	Traficant
Holden	Peterson (PA)	Upton
Horn	Petri	Visclosky
Houghton	Phelps	Walden
Hulshof	Pickering	Walsh
Hunter	Pickett	Wamp
Hutchinson	Pitts	Watkins
Hyde	Pombo	Watts (OK)
Isakson	Pomeroy	Weldon (FL)
Istook	Porter	Weldon (PA)
Jenkins	Portman	Weller
Johnson (CT)	Pryce (OH)	Whitfield
Johnson, Sam	Quinn	Wicker
Jones (NC)	Radanovich	Wilson
Kanjorski	Ramstad	Wolf
Kasich	Regula	Young (AK)
Kelly	Reynolds	Young (FL)
King (NY)	Riley	
Kingston	Rivers	

NOT VOTING—10

Barcia	Dingell	Smith (TX)
Brown (CA)	Hostettler	Stupak
Burton	Metcalf	
Cooksey	Pelosi	

□ 1853

Messrs. PHELPS, EHLERS, and CAMPBELL changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall No. 76. Had I been present, I would have voted "no".

The CHAIRMAN. The final period of general debate is now in order.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

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

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I will need to take the 5 minutes allotted me. Before Members make the decision to vote for this resolution and put the country potentially on this fiscal path for a number of years to come, I want to suggest that Members think twice. I want to point out the consequences of it.

I am not opposed to tax cuts. Members will find in our budget resolution \$62 billion in the first 5 years, \$164 billion in the second 5 years.

□ 1900

As I said in the debate, when we find whether or not these surpluses are for real, whether these billions of dollars are actually going to materialize out in time, then we can revisit tax reduction and do it on a sensible basis and not bet on the come, bet as if everything projected on paper is going to take place, and we can do a \$779 billion tax cut with no consequences to the budget.

These are the tax cuts that we plotted here: \$143 billion in the first 5 years, \$436 billion in the next 5 years. Then, if we extrapolate those tax cuts at the rate of growth of the economy, in the third 5-year period, between 2009 and 2014, they will grow, by our calculation, to a loss of revenues of \$1.11 trillion.

What does that mean? It means, first of all, that in the years we are talking about, 2009 to 2014, when the Social Security program may need assistance because the administrator of the Social Security Administration will be taking in less in payroll taxes than he is paying out in benefits, my colleagues' tax cut will take maximum toll on the Treasury.

Indeed, if these surpluses do not materialize, my colleagues may indeed be cutting into the Social Security surpluses to bite their protestations that they will not touch them. This tax cut may lead inevitably to that. That is somewhat speculative, but I think it is a real risk. This is not a risk.

The reciprocal of these tax cuts is a matching decline in discretionary spending. So while my colleagues have talked about doing more for education, if they look at their budget, when they get to the out years, starting in 2005, they do \$50 billion less than we provided.

If my colleagues go through the budget, there are all kinds of anomalies in the budget. These are the reasons for it. When my colleagues get to NIH, both in the Senate and in the House, the Republicans touted the National Institutes of Health, said we were going to do more. We looked to see how they did it, only to find that the health function was shrinking.

NIH is 52 percent of the health function in this budget. How in the world are my colleagues going to enlarge NIH while they shrinking the function is a

mystery to me. It certainly comes out of the hide of other important public health programs.

Look at veterans programs. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP), the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, wrote the committee, the Committee on Budget, after a vote taken by his Committee on Veterans' Affairs and said, I need a minimum of \$1.9 billion to keep the promises we have made to our veterans every year.

What my colleagues did in their budget was give him \$900 million, not \$1.9 billion, but \$900 million. Then, in 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, it disappeared. It did not recur. As a consequence, over that 5-year period of time, instead of giving veterans more to meet the benefits of the World War II population, which is getting older and older, they gave them less, \$500 million less than a 1999 freeze.

Why did my colleagues do it? They are trying to accommodate this tax cut. This budget is fixated on a tax cut. There is nothing wrong with going with tax reduction, particularly when we see these surpluses, but that is all they have got in this budget.

Let me take the case of agriculture. My colleagues' committee put \$6 billion in the budget for the creation of a crop insurance program. That is a centerpiece of what agriculture wants this year. Six billion dollars over a 5-year period of time. We matched it.

But guess what happens in 2005, about the time my colleagues are getting this crop insurance program up and running and well established? The funding disappears. My colleagues tell the Committee on Agriculture, go find mandatory sources to offset the cost, which will be \$9.1 billion. We were able to squeeze it in our budget. My colleagues were not because of their fixation on doing the biggest tax cut since Kemp-Roth. Throughout the budget, that holds true.

Let me tell my colleagues where it really holds true: national defense. My colleagues went to the trouble of putting \$29.6 billion in this budget for national defense. They did not fund the out years. They are lower than the President. They have got a flat budget. In the near term, the \$30 billion that they put up is not matched by outlays. All of it because this is an unbalanced budget. It is not a balanced budget is not a balance. It ought to be rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, this majority took control in 1995. The first budget that we saw in our majority was from the President that showed deficits as far as the eye could see. We fought very hard. We took some real political hits because we wanted to deal with programs that had never been dealt with before.

In the process of dealing with Medicare, something that we paid a high political price for, not only did we deal with the problems of Medicare, but we extended the life of the program for 13 years. We are very proud of that.

In addition to that, we got to 1997, and we stayed on our path towards a balanced budget. Because of our persistence and because of some of the bipartisan support from people on the other side of the aisle, we joined together, and we worked with the President, and we created a historic agreement in 1997.

Now we take a look at the situation in regard to the future and now, rather than having deficits as far as the eye could see, we have surpluses as far as the eye can see.

We want to use those surpluses to do several things, things that we never thought were possible in 1995 when we won the majority. For the first time, we are going to keep our mitts off the money that we collect from Social Security and Medicare. Politicians have only been talking about it.

Frankly, there were some on the other side of the aisle that said that we ought to move it off budget, and I pay tribute to them. But do my colleagues know what? We have been able to be intellectually honest to take the money from Social Security, the payroll taxes, and lock it up and keep our fingers off of it.

In the meantime, we are going to pay down some of the national debt. Many of my colleagues who have served here for 25 years, did they ever think, did they ever think, not only would we have a balanced budget, but we begin to reduce the publicly held debt last year by \$50 billion. We all should take credit for that. Then this year, under our proposal, we will reduce the publicly held national debt by an additional \$125 billion. Unthinkable in the past.

We intend to save the \$1.8 trillion. Do my colleagues know what we really want to do with it? We not only, all of us, not only want to protect the programs for our mothers and fathers, but we want to use the surplus as a leverage to transform Social Security and Medicare so that it will use this surplus to, not just save the programs for our parents, the elderly who does not want the rug pulled from under them, but do my colleagues know what else we can do with this surplus? We can use the power of the American system, the American economy, to set ourselves free so that, not only mom and dad are going to get the benefits, but there will be hope for the baby boomers and their children.

We must not squander this opportunity to transform these programs, to make them more personal, and to make sure, not only mom and dad, but all of us and our children will have the same kind of retirement security that we all hope and dream for.

At the same time, we have decided not to walk away from the 1997 budget agreement. We want to live within the spending caps. But within those caps, we want to emphasize defense. We want to say that our troops need more, that we need better readiness, we need better training, that we can buy the needed equipment.

Over these next 5 years, we are going to struggle to do it, and we were going to work with the Committee on Armed Services to make sure that our military is second to none.

At the same time, we are going to prioritize education. Maybe at some point we will actually be able to look at the special education programs that we have mandated on local schools and say that we will keep our promise to those school districts.

Does that mean some tough choices have to be made? Let me tell my colleagues, with my friends on the Committee on Appropriations, they are not walking around the floor winking at one another. I know they are ready to start the job to make some choices.

I do not think we want to abandon the 1997 agreement. It is too important to all of us. We all have a stake in it. If we can stay with it, we will not get in the way of this economic growth.

Then, finally, Mr. Chairman, as it relates to tax relief, look, we are going to have on budget surplus aside from Social Security and Medicare. I would love to tell my colleagues that we could just leave it here and use it to pay down more debt. But we have all been here long enough to know that the temptations of spending that money to create bigger government are inevitable.

So what we really want to do, if we want to return power to people, if we really want to emphasize the dignity and power of the individual in the next century, we want people to have more power, more control over their lives; and tax cuts are the best manifestation of it. Do my colleagues know why? Because the more one has in one's pocket, the more one's children has in their pockets, the more one's parents has in their pockets, the more they can pursue their destiny and the American dream.

Every day, we ought to work to meet the challenges that the government must meet, but at the same time empower people.

What this resolution does is historic. It begins to transform the programs that provide retirement security while maintaining fiscal discipline while returning a big chunk of the revenue of the Federal Government back in the pockets of the taxpayers. Approve the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. CAMP, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 68) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2009, pursuant to House Resolution 131, he reported the concurrent resolution, as amended by

the adoption of that resolution, back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the concurrent resolution, as amended.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 208, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 77]

YEAS—221

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

NAYS—208

Abercrombie	Baird	Barrett (WI)
Ackerman	Baldacci	Becerra
Allen	Baldwin	Bentsen
Andrews	Barcia	Berkley

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

NOT VOTING—5

Burton	Pelosi	Stupak
Paul	Smith (TX)	

□ 1924

So the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall No. 77. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on the vote for final passage of H. Con. Res. 68.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the concurrent resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 1141. An act making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 1141) "An Act making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. STEVENS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. BOND, Mr. GORTON, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. BURNS, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. GREGG, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CRAIG, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. KYL, Mr. BYRD, Mr. INOUE, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. HARKIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. REID, Mr. KOHL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DORGAN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. DURBIN, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

THANKS TO THOSE INVOLVED IN BUDGET PROCESS

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

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment to thank the members of the Committee on the Budget, in particular the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), for his great work throughout this process.

And, of course, the people who are the unsung heroes, the members of the staff, Wayne Struble and his whole team. They have done a fantastic job and worked many late nights.

The same would go for Mr. Kahn, the staff director of the minority side. Without the staff and without the members of the Committee on the Budget, of course, we would never be successful.

Furthermore, I would like to just spend a second to pay a little tribute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), because while he is as tough a partisan fighter as I have ever been up against, at the same time he does it with style. He is not looking to be a cheap-shot artist. And when he can give us a break on our side, he does, and we try to do the same for him.