

□ 1752

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. UPTON) at 5 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.

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 concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 68. Concurrent resolution 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.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. Con. Res. 68) "A concurrent resolution 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" and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 68, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET—FISCAL YEAR 2000

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 68) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2009, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES OFFERED BY MR. SPRATT

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Spratt moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 68 be instructed, within the scope of the conference, to insist that the huge and fiscally irresponsible tax cuts set forth in the reconciliation directives in the concurrent resolution be reported at the latest possible date within the scope of the conference, and to require that the reconciliation legislation implementing those tax cuts not be reported any earlier, to provide the Congress with sufficient time to first enact legislation extending the solvency of the social security and medicare trust funds consistent with the sense of the Congress language in section 315(b)(4) and (5) of the Senate amendment and findings in 322(a)(1)-(3) of the Senate amendment and

provisions in sections 5 and 6 of the House concurrent resolution because of the pre-eminent importance of so enhancing retirement security without reducing benefits and because projected budget surpluses should first be reserved for the use of those trust funds consistent with section 315(a)(4) and (5) of the Senate amendment and sections 5 and 6 of the House concurrent resolution rather than dissipated through the resolution's tax cuts which jeopardize the future of both social security and medicare.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

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

My motion to instruct conferees demands that Congress deal with the solvency of the Social Security and Medicare trust funds before we enact huge tax cuts that could drain the budget of the very funds that are needed to save, protect and make solvent for the long run Social Security and Medicare.

By our calculation, in the first 5 years this proposed tax cut will take \$143 billion out of the resources of the Federal Government. The next 5 years it will be \$788 billion. And in the third 5-year period of time, occurring around the year 2009, just when Social Security and Medicare need it most, in that 5-year period of time alone by our calculation, this conference report, if enacted and reconciled, would drain the Treasury of \$1.066 trillion and leave Social Security and Medicare high and dry.

The motion we make is similar to a motion I made in committee and it is similar to an amendment that we brought to the House floor. It simply says, let us deal first with Social Security, then with Medicare; let us establish them as priorities.

Mr. Speaker, we have come farther than anyone would have expected since 1993 in eradicating the so-called budget deficit, the year-to-year deficit. We now face the next big challenge. If we can step up to it, we can turn the corner into the next century in better fiscal condition than this country has been in a long, long time. But we cannot lay claim to that until we have dealt with Social Security and Medicare. We cannot deal with Social Security and Medicare and make them solvent for the long run, assuredly solvent, 50 to 75 years, unless we deal with them first.

If we first pass a tax cut of the magnitude proposed by this budget, we will leave Social Security and Medicare unattended, neglected, and we will leave the budget without the resources necessary to do anything about those programs in the future.

In the well of the House just a couple of weeks ago when this budget resolution passed, I pointed out the fact that I am not opposed to tax reduction. We have got it in our own budget resolution. I think in due course it is very much in order, given the surpluses that we see projected. I think they should

materialize before we commit ourselves to a big tax reduction, but their budget, the resolution before us, is fixated on tax reduction to the extent that when it comes to dealing with national defense, they flatten the President's budget out in the last 5-year cycle. In dealing with veterans, they actually cut the allocations for veterans' programs at a time when our World War II veterans are swelling to the point that they need it most. They deal with crop insurance for 5 years and then cut the money off in order to provide for more tax cuts. They say that they are for funding more for the NIH, but they take the function for health in the budget and actually give it less, all in the name of maximizing the tax cut.

What we are saying is, as to these other programs, the time and day will come when we can sort through those priorities, but as to Social Security and Medicare, there is no question that they have primacy, they should come first, they should come before tax reduction. That is the gist of this motion to instruct conferees.

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

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

I have just been handed essentially this motion to instruct. In a spirit of just being back from the break that we have been on, I am trying to ignore a lot of the kind of inflammatory language that is contained in this motion to instruct, like the word "irresponsible" tax cut. That, to me, is an oxymoron, an irresponsible tax cut. There is no such thing as an irresponsible tax cut. But, I mean, if the gentleman from South Carolina wants to call this fiscally irresponsible, I do not know that I want to get into a big fight with him about that.

Essentially, the way I read this motion to instruct, it is basically saying that we should take the latest possible date within the scope of the conference and require that the reconciliation legislation implementing those tax cuts not to be reported any earlier. It does not seem as though it has got any real force to it.

□ 1800

The gentleman is just saying, "Can you put off the reconciliation as long as possible?" That is the way I read this. The gentleman from South Carolina, is there something more than that that he is trying to say?

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

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

Mr. SPRATT. I am trying to say a lot more than that, Mr. Speaker, but to stay within the scope of what is permissible, I have to say do not do it except as the last act. But I am saying to the gentleman the responsible thing, the responsible thing is not to drain

the budget dry so that the resources there are not there to deal with Social Security and Medicare. The responsible thing is to deal with Social Security, deal with Medicare, and then address tax reduction.

Mr. KASICH. All right. I understand.

There is a reason to be thankful for small things like scope is what I can tell the gentleman because what this means is that basically the gentleman is saying that we have got to make sure that we take care and set aside money for Social Security and Medicare and do tax cuts in a way that it does not impact on that, is essentially what the gentleman is saying, and let me just say to the gentleman from South Carolina that it has been fully our intention, of course, to preserve for the first time in, I think, my lifetime, to be able to preserve all the money that gets collected from the payroll taxes for retirement security, and, as my colleagues know, we are going to save at least \$1.8 trillion, which is well over a hundred billion dollars more than the President for purposes of being able to transform Social Security and Medicare and not just so that our seniors will get it, but so that the baby boomers and their children will have a retirement program as well, and at the same time I think we made the argument a couple weeks ago for the other part of the surplus that gets produced by the income taxes and all the other taxes that flow into the Federal Government. We have an overcharge right now, and we believe that overcharge will be to the tune of almost \$800 billion.

So we have a twofold program, one to save \$1.8 trillion for Social Security and Medicare and an additional \$780 billion for tax cuts, and if what the gentleman is arguing for is that we ought to make sure our tax cuts do not impinge on Social Security, the fact is our resolution does that.

So, I will preliminarily say that I do not have any objection to the motion to instruct, and some of my colleagues have come to the floor, and I want them to take a look at it, but my initial reading is that I do not really have any objection outside of the inflammatory language that is contained in the resolution with words such as the fiscally irresponsible tax cuts, and I thought there was at least another one of those inflammatory words somewhere, but that is not such a big deal.

Another thing is the huge and fiscally irresponsible tax cuts. I mean any time we can make the government have a little less in its pockets and people have a little bit more, I think that is very good, and at the same time preserving for the first time since I have been in the Congress all the money we collect from Social Security I think is a huge step forward.

So I will reserve the balance of my time at this point and would preliminarily, unless some of my colleagues here object, would accept the motion to instruct.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor really to thank the gentleman from Ohio. The closer we get to the presidential election, the more common sense really reaches this body.

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

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

Mr. KASICH. Be careful, I may have his words taken down.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, there was a time when people used to run around asking for \$800 billion tax cuts, and some got closer to a trillion, there was whispering of people meeting in the middle of the night in Michigan asking for 10 percent across the board, and knowing the gentleman from Ohio and his concern about the common folk, and those that drive those milk trucks, and those that are Post Office employees, and just those that make our country so great, I know that when he does come up with a tax cut, and America sure deserves one, that it is going to be equitable, it is going to be fair.

I, of course, have to work more closely with the chairman of my committee, and we may not be able to participate with these formula cuts because we have dedicated ourselves to pull the coat up by the roots, and of course that is a little more complex than just setting aside a trillion dollars. But as we decide how we are going to do it with the gentleman's help, I hope that I heard him say that before we go to the American people to thank them for their productivity, to thank them for the excesses they have had to pay in taxes, especially the payroll tax, that we, as Democrats and Republicans and the House and the Senate, will present to them a secure Social Security system for their children and for their children's children. And even though I know that in the past Medicare has not been a word that the other side likes to talk about much, I am assuming that the same deep-seeded commitment that we have to meet our obligations in the future for Social Security benefits will also repair the Medicare system so that that system will be there too.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what is going to happen in our various conventions, but I know one thing. If I do not hear my side talking as straight talk as the gentleman from Ohio is, if I do not hear that commitment from my side, that we are going to fix the Social Security system for the American people, we are going to fix the Medicare system, and then we are coming back with fair and equitable reduction in people's taxes; that is not a Republican talking, that is a good American.

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

I love when a speaker can drip with irony and cynicism about the intentions of what we are doing with our fiscal program, but I would choose not to think that the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) would be at all cynical about our intentions because I think the gentleman would have to admit, would have to recognize, the fact that for virtually all of the time of my lifetime we have stolen from the Social Security Trust Fund, and we have spent it on other programs, and for the first time we intend to lock up the \$1.8 trillion and keep it in reserve, and it will be kept in reserve for purposes of being able to transform the Social Security and the Medicare program, retirement security programs. That is why we have actually saved over a hundred billion dollars in revenues.

I also want to compliment the gentleman for saying that he likes the idea of a tax cut. I wonder if the gentleman may be running for mayor of New York, that he might be giving consideration to that considering the fact that he has made the comment that he likes the idea of tax cuts. I want to compliment the gentleman from New York for coming in our direction.

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

Mr. KASICH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I think there will be more political opportunities for me in the House, but having said that, the gentleman from Ohio did not say that he was just going to re-serve the money for Social Security and Medicare. He said that he was going to fix these programs, and then we get on working together for a tax cut. I thought I heard the gentleman correctly when I came over here.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, let me just say to the gentleman that we stand ready, willing and able to be able to move forward on a program that would be able to transform Social Security not just for our parents, but for the baby boomers and their children, and of course we had this opportunity with the Medicare Commission that the President rejected. But I certainly believe that we need to look at creative programs like letting individuals keep 2 percent of the payroll taxes to invest in the American economy, just like Federal employees do, and I think we need to breathe new life into Medicare. I am pleased about the fact that the Republican Congress was able to be significantly involved in terms of extending the life of Medicare.

But let me say to the gentleman what we intend to do is to save all the money that we collect from the payroll taxes and use it at the current time to pay down debt, but we stand willing and able to work with the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the President of the United States to be able to transform those programs and at the same time be able to also give people some of their overcharges back in a tax cut.

So, what the gentleman should anticipate in our budget resolution and what he should anticipate later in the year is saving \$1.8 trillion from the payroll taxes to provide the retirement security that our seniors want, and the gentleman should also anticipate a tax cut moving through the United States Congress this year, and that is what I think the game plan is.

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

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, it is one thing to say they are going to put it in the reserve and reduce the Federal debt, and that is good. But I think what we are trying to do here is to get some type of commitment in saying that if we can delay how we are going to handle taxes until after we come together on Social Security and Medicare, that we will be working more closely together. The gentleman may want 100 percent of it to go in investments, private investments, but at least come up with something that we can say that we tried to do Social Security, we tried to do Medicare, and I think that would be better than just saying that we are putting it in reserve.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, as I listened to this discussion, I think maybe we should pass a resolution against dumping irony on this floor. When I hear the chairman of the Committee on the Budget say he does not know what an irresponsible tax cut is, that drips, Mr. Speaker, that drips.

There was a time when we had a President named Ronald Reagan who talked about, as my colleagues know, balancing the budget and all that fiscal stuff and then proceeded to drive the deficit higher than it has ever been in the history of this country by giving tax cuts and spending out of the Social Security money. Now it is for that reason we have this motion on the floor. There are some of us who think it is time now to pay down our credit card debt, and the credit card debt is not only in Social Security, but it is in Medicare.

Now I sat on the Medicare Commission for a year and watched people try and push the idea of privatizing Medicare, and that was the only solution they could come up with. Meanwhile, the President had a proposal laying on the table to put 15 percent of the deficit into strengthening Medicare, and it was not even considered by the Commission.

Now I have been waiting. I sit on the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Ways and Means, and I am waiting for the chairman to call a meeting and make a proposal by which he can make any way in saving Medicare. Nothing has happened in this Congress. We are at the 15th of April

almost, and everybody is real pleased this year that we have a budget resolution. But nothing is happening on the two biggest issues, and that is why we are concerned, that is why the motion is here, and I think that the gentleman from Ohio has also been very, very careful about the so-called lockbox that he says that he is putting the money into in the Committee on the Budget. That lockbox has a trap door in it that has a key that is possessed by the majority, and they are going to drop that door, and drop the money out and want to give a tax break, and that is the reason we want to make sure that Medicare and Social Security get dealt with before we go and give another tax break like 1986.

I have been in my district, and I have not had a single soul come up to me and say, "When are we going to have a tax break? How big is the tax break?" They all ask about what is happening to Social Security and what is happening to Medicare, and I think this Congress will make a serious error if we do not deal with those things first before we even have a discussion in the Committee on Ways and Means around the discussion of tax breaks.

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

□ 1830

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this motion to instruct, and I would hope that the chairman of the committee would be listening to this discussion because the major point of this resolution is to make sure that we do preserve and protect Social Security before we have a tax cut that literally explodes in the year 2010 to 2015.

The estimates of the budgets that we are now discussing in the conference between the House and the Senate position, if the tax cuts as currently being discussed go into place, it will mean that there will be a drain on the Treasury in 2010 to 2015 of some \$1.7 trillion at exactly the same time that Social Security will be running out of money. That is a point that is being overlooked in this exuberance for a tax cut, and I would sincerely ask the majority to take another look.

We all agree with preserving and protecting by taking the Social Security trust funds and applying them to the debt. That is great policy and everyone agrees to that. But when we have a tax cut that starts small and expands to \$1.7 trillion by 2015, exactly the same time that the monies paid into Social Security will no longer be adequate to pay out to the beneficiaries at that time, that is the point of this amendment.

I would much rather, as the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has said, have had a more straightforward motion, but this is an

excellent motion to set in the general principle that we will fix Social Security before we do anything else to spend any more of the Social Security trust funds than what we have already done.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) is correct when he says we have been doing this for the last umpteen years. What some of us would like to see now, and I know the Speaker agrees with this point, what some of us would like to do is change that, would change that right now. That is the point of this motion to instruct, and I hope that Members will pay particular attention to it because if we really and truly want to preserve and protect Social Security, this motion must be not only passed but accomplished in the conference and voted through the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). Without objection, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) will control the time of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH).

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS).

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, it is nice to be back and listening to the political rhetoric.

I came to the floor because the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) indicated that as chairman of the Subcommittee on Health I had not held a single meeting talking about making changes in the Medicare program.

We have been holding hearings taking a look at current Medicare and trying to deal with the current issues. Just as at the end of the last Congress we made adjustments in home health, we are looking at current areas. Although I find it ironic, because I also was for a year on the Medicare Commission, and for want of a single vote, we had a plan which in fact took the government entitlement to standard benefit and blended it with the savings in the marketplace.

It was a plan that was going to save a percent, a percent and a half in the outyears. It was a meaningful change. The President announced that none of his appointees were going to go ahead and support the plan, and he said he was going to offer a proposal.

So it seemed to me, based upon his State of the Union message and based upon his going out the day the Medicare Commission voted on a very responsible plan, saying he was going to come up with his own plan, that I thought I would say, let us see it, Mr. President. Because what we did was guarantee Medicare, guarantee prescription drugs integrated into a program in a responsible way and expanding 100 percent coverage to the low and near low income up to 135 percent of poverty.

The President has not laid a plan in front of us that shows us that. The

President told his appointees not to agree with that bipartisan, broad-based position. Ten of the seventeen members agreed. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) did not agree on the changes in 1997. He did not agree on the commission. I actually am looking forward to trying to find something that he agrees on. He does a great job of coming down and giving speeches in which he is able to point and criticize, but I would love to see a solution which captures a majority; not a single vote, as he was on the 1997 changes, 34 to 1, or in the minority on the Medicare commission. I reach out. Let us try to do something in a real bipartisan way.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, 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. Speaker, let me say first of all that I hope the chairman, the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), who is not on the floor, does accept this motion to instruct because if one reads the last part of it, it states that we would reserve the surplus rather than have it dissipated throughout the resolution's tax cuts which jeopardize the future of both Social Security and Medicare. That is what this is all about.

We would love to have a bipartisan budget resolution. Having a budget resolution would be a start, compared to last year when we had no budget resolution.

The fact is that the Republican budget really does not do anything for Social Security and Medicare. Sure, it saves the surplus that belongs to Social Security, but it does nothing more, and in fact it does not make up for the incurred liability from the years when the surplus in Social Security was spent. It creates a huge liability of nearly \$1.8 trillion over 15 years by locking in tax cuts which are based upon projected surpluses over 15 years, and I think that is a pretty weak basis on which to lock in those tax cuts.

What is going to happen is, when those 15-year projections do not turn out, we will go back to more deficit spending and we will add to the national debt and that will be to the detriment of Social Security, to the detriment of Medicare and to the detriment of the general economy as well.

Finally, this budget uses the old smoke and mirrors. It blows through the pay-go rules, it robs nondefense discretionary spending to pay for defense spending, and it relies on a mythical July CBO update that hopefully will allow us to write the appropriations bills. So it is not a real budget; it is a political document.

Maybe it is better to get one done than getting nothing done like last year, but the fact is, it does nothing for Social Security, and that is what the American people sent us here to do. It

does nothing for Medicare. It does not pay down the national debt to the extent that we ought to do. We offered a proposal to do that. It was rejected by the majority. We are eager, when my colleagues want to get serious, to sit down and do that.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the vice chairman of the committee.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat encouraged by what I hear from my friends on the other side because I think we have a real opportunity here to work together in a bipartisan fashion to, in fact, save Social Security.

Our budget does exactly that. We do dedicate \$1.8 trillion over the next 10 years to Social Security. That will go to pay down debt. That does not mean the program itself is reformed.

The real way that we have got to work together to save Social Security is to come up with true and meaningful reforms. I think we all agree to that.

I am encouraged by what I hear over here. My good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) who works with me on so many other issues of mutual interest made some good points. My friend, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), that I work with on the Committee on the Budget made some excellent points, and I think it is time that we came together on this issue of the budget, came together on the issue of Social Security, came together on the issue of Medicare, and let us work for meaningful reform. Let us take the numbers that both of us know we are dealing with.

Irrespective of what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) just said, we know what we are dealing with in the short term, and we have some idea of what we are dealing with in the long term. We can take those numbers and we can make it work, if we will work together. I look forward to working in a bipartisan fashion to truly save Social Security and truly save Medicare, and we thank the Members for wishing to join our team on that.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I stand in favor of this motion to instruct conferees to address the solvency of the Social Security and Medicare trust funds before enacting huge and fiscally irresponsible tax cuts that would drain the budget surplus. Virtually all economists, including the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Alan Greenspan, have argued that addressing the fiscal challenges posed by the impending retirement of the baby boom generation should take precedence over tax cuts.

Of course, the challenge is not just one facing Social Security but most especially Medicare as well. The Medicare hospital insurance trust fund in fact is projected to become insolvent

long before the Social Security trust fund. So a broad consensus has developed that we should address the long-term future of both of these programs, that that really is of the utmost priority on our national agenda.

Nonetheless, here we are about a fourth of the way through this first session of the 106th Congress and we have made no discernible progress on these two issues, which arguably are the most important domestic issues that face us.

Both the Senate and the House versions of the budget resolution would take us down a road that provides no help on extending the solvency of Medicare and Social Security. They do contain across the board as opposed to targeted tax cuts that would certainly grow in the future, in a way that jeopardizes the progress we have made in eliminating the budget deficit.

We did offer an alternative in committee and on the floor, we on the Democratic side of the aisle, an alternative that would buy down more debt and would transfer assets into these trust funds to extend their life. Unfortunately, that alternative was rejected.

At the very least, we should instruct our conferees now to include in the budget resolution provisions to put on hold attempts to enact a large tax cut that will consume the budget surpluses and more into the future.

We should at least put tax cuts off limits until the end of the fiscal year to give us time to seriously address the Social Security and Medicare challenges that face us. So I welcome the prospect of bipartisan cooperation on this and urge passage of the motion to instruct.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds just to respond to the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution basically is asking us to do what we intend to do and that is save Social Security first and then deal with tax cuts.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY MILLER).

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting listening to the debate on this side of the aisle. Some have said we need to continue our course and others say we need to have a bipartisan agreement on the budget resolution, and I wish that were possible.

However, this side of the aisle balanced the budget. The President wants to increase taxes, wants to spend more money. We fought in the past to continue the concept of welfare reform. The President vetoed welfare reform twice before finally deciding to follow our lead.

We are keeping the budget caps. The President wants to break the budget caps. For the last year, all I have heard from this side of the aisle is, we need to save Social Security.

Where is all the rhetoric now? Obviously one of the Members from the other side got his wish and some of my colleagues were beamed up.

All we have talked about is talk. This side of the aisle wants to set 100 percent aside for Social Security this year alone, \$137 billion, and over 10 years \$1.8 trillion.

The President wants to save 62 percent and spend this year alone \$58 billion on his programs, and over 10 years wants to set only \$1.3 trillion aside, compared to our \$1.8 trillion.

We provide for Medicare in our budget. The President cuts \$11.9 billion over 5 years out of Medicare. This side of the aisle believes working men and women should have a tax cut. The President proposed raising taxes \$172 billion over 10 years.

We provided \$22 billion for elementary, secondary and vocational education. That is \$1.2 billion more than the President proposes.

I wish we could come to a bipartisan agreement.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY).

□ 1830

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I just came back from conducting town meetings all across the State of North Dakota.

When the people I represent consider the priority in which this body and this Congress ought to move forward in response to the budget surplus, they uniformly come down, in town meeting after town meeting, with a strong consensus to do something about preserving and extending the solvency of the social security trust fund, to do something about extending the solvency of the Medicare trust fund.

The preceding speaker gave an awful lot of statistics, but the bottom line reality is this: The Republican budget resolution passed before the Easter recess by this House does not extend by one day the solvency of the Medicare trust fund, the solvency of the social security trust fund. That is what has led us to this motion to instruct we are offering this afternoon.

Just like the folks I represent think, I bet the folks throughout the country think that we need to take care of the existing responsibilities before we fritter away this surplus. That means doing something to extend trust fund solvency. That means that before tax cuts, we commit the resources to make sure that social security is prolonged and strengthened, that Medicare is prolonged and strengthened.

That is what is before us, Mr. Speaker, two alternatives: the budget resolution, which does not extend by a day the solvency targets for the trust funds, and would instead move the tax cuts forward; or the motion to instruct, which would make it very clear that this Congress, in a bipartisan way, hopefully, believes first things first: First we address the solvencies, then we look at what we can do with tax cuts.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I think my colleague on the other side of the aisle voted against the President's proposal. I know few people on the other side of the aisle who voted for it.

We in our budget resolution save social security, and with the surplus that goes above and beyond that, we are able to provide a tax cut instead of spending more, which my colleagues on the other side of the aisle seem to want to do, is to spend more. We do not.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. MARK GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, like so many others here today, I am fresh off a two-week district work period. During that two-week time, I had about a half-a-dozen town hall meetings, all of them on the budget. I had town hall meetings in Green Bay, Sturgeon Bay, Marinette, Appleton.

During that time I outlined what is in the budget resolution that we passed in this body last week. The reaction that I got was universal. The reaction was simply, well, it is about time. It is about time that we set aside the social security surplus for social security.

I have to pause here for a moment. My friend, my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, said, well, this does not do much for social security. It simply sets aside the surplus belonging to social security. I would agree with him philosophically, but it is something that this institution has failed to do for 30 years, so it is something important. It is something historic.

My constituents believe that these principles are long overdue. They believe in setting aside the social security surplus. They believe in paying down the debt. They believe in putting dollars into the programs that this president promised but failed to fund, like valuable money for crop insurance; like important, long overdue money for veterans' health programs. My constituents throughout northeastern Wisconsin want to see these principles implemented as soon as possible.

Today we are establishing a conference committee, and there are good arguments we have heard on both sides, arguments presumably we will hear within the conference committee, but today is not the day to let this deteriorate into partisan bickering. Today is not the day to try to snatch defeat from the jaws of victory.

Today is the day for us to move forward so these principles will be implemented as soon as possible, and on a bipartisan basis, because this is what we have been telling the American people we will do and this is clearly what they want.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, boy, this discussion has been heartening, because what I hear on the other side of the aisle is that they agree with the thrust of the Democratic budget

resolution, which is that no net tax cuts or additional spending should be passed until we extend the solvency of social security and Medicare. That is really the only major issue on which we have disagreed.

Now I hear from the other side of the aisle that we really do not disagree on that. That is what this resolution said, and simply, no tax cuts until we extend the solvency.

Now, we are told by independent, objective actuaries, ones that the other side uses as well as we do, that the Republican budget resolution does not extend the solvency of social security or Medicare for even one day. That means that we will go back to the drawing board together and come up with a proposal that we both agree on that will extend the solvency.

This is an intergenerational responsibility. Our parents met that responsibility. Not only did they win a war and ensure freedom for us, but they gave us the foundation of prosperity, which was fiscal responsibility. That is all we are suggesting we should do for the next generation.

Let us not use up all the trust funds for our own purposes. Let us not give ourselves tax cuts that we do not necessarily need, as much as we would like them, until we make sure that the next generation is going to experience as high a standard of living as we are experiencing. That is the least we owe them.

That is all our resolution does is to say, let us do our homework first before we give ourselves a big additional allowance. It is an intergenerational responsibility. It is what America ought to be all about. I am glad that the Republicans agree, no additional tax cuts until we extend the solvency of Medicare and social security. Now we can agree, we can move forward and do the people's business.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are going to save social security, not spend it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PAUL RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important to go back to the basics and point out what we are actually accomplishing in this budget. For the first time in over 30 years, for the first time in my lifetime, we are proposing to stop the raid on social security. We are proposing to stop taking our FICA taxes, our social security payroll taxes, and spending it on other government programs.

We are saying that for every dollar in social security taxes we pay, that will go to social security. For every dollar of Medicare taxes we pay, that will go to those programs. No longer will this become a slush fund for politicians. This money that we pay in our payroll taxes will go to those programs. That is a sea change.

On the contrary, the President has proposed to raid social security by the

tune of \$341 billion over the next 10 years. We hear this talk about social security surpluses, non-social security surpluses. What our budget plan is doing is doing this: One hundred percent of social security revenues go to social security.

If we do begin to overpay our income taxes, off of our income taxes, non-social security surpluses, rather than spending that money in Washington, we should get that money back. That is the difference we are talking about here.

The President, in his State of the Union address, did say he was going to extend the life of social security, but what he actually achieved was putting more IOUs in the social security trust fund. We need real reform of social security, not more IOUs. We have to start reforming social security by putting real money in the trust fund, by making sure that our payroll taxes do in fact go to social security, not to fund other government programs.

That is what this is about, honesty in accounting, honesty to the American people, and making sure that our payroll taxes go to the very programs they were designed to go to.

If we begin overpaying our taxes after we have set social security aside, after we have got our debt going down on a downward glide path, we ought to get our money back. Rather than sending more of our income tax dollars here to Washington and letting people sit around and finding different ways to spend it for us, we ought to get our money back.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and I thank him for bringing this resolution out onto the floor, because it makes quite clear in its language, and I read, that huge and fiscally irresponsible tax cuts set forth in the reconciliation directives in the concurrent resolution are in fact jeopardizing our ability to be able to deal with the social security and Medicare crisis in our country.

Now, if the majority, if the Republicans, want to vote for our resolution, then they are essentially now taking that oxymoronic position of being carnivorous vegetarians. They are trying to be both at the same time, which is fine, I guess, for this evening and trying to have it both ways, but the reality is that the Republican budget does not extend the solvency of the Medicare trust fund by one day. Instead, the Republican resolution ignores the dark clouds on the health care horizon and offers an \$800 billion tax cut proposal.

This hurricane that will hit the health care system is something that we all know to be real. We have the baby boom generation that is about to hit the retirement system, to start to have all of the health care problems that come with aging.

The Republicans insist on attacking the President's budget. We are not, on the Democratic side, defending the President's budget. We have a different budget on our side, one that does ensure that Medicare and social security is made solvent, that these programs are not cut in any way, and that we ensure that the tax cut of the Republicans does not dip their straws into this revenue and make it impossible for us to take care of ordinary families.

I hope that everyone in the House sincerely supports this Democratic motion. I am afraid that too many are going to pay tribute to it only by the hypocrisy which will be evident by, I am afraid, supporting something that at the end of the day they will never in fact support when the real votes come on the House floor.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to respond to my colleague from Massachusetts.

I would just point out that we set aside more money to save social security than the President does. We do it because we have set aside all the surplus of social security for the next 10 years. We box it in and do not spend it and do not use it as tax cuts.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, it is easy to hoodwink people who might be listening when we are sort of listening superficially, but I think it should be very clear that the Democrat proposal does not do anything more to save social security than the Republican proposal.

Members can say, well, here is scoring, and here is that. The fact is that we are going to have to come up with the same money to save social security with the Democrat proposal by saying, look, we are either going to cut other spending or we are going to increase taxes someplace. In fact, the Democrats' proposal implies that we are going to have to increase more taxes to save social security.

Look, this is historic. Both sides of the aisle should be supporting this budget, because for the first time in history, for the first time in at least recent history, in the last 40 years, we do not spend any of the social security trust fund money for other government programs.

Let me say it again, none of the social security surplus money is being spent for any other government spending. That is what this Chamber has been doing for the last 40 years. That is what has added to the predicament of social security and Medicare. No tax cuts from social security surpluses next year. That is historic, also.

We have problems, where we go in military spending. Maybe that military spending and supporting what is happening in Kosovo is going to reach into the social security surplus funds before we finish out the end of this year. This is a good start on a budget. Our next

step to save social security and Medicare has to be to step up to the plate, for people like the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CHARLIE STENHOLM), people like the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. JIM KOLBE).

Like I and so many others have said, let us face up to what really needs to be done to save social security by making some of those changes, by getting a better return on investment.

I would suggest that the Democrats and Republicans have come a long way in the last several years doing what needs to be done, and that means stop spending the social security surplus money.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we have come a long way, but we are still a long way apart. Number one, there is a major difference between our position and theirs in the two opposing budget resolutions brought to the Floor of the House 2 weeks ago.

First of all, we have a lockbox that works. Theirs has a loose lid and a trap door. We have one that works. It sees that the social security surpluses are used solely for social security.

Secondly, over 15 years, we pay down debt by \$474 billion. That in itself reinforces the solvency of social security.

Thirdly, we came to the Floor with a letter from the chief actuary of the Social Security Administration and made it part of the record of that debate, certifying that our proposal would extend the life, the solvency, of social security until 2052. They have no such plan. They have not added one day to the solvency of social security.

□ 1845

And, finally, this is our concern in this resolution. This is our concern that in acting, locking in these huge tax cuts that get bigger and bigger such that in the 5-year period from 2009 until 2014, we will have \$1.66 trillion in tax reduction at a time when Social Security will be in duress. What happens if these surpluses do not materialize? What happens to Social Security under the Republican budget? What happens if the surpluses do not materialize and the tax cuts do?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the problem, as the honorable gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, knows, is where do we come up with the money when there is not enough money coming in from Social Security to pay those benefits required? And the gentleman is just saying, let us add another giant IOU.

But still the problem comes down to coming up with that money to pay those benefits. That is what needs to be dealt with.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, do not take it from me;

take it from the chief actuary. Our plan extends the life of Social Security to 2052; the Republican plan does not extend it 1 day.

Mr. Speaker, 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. Speaker, listening to the debate that my colleagues just had brings me to where we are today and why we need to move on this motion to instruct conferees. It is a simple request that will have an enormous impact.

Interesting, my good friend on the other side of the aisle never really answered the question, where will those monies come from? That is why Democrats are simply asking that we put on hold, put on hold the large tax cut that is being proposed by Republicans so that it will not consume the surplus that we are trying to focus on, a very crucial issue—saving Social Security and Medicare.

In fact, if we would listen to people like Federal Reserve Chairman Greenspan, who has no ax to grind, he has argued that addressing the fiscal challenges posed by the impending retirement of those in the baby boomer generation should take priority over any tax cut. So in actuality, any suggestion of a tax cut without reasonably responding to how we best support and save Social Security does not make any sense.

Social Security and Medicare are too important to neglect. And without Social Security we will find that the elderly poverty rate would be 48 percent instead of the 11 percent that it is now. Without action to address Social Security, the trust fund will exhaust itself by 2034 and Medicare will exhaust itself by 2015.

The real key to what baby boomers understand and what working Americans understand is that if we do the Democratic plan, we will be able to reduce the debt and thereby interest rates because we will have the monies focused on the trust fund. And at the same time our budget resolution reduces the debt. We understand in black and white what it means to pay this higher interest rate without the reduction of the debt, which results in a lower interest rate on the mortgage payments so many working families have to pay if we do reduce the debt.

This is what Americans clearly understand efforts that will save them from high interest mortgage rates. It simply does not make sense that Republicans will not put a hold on their urgent desire for tax cuts which, in actuality, the 10 percent the preferred tax cut supported by the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman KASICH) of the Committee on the Budget goes mostly to those making over \$200,000 a year. Forty-eight million households in the United States will not even see the tax cuts.

So why are the Republicans trying to represent that now we are coming with a bundle of goodies—tax cuts. It is not a bundle of goodies, but a bundle of misconceptions. I urge the House to support this motion to instruct and let us make sure that we deal with the question of saving Social Security, saving Medicare. And further when Americans get the real results in their monthly mortgage payment because the debt is reduced they will see the real difference when they pay less interest on their mortgage payment. That will be the policy upon which we can stand and be united on—saving Social Security and Medicare while reducing the nation's debt.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the motion offered by Ranking Member SPRATT, which instructs the conferees to hold off on filing a report until this body passes legislation that will extend the life of Social Security and Medicare.

When the House version of the Republican Budget was passed just a few short weeks ago, it was heralded by the Majority as the move which saved Social Security. However, that assessment is incomplete, just as was the budget resolution. This is because, unlike the Democratic substitute that was offered at the time, it failed to place our surplus back into the Social Security Trust Fund. While Republicans continued to champion their budget, because it purportedly offered to take 100% of the surplus and put it aside for Social Security, they failed to advise the taxpayers that those funds, while set aside, could still be used for other purposes—like tax cuts for the wealthy.

Furthermore, the Republican Budget fails to do anything to extend the life of Medicare, which is just as important a program for our seniors. The Democratic resolution, on the other hand, would have extended the life of this poverty and life-saving program for another eighteen years. By failing to instruct the conferees to handle this pressing issue today, you are postponing for another year our opportunity to address this issue. By voting for this motion offered by Ranking Member SPRATT, we can send a signal to the American people that we are ready and willing to renew Medicare, and to provide a ready safety net should they suffer catastrophic illness.

We Democrats are not foreign to tax cuts. In fact, we have supported them in our budget resolutions. The difference is that our cuts are focused and disciplined. They benefit families by making childcare more affordable. They do not jeopardize our future for short-term gains, and they preserve our economy, which is enjoying its longest period of sustained growth since World War II.

I urge my colleagues to support the Spratt motion, and to support our efforts to preserve both Social Security and Medicare for our future generations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) has 9½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 4½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, the budget resolution that is debated on the

floor of the House and in the other body, as well, represents a blueprint, a broad outline of our vision and priorities for the future. And as this is the first budget resolution of the 21st century, it ought to reflect our economic priorities as we move into the next century as well.

Putting together that blueprint at the Committee on the Budget level, we asked some basic questions. First, what do we do about Social Security, one of the most important issues we will face this year? And as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) has clearly described, we said, let us end the raid on the trust fund; let us set aside the entire Social Security surplus, 100 percent, exclusively to strengthen Social Security and Medicare. In contrast to the President's budget that only set aside 62 percent of that surplus, and he spent the other 38 percent.

Then we asked the question: What do we do about spending and the growth of the Federal Government? And the answer to that question was: Let us respect the 1997 budget agreement, a bipartisan agreement that controls the rate of growth of government spending. It was put together through lengthy negotiations in 1997 and sets a limit on how large and broad the scope of the Federal Government should be.

Third, we said: Well, what about taxes? And this is an important question, because today taxes are at an all-time high; 20.5 percent of our Nation's economy is being consumed by taxes at the Federal level. And we said once we have set aside every penny of the Social Security surplus, if we have revenues higher than that we ought to give those back to the American people, because there are more of them working today than ever before. They are more productive, they are earning more, and they are paying more in taxes than they ever have before.

Mr. Speaker, we set aside every penny of the Social Security surplus, not 62 percent, as the President suggested. We adhere to the 1997 budget agreement instead of breaking it, as the President's budget does; and we provide for tax relief once we set aside the Social Security surplus, instead of raising taxes by \$100 billion.

It has been stated very clearly from the other side of the aisle when we make these comparisons between our budget resolution and the President's budget resolution: But we are not defending the President's budget. Do not force us to defend the President's budget.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States is the leader of his party, the leader of the strongest Nation on Earth, and we cannot find a single Member from the other side to defend his budget blueprint, the blueprint that should set the economic priorities for the future of this country, that should set the economic priorities for the first year of the next century, and we cannot find anyone that is willing to defend that budget.

We should support the principles that gave us the first balanced budget in 30 years, that strengthened Medicare, extended its solvency for another 10 years, and that gave the first tax relief in 16 years. Support the Republican principles that are embodied in this budget. Support this rule and let us move forward to economic prosperity.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I was interested to hear the Members on the other side talk about how they are planning to save Medicare. Never has salvation looked so unattractive.

Medicare is today hurting. The people in the State I represent, Massachusetts, used to have prescription drugs through their HMOs. Then the Republicans passed the Medicare bill in 1997 and they lost it. There was a reasonable home health care program in Massachusetts and elsewhere, and then the Republicans "saved Medicare" in 1997 and wrecked home health care along the way.

Hospitals are hurting, hospitals that are teaching hospitals and hospitals that deal with poor people. In 1997, the Republicans gave a capital gains tax cut and paid for it by cutting Medicare. So their notion of saving Medicare comes after they already, in 1997, made serious restrictions.

People listening ought to understand, if they think Medicare is perfect now they can thank Republicans for saving it in that fashion. I find it to be a serious problem.

And then the gentleman from California said, "We are going to fix it." How are they going to fix it in their plan which, fortunately, did not get enough votes? Well, for one thing they were going to raise the age from 65 to 67, so that people who are now working and do not have medical care could wait another 2 years. Some fix. They fix the system by breaking the people.

Then we said, well, prescription drugs. We will provide prescription drugs for people up to 135 percent of poverty, because if they are in poverty they probably can be on Medicaid. Well, what is 135 percent of poverty? For an elderly couple whose income is about \$20,000 a year, they get no help with prescription drugs.

So what we have here is a Republican plan to continue the damage with Medicare. And that is one of the most central differences now between the parties. The Republican plan of 1997 already weakened Medicare's ability to provide adequate service. I know very few people in my part of the country who are in the business of either providing or consuming health services who think Medicare is tenable the way it now is. And what they will do is, of course, leave all that damage that they did undone.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes just to point out to my colleague that the President came in

with an \$11 billion cut in Medicare. And when he did, my colleagues on other side of the aisle said the President had a great budget. They liked his new tax increases. They liked his new spending. They did not seem to complain then about the \$11 billion worth of cuts that the President had in his budget.

Now they do not like the President's budget. But what I know is that in 1994 when Republicans got elected, we set out to get our country's financial house in order and balance this financial budget and save Medicare and Social Security, and that is what we are doing. And to move from this welfare state into a society of opportunity. That is what we are doing.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is we have set aside \$1.8 trillion for Social Security and Medicare. It is \$1 billion more than the President set aside. We do not spend it and we do not provide tax cuts. We reserve it, and in our budget resolution we do not allow the national debt to go up; and the President said he would veto it because he wanted to raise the debt ceiling. We are not going to raise the debt ceiling. It is the best way to make sure that we do keep our country's financial house in order and do not make this government larger.

When this President got elected, 17.5 percent of all revenues funded the Federal Government. Now it is 20.5. It has gone up and we are not looking to have it go up any higher.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, let me, in summation, say that the language in this resolution, while at times bordering, well, not bordering but frankly inflammatory, the orders directed therein are not anything different than what we were planning to do. Boy, that sure sounds like Washington doublespeak. We do not think this resolution is a big deal, so I am urging my Members to go ahead and accept it.

Let me just for a second talk about the budget so that Members of this body will clearly understand what we are doing. And it should give us cause for celebration, because at one point we were struggling to try to figure out how to balance the budget. Now we are to the point where we are actually able to go beyond balancing the budget to the point where we are running huge surpluses. And we think the surpluses are a great opportunity to leverage good news into even better news.

The good news on the side of Social Security, and I want to compliment the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), my friend. He has joined with the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) in what I think is a creative opportunity to try to preserve Social Security, not just for the seniors. We

know the seniors are going to get their Social Security. But the challenge is what do we do for the baby boomers and their kids? So if mom and dad are listening, mom and dad are going to get their money because there are so many baby boomers. But the arithmetic runs us into trouble because when the baby boomers retire, there are not a lot of workers.

Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the bipartisan team here in the House for their efforts to try to work together, have some guts. I am very interested in what they are doing. They ultimately get to where they are. I believe that we ought to put 2 percent aside into a private account for people to be able to participate in the economy like Federal workers. But the point is that we are not going to spend that money coming in from Social Security now on other government programs; we are going to lock it up. And we are either going to use it in the transition program to transform Social Security and Medicare or we are going to use it to pay down some debt.

The time will come when we are going to have some people with some guts in all branches of the government who are going to be willing to fix these retirement programs. So, I do want to compliment my friend and colleague from the State of Texas for his efforts.

□ 1900

At the same time, there is going to be somewhere around a \$780 billion overcharge in the rest of the taxes we levy on the American people. My fear is that we take that money and we use it to expand the size of government, just the opposite of why we balanced the budget. We balanced the budget to make government less important and people more important, and we ought to proceed on that path.

So what we are going to do is take some of those overcharges we have put on the American people, overtaxes, and we are going to give them a refund. We are going to let them have more money in their pockets. With more money comes more power.

That is why I say, when I hear people say irresponsible tax cuts, I cannot think of a situation where my colleagues want to give people more power and government less where that can be argued in a negative way. I mean, the reverse of that argument is that people ought to be less important and government ought to be more important. I respect my colleagues if they think that way, but I do not agree with them.

I have got to tell my colleagues, when the people understand it that way, they want their money back. They do not want the government to be more important. They want to be more important. Do my colleagues know why? Because when they are more important, they can control their own future, their own destiny. They can go out and do more to support their family and their community. The Speaker here today can go out and buy those

Michigan tickets to go to the ball game a little easier.

The fact is that when people have more in their pocket, it is the nature of power; and power is a zero-sum game. When government has more, people have less. When people have more, government has less. That is where I think we ought to be. That is why we are going to have a tax cut. At the same time, we are going to preserve the spending discipline that we put in when we passed the 1997 budget deal.

I have just got to suggest to everybody in this Chamber, this is a budget that everybody ought to be voting for, because we have been able to accomplish things that have not been accomplished before. We do not want to blow the opportunity to return power to people and fundamentally reform our retirement programs for the baby boomers and reform it in such a way that, again, people are handed some more power to be able to do better planning themselves for their future, particularly when they get to be seniors and it becomes some of the most important time in their life.

So I would like to say to my colleagues, they can vote for this, and I would anticipate before the 15th of this month, we will have a budget resolution conference agreement on this floor that will accomplish what I have outlined. I will look forward to broad bipartisan support.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 1/4 minutes, the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution we are about to send to conference does not protect Social Security, and it does not protect Medicare. It does not extend the life of either program or assure the solvency of either by 1 day. It does not rise to the challenge.

Worse still, the enormous tax cuts that it calls for could undercut Social Security and Medicare, especially, Mr. Speaker, if the surpluses projected do not materialize. The tax cuts are locked in: \$143 billion the first 5 years, \$788 billion the second 5 years, \$1.66 trillion the third 5 years. They are a certainty. They are locked in.

The surpluses are economists' constructs. They may happen. I hope they do, but they may not. If they do not, what happens? What happens? How do we run the government when we do not have enough income tax and other tax revenues? We spend the payroll tax revenues.

The problem with that is that the demand upon the Treasury that this bill will make are greatest at the time when Social Security is in greatest need, between 2009 and 2014 when the war babies begin to retire and baby boomers begin to retire.

So this resolution says fix this budget resolution in conference. Save Social Security first, save Medicare as well, and then do tax cuts.

Mr. Speaker, given what the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) has said, I would say that everyone who

votes with this motion to instruct conferees is making a pledge to follow these priorities, making a pledge to follow these procedures, and specifically making a pledge not to bring a tax bill to the floor of the House for consideration until Social Security is assuredly solvent, until Medicare is assuredly solvent, until both of those things are accomplished and enacted.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed until after the votes on the two suspension motions postponed earlier today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules and then on the motion to instruct the conferees on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Res. 135, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 911, by the yeas and nays; and

H. Con. Res. 68, the motion to instruct conferees, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the second such vote in this series.

PROVIDING FOR CONCURRENCE BY HOUSE WITH AMENDMENT TO SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 98, EXTENSION OF AVIATION WAR RISK INSURANCE PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, House Resolution 135.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 135, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 392, nays 1, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

YEAS—392

Abercrombie	Ehrlich	Kuykendall
Ackerman	Emerson	LaFalce
Aderholt	English	LaHood
Allen	Eshoo	Lampson
Andrews	Etheridge	Larson
Archer	Evans	Latham
Armey	Everett	LaTourette
Bachus	Ewing	Lazio
Baird	Farr	Leach
Baldacci	Fattah	Levin
Baldwin	Filner	Lewis (CA)
Ballenger	Fletcher	Lewis (GA)
Barcia	Foley	Lewis (KY)
Barrett (NE)	Forbes	Linder
Barrett (WI)	Ford	Lipinski
Bartlett	Fossella	LoBiondo
Bass	Fowler	Lofgren
Bateman	Frank (MA)	Lowey
Becerra	Franks (NJ)	Lucas (KY)
Bentsen	Frelinghuysen	Lucas (OK)
Bereuter	Frost	Luther
Berkley	Gallegly	Maloney (CT)
Berry	Ganske	Maloney (NY)
Biggert	Gejdenson	Manzullo
Bilbray	Gekas	Markey
Bilirakis	Gephart	Martinez
Blagojevich	Gibbons	Mascara
Biley	Gilchrest	Matsui
Blumenauer	Gillmor	McCarthy (MO)
Blunt	Gilman	McCarthy (NY)
Boehlert	Gonzalez	McCrary
Boehner	Goode	McDermott
Bonilla	Goodlatte	McGovern
Bonior	Goodling	McHugh
Bono	Goss	McInnis
Boswell	Graham	McIntosh
Boucher	Granger	McIntyre
Boyd	Green (TX)	McKeon
Brady (PA)	Green (WI)	McKinney
Brady (TX)	Greenwood	McNulty
Brown (CA)	Gutierrez	Meehan
Brown (OH)	Gutknecht	Meek (FL)
Bryant	Hall (TX)	Meeks (NY)
Burr	Hansen	Menendez
Burton	Hastings (WA)	Metcalf
Buyer	Hayes	Mica
Callahan	Hayworth	Millender-McDonald
Calvert	Hefley	Miller (FL)
Camp	Herger	Miller, Gary
Campbell	Hill (IN)	Miller, George
Canady	Hill (MT)	Minge
Cannon	Hilleary	Moakley
Capps	Hilliard	Mollohan
Capuano	Hinchey	Moore
Cardin	Hinojosa	Moran (KS)
Castle	Hobson	Moran (VA)
Chabot	Hoeffel	Morella
Chambliss	Holden	Murtha
Chenoweth	Holt	Myrick
Clay	Hooley	Napolitano
Clayton	Horn	Nethercutt
Clement	Hostettler	Ney
Clyburn	Houghton	Northup
Coble	Hoyer	Nussle
Collins	Hulshof	Oberstar
Combest	Hunter	Obey
Condit	Hutchinson	Olver
Conyers	Hyde	Ortiz
Cook	Inslie	Ose
Costello	Isakson	Owens
Coyne	Istook	Oxley
Cramer	Jackson (IL)	Packard
Crowley	Jackson-Lee	Pallone
Cubin	(TX)	Pascrell
Cummings	Jefferson	Pastor
Davis (FL)	Jenkins	Payne
Davis (VA)	John	Pelosi
Deal	Johnson (CT)	Peterson (MN)
DeFazio	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson (PA)
DeGette	Johnson, Sam	Petri
Delahunt	Jones (NC)	Phelps
DeLauro	Jones (OH)	Pickering
DeLay	Kanjorski	Pickett
Deutsch	Kaptur	Pitts
Diaz-Balart	Kasich	Pombo
Dickey	Kelly	Pomeroy
Dicks	Kennedy	Porter
Dixon	Kildee	Portman
Doggett	Kind (WI)	Price (NC)
Dooley	King (NY)	Quinn
Doyle	Kingston	Rahall
Dreier	Kleczka	Ramstad
Duncan	Klink	Rangel
Dunn	Krollenberg	
Edwards	Kolbe	
Ehlers	Kucinich	