

data while consuming less than 1% of the federal budget.

That's why members of the full House Appropriations Committee should restore NASA's funding when they take up the agency's budget on Friday. Democrats on the committee are expected to support restoration, but Republican members might need persuading. You can encourage them by calling the numbers below.

To take Action: Reps. Jerry Lewis (R-Redlands); Ron Packard (R-Oceanside); and Randy "Duke" Cunningham (R-San Diego).

□ 1500

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may give my special order at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE DEBATE ON THE BUDGET SURPLUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, in the last couple of weeks we have seen a vigorous debate here in the House and in the other body. I think it is one that resonates across the country. That is, what to do with the projected \$3 trillion budget surplus.

There are those who want to argue that the path to prosperity really begins and ends here in Washington, that bigger government and higher taxes and taking away control from our everyday lives is the way to go.

There are those who feel that the path to prosperity is paved across every street across our great Nation; that rewarding people to go out and work hard, and to allow hard-working Americans to keep more of what they earn, that is the direction we believe is

the right way to go; to strengthen personal freedom, to strengthen individual liberty, and to allow economic growth to create more jobs and to put more people to work.

Mr. Speaker, this is a debate that is just beginning, but one I think every hard-working American taxpayer needs to take note of.

As a reference, I cite a statement that was given about 36 years ago from then President John Kennedy. These were his remarks.

The most direct and significant kind of Federal action in aiding economic growth is to make possible an increase in private consumption and investment demand—to cut the fetters which hold back private spending. In the past, this could be done in part by the increased use of credit and monetary tools, but our balance of payment situation today places limits on our use of those tools for expansion.

It could also be done by increasing Federal expenditures more rapidly than necessary, but such a course would soon demoralize both the government and the economy. If government is to retain the confidence of the people, it must not spend a penny more than can be justified on grounds of national need and spent with maximum efficiency.

The final and best means of strengthening demand among consumers and business is to reduce the burden on private income and the deterrents to private initiative which are imposed by our present tax system. This administration pledged itself last summer to an across-the-board, top-to-bottom cut in personal and corporate income taxes to be enacted and become effective in 1963.

Madam Speaker, President John Kennedy then, like Ronald Reagan several years ago, recognized what it meant to invest and truly believe in the spirit of the American people. This American spirit to produce, to invest, to create, and to give back is what this Nation is truly all about.

Currently we engage, as I say, in this debate, and although it is 36 years later, the core principles still remain the same. On one side are those who do not believe in the American spirit or the American people. According to this view, bigger government, higher taxes, and more government control is the answer and the salvation.

The alternative view, however, places trust and wisdom in the American people. Our views seem to strengthen personal freedom and reward individuals for the efforts they are willing to undertake. We wish to promote economic growth by reducing the tax burden on hard-working Americans and essentially telling the American people, we believe in you, we trust you, and we want you to keep more of your hard-earned money in your pockets, so you are allowed to spend that on your families, on your education, on your vacation, on your car, making that mortgage payment, buying the new washing machine.

Because ultimately it is not about, well, we are going to destroy this program or destroy that program. No, it is about reminding folks what is important: to protect and strengthen social security and Medicare, to strengthen our national defense, and so many

other vital programs that are critical to our Nation.

But when we are confronted with a projected \$3 trillion budget surplus generated by the American people, who are working hard every single day, I do not believe, nor do I think it is unfair, but in fact I think it is not right unless we give a portion of that money back to the people who earned it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. TANNER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my 5 minutes at this time.

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

There was no objection.

THE MEANING OF COMPASSIONATE CONSERVATISM: CUTTING FUNDING FOR AMERICA'S VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I believe I have discovered the meaning of compassionate conservatism, at least as defined by the congressional Republicans. It is conservative to cut funding for the critical needs of our Nation's veterans, and it is compassionate to use that money for pork projects for congressional people in exchange for their votes.

At least that is the definition implied by the VA-HUD-Independent Agencies appropriations bill which was crafted by the Republican majority in its subcommittee earlier this week.

As the Washington Post reported yesterday, this pending bill is chock full of pork, 215 provisions funding a host of projects and activities that have little or nothing to do with veterans or housing, or the other concerns that this bill is supposed to address.

Madam Speaker, the gentleman just before me spoke of returning the surplus to people. What we are doing here is returning that surplus in pork projects to the majority Congresspeople.

As one who has joined our veterans throughout the Nation in advocating for the past many months for additional funding in the veterans budget, I am frustrated, appalled, shocked, and angry at this turn of events.

Our veterans must wait for months to see a doctor, but we fund the pork project of a machine aimed at growing

plants in space. A Virginia doctor in Kentucky was authorized to provide care for only 35 of the 500 veterans suffering from Hepatitis C, a disease that is often fatal, but we fund the pork project of ship bottom painting.

Last year we fought to pass legislation to provide health care for Persian Gulf veterans suffering from undiagnosed illnesses. We now have no funding to absorb these additional veterans in VA medical facilities, but we are funding the pork project of research into windstorms. One-third of our homeless are veterans who served their Nation. We need services to help them get off the streets and back into productive lives. But instead, Madam Speaker, we fund a pork project for studying the impact of temperatures on living organisms.

We are discharging veterans every day who are Alzheimer's patients, but we fund three separate pork projects worth \$11.5 million in the district of our Speaker of the House.

Some of these projects may be worthy, especially in the abstract. But then Congress should fund them openly and honestly and above board. Sneaking them into a bill that should include \$2 billion more for veterans just to keep the services we are providing today afloat is dishonest, it is an insult to the men and women who served our Nation in battle.

Is that what compassionate conservatism is all about: We cut veterans, but we hand out pork?

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this bill next week, and adequately fund the health needs of our Nation's veterans. I yield back whatever rationality exists in this House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GOSS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET REGARDING REVISIONS TO THE BUDGET AGGREGATES AND RECONCILIATION INSTRUCTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KASICH. Madam Speaker, pursuant to Sec. 211 of H. Con. Res. 68, I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD revisions to the budget aggregates and reconcili-

ation instructions. The aggregate level of revenue for fiscal year 2000 is reduced by \$14,398,000,000. This will change the recommended level of revenue for fiscal year 2000 to \$1,393,684,000,000.

In addition, the revenue reduction reconciled to the Committee on Ways and Means in H. Con. Res. 68 is increased by \$14,398,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004, and the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2009. This will change the amounts reconciled to the Committee on Ways and Means in Sec. 105 of H. Con. Res. 68 to \$14,398,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, \$156,713,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004, and \$792,266,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2009.

Questions may be directed to Art Sauer or Jim Bates.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET REGARDING STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000 AND FOR THE 10-YEAR PERIOD OF FISCAL YEAR 2000 THROUGH FISCAL YEAR 2004

Mr. KASICH. Madam Speaker, to facilitate application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, I am transmitting a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 2000 and for the 10-year period of fiscal year 2000 through fiscal year 2004.

The term "current level" refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature as of July 21, 1999.

The first table in the report compares the current level of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the aggregate levels set by H. Con. Res. 68. This comparison is needed to implement section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 2000 because appropriations for those years have not yet been considered.

The second table compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays of each direct spending committee with the "section 302(a)" allocations for discretionary action made under H. Con. Res. 68 and for fiscal year 2000 and fiscal years 2000 through 2004. "Discretionary action" refers to legislation enacted after adoption of the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to implement section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority or entitlement authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2000 with the revised "section 302(b)" sub-allocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees.

This comparison is also needed to implement section 302(f) of the Budget Act, because the point of order under that section also applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) sub-allocations.

The fourth table compares discretionary appropriations to the levels provided by section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985. Section 251 requires that if at the end of a session the discretionary spending, in any category, exceeds the limits set forth in section 251(c) as adjusted pursuant to provisions of section 251(b), there shall be a sequestration of funds within that category to bring spending within the established limits. This table is provided for information purposes only. Determination of the need for a sequestration is based on the report of the President required by section 254.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2000 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN H. CON. RES. 68—REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF JULY 21, 1999

[On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—	
	2000	2000–2004
Appropriate level (as amended by P.L. 106–31 and H.R. 2490):		
Budget Authority	1,428,745	NA
Outlays	1,415,484	NA
Revenues ¹	1,393,684	7,399,759
Current level:		
Budget Authority	898,425	NA
Outlays	1,092,887	NA
Revenues	1,408,063	7,556,473
Current level over (+)/under (–) appropriate level:		
Budget Authority	– 530,320	NA
Outlays	– 322,597	NA
Revenues	14,379	156,714

¹ The revenue numbers reflect adjustments made pursuant to Sec. 211 of H. Con. Res. 68.

NA—Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for Fiscal Years 2001 through 2004 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Enactment of any measure providing new budget authority for FY 2000 in excess of \$530,320,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2000 budget authority to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 68.

OUTLAYS

Enactment of any measure providing new outlays for FY 2000 in excess of \$322,597,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2000 outlays to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 68.

REVENUES

Enactment of any measure that would result in any revenue loss for FY 2000 in excess of \$14,379,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 68.

Enactment of any measure resulting in any revenue loss for FY 2000 through 2004 in excess of \$156,714,000,000 (if not already included in the current level) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate levels set by H. Con. Res. 68.