

tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida) at 5 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.

**APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2488, FINANCIAL FREEDOM ACT OF 1999**

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XXII and by the direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I move to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2488) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to sections 105 and 211 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is the customary motion to go to the conference with the Senate. I understand that the minority has a motion to instruct which is debatable for 1 hour, so I would yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER).

The motion was agreed to.

**MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. RANGEL**

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RANGEL moves that (1) in order to preserve 100 percent of the Social Security Trust Fund surpluses for the Social Security program and to preserve 50 percent of the currently projected non-Social Security surpluses for purposes of reducing the publicly held national debt, and;

(2) in order to insure that there will be adequate budgetary resources available to extend the solvency of the Social Security and Medicare systems, and to provide a Medicare prescription drug benefit.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 2488 be instructed, to the extent permitted within the scope of conference, to insist on limiting the net 10-year tax reduction provided in the conference report to not more than 25 percent of the currently projected non-Social Security surpluses (or if greater, the smallest tax reduction permitted within the scope of the conference).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

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

Mr. Speaker, few people in the country and a lot of people in the House of Representatives are unaware as to what this procedure is in terms of going to conference. Civics 101 would dictate that the House and Senate conferees are trying to come out in a conference in working out their differences so that we can send a tax cut bill to the President of the United

States for his consideration so that it would become law.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, nobody in the House or the Senate, no Democrats or Republicans, truly believe that anybody believes the President is going to sign such a bill.

This thing rushed through the Committee on Ways and Means in 1 day. And why? Because it was already pre-packaged. We already had an offer from the majority that we had to refuse. A similar thing occurred in the Senate.

So this evening we meet for the first time. Do we really meet to work out our differences in order to have a tax cut bill? No. We meet to see how Republicans in the House and Republicans in the Senate can fashion a bill to such an extent that they know that the President of the United States will have to veto it. And so instead of talking as legislators, instead of talking as tax writers, we are having a political meeting to determine the campaign for the year 2000.

Chairman Greenspan had indicated that he thought it would be best for the economy for us just to take a deep breath, to do nothing. To just allow hundreds of billions of dollars to pay down our national debt, to give a tax cut for everybody by reducing the interest for everybody. And then we say that after we take a look at this objective suggestion by Chairman Greenspan, we should do what every responsible citizen would want us to do, and that is to find out how much money do we owe? How much money do we have? And why not pay off some of this debt before we move forward?

The Republicans would suggest, oh, my God, we have to return this money to the taxpayers because if we do not, we will spend it. Well, I know it is a very small majority that they have, but they still are the majority. They still are the leaders. And unless we have an implosion, unless we have an exodus, it seems as though they will have the majority at least until the year 2000. So what are they afraid of if they are the ones that are in control of the spending?

So we just hope that the motion to instruct the conferees is save Social Security, save Medicare, and let the conference say we do not need a political statement, but we are going to come back together, send this bill quickly to the President to get the veto that you are begging for, and then we will not have to debate throughout August what the tax bill would have been, but we can work together not as Democrats, not as Republicans, but Members of the House and Senate to say to America we fixed the Social Security system, we fixed the Medicare system, we fixed the prescription drugs that are so necessary for our senior citizens. Now we will review and see what in the responsible way we can do to reduce the tax burdens on all of America and not just the richest among us.

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

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in opposition to the motion to instruct conferees.

Mr. Speaker, this motion it is almost identical to the motion to recommit that was offered by the minority when the tax bill was debated on the floor of the House and perhaps we might simplify things by simply stipulating to the debate that occurred on that motion and then we could just go to a vote.

But I am not sure that I am quite as eloquent as the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS); but I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the American people are caught in a tax trap. The longer they work, the harder they work, the more they pay. And that is wrong.

Now the American people are simply paying too much. Perhaps it was unexpected, but they are paying too much. And the strongest proof of this is that the IRS is now accumulating more cash and will accumulate more cash in the future.

Americans are sending too much money to Washington and there is actually more money than is projected for the government's needs in which to operate.

Mr. Speaker, the problem is not that Washington does not have enough money. The problem is that Washington does not spend money efficiently, prudently, productively. We should begin to cut out the waste instead of saying we have got to have more money and more money and more money.

I know there are those who believe that Washington knows best how to spend the people's money and they should not be given the opportunity to do it because maybe they might make a mistake; but it is their money, not ours and I am proud that the House and Senate on a bipartisan basis think this is unfair and have passed good plans to let people keep more of their money. Yes, the plans are different, but they are both based on the principle that all Americans deserve to keep more of what they have earned. After all, it is their money. If we keep it in Washington, politicians will most surely spend it.

That has been the way it has been throughout history. And over the last hundred years right here in Washington, over 70 percent of all of the surpluses that have ever been generated into the Federal Government have been spent by politicians. Unfortunately, the motion before us is designed to keep hundreds of billions of dollars in excess taxpayer money in Washington to be spent. All along, we warned that there would be enormous pressure and great temptation to spend this budget surplus on more government programs, and it looks like we were right. But, Mr. Speaker, we do not need full-time government and part-time families. We need part-time government and full-time families.

This motion guts broad-based tax relief for the taxpayers who created the

budget surplus in the first place. This motion threatens marriage penalty relief. This motion would make it tougher for people who care for elderly relatives at home by blocking health and long-term care insurance incentives. This motion would stand in the way of pension modernization that will help more men and women enjoy retirement security.

This motion would take away education incentives to make college more affordable and to give parents the ability to save for their children's education and that is what is fair.

Mr. Speaker, we can save Social Security, strengthen Medicare, and provide for prescription drug benefit for needy seniors, pay down the debt and provide tax relief for the American people. Mr. Speaker, 25 cents out of every dollar of surplus is what we are talking about in this tax relief bill. There is plenty to do all of these other things.

I hearken back again when I say *deja vu* to 1995, 1996, and the beginning of 1997 when the same people who offer this motion to instruct said, oh, we cannot give tax relief until after we have balanced the budget. First things first.

□ 1730

Yet, most of them voted for a tax relief bill when we did not even have a balanced budget. Most of them voted for a tax relief bill almost as big as this one today that they call risky and irresponsible when we had no surplus projections at all.

We heard not one word about Social Security. We heard not one word about Medicare. We heard not one word about paying down the debt. My how things change.

To my colleagues on the other side who say we cannot, I simply remind them of the Democratic Senator from Nebraska, BOB KERREY's comment about their argument. He said, "To suggest that we cannot afford to cut income taxes when we are running a \$3 trillion surplus is ludicrous."

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to this motion to instruct conferees.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI).

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a couple observations. As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Social Security who has studied the issue of Social Security now for 2½ years, I have to say that there was a lot of misleading information passed on by the House of Representatives last week when we discussed this bill.

There has been a lot of talk about a lockbox and \$3 trillion. The fact that \$2 trillion will be put in a lockbox, that in fact is Social Security money. That is payroll tax money coming in over the next decade, 15 years, the \$2 trillion. The problem is that will not preserve Social Security.

The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS) said last week that that will save Social Security. That will not save Social Security. By putting the \$2 trillion in a lockbox, all that does is make sure that Social Security problem does not get any worse, that it does not get any worse. That is what the issue is. But it will not solve that problem.

In fact, what will be needed, if we do not want to cut benefits, is general fund money going into the Social Security system. The bill of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) puts general fund money into the Social Security system.

Now, we have a \$1 trillion dollars surplus that is projected, it is only projected over the next decade in the on-budget, non-Social Security surplus. If in fact this tax cut goes through and becomes law, and we all agree it probably will not, but assuming my colleagues vote for this tax bill, that essentially means that they are going to favor cuts in benefits over the Social Security system.

I have to say the purpose of this vote is to put Members on record so that the American public in the year 2000 will find out who wants to protect Social Security and maintain the level of benefits we have now or who wants to cut benefits. Because this vote, if my colleagues vote against this motion to recommit, they are saying, in the year 2001, when we try to deal with Social Security, that they are going to cut benefits, or an alternative, they may want to raise payroll taxes, although I do not believe that is true, so they are going to be cutting benefits.

So this vote against the motion to recommit will be to cut benefits and Social Security. What we are talking about here is a reduction in benefits of 25 percent of the Social Security benefits.

So I urge a "yes" vote on the motion of the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute simply to respond to the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI), and he is my friend.

This is the same sort of statement that we heard when we passed the last tax relief bill: One cannot balance the budget and pass tax relief. One will be cutting benefits. One will be doing all these awful things. But we did it.

I say, Mr. Speaker, today we can save Social Security, we can save Medicare, we can give a prescription drug benefit, and we can pay down the debt, and we can give a small amount in tax relief to the people who earned it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the respected gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, as Ronald Reagan once said "Here we go

again." Whenever Republicans want to lower the tax burden on families, my friends on the other side of the aisle always say it is going to somehow hurt people when they lower their taxes.

Now, where I come from, people tell me their tax burden is too high. Our tax burden today is 21 percent of our economy which is consumed by the Federal Government.

Since 1993, the tax burden has continued to go up. In fact, in 1993, the tax burden was less than 18 percent. Today it is 21 percent of our gross domestic product going to the Federal Government. That tax burden is too high.

When it comes to Medicare and Social Security, thanks to this Republican Congress, we have a balanced budget, the first balanced budget in 28 years. It is now projected to provide a \$3 trillion surplus over the next 10 years.

Under our budget, of course we do something that Congresses of the past and Presidents of the past for the last 30 years have refused to do; and that is, we set aside 100 percent of Social Security for retirement security to save Medicare and Social Security.

Now these 3 dollar bills I have, each dollar bill represents \$1 trillion. Under our budget, we set aside \$1 trillion, \$2 trillion. In fact, we set aside two-thirds of the so-called surplus over the next 10 years for retirement security, leaving one-third for other purposes.

We believe the vast majority of that extra surplus, the non-Social Security surplus, should go to help working families, helping working families by lowering their taxes.

Now, folks complain their taxes are too high. That is a common concern. But folks also tell me back home that the tax code is too complicated. They are frustrated that they will have to hire someone else to do their taxes. They are frustrated about the unfairness of the tax code. Frankly, a lot of them are just plain angry that, under our tax code, a married working couple on average pays \$1,400 in higher taxes just because they are married.

Under this packaged tax relief to help working families, we eliminate the marriage tax penalty for a majority of those who suffer it. I have an example here of a couple back in Joliet, Illinois, Michelle and Shad Callahan. They are schoolteachers in the Joliet public school district. In fact, Michelle here is due any day to have a baby, their first child.

They discovered when they got married that they now pay higher taxes just because they are married. In fact, they pay the average marriage tax penalty of \$1,400. Their combined income is about \$60,000.

Under our legislation we passed out of the House, 70 percent of taxpayers receive direct marriage tax relief. I believe by the time the House and Senate work out their differences, more families like Michelle and Shad will receive marriage tax relief.

We work to address the marriage tax penalty, addressing the unfairness in

the tax code, and also simplify the tax code. Because in the House-passed tax relief, 6 million couples will no longer need to itemize.

I would also point out that, under our legislation, since Michelle is due to have a baby, like many moms like to do, she is a working mom, she may take some time off from being in the work force to be home with her baby. Under the legislation we passed out of the House, we are going to let Michelle make up missed contributions to her retirement accounts with catch-up provisions. That will help Michelle and Shad and working families just like Michelle and Shad Callahan.

This legislation is good legislation. We simplify the code by eliminating the marriage tax penalty for millions of working couples, by eliminating the death tax which is suffered by family farmers and family businesses, by providing alternative minimum tax relief to millions of middle class families that now suffer the alternative minimum tax. Also, if one is self-employed, an entrepreneur, we give 100 percent deductibility for one's health insurance, the same corporations get. Today, one only gets 60 percent, and we believe one should get 100 percent.

Mr. Speaker, lowering taxes in a time of prosperity is a good idea. In fact, let me quote a Democrat on the other side of the aisle, BOB KERREY. He says, "To suggest we cannot afford to cut income taxes when we are running a \$3 trillion surplus is ludicrous."

Cutting taxes deserves bipartisan support.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) making this so personal in sharing the happiness of Shelly and Shad Callahan, and I would like to wish them well. But if they are really looking for a simplification from what is going on in the House and Senate conference, they are in for a nightmare.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, first, let me correct the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) in that we do not have a balanced budget. We do not have a balanced budget today unless they count the surplus for Social Security generated income, and none of us want to do that.

They talk about \$3 trillion over the next 10 years. We do not have that. If they look at what is the on-budget surplus that we all acknowledge is money that could be used, we have a projected \$1 trillion surplus over the next 10 years; and we have not seen dime one of it yet. Yet, the Republicans want to spend the surplus before we get the surplus. That is not responsible.

We are talking about what should the priorities be, and the Democratic motion makes it clear that our priorities should first meet our current responsibilities under Social Security and Medicare, not an expanded role, but

they meet our current responsibilities. We think that should be our first priority.

Why do we say that? If they look at the Republican bill to pass this House, it not only spends the trillion dollars during the first 10 years, but then it explodes after that, because it is backloaded. It shoots up to \$4 trillion over the next 10 years. Just as the baby boomers are reaching the age of eligibility for Social Security and Medicare, we are not going to be able to meet our obligations for Social Security and Medicare. That is why we say they cannot do both. We cannot do both.

Our priority is to protect Social Security and Medicare. And how about paying off some of the debt? That will help everybody. The Republicans on one hand offer tax relief, they say; and then, on the other hand, they are going to increase interest rates because of their irresponsibility.

That couple that was so nice that they are trying to help, they are going to lose all that money by increased interest costs if they have any credit responsibility under any charge accounts or financing a car. They are going to end up paying back more than is in the Republican tax bill.

This is an irresponsible and reckless proposal. That is why our motion to instruct is an attempt to try to bring some sanity to what left this House as far as the tax relief is concerned.

Fortunately, this bill will not become law. That is the good news. The President is going to veto it if it passes anywhere near its current form. We do not believe that we should go back to the 1980s when we tried trickle-down economics and we were told that tax cuts were going to help our economy, and all it did was grow our debt.

Now, I understand the Republicans did not support the 1993 economic program that brought about our prosperity. We understand that. But do not turn the clock backwards and try to accumulate large debt again.

We do have projected surpluses in the future. Let us use that to pay down our debt so that we can continue the economic prosperity that we have. Let us meet our obligations under Social Security and Medicare. Let us invest in the priorities that are important, including responsible tax legislation.

This bill is irresponsible. The motion to instruct corrects it. I urge my colleagues to support the motion.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I want my colleagues to look up in the web page [www.dsusa.org](http://www.dsusa.org). It stands for Democratic Socialists of America.

In there, the Progressive Caucus, 58 Members of the Democratic party belong to that. What do they want, Mr. Speaker? This is their own 12-point agenda, not mine, but their 12-point agenda. They want government control of health care. They tried that when

they had the White House, the House, and the Senate. They wanted government socialized health care. It failed miserably.

They want government control of education and environmental laws. They even want government control of private property. They want union over small business. They want the highest possible socialized spending, and they want the highest possible progressive tax that they can get. The highest progressive tax, income tax.

That is what the Democratic Party is controlled by, their leadership, the Democratic Socialists of America, the Progressive Caucus. Guess what, one of their agenda is also to cut defense by 50 percent to pay for that spending.

We fought to save Medicare, and the Democrats fought against it, dead fought against it, \$100 million of union ads against it. In 1993 when they had the White House, they had the Senate, and they had the House, they raised taxes. They promised a middle-class tax cut. What did they do? They increased the tax on the middle class. They increased the tax on Social Security.

Yeah, they made some cuts, and they showed what their real stripes were because they cut veterans' COLAs, they cut military COLAs, and they increased the tax on Social Security.

□ 1745

Now, we have a balanced budget, and we are going to have tax relief, not for the rich, as the Karl Marx-Engels class warfare Democrats talk about, but we are going to have a tax break for working Americans.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds just to say that Herbert Hoover is still alive and Herbert Hoover is well. The same accusations that were made against President Franklin Roosevelt for the Social Security System we hear today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to get back to the subject at hand. When the Republican leadership was trying to find the votes for the bill, the majority leader said this: "You always know how many horses are in the herd, it is just a question of how long it takes to get them into the barn." Well, I hope that some of the horses that went into the barn will take a second look and get out of this barn before we get a roaring deficit once again that would burn it down.

The proponents of this bill like to talk about a \$792 billion cost, but look at the second 10 years. It would be \$3 trillion, \$3 trillion. And the timing could not be worse, as this chart shows, because at the time there would be an explosion, an explosion, in terms of revenue loss that same second 10-year period, the Social Security surplus begins to fall. During the same period,

Medicare runs out of money, 2015. And during that same period, non-Social Security budget surpluses begin to fall. Look, there could not be anything worse in timing. But to make it even worse, the projected surpluses do not even include recognition that there may be emergency supplementals.

Listen, I say to the Republicans, to a fellow Republican, Alan Greenspan, who serves in a nonpartisan position at the moment. Here is what he has said about the Republican bill. "Hold off for a while," "the timing is not right for your bill," "allow the surpluses to run for a while."

The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means refers to the 1997 tax bill, \$275 over 10 years. This is a \$3 trillion tax cut over 20 years. This is a ridiculous, a reckless, and an irresponsible proposal. It would return our country to the days of borrow and spend.

I heard the chairman of our committee say we can do it all; it is easy. We can do everything. Do not worry, be happy. Well, if this law ever were enacted, this country would be very sad. The Republican Party is becoming the spendthrift party. The spendthrift party.

This is reckless, it is irresponsible, let us vote for the motion to instruct.

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

I would say to the gentleman from Michigan, I did not say it was easy. I did not say it would be easy to balance the budget and give tax relief, but we did it. And the President himself speaks over and over again about the accomplishment of a tax bill that we pushed, and a balanced budget that we pushed. He claims that.

I did not say it would be easy. It will not be easy. What I did say is it is not that Washington does not have enough money to spend, but if we get tough and we eliminate the waste and we become prudent and productive in the utilization of the taxpayers' dollars, we do not have to keep adding bushels and bushels of money by taxing the American people more and more and more. They earned it; they produced it; they worked hard for it; and Washington is enjoying a windfall. Maybe there should be a new windfall profits tax on the windfall to Washington to let the people keep more of their money.

As far as Alan Greenspan is concerned, a lot of what he said has been taken out of context and it needs to be set straight. He said, "If you can save the money, save it." If.

And he knows full well what the halls of history teach this country and other countries that are democracies, and that is that politicians will spend the surplus. Let me repeat again that in the last 100 years every surplus generated by the Federal Government, 70 percent has been spent by the politicians. That is a history of surpluses that are left to "ride" unencumbered.

What does the President do? In his budget, and I now cite from the CPO

documents, "The President's proposals would spend most of the projected on-budget surpluses." Would spend them. And the debt would increase by a greater amount than under the budget that we Republicans passed this year and is now the congressional budget for the United States of America.

Will it be easy? No, it will not be easy. We need to assure the taxpayers that the money that they send here is spent right and not wastefully, instead of merely saying we have to throw more money at it. And there is more than enough money in the Social Security surplus to pay down the Federal debt, to save Social Security, to save Medicare.

The charts that my friend from Michigan used are a little outdated. I am sure he did not prepare them recently, in the last 24 hours. The Senate already, by their rules, prohibits any additional revenue losses outside of the 10-year window. They are shut off totally. Not \$1 is permitted to be used for tax relief outside of the 10-year window.

Besides that, there are no official projections for the years after 10 years, so one can only guess. There are not of official government documents, but under the Senate provisions that must be complied with, there is not \$1 of revenue loss outside of the 10-year window. So the gentleman needs to find a new chart for his next speech.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, 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. Speaker, I rise to support the Democratic motion to instruct conferees on the Republican tax bill.

America needs a fiscally responsible tax bill, not an excessive and reckless \$800 billion tax cut, almost a trillion dollar tax cut. A tax bill of this magnitude stands in the way of strengthening Medicare and Social Security and threatens the progress we have made in eliminating the deficit and reducing the national debt, and it does nothing, it does absolutely nothing, to help our crumbling schools.

My constituents have demanded this Congress strengthen and protect Social Security and Medicare as well as to continue to pay off the national debt, rather than give tax breaks to the top 1 percent of Americans. I am not arguing there are no Americans who need tax relief, but let me just add that no one on this side of the aisle has said no one in this country needs some tax relief, we are saying just do not give it to the 1 percent richest people on this planet. Many middle income families would greatly benefit from affordable tax cuts, however, these families are not the ones assisted by the Republican tax bill.

Mr. Speaker, please listen to the American people. And if my colleagues

will not listen to them, they should listen to the chairman of the Federal Reserve, Mr. Greenspan, who has vocally denounced a massive tax cut initiative such as the ones passed by the House and the Senate as potentially harmful to our Nation.

This bill does not strengthen Social Security and Medicare and it does not assist our school districts with building new schools and modernizing their old, outdated, and oftentimes unsafe existing structures.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to envision one classroom in my district. A single-room classroom with 50 kindergarten students in it, two teachers, and no funds under this tax proposal to improve the situation in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this motion to instruct conferees.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, because again Mr. Greenspan's comments are taken out of context. He said that as between tax relief and spending, he would far prefer tax relief. In fact, he said, "It is not even a close call."

The Congressional Budget Office has just certified that the President proposes to spend almost all of the projected on-budget surplus. Mr. Greenspan would most certainly say that tax relief is better than spending from the surplus. In fact, he did say it and he will continue to say it.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE).

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I also would like to speak to the last gentleman who spoke and say that I also heard Mr. Greenspan in the Committee on Banking and Financial Services. I heard what he said, and what he said was, "My first preference is to pay down debt." My first preference is to pay down debt. Now, maybe the majority knows something Alan Greenspan does not, but I do not think so. I do not think so.

We have a \$5.6 trillion debt in this country. We have an opportunity for the first time in a generation to do the right thing and put our financial house in order. The question is whether we will step up to the plate and do that or we will take the money and run and hand the debt to our children and grandchildren.

It is simply not right. It is unconscionable and we should not do it. The fiscally prudent and the financially sound thing to do is to use 50 percent to pay down the debt, 25 percent for tax relief, and 25 percent for Social Security and Medicare.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) has 14 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New

York (Mr. RANGEL) has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), a respected member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I would like to say that he deserves a lot of credit for getting this bill through the House and for having spent this weekend working with the Senate to come up with a compromise package that will, in the end, be able to give taxpayers the relief that they so well deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the motion to instruct. I was watching it over in my office and thought I should come over and talk about the fact that the Financial Freedom Act that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) and others have put together, so many of us have had a part in this, is, in fact, not fiscally irresponsible but it is simply taking what is \$3 trillion in projected surpluses over the next 10 years and allowing the taxpayers to keep a little more of their hard-earned money, roughly one-third of that amount, rather than spending it here in Washington on new programs.

It comes down to a philosophical difference, really. The philosophical difference is that Republicans believe people should be able to keep more of their hard-earned money, and the other side believes that it ought to be spent.

Now, we have talked about Alan Greenspan here a lot today. I heard Alan Greenspan testify before the Committee on Ways and Means, and I questioned him. He was very straightforward. He said if it is going to be spent or it is going to be sent back in terms of tax relief, he would far prefer tax relief. In fact, he said it is not even a close call.

Now, Alan Greenspan may believe if it were to stay here in Washington that it would be used to reduce the surplus. I find that hard to believe when I look at the President's own budget proposal, which in fact spends the money. In fact, in this tax bill there is more debt relief than there is in the President's proposal, based on what the Congressional Budget Office, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, just told us last week.

Second, I believe that if we look simply at the record of the last 40 years, we will see that every time there is indeed a surplus in this town, Congress turns around and spends it, expanding Federal programs already in place and creating new programs.

□ 1800

So what we are saying is very simple, which is one dollar out of the three ought to go back.

Second, I want to make the point that this tax bill contains a number of wonderful provisions for the taxpayer in terms of relief from excessive com-

plication of the Tax Code and also in various areas like the marriage penalty, and one I really want to focus on is retirement security.

In this bill our provisions are the most fundamental changes in retirement security in well over a generation that allow every American to have the ability to save more money for themselves for their own retirement. It lets everybody save more on their 401(k) account. It allows everybody coming back into the workforce at age 50 or above, particularly helpful to women who have stayed at home to raise kids, to put more into their defined contribution plans, 401(k)s, 457s, 403(b)s, and so on.

It expands all the defined benefit plans. These are plans that are, unfortunately, dying on the vine out there. There are fewer and fewer of them being offered. We go into these plans. We enable people to save more. We enable people to get more in terms of a benefit. We enable people who are in multi-employer plans, section 415, to be able to get more into their own retirement, taking away some limits that do not make any sense. It will help in the end every single American.

What I love about this is that 77 percent of pension participants are precisely the people we are trying to help the most who make under \$55,000 a year. It is in this bill, and it is precisely what this Congress ought to be doing, in the context of tax relief, simplifying the Tax Code, increasing the savings rate in this country, and finally providing retirement security for millions of Americans.

Sixty to 70 million Americans do not have any kind of pension at all now. Millions of those Americans will be able to get immediate retirement security from the legislation that is contained within this tax bill.

Again, I commend the chairman. I hope we can move on from this motion to instruct, get this legislation together between the House and the Senate, and get it to the President where, hopefully, he will change his mind and sign it for the American taxpayer.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, the Republican tax message is one that we cannot trust Congress to act responsibly with the surplus.

They say, get the money out of town before it even arrives here yet. Is it not a little bit ironic to think their theme is one cannot trust the Congress to manage money wisely, when they in fact are in the majority? Do my colleagues not think that we could be disciplined enough just to run one true budget surplus before we spend what we do not even have yet?

If a business had borrowed money from a bank to operate for 25 years straight and for the first time in 25 years showed a small profit, would we not think we would try to pay down that huge debt?

Two weeks ago this House had a historic opportunity that every businessman and woman understands. That is, when faced with a choice of paying down the debt or spending the surplus, we should pay down the debt. We had a motion on the floor that would dedicate 50 percent of the on-budget surplus to paying down the debt, 25 percent to tax cuts, 25 percent to priority spending needs such as Medicare and Social Security.

Today we are trying again.

Where have all the fiscal conservatives gone in the Republican Party? Fiscal conservatives do not spend money that we do not even have yet. Fiscal conservatives do not ignore the advice of Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan. Fiscal conservatives do not gamble with our economic security, our health security, our retirement security. Fiscal conservatives understand that paying down the debt means lower interest rates. Fiscal conservatives do not pass on debts to our children and our grandchildren. And fiscal conservatives do not backload tax cuts into an uncertain future.

The President is right to veto this bill. We can take it up next year. What is the rush anyway? There is only \$5 billion in tax cuts next year out of the \$792 billion in the bill, and half of that is extenders.

Only six-tenths of 1 percent of the tax relief will be effective next year, fiscal year 2000. The 10 percent across-the-board tax cut, the increase in standard deduction to reduce the marriage penalty, those could not even happen next year. There is little tax relief in the bill next year, so what is the rush?

I say pay down the debt. Do what is right for our children, right for Social Security, right for Medicare, and right for America.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, what is the time proration again, please?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) has 10½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) has 11 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York has the right to close.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to instruct. I hope we will vote for this motion to be responsible and to be prudent.

We have to remember, we are not at a crap table in Washington, D.C. This is not Vegas. And I have seen the trick made with the \$3. I hope that all Americans understand that the \$3 we keep

hearing about, these \$3 which represent \$3 trillion, when we talk \$2 trillion being saved for Social Security, we are not saving it for Social Security; we are just telling all the people who contributed this money, the Social Security contributors, the taxpayers who give out of their payroll taxes that money, that we are going to reserve it.

Because that is what it was supposed to go for. It was never meant to be spent for tax cuts or something else. So when my colleagues talk about the three, take the two off the table. Because no one would want us to play with that money.

When we take out of people's paycheck every month Social Security taxes, we do not tell them it is for tax cuts or anything else. We tell them it is for their retirement.

So we are left with \$1 trillion, this \$1 bill. Most of that, under this Republican bill, would go to tax cuts, some \$800 billion dollars.

Now, if we take that \$800 billion tax cut, two-thirds of all that money, two-thirds of this \$1 trillion is going to go to 10 percent of all of America. The 10 percent wealthiest tax filers get two-thirds of this dollar. That means the remaining one-third is left 90 percent of America. That is what we get with this tax bill.

But forget about all that because all this is just projections. We do not know what kind of surplus we will have. The projection is we will have a large surplus. But this is all like playing craps on a crap table. They are shooting and hoping and praying that they win.

But what happens if they do not? Let me put it to my colleagues this way: the average tax cut for someone who earns about \$50,000, a couple who earns about \$50,000 under the Republican tax bill is about \$200 per year. And that is when we have got some of these provisions fully phased in. Because, by the way, in the year 2000 no one is going to get \$200 in tax relief if they earned about \$50,000. They have got to wait until all these provisions are phased in.

But say they are all phased in. They get about \$200 in tax cuts. They are not going to have it. Because all they have to do is save that money, use it for debt relief; and if they have a \$20,000 debt, interest rates go down by one percent, they will save \$200. Do not vote for the tax bill. Vote for this motion to instruct.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have so many speakers, perhaps the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means might yield some time to us so that we could allow the Members to speak out.

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

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

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to yield adequate time to anyone on the side of my colleague who

wants to speak against the motion to instruct.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, that does not sound fair.

Let me say this. Would the chairman want me to have all of the Democrats speak and then close the argument debate?

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I served in the minority for 24 years, where I was greatly outnumbered. So I feel very comfortable today being by myself here.

Mr. RANGEL. Well, I guess that makes sense. But what I am trying to do is to find out whether or not my colleague intends to be the last speaker before I close the debate. Because I have half a dozen people here and I just want to know, with the time being what it is, I have 8 minutes and my colleague has 11, I do not know how to space it.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, when he gets to his last speaker, then I will be glad to yield the balance of my time.

Mr. RANGEL. Very good. I understand.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a member of the committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, this Republican tax bill has declared Christmas while it sizzles.

On this Christmas tree that has been erected here in Washington, one will find a package wrapped up for anyone who has a lobbyist and a political action committee.

There is one break after another. They think nothing of having the taxpayers subsidize 80 percent of the cost of a \$100 bottle of cabernet or a two-martini lunch. They want the taxpayers to subsidize our defense contractors to go out and start more arms races around the world. And these conferees will even be considering a tax subsidy for chicken manure, something that many people have said symbolizes this entire bill.

Instead of simplifying the Tax Code, this bill makes the Tax Code even more complex, and it certainly does not reduce the abusive billions of dollars that occur in corporate tax shelters that all the rest of us end up having to pay. And of course when it comes to fairness, this Christmas tree, while it sizzles, is one that provides a third of its proposed individual tax benefits to the wealthiest one percent of Americans.

It is truly amusing to listen to this debate about Alan Greenspan. After all, what difference does it really make? Well, the difference I think centers on the fact that he is a President Ronald Reagan appointee, an admitted Republican, who has been given credit by many people, Democrats and Republicans, for the success of our economic expansion.

It has been said he would prefer tax cuts to spending. My guess is he prefers

tax cuts to death, as well. But that is not the alternative that he was presented. There is the alternative instead of this massive tax cut bill of reducing the Federal debt. When he was asked last week about this House and Senate Republican approach to taxes, he said it would be "creating a risk that I don't think we need."

We do not need to jeopardize either Social Security or our economic success. And the leading Republican economic expert in this country is the one who said we ought not to do it. If he were here tonight, he would be endorsing the motion of the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), which is only a motion to assure a fiscally responsible bipartisan alternative; and it ought to be preferred over this tax break and borrow-more scheme that is being advanced by our Republican colleagues.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH). A respected member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the esteemed chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, for yielding me the time.

As I walked onto the floor, Mr. Speaker, I was greeted by the familiar incendiary rhetoric of my friend from Texas. While I appreciate his ability to frame in the most extreme terms what is a reasonably prudent bill and action to give the American people more of their hard-earned dollars, give it back to them, I do find it interesting that my friend from Texas supported tax reduction in 1997 when this government was still in a deficit and yet he would use all matters of extreme rhetoric to try and mischaracterize the essence of what we are doing here as the responsible majority in the United States House of Representatives as we prepare to go to conference with our friends from the other body.

I think the motion offered from my good friend from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member of the committee, shows the length to which the minority will go to separate the American people from their hard-earned money. It is sad but true, and the rhetoric indicates it and so does the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, as we have documented before, we talk so much about billions and trillions of dollars in this body and on the airwaves across America that sometimes we tend to lose focus about what it is our common sense majority proposes.

I think the best way to characterize it, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, is to ask us to take a look at these \$3 bills and let them represent the \$3 trillion of surplus that this government will have in the years to come. This is what we propose to do, to lock away almost \$2 trillion dollars to save Social Security and Medicare. And that leaves the remaining trillion dollars.

This is the crux of the question, when we get through all the legislative leggerdeman and the name calling, this question remains at the end of the day.

□ 1815

To whom does this money belong? We would say, in the common sense majority, this money belongs to the people who earned it, not to the Washington bureaucrats. Let us take this money and return it to the hardworking taxpayers who have been called on again and again and again to feed the gaping maw which is this insatiable Washington bureaucracy.

And so the gentleman's motion to instruct conferees again asks us, after we have seen the largest tax increase in American history, so extreme a tax increase that over 10 years' time it asked for an additional \$800 billion from the pockets of every American, we are told somehow that is responsible, a tax increase so extreme that it was retroactive, to take money from taxpayers beyond the grave in terms of the death tax.

What we simply say is, Americans have had enough of this. We should put the death tax to death, we should reduce the marriage penalty, and I am glad my friend from Texas mentioned the special interests. Because, as we have seen throughout the years, no one accedes to the special interests more than the previous liberal majority.

Mr. Speaker, I stand with my friends on the right. Reject the motion to instruct conferees.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute 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, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me this time. I rise to support the motion to instruct.

Mr. Speaker, I wish we had time for a philosophical debate as was just given by my esteemed colleague, but we have business to do. I would simply tell him that from the far reaches of my district and the people that I have spoken to, businesspersons, they say they do not want a tax cut that is so enormous that it damages Social Security and Medicare, they do not want a tax cut that will increase the national debt by \$1 trillion over the next 10 years, will increase the national debt by an additional \$4.4 trillion over the next 10 years. What they want is a family-friendly, middle-income tax cut and what the Harris County citizens want is the ability to be able to support the Harris County Hospital District with Medicare and Medicaid dollars so that we do not have to cut 165 beds, cut the treatment for AIDS and cancer, and I would imagine the public hospital systems around this Nation are crying now because we are taking \$800 billion away from treating sick people, closing beds, denying them service.

What we want is a motion to instruct to protect Social Security, Medicare,

and provide more Medicaid dollars. I would hope my colleague from Texas and all of my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, will come down on the side of middle-income tax cuts and saving Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid.

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

Mr. Speaker, the one thing that has not been debated tonight yet is what is in the Democrats' motion to instruct.

One thing that is not in it is a 10 percent across-the-board tax relief to all working Americans and families, men and women who made this surplus possible. What is not in it is marriage penalty relief for millions of Americans who are being punished simply because they got married. That is not in their motion to instruct. They do not include education incentives on student loan interest payments, education savings accounts, and making prepaid college tuition plans tax-free. Those education provisions are not in their motion to instruct. Health care provisions, providing a tax deduction for people who buy their own health insurance, and for long-term care, including help for people who take care of their elderly in their own homes. Our plan has those provisions. It is nowhere to be found in the Democrats' motion to instruct. The Democrat motion has no strengthening of our pension system to help more American workers, particularly women, get a pension and have greater retirement security. No, that is not in their motion.

To 100 million American investors, the Democrats say, "Sorry, you've got to keep paying taxes on your savings every time you sell an asset." To 68 million Americans who have small savings accounts, the Democrats have no provision in their motion to instruct to help. And the Democrats' tax hike, because that is what they proposed in their substitute, and this motion does not even lessen the unfair death tax or the punitive alternative minimum tax. This motion is a turnback to the days of more taxes and more spending and away from the days of economic growth and opportunity for every American.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I think the biggest problem with this tax cut is that it is built upon a false assumption, a false assumption that at least the majority party is not willing to admit, and, that is, that of the \$792 billion tax cut, \$720 billion is attributable to cutting the existing level of Federal spending by 29 percent below today's current spending level. It is not going to happen.

The majority party is not going to cut veterans spending by 28 percent, agriculture by 33 percent, the FBI by 28 percent. Are you going to cut transportation by 23 percent, are going to cut

defense by \$68 billion? You are not going to do it.

The Committee on Appropriations met last week. It did not do it. It will not do it. And so if you do not do it, \$720 billion of the \$792 billion tax cut is not there. It evaporates because it is built upon a false assumption. You know it and we know it and that's why you should support this truthful instruction to the conferees.

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

Mr. CAMP. I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to point out that we are here talking about this measure only after we have a balanced budget. We have passed legislation to set aside the surplus to save Social Security and Medicare. We have locked that Social Security surplus away in a lockbox, and we are talking about part of what is left.

I think it is important to point out that the average American family, and I repeat, the average American family today pays double in taxes what it paid only in 1985. Today's tax burden is the highest ever in peacetime history.

I think the key question is, should your hard-earned tax dollars stay here in Washington to be spent on new Federal programs? Or should they be returned to you, the taxpayer, who sent them here in the first place? I think the answer is pretty clear that you, the taxpayer, deserves the money.

We have over \$1 trillion in non-Social Security surplus, and I think we absolutely must return the taxpayers' money to the people who sent it here. Our bill means that the average Michigan factory worker and his family will save \$1,000 in income taxes. Our across-the-board rate reduction will save the seniors who live in my district over \$500 in income taxes, and, if that senior has a mutual fund, will cut her investment tax rate so that more of her savings can stay with her, not the government.

Mr. Speaker, I believe tax relief is needed. There is no doubt about that. We have balanced the budget, we have set aside money for Social Security which pays down the debt, and I think now is the time for the American people to reap the rewards of their hard work. I urge that we vote against the motion to instruct.

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

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, my friend from Texas left off a few other things that are not in the motion to instruct. There is not a \$200 billion increase in the national debt over the next 5 years. There is not a \$3 trillion increase in our national debt from 2011 to 2020, or \$4.5 trillion of additional debt when you add in interest. That is also not in the Democratic motion to instruct.

The motion to instruct is truly a debate about priorities and values. The priorities, we believe very strongly this is the time for us to use that which we have the opportunity to do, and, that is, to pay down our national debt. We do have a surplus. This is the time for us to be fiscally responsible and pay down the national debt. This is the time for us to be dealing with a very serious problem of 2014 and Social Security, of which the gentleman from Texas certainly knows and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) here knows that unless we do some things of a responsible nature soon, we will have deeper problems in 2014. That is what we ought to be doing. That is what the motion to instruct is all about. Do not have a tax cut today. What we should be debating this week before we go home is Social Security reform. What we ought to be dealing with is Medicare and Medicaid reform. We ought to have the debate on this floor right now dealing with the problems of our hospitals around the country that are saying to me, "Unless you deal with some of our problems by October the 1st, we must close." That is what we ought to be doing.

Really and truly what this motion to instruct is all about is just saying "no" to a tax cut first, let us deal with Social Security, let us deal with Medicare first and then let us bring a tax cut to the floor.

If we would only do that, we would send the kind of message to our children and grandchildren that they need to hear. We should not be spending their future inheritance today based on our desires and all of the wonderful things that we say today. We ought to be paying down the debt so that they will have an opportunity for the same kind of future.

Although a lot of numbers get thrown around in the budget discussions, this is really a debate about priorities and values. This motion to instruct is based on the value that has guided generations of Americans: the value that we should leave our country stronger for children and grandchildren. This motion simply says that meeting our obligations for Social Security and Medicare and first reducing the debt burden on future generations should be a higher priority than current consumption for tax cuts or new spending.

We should put our fiscal house in order before we talk about tax cuts or new spending. We should agree to lock up a substantial portion of the surpluses outside of the Social Security trust fund to pay down national debt and deal with Social Security and Medicare before we start talking about how to carve up the surplus between tax cuts and new spending. How can we talk about having surpluses to spend when we still have a \$5.6 trillion national debt and huge unfunded liabilities facing Social Security and Medicare?

The tax bills passed by the House and Senate do not deal with these obligations and do not reduce the burden on future generations at all. Even if we stick with the lock box and save the Social Security surplus, this will not reduce the total national debt—it just shifts the debt from one part of the ledger to another.

While my Republican colleagues are correct when they say that the lockbox requires us to use the \$2 trillion in Social Security surpluses to pay down the debt held by the public, they forget to mention the rest of the story: that we will be accumulating \$2 trillion in IOUs to the Social Security trust fund at the same time. If the lockbox is successful in requiring us to save future Social Security surpluses, it will prevent us from digging the hole deeper, but it won't do anything about the \$5.6 trillion hole we have already dug for ourselves.

Despite all of the talk about the debt reduction trigger added to the tax bill, the debt left for future generations to pay would not be one dime smaller than the tax bill passed by the House. In fact, the national debt would increase by \$200 billion over the next five years under the Republican tax bill according to their own numbers.

My Republican friends will say that the President's budget will increase the debt as well because his budget uses some of the surpluses for new spending. I agree with much of those criticisms, but that is not what we are talking about today. The motion before us today provides that we should reduce the debt and deal with Social Security and Medicare before we talk about tax cuts or new spending.

The only way to truly reduce burden on future generations is to lock up a significant portion of the non-Social Security surpluses to reduce debt held by public. That is what this motion to instruct calls on our conferees to do.

Paying down the national debt is the most important thing Congress can do to maintain a strong and growing economy with low inflation and providing working men and women with a tax cut in the form of lower mortgages, lower credit card payments, etc. Reducing our \$5.4 trillion national debt will reduce the burden left to future generations by reducing the amount of the federal budget that will be consumed by interest payments.

The motion to recommit will provide an opportunity to begin a bipartisan process to achieve a responsible budget agreement. Members on both sides of the aisle have said they agree with the Blue Dog budget approach of paying down our national debt, dealing with Social Security and Medicare, and then dealing with tax cuts.

Voting for the motion to instruction would send a strong message to the conferees, the leadership in Congress and the President that we are committed to a fiscally responsible, bipartisan budget that is based on the principles of paying down the national debt and dealing with our obligations before agreeing to tax cuts or new spending.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY).

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

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the motion to instruct on the Republican tax cut bill. This motion will urge conferees to take responsibility and commit to reducing the debt. I am for a tax cut. I think we all are. But not with funny money. We should be sure that we really have a surplus before we commit to these tax cuts, put the budget on a long-term path, take the so-called surplus and

pay down the debt, deal with Social Security and Medicare first, and then talk about tax cuts. Do not spend projected surpluses that may not ever exist and certainly do not exist today.

Let us take this terrible burden of a \$5.6 trillion national debt off our children. Vote for the motion to instruct.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Social Security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 2 minutes.

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

In looking at what is before us and the guidelines in which the tax bill that is presently going to conference is drawn, and looking at that in comparison with the motion to instruct, these tax bills, both the House and the Senate, were very carefully drawn and crafted within the budget limitations. I think it is very important for this House to realize that the budget that passed this House and the Senate and, under which this tax bill is tailored, pays down the debt more than the President's budget.

We have heard a lot of rhetoric this afternoon regarding Social Security.

□ 1830

There is a bill, that will be filed shortly, that the people on both sides of the aisle are fully versed in, that is the Archer-Shaw bill that could save Social Security for all time. There is ample money to save Social Security and save Medicare and pay down the debt and give the taxpayers some relief.

The previous speaker, I know he did not mean to be flip, but he talked about funny money. This is not funny money. This is the taxpayers' hard-earned dollars, and I think when my colleagues find that we are moving forward, that we have created a surplus, I think it is important that we not only pay down the debt, which I agreed with, the accumulated debt must be reduced; But I think it is also important that we let the taxpayer keep some of their own money.

This is hard-earned dollars. The taxpayers are paying far too much money today, and when we put all the taxes together that the taxpayers pay, let us reject this motion to instruct, and let us let the conferees go about their task of conferencing this most important bill and give the taxpayers some relief that they so richly deserve.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KLECZKA) to close the debate on the motion to instruct the conferees.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to some of the items that have been brought up in debate. Let me start out by saying I support the motion to instruct, and my Republican colleagues know full well that

after their tax bill is vetoed, we are going to be back to precisely what we are talking about today, a tax cut which would give back about 25 percent of the projected, projected surplus.

My good friend from Florida talks about funny money. The thing that is funny about the money is it is not here yet. I have heard this afternoon Members come up and say, give it back, it is not easy to balance the budget, but we did it. My friends and colleagues, as we close out this fiscal year, the budget is not in surplus, but in a \$5 billion deficit, and for those who say, give it back, we do not have it. It is a projection over the next 10 years based on some very rosy assumptions, very low inflation. One economic downturn, Mr. Speaker, and those dollars will not be here.

In fact, I said it before, and I will say it again. I have a better chance at winning the lottery than this government having a trillion dollars surplus over the next 10 years.

We have had unheralded economic success over the last 4 years. To think it is going to continue for 14 and then for another 10 to make it 24 is totally absurd.

The motion before us says, let us pay down the debt. The gentleman says already we are paying down the debt. If the Congress will go home for 2 years, that debt would be paid down because it is a double counting of the Social Security surplus. Do not kid a kidder. That is going to happen with or without the Congress doing anything.

But what we are saying in our motion is let us take it down even further. It is in excess of \$5 trillion. The Republican tax bill expands all the money and leaves no room for modernizing Medicare. What happens to the extra dollars that are there? We spend it on increase on the national debt. So to say that we are doing Social Security and Medicare is totally false.

The bill will be vetoed. I ask my colleagues to vote for the motion to re-commit, vote for the motion to instruct because in October that is exactly what we are going to do any way.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my extreme concern over the President's threat to veto H.R. 2488, the Financial Freedom Act of 1999. This legislation offers nearly \$800 billion in tax relief for America's families, including eliminating the death tax, reducing the marriage penalty tax and capital gains tax, a 10 percent across the board income tax reduction for all Americans.

The President opposes the Financial Freedom Act because he claims this legislation does not secure Social Security. This is false. The fact is, H.R. 2688 leaves more than \$2 trillion for Social Security and Debt Reduction, which exceeds the amount requested in the President's own budget.

Mr. Speaker, tax relief is the right thing to do. H.R. 2688 gives the surplus back to those who created it, the American taxpayer. Over the next ten years, the government will receive an average \$5,307 more in taxes from each American family than it needs to operate. If families continue to overpay the federal gov-

ernment in taxes, Washington will just spend it on more big government programs. Mr. Speaker, it is time we let those who worked for the money spend it as they see fit.

I urge the President to reconsider his position against American taxpayers and support the Financial Freedom Act. Government should do more for its citizens than raise their taxes and feed the federal bureaucracy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). 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 New York (Mr. RANGEL).

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The Chair announces that proceedings will resume immediately following this vote on two motions to suspend the rules postponed from earlier today. The first vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 747 will be not less than 15 minutes in length, followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1219.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 205, nays 213, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 356]

YEAS—205

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

Pomeroy  
Price (NC)  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Rivers  
Rodriguez  
Roemer  
Rothman  
Royal-Allard  
Rush  
Sabo  
Sanchez  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Sawyer  
Schakowsky  
Scott  
Olver  
Serrano  
Sherman  
Shows  
Sisisky  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Payne  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Peterson (MN)  
Spratt  
Stabenow  
Stark

NAYS—213

Aderholt	Gilchrest	Norwood
Archer	Gillmor	Nussle
Armey	Gilmor	Ose
Bachus	Goode	Oxley
Baker	Goodlatte	Packard
Ballenger	Goodling	Paul
Barr	Goss	Pease
Barrett (NE)	Graham	Petri
Bartlett	Granger	Pickering
Barton	Green (WI)	Pitts
Bass	Greenwood	Pombo
Bateman	Gutknecht	Porter
Bereuter	Hansen	Portman
Biggert	Hastings (WA)	Quinn
Bilirakis	Hayes	Radanovich
Biley	Hayworth	Ramstad
Blunt	Hefley	Regula
Boehlert	Herger	Reynolds
Boehner	Hill (MT)	Riley
Bonilla	Hilleary	Rogan
Bono	Hobson	Rogers
Brady (TX)	Hoekstra	Rohrabacher
Bryant	Horn	Ros-Lehtinen
Burr	Hostettler	Roukema
Burton	Houghton	Royce
Buyer	Hulshof	Ryan (WI)
Callahan	Hunter	Ryun (KS)
Calvert	Hutchinson	Salmon
Camp	Hyde	Sanford
Campbell	Isakson	Saxton
Canady	Istook	Schaffer
Cannon	Jenkins	Sensenbrenner
Castle	Johnson (CT)	Sessions
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Shadegg
Chambliss	Jones (NC)	Shaw
Chenoweth	Jones (NC)	Shays
Kasich	Kasich	Sherwood
Kelly	Kelly	Shimkus
Coble	King (NY)	Shuster
Coburn	Kingston	Simpson
Collins	Krollenberg	Skeen
Combest	Kolbe	Smith (MI)
Cook	Kuykendall	Smith (NJ)
Crane	LaHood	Smith (TX)
Cubin	Largent	Souder
Cubin	Latham	Spence
Cunningham	LaTourette	Stearns
Davis (VA)	Deal	Stump
Davis (VA)	DeLauro	Terry
Duncan	DeLay	Sununu
Dunn	DeLay	Sweeney
Manzullo	DeLay	Talent
McCollum	DeLay	Tancredo
Ehrlich	DeLay	Thune
McCrery	DeLay	Tiaht
McHugh	DeLay	Toomey
McInnis	DeLay	Upton
McKeon	DeLay	Vitter
Metcalfe	DeLay	Walden
Mica	DeLay	Walsh
Foley	DeLay	Wamp
Fossella	DeLay	Watkins
Miller (FL)	DeLay	Watts (OK)
Miller, Gary	DeLay	Weldon (FL)
Moren (KS)	DeLay	Weldon (PA)
Morella	DeLay	Weller
Franks (NJ)	DeLay	
Frelinghuysen	DeLay	
Gallegly	DeLay	
Gekas	DeLay	
Gibbons	DeLay	
Ney	DeLay	
Northup	DeLay	

