

Jefferson	McCollum	Sessions
Klink	McDermott	Tiahrt
Kuykendall	Pallone	Toomey
Linder	Pomeroy	Wise
Lowey	Royce	Young (AK)
Martinez	Schakowsky	

□ 1047

Mr. OWENS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR H.R. 2418, ORGAN PROCUREMENT AND TRANSPLANTATION NETWORK AMENDMENTS OF 1999

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon a "Dear Colleague" letter will be sent to all Members informing them that the Committee on Rules is planning to meet the week of March 27 to grant a rule which may limit the amendment process on H.R. 2418, the Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network Amendments of 1999.

Any Member who wishes to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies and a brief explanation of the amendment by 12 noon on Tuesday, March 28, to the Committee on Rules in Room H-312 in the Capitol. Amendments should be drafted to the text of the bill as reported by the Committee on Commerce.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Council to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House. Again, this is the Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network Amendments of 1999.

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

Mr. GOSS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, we are talking about the organ transplant bill?

Mr. GOSS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Is this the bill that we will eventually work on, unlike the budget that we are voting on today that was constructed at 3 o'clock this morning without anybody testifying on it?

Mr. GOSS. Reclaiming my time from the distinguished gentleman, the ranking member of the Committee on Rules, who I am delighted to see this morning again, I will assure the gentleman, to the best of my knowledge, this will proceed in the normal way of the Committee on Rules business and should be discovered on your desk at the Committee on Rules meeting time as we normally do at the daylight hour.

We will hopefully proceed through a hearing process and hopefully proceed through the rulemaking process in a timely fashion with the cooperation of the gentleman's minority party.

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

Mr. GOSS. Of course, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MOAKLEY. I appreciate my friend yielding. I have not seen him since 3 o'clock this morning, and also the wonderful chairman we have here, I have not seen him since 3 o'clock this morning.

Mr. DREIER. Why did the gentleman leave so early?

Mr. MOAKLEY. I had to catch a bus, but the only thing I want to be sure is that all the efforts that we go to in getting ready for this piece, if this is going to be the bill that we are ultimately going to vote on, unlike the budget bill that was put before us at 2:30 this morning, after being constructed in the dark of night in some den by I do not know who, but that bill never saw a committee, and it was never voted on by a committee. I want to make sure that is the way it is going to go.

Mr. GOSS. Reclaiming my time, I can assure the gentleman that is my understanding. We are fortunate to have the chairman of the Committee on Rules here who can give the gentleman further assurance. I shall yield to him.

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

Mr. GOSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let us not have a vote on his assessment.

Mr. MOAKLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding. Let me assure my colleague, who was in his office I know last night at 8:29 last evening, the gentleman received 99.9 percent of this budget package that we had. And I know that the gentleman spent the following several hours carefully scrutinizing this legislation. I think that he will find when we have this vote today it is a very responsible, appropriate way to move ahead with this.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GOSS. Reclaiming my time from the chairman, I yield further to the distinguished ranking member.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, there was an additional \$5 billion added that was not in the bill when we heard it.

Mr. DREIER. I do not know about \$5 billion that was added.

Mr. MOAKLEY. The gentleman does not know that. Maybe we should take more time to look at it.

Mr. DREIER. We looked closely at it.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I reclaim my time and assure the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) that the next piece of business we hope to see on the floor which I am about to call up will give us the opportunity to discuss further matters of interest that he has raised.

□

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up

House Resolution 446 ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 446

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 290) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2005. The first reading of the concurrent resolution shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution for failure to comply with clause 4(a) of rule XIII are waived. General debate shall not exceed three hours, with two hours of general debate confined to the congressional budget equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, and one hour of general debate on the subject of economic goals and policies equally divided and controlled by Representative Saxton of New Jersey and Representative Stark of California or their designees. After general debate the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original concurrent resolution for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. All points of order against the amendment printed in part B of the report are waived except that the adoption of an amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute the conclusion of consideration of amendments to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. After the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment and a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendment as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the concurrent resolution or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to final adoption without intervening motion except amendments offered by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to achieve mathematical consistency. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

SEC. 2. Rule XXIII shall not apply with respect to the adoption by the Congress of a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), my friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate on this issue only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 446 is a structured rule, which is fairly typical for bringing forward the annual congressional budget resolution. For a number of years, we have gotten into the very good habit of managing debate on the budget by asking that all amendments be drafted in the form of substitutes so that Members could consider the whole picture as we debate and weigh our spending priorities. This rule continues that tradition and wisely so.

We have gone to great lengths with this rule to juggle the competing needs of having a full debate on a range of issues and perspectives without allowing the process to become so unwieldy that it breaks down of its own weight.

In that regard, I think the rule is fair in making in order five substitute amendments reflecting an array of points of view.

Specifically, the rule provides for 3 hours of general debate, with 1 hour specifically designated for discussion of economic goals and policies as described by the Humphrey-Hawkins provisions of the current law.

Two hours of the debate time shall be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, and 1 hour shall be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK).

The rule waives clause 4(a) of rule XIII, requiring a 3-day layover of the Committee report, against consideration of the resolution. The rule makes in order an amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in Part A of the Committee on Rules report as an original concurrent resolution for the purpose of amendment.

This new base text makes a number of technical and substantive changes to the underlying resolution, changes that were discussed and negotiated throughout the day yesterday. This text is available to Members in the Committee on Rules report, which was filed last night.

The rule waives all points of order against this amendment. The rule further makes in order only those amendments printed in Part B of the Committee on Rules report. I would note that, of those five substitutes I mentioned, four are sponsored by Members of the minority.

Those amendments may be offered only in the order specified in the report, only by a Member designated in the report, and they shall be considered as read, they shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and they shall not be subject to amendment.

The rule waives all points of order against the amendments except that, if an amendment in the nature of a substitute is adopted, it is not in order to consider further substitutes.

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

The rule permits the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to offer amendments in the House necessary to achieve mathematical consistency.

Finally, the rule suspends the application of House Rule XXIII relating to the establishment of the statutory limit on the public debt with respect to the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001.

Mr. Speaker, thanks to the effort of our congressional majority, we have emerged from decades of deficits; and we are now operating in a brave new world of surplus. But that does not mean we can or should now abandon our commitment to fiscal discipline. In fact, it is when the sky looks most blue that we should be thinking about how best to shovel out from the mountain of debt we have incurred and prepare for the next rainy day, which inevitably we know will come.

So I am delighted to be bringing forward to the House, House Concurrent Resolution 290, the fiscal year 2001 fiscal budget blueprint. This document, although not binding as a law, sets forth the guideposts that will dictate the path we take for the rest of this session of Congress as we complete our budgeting work.

The budget reflects conservative principles and lays the groundwork for continued success in our mission of paying down the debt, protecting Social Security, shoring up Medicare, strengthening the national defense and education, and offering meaningful tax relief to our seniors, our families, and our small businesses.

□ 1100

This budget outlines \$1 trillion in deficit reduction while taking the Social Security trust fund completely off the table and while opening the door for Congress to provide realistic prescription drug coverage for Medicare beneficiaries. At the same time, we have gone further than the President in the area of defense, something that is so critical in this changing world and at a time when we are asking so much of our men and women in uniform and those in our intelligence activities.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) and his committee for the work they have done. I particularly share their interest from a process standpoint in seeking ways to enforce the fiscal discipline this budget document outlines. I am delighted that we have been able to work out an arrangement that meets the concerns of some Members about setting aside surplus moneys up front for further debt reduction even while we make sure that we have provided the resources necessary so the appropriators can bring forward legislation that brings to life our commitments in key areas.

This rule brings that negotiation to fruition, and we have now put in place a process so that the issue of debt reduction will continue to be addressed as we move through this year's spending process. That is good news all around for all Americans. This is a fair rule. I urge Members to support it.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me the customary 30 minutes and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule. This resolution has never seen the light of day. This is not the resolution that the Committee on the Budget worked over for a few months. It is certainly not the resolution that the Committee on Rules held hearings on for several hours yesterday. In fact, I have talked to Members who have been here much longer than I, and they can recall no time in which a bill has come to the floor under those circumstances.

It arrived at 2 in the morning, hours after the final vote when the majority of the Members of this House had left the Hill. The ink will barely be dry when the leadership makes Members vote on this document. How many Members will see this new substitute before they have to vote? I would note that these are not technical changes. The majority has added \$3 billion for science, still below what the President requested. The new resolution calls for \$5 billion in unspecified cuts all to be announced later, and this is a travesty. The measure changes reconciliation numbers and includes two new points of order. It even changes the public debt limit though the rules of the House prohibit changing that number from what is reported by the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, we have been down this road with this budget process time and time again. The leadership in this body reminds me of the bridal contestants in the television show "Who wants to marry a millionaire." They know it is a charade, but they are going through the motions anyway. This budget is as unrealistic as the failed budgets from

1998 and 1999. This proposed budget by the majority maintains a single-minded obsession with large tax cuts. It does nothing to extend the solvency of Social Security and Medicare for a single day and cuts funding for critical education, housing, and environmental protection programs.

In 1998, the majority party in the House and Senate failed to pass a budget resolution for the first time since the creation of the congressional budget process. In 1999, the budget adopted by the majority called for draconian cuts in appropriations to finance a huge \$792 billion tax cut for the wealthy. This budget was disregarded by the majority almost as soon as they began the appropriations process.

When the final appropriations bill passed Congress in November, 2 months into the fiscal year, appropriated spending overran the budget resolution by \$43.8 billion. In both 1998 and 1999, the American people rejected these same unrealistic cuts in essential Federal spending and excessive tax cuts for the very rich. Why on earth does the majority party believe the American people will suddenly change their minds and reject essential government services like Social Security and Medicare in favor of benefits for the wealthiest among us?

The definition of folly is to repeat what has failed and expect it to succeed, and that is just what this resolution does. It assumes that Congress will cut nondefense spending by \$7 billion below this year's level and by \$20 billion below the level needed to make up for inflation. Congress must then keep its foot on the brake for 4 more years, eventually taking nondefense spending \$114 billion below the level of current purchasing power.

Compounding the problem of calling for implausible program cuts is the fact that the resolution already spends some of the Social Security surplus. The resolution's \$200 billion tax cuts overwhelm the \$114 billion reduction in the purchasing power of domestic appropriations. As a result under the resolution, the non-Social Security surplus is virtually gone by the year 2003. By 2004, the Government begins spending the Social Security surplus. And by 2010, the measure spends \$68 billion of the Social Security money.

We have a choice. We can substitute this budget for one that extends the solvency of Social Security and Medicare, repays the national debt by the year 2013, provides targeted tax cuts to working families, invests in domestic priorities such as school modernization and improved access to health insurance for families.

I would like my colleagues to reflect for a moment. The surpluses on our horizon offer an extraordinary opportunity to pay down our large public debt which would be the ultimate tax cut. They allow us to make Social Security and Medicare sound and solvent for future generations. They mean that we can close the gaping hole in Medi-

care coverage and they make it possible for us to do more for education at all levels.

Unfortunately, this proposed budget resolution squanders this opportunity and jeopardizes the progress that we have made in eliminating the annual deficits and paying down the public debt. This measure also passes up the opportunity to put Social Security, Medicare, and the Nation as a whole on sound fiscal footing.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds. I would urge Members to pay very close attention to debate on the five substitutes we have made in order, four of them being from the other side of the aisle. Members need to know that under the process of this rule as I stated, once a substitution passes, we are not going to continue any others. In the vernacular, that means there are no free votes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. DREIER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule. I think it is important for us to note that this rule in fact puts into place what has been the case under both Democratic control of this institution and Republican control. What we have done is we have made four Democratic substitutes in order, one Republican substitute in order. We have been able to provide an opportunity for a wide range of proposals, to be very fairly debated. We listened up in the Committee on Rules to authors of those substitutes. They have indicated their willingness to be supportive of what it is we are trying to do here by moving ahead with a very fair and open debate, and I believe that it is in fact that.

99.9999 percent of this package was provided by the Committee on the Budget. We had the package placed in the hands of the minority and other Members of the Committee on Rules by 8:30 last night, and we did in fact make a modification. It deals with increasing spending for science. I happen to think that is a very high priority. For me as a Californian it is very important for us to do that. So let me just say that the rule is fair. The rule provides the minority with four opportunities to offer substitutes; the majority with one opportunity. So I think it should continue to enjoy very strong bipartisan support.

Let me move beyond the debate that we have going on right here to talk for just a few moments about the issue of the budget itself. I have found, maybe this is just my perspective as a Californian, that the American people very much want to see an end to the ex-

traordinary partisanship that goes on, the partisan bickering which we have seen back and forth, just listening to some of the speeches that have been made and criticism of this very fair rule. They do not like those sorts of partisan attacks, and I hope very much that we can bring an end to that kind of harsh partisanship, and I think we have evidence of it coming to an end by simply looking at this budget.

Frankly, just take the example of education. Republicans and Democrats alike want to improve our public schools. This budget actually increases by almost 10 percent over last year the level of funding for schools. That is a \$20 billion increase over 5 years. As we develop policies to go with those resources, we need to make sure that every American child has a chance to learn the skills and knowledge to succeed in our new 21st century economy.

Now, let us take another issue on which we have bipartisan agreement, national defense. Most Democrats, I am happy to say, now agree with what we Republicans have been saying for years, that we must bolster our national security spending so that we can get every soldier, sailor, and airman and their families and their children off of food stamps and into quality housing.

Let us look at a third issue, Social Security. This budget shows how Republicans and Democrats now stand together to ensure that the Social Security surplus is never again spent on other government programs. I am very happy to say that it is under this Republican leadership, under the strong leadership of Speaker Hastert, we have successfully protected every dollar of the Social Security surplus for the past 2 years, and this plan now does that for an additional 5 years. This is clearly the basis for long-term bipartisan retirement security reform.

Republicans and Democrats stand together to increase medical research. This budget dedicates \$1 billion more than last year to find cures that will ease the pain of millions of American families. Republicans and Democrats stand together on key science initiatives, as I was saying. When we pass this rule, we will ensure that the science and space programs funded in this budget are supported at a level needed to continue the cutting-edge science and space work that go on in places like the Jet Propulsion Laboratory in Southern California and other fine facilities throughout the region that I am privileged to represent.

Now, Republicans and Democrats do agree on a wide range of very important priorities. But of course, there is still quite a bit of politics left. There is a difference between the basic philosophy of the competing budgets with the five substitutes that we will have today. Republicans believe that the Government has an important role in helping to address many problems, but we never lose sight of the fundamental fact that America is great because of

the American people, families, entrepreneurs, neighborhoods, businesses and farmers, not the Federal Government.

What does this mean in a budget? It means that while we work hard to address education, medical research, national defense, retirement security, and health care, we also set something aside for families. The Republican budget helps families by paying down \$1 trillion in public debt by 2005 and retiring the entire debt by 2013. This will provide a tremendous boost to ensuring a strong, stable, vibrant economy for our children and grandchildren.

The Republican budget also provides some tax relief for American families, senior citizens, small businesses and farmers. Make no mistake, this budget spends a lot of money. As I said, we increase spending on education, health care, medical research, defense and science. But we believe that families should be in that priority list as well so that they have a little more of their own money to spend on school clothes for the kids, college tuition, or a new home computer. With half of American households participating in financial markets today, our Nation has what we like to call an emerging investor class. More than ever before, the American people recognize that they have a direct stake in policies focused on expanding economic prosperity, including smart tax relief.

Mr. Speaker, the investor class supports pro-growth, pro-investment tax reductions because they know that America's strength, our prosperity, is driven more by the emerging Internet economy and the NASDAQ, the wonder of NASDAQ and the companies involved there, than the Federal bureaucracy that exists here in Washington, DC.

This is a very, very good budget that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) is going to be moving forward here. I think that this rule deserves again strong bipartisan support by providing all these alternatives to our colleagues, and we can move ahead focusing on the areas of agreement and we can have what the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) describes as a full, vigorous, tough debate on these areas of disagreement.

I urge support of the rule and our budget package.

□ 1115

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT).

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, judging from comments by the campaign of Governor Bush, this Republican budget abandons conservatives. If we take a close look at the details of this budget, it is clear that this budget also abandons middle-class families. In their haste to embrace massive fiscally irresponsible tax cuts, Republicans are

abandoning Social Security, Medicare, and fiscal responsibility.

Despite their talk about how much they care about seniors, the Republican budget does nothing to strengthen the retirement security for current and future retirees.

This Republican budget does nothing to extend the life of Social Security and Medicare. It does not provide one dime to strengthen the Social Security or Medicare trust funds. They ignore the looming shortfall that threatens the future retirement security of all Americans.

The Republican budget fails to propose a Medicare prescription drug benefit to cover all seniors. The cost of prescription drugs is hurting all seniors. This is not a problem which is just limited to low-income retirees.

The Republican budget does not help middle-class seniors. Their budget says that they need to be spending themselves into poverty with prescription drug costs before they get Medicare coverage of prescription drugs.

To make matters worse, I understand at 3:00 a.m. in the morning, the funding that was in their budget to support a Patients' Bill of Rights was taken out. So I suppose that priority will also be lost.

The Republican budget abandons the fiscal responsibility that we worked so hard to achieve and tries to turn back the clock to the early 1990s. They threaten the balanced budget and efforts to pay off the debt by the year 2013.

The analysis by the Democratic staff of the House Committee on the Budget found that the Republicans would spend some of the Social Security surplus by 2004 and as a result we would be revisited by on-budget deficits if we enact this budget once again.

The Republican budget proposes deep cuts in investments in education, health, and veterans affairs, putting our children and others even further behind.

One may ask, why this abandonment? The Republican budget sacrifices fiscal responsibility on the altar of massive tax cuts. The Republican budget proposes \$150 billion in tax cuts now, \$50 billion after the smoke clears, and then possibly another \$50 billion in tax cuts for the wealthy and special interests if revenues increase.

The American people rejected these massive tax cuts that threaten our economic progress and retirement security last year, in last year's budget debate. Clearly, Republicans still have not gotten the message. The American people want a budget plan that pays off the debt, extends the life of Social Security and Medicare, provides a prescription drug plan for all seniors, and addresses our pressing health and educational priorities.

So this is not the right budget. We need to vote against the rule and vote against this budget. Let us reject this budget and protect the surplus for the priorities of working families.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this budget and for our alternative that puts families first and keeps our fiscal house in order.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I am frankly kind of astounded by what I have just heard because I thought that was a speech laying in the bottom of the desk drawer from 6 years ago. It is so far from representing reality, I am really stunned.

I want to say what the budget does. I think the people will be very surprised when they hear about what we have in this budget.

First of all, this will be the second year, I think in my lifetime, that the politicians in Washington kept their mitts off of Social Security. That never happened before. In 1995, we were running \$175 billion deficits; and they were projected to be as far as the eye could see, and here we are for the second year in a row, because of the leadership of people in this House, we are not going to touch the Social Security surplus. We are locking it up. We are saying to senior citizens, we are not going to take one dime of it and use it for any other spending like my colleagues on the other side of the aisle did for all of my lifetime.

We are saying we are not going to touch it. We are going to lock it up. We are going to put an electric fence around it, and it will only be used to pay for Social Security benefits or to pay down debt. We are the first group of leaders in this town to keep our mitts off of Social Security in decades. It is amazing.

Secondly, in terms of Medicare, not only are we going to have a reform agenda on Medicare to try to strengthen Medicare, but we have money set aside so that our poorest senior citizens can have access to prescription drugs; \$40 billion worth of potential resources to both reform Medicare, strengthen Medicare and to provide a prescription drug benefit to our poorest seniors who cannot afford to go to the pharmacy because they do not have any money. That is in this budget.

Thirdly, we are going to pay down a trillion dollars in the publicly held debt. Did my colleagues hear what I said? We are going to pay down \$1 trillion of the debt that is owed to the public in this country.

Now, if Regis was here and he was flashing this up on the wall about being a millionaire, everybody in the gallery would be standing up and cheering; but the fact is I think they will be cheering when they realize that by paying down a trillion dollars in the publicly held debt we are lifting a huge burden off the backs of our children.

When we came to this body in 1995 and took our majority, the guiding star was the future of our children. We are beginning to carry through with our promises, which is unusual for politicians.

Fourthly, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) just said that we do not have any tax relief for the middle class. I have to send him our budget because the first thing we passed around this House was to ease the marriage penalty so that when people get married they do not get punished for getting married. Now that is not something that does not apply to the middle class. Most of the people who are going to benefit are middle-class couples who got married, who are not going to be punished anymore because they got married. This budget will accommodate that.

In addition to that, if one is a senior citizen and they have decided to work, in this town we have a formula: if they work, we punish them.

Well, we just passed a bill through this House that I think received total support from everybody in this House that said if seniors work we are not going to take away their Social Security benefits.

Who does that apply most to? People at the lower end of the economic spectrum.

Now, say someone is a little family farmer. We just had a thousand farmers show up in this town. We are saying that when they die, they are not going to have to visit the undertaker and the IRS on the same day. They can take their family farm, and they can give it to their kids.

Is that not what we want in America? I think so.

Someone owns this little pharmacy, they are struggling every day to make it, they make their dollars, they get old, they want to pass it on to their kids, that is the American dream. To say that that does not reflect a middle-class value, I mean, come on, shame. We know better than that.

There are going to be more programs for tax relief for all Americans. If someone is self-employed and they want to get health insurance, we are going to make that available to them. If one is a mother and father that has their kid in a school where their kid is not safe and not learning, we are going to give them incentives so they will be able to save so their kid can go to the school of their choice.

It is going to be in this budget. It is all provided for.

We strengthen defense, and we also strengthen education. We also continue our historic increases in investments at the National Institutes of Health to help people fight the diseases that afflict them with heart, with cancer, and with lung.

I am astounded. I believe in a good old-fashioned, fair fight, but let us just fight on the facts. Let us not make stuff up. Let us not scare people.

The question today is whether we are going to advance the reform agenda in Washington or whether we are going to continue to be obstacles in this town to the need to reform and pare down government and prioritize government and clean up waste, fraud and abuse and

protect Social Security and provide tax relief.

If one is for the reform agenda, they will support this budget. I know that for the period of the next, I do not know, 6 or 7 hours, we are going to hear a lot of code words: risky, dangerous, irresponsible. Those are code words for more bureaucracy. They are code words for more standing in line. They are code words for more frustration. They are code words for higher taxes.

That is fine, but let us not just make stuff up out of the thin air.

Mr. Speaker, I hope some of my colleagues will have the good sense to fight this fair. If they want more spending, great; say it. If they want higher taxes, fine; say it. That is what the fight ought to be on.

This is a budget we should all support.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, last week things were looking pretty good around here. Last week the Republican members of the Committee on the Budget showed the world their proposed budget. They gave people plenty of time to read it, and they were not ashamed of it.

Last night, all that changed. Last night, or this morning, at 2:00 a.m. this morning, the real Republican budget came out. But unless one is a member of the Committee on Rules, they did not see the Republican budget until 2:00 this morning, just hours before its coming up for a vote.

Mr. Speaker, these days the only creatures that stir in the middle of the night, long after the sun goes down, are vampires and members of the Committee on Rules. Eighty percent of the members' meetings on the Committee on Rules do not start until the lights have to be turned on, and from the looks of some of these bills, Mr. Speaker, I could see why. They read a lot better in the dark.

This budget does nothing to save Social Security or Medicare or help seniors with the Medicare prescription drug plan. The chairman of the committee said that 99.9 percent of this was the same budget. Let me say some of the other parts of that budget.

Some of the changes are pretty big, Mr. Speaker. This was all done after the hearing concluded. They went back into this room somewhere, and they changed the public debt limit, which is a violation of the Budget Act. They promised to cut \$5 billion, but they did not say where they were going to cut it from. They added \$3 billion for science, which still is far less than the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) would have added if his amendment was made in order.

They still did not do much more middle-class families.

They added two brand-new points of order. They changed the reconciliation directives. They changed the provision dealing with health care and Patients' Bill of Rights. They changed the reserve fund for thrift savings plans and benefits. These were all done, Mr. Speaker, after the hearing had been concluded for hours.

This bill that we are voting on today never appeared before the Committee on the Budget.

So I urge my colleagues to reject this budget and send it back and let the Committee on the Budget who have expertise in this field really have a chance to look at it and do something about Social Security and Medicare, and preferably earlier in the day.

□ 1130

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the time available on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) has 11 minutes remaining and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) has 19 minutes remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, last year, for the first time in 40 years, we balanced the budget without including the surplus and Social Security. We balanced it to the tune of \$704 million. Having reached this milestone, we made a vow on both sides of the aisle when we brought our budget resolution to the floor last year that we would not get back into an on-budget deficit again, we would not slip back into borrowing from the Social Security trust fund. We would use the surplus, we said, in the Social Security trust fund instead to buy up existing Treasury bonds and notes, reduce debt rather than create new Federal debt.

To accomplish that purpose we both trotted out something we called "lockboxes," a portentous name. When you got through all the boilerplate, both of them came down to this. You have a point of order. If somebody brought to the House floor a resolution, like this resolution, a budget resolution, and it dipped into Social Security again, went into deficit, you could raise a point of order.

Now, to the American people, that suggests summary dismissal. It disposes of the question. But in truth, the Committee on Rules in the House is the task master at waiving points of order.

We have before us today a rule that ought to be subject to a point of order if we take the lockbox seriously, because this rule waives all points of order. This rule permits a budget resolution to come to the floor that, in our

opinion, would wipe out the surplus in 3 years and, in the 4th and 5th years, 2004, 2005, and subsequent years, it would put us back into deficit again, put us back into borrowing from Social Security.

This simple chart, this simple arithmetic on this chart shows you why. The Republicans claim that they have \$110 billion surplus over the next 5 years. But the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) just showed that they intend to use \$40 billion for a prescription drug benefit, and we welcome them to the fold on this issue, because we think it needs to be done. So they have matched us. They have \$40 billion for a Medicare benefit.

In addition, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) has said on repeated occasions in committee markup, yesterday in the Committee on Rules, last night on the floor, that they will have a tax cut of \$150 billion, plus \$50 billion more, and if CBO says there are more revenues, they will go up still more. When you factor in that additional \$50 billion, the \$40 billion for Medicare prescription drugs, guess what? The surplus disappears in 3 years and we are back in deficit, back into borrowing from Social Security.

So this in simple arithmetic is the argument why this rule should be voted down. Vote it down. Make the Republicans bring back to the floor a budget resolution that safely is in surplus, and not this one, which clearly puts us in danger of backsliding into deficit and borrowing again from Social Security.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding me time to speak in opposition to this rule.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is restrictive. Although there are claims that it is allowing all debate on all points of view, it, in fact, does not do that.

I spent a considerable amount of time with my staff putting together a substitute amendment that certainly would have allowed this debate to be expanded out to talk about tax fairness and the kind of investments we need to keep our economic growth and to keep families secure in this country. I think it was a point of view that deserved to be debated, deliberated and voted upon.

We ought not to have just a debate about whether we are going to have incredibly huge tax cuts that favor only a small segment of already wealthy individuals and corporations, or a situation where people talk about taxing some more.

We have within this trillions of dollars of budget a huge amount of unnecessary and unwarranted advantages that are given to special interests. If we were to recapture those, we can do the two things that we need to do in this country, invest in our economic growth, in education and job training, in health care and retirement security,

and research and development, in infrastructure, and, at the same time, have the kind of fairness we need.

Mr. Speaker, we need to have this process go back to the drawing board and come out again.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

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

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have a problem with the rule, but I do have a problem with the budget resolution offered by the Republican Party today. Yogi Berra should be with us here today, because it is "deja vu all over again." Last year it was a \$800 billion risky tax cut scheme, this year it is a \$1 trillion 10-year risky tax cut scheme.

You would think that the Republican leadership would get it eventually and start listening to the American people about where our priorities should lie. But the problem is not that they do not get it, the problem is that they cannot sell it. They could not sell it last year when it was a \$800 billion tax cut, they are not going to be able to sell it this year with a \$1 trillion tax cut.

They can't sell it because the American people won't buy it. The American people understand if these projected budget surpluses do in fact materialize, although there is no guarantee they will, now is the time to take care of existing obligations, to shore up Social Security, Medicare, and pay down the \$5.7 trillion national debt. That is the fiscally responsible and fiscally disciplined approach.

It is sad that when the Republican leadership and members on the committee had an opportunity to vote for their presidential nominee's fiscal plan, a \$1.5 trillion tax cut scheme, they were all ducking for cover, hiding under their desks and trying to flee the budget room in order to avoid having to vote on that issue.

But the saddest commentary of all is that a contemporary American comic strip is more reflective of the values of the American people today than the governing majority party in the House of Representatives. I do not know how many of my colleagues had the opportunity to see the *Doonesbury* article that appeared about a week ago, but I think it tells the story very, very well.

It opens up with a scene of men with one guy saying, "Heads up, he is coming this way."

Another gentleman, "Try not to make eye contact."

And an empty hat, which I suppose depicts Governor Bush. Then Governor Bush saying, "Hi, fellows, I'm George Bush and I'm asking for your support. If you vote for me I will give a huge tax cut. How is that for a straight deal, huh?"

"Well, I'm not sure. I mean, I can see how the wealthy might get excited. They'd be averaging \$50,000. But it

wouldn't mean much to a guy in my bracket."

Another gentleman says, "Besides, I care a lot more about shoring up Social Security and Medicare and paying down the national debt."

"Yeah, didn't fiscal responsibility used to be a Republican issue?"

Then Governor Bush: "But, but, you do not understand. I am offering you something for nothing. Free money. Don't you want free money?"

Then another gentleman: "Sure, but not until we pay our bills."

"Right."

Governor Bush: "What is the matter with this country?"

The last gentleman: "I guess we have grown up a lot as a people. I know I have."

Now, I am not saying the *Doonesbury* comic strip should set fiscal policy in this Nation, but I do believe, sadly, this comic strip better reflects the values of the American people and why we should support the Democratic alternative today.

I certainly didn't come to this Congress in order to leave a legacy of debt for my two little boys or for future generations.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, today we enjoy the fruits of fiscal responsibility and an expanding economy. This budget resolution, thrown together at 3 in the morning in the dark of night in a secret room, this budget resolution puts all that at risk. Why? To support huge tax cuts that threaten to bust budget and endanger Social Security and Medicare.

The only good thing that can be said about this resolution is that it is slightly less fiscally irresponsible than the plan put forward by Governor George Bush, to which Senator MCCAIN responded that it represented fiscal irresponsibility.

What kind of tax cuts are we asked to risk Social Security and Medicare for? We saw earlier this month, when the Republican tax bill provided three-quarters of the benefits to 1 percent of the richest Americans.

Mr. Speaker, in his earlier speech, the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman KASICH) invoked the sacred name of Regis Philbin. What game are we playing here?

The Republicans are not playing the game who wants to be a millionaire or who wants to marry a multimillionaire. They have a new game, who wants to risk Social Security to give huge tax breaks to multi-multi-multimillionaires.

Let us not play that game. Let us reject this rule and reject the Republican budget resolution and return to fiscal responsibility.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH).

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me time.

I love listening to these budget debates every year. It is like back to the future. It is like *deja vu* all over again. Unfortunately for the Democrats, they seem to be what Paul Simon called a one trick pony. It is the same thing over and over and over again.

Except this year they have got three trick ponies. They have MediScare. They talk about how Republicans are going to destroy Medicare and Social Security. They have class warfare, talking about massive tax cuts for the rich, and Americans are not going to buy it. Well, heck, Democrats are buying it. One hundred Republican and Democrat Senators last night supported stopping penalizing senior citizens for earning money. They supported the marriage tax penalty reduction, bought and sold for by Democrats. God bless America. Everybody is doing it.

They also spend without care. Every one of their substitutes spends more and taxes more than the Republican budget.

Now they are reading cartoons. That is how sad it has gotten. I understand, because you know, in 1995, when we got here, they were doing the same class warfare argument, saying that we were going to destroy the economy. You cannot balance the budget in 7 years without destroying the economy and killing the middle class.

Yet Alan Greenspan came to the Committee on the Budget and testified if you all would pass this Balanced Budget Act, I predict Americans will see unprecedented growth over the next 5 to 7 years. Greenspan said it in 1995. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) had the courage and vision to follow through with it, as did the Republican Congress. We did it, and you know what? It was not 7 years later. Five years later we balanced the budget. We gave the middle class Americans the strongest economic boom in over a generation. And we did something else. For the first time in a generation, this Congress did not steal from Social Security in their budget.

Yet these same Democrats that come to the floor today, that have the nerve to call themselves protectors of Social Security, were the very ones while in power for 40 years, stole from Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, I remember when some of us in 1995 said we could balance the budget and not steal from Social Security's trust fund, we were called radical extremists. Five years later, the budget is balanced; and we are keeping Social Security solvent by keeping our hands off of it.

I will tell you what, this year continues what we have done for the past 5 years. The gentlewoman from New York defined folly as repeating what has failed and expecting it to succeed. They have repeated the same class warfare arguments. They have repeated the same arguments of fear. They have repeated the same arguments of risky schemes. And their arguments have failed.

It is time to look at what has happened because of the vision of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the Committee on the Budget's vision, and this Congress' vision. We have balanced the budget. We have saved Social Security. And we have given tax cuts to middle class Americans.

□ 1145

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA).

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the budget rule. I am totally against the budget debate and the budget rule. I think it is wrong for America. We just heard the debate right now, and we talked about keeping the budget balanced. It is not just about keeping the budget balanced today. We are talking about a solvent budget, a budget that will be there for the future as well, protecting our children for today, investing in our future, protecting Social Security, taking down the debt, taking care of drug prescriptions, taking care of what we need to do.

It is easy to get up here and talk about a balanced budget. Yes, we can talk about it today, but what is the impact it will have on the future? That is what is so important right now. It is being fiscally responsible, taking that budget and doing what needs to be done. We are not doing that.

The Democrats have a budget proposal right now that deals with taking care of the American people, working families; taking care of investing in our future, protecting as well what we need to do, and that is to make sure that we have good education, quality education, scholarships that will be available. It is investing in the future. I ask my colleagues to vote against this rule.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask again where we stand on the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) has 8 minutes remaining; the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) has 9½ minutes remaining.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

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

Again, I did not have time before, but I think I should call to the attention of the House, in light of what the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) said earlier, that this resolution offered by the Republicans does not provide for the abolition of the Social Security earnings test. If it did, on page 33 of the concurrent resolution of the budget under function 650, Social Security over the next 5 years would have to be adjusted by \$20 billion. They do not adjust it. They do not provide for this waiver, repeal of the earnings test, despite what the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) just said.

Now, this is an example of doing something hurriedly, doing something slipshod and not attending to important detail. They are not doing what they are purporting to say that it does.

We had the same problem last year. We had a military pay raise on the floor, retiree increases; and the budget resolution did not reflect those, did not account for those.

Mr. Speaker, I call it to the attention of the House. Function 650 is unadjusted, does not reflect the cost that over the next 5 years if we are going to repeal the earnings test, we have to add \$20 billion in outlay expenditures by the Social Security Trust Fund. Everybody should know that when voting on this rule.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), a distinguished member of the Committee on the Budget.

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

The minority leader's speech today was a speech taken out from something he said 5 or 6 years ago, and the speech I just heard from the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on the Budget reminds me of straining out gnats and swallowing camels. We set aside \$200 billion for tax cuts. Now, we are told it is irresponsible. We are told it is outrageous. We are told it is something we cannot afford.

The fact is, in the next 5 years we are going to raise \$10 trillion in revenues, and we are going to return to the American people \$200 billion. The tax cut ends the marriage penalty. A good number of Democrats voted for that. The tax cut repeals Social Security earnings limit. All Democrats voted for that. The next tax cut, which a good number of Democrats voted for, reduces the death penalty. We are expanding educational savings accounts. We are increasing health care deductibility. We are providing tax breaks for poor communities, and we are strengthening private pension plans. Mr. Speaker, \$200 billion out of \$10 trillion, a 2 percent tax cut. But our colleagues on the other side of the aisle do not even want to return 2 percent.

Mr. Speaker, we protect Social Security. Last year was the first year since 1960 that a Congress did not spend Social Security reserves. We protect it in this budget we are in, and we protect it in the budget we are now voting on. We are strengthening Medicare. We are setting aside \$40 billion for prescription drugs, \$40 billion. That is what we are setting aside, and yet the minority leader said we were cutting Medicare.

We retire the public debt. Mr. Speaker, \$1 trillion of public debt in the next 5 years, \$1 trillion. It never happened under Democrat rule. We are doing it now, and it is in this bill. We are providing that tax fairness for families. It is not just returning revenue to the American people, but dealing with fairness. Couples should not have to pay taxes when they get married; seniors

should not have to lose Social Security when they work. And we are restoring Americans defense; we are putting more money in education, science, and health. We are doing exactly what we should do.

Now, we are going to have 5 amendments come up and we are going to oppose 4 of them. We are going to oppose them because they do not meet these tests. We are going to protect Social Security; and if it does not do that, we will oppose that. We want Medicare prescriptions, \$40 billion. If it is not there, we are going to oppose it. We want to retire debt. We have already retired \$302 billion of debt. We are going to promote tax fairness, which on the other side of the aisle they seem to be opposed to. We are going to restore America's defense, and we are going to strengthen and support education and science. That is what we are going to do in our budget, and we are determined to succeed.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was so struck by what the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) said just a moment ago, that this budget fails to take into account the repeal of the earnings test, and I want to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) the rest of my time, save 1 minute, to sum up.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I would inquire of anyone on this side who wants to explain why the \$20 billion is not provided in function 650, spending by Social Security, to effect this policy that the chairman of the Committee on the Budget just claimed that he is accommodating. Where is it?

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

Mr. SPRATT. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, Social Security is off-budget, is it not?

Mr. SPRATT. It is indeed.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, function 650 is a discretionary account, is it not?

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, function 650 is a discretionary account, but it also has an off-budget account.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, it does not include mandatories. We passed that bill unanimously in the House; it passed unanimously in the Senate. It will be signed by the President into law. It was initiated by the Speaker of this House, and it does not need to be included in function 650, because it is a mandatory outlay and not a discretionary fund.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would advise the gentleman simply to look at page 33 and the gentleman will see there is an on-budget provision and an off-budget provision, and the off-budget provision is the Social Security benefit spending provision. It is \$20 billion short. I mean this is government work, but \$20 billion is still real money. It is a big mistake.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I

think the point is clear, is eminently clear. All of Social Security spending is off-budget. Function 650 is a discretionary account. What we are voting on here today includes the incorporation of the Social Security earnings test to the extent that it needs to be included in this budget document. I think it is misleading to suggest that it was put together in a slipshod way when the gentleman knows that the legislation has already passed the House and the Senate and will be signed into law and that it will not have a material impact on discretionary outlays.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his explanation, although I think it falls short.

The fact of the matter is there is provision for off-budget spending. It is on page 33, function 654 and your report; and that function understates spending over the next 5 years by Social Security to the tune of \$20 billion. Because my colleagues understate spending here in calculating how much debt reduction they will achieve in the purchase of our debt held by the public, they owe the State the accomplishment of debt reduction. That is a significant mistake, unless they want to say this is a waivable mistake; it is not. It is bad work. It is a good reason to vote against the rule and to take this thing back and clean up.

Let me go back to my chart. I did not have enough time to talk about it. This chart is simple arithmetic. In simple arithmetic, it shows my good friend, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), whom I have enormous respect for and who was just on the floor saying they are going to have a \$200 billion tax cut. That is what the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) said in the Committee on Rules yesterday, and that is what he said repeatedly in our markup.

If they have a \$200 billion tax cut, then they have to add \$50 billion to the amount of tax reduction over the next 5 years. In addition, if they have a pharmaceutical benefit, a drug benefit in Medicare, they have to add \$40 billion. And when they add those two things that they both claim are included, \$50 billion and \$40 billion, guess what? The surplus disappears.

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

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. This bill does not, in fact, reflect what the Committee on Budget did. Until the Committee on Rules stops rewriting budgets, we are going to be in a situation where neither the Committee on the Budget on the Democratic or Republican side or any House Members have had any real role in its construction. That is just plain wrong. This is the most important document which we produce.

Moreover, let me tell my colleagues that in the Committee on Budget they

blocked our ability to put the Bush tax cut up as an amendment. They do not want to vote on it. It was not a pretty sight in the Committee on Budget; it was not a pretty sight in the Committee on Rules. Neither one of them put the Bush tax cut in order for us to be able to take a vote upon it. And there is a good reason why, because two-thirds of the Bush tax cut goes to the richest 10 percent of taxpayers. The richest 1 percent of taxpayers get an average of \$50,000 tax cut. It does not leave enough money to shore up Social Security, Medicare, education, all the way down the line.

So I urge a vote against the rule so that we can debate this issue fairly, openly and freely; let us have an open vote on the Bush tax cut. It is the centerpiece of the economic claim which is being proposed by the other party. All of us should be allowed to vote upon it.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Let me go back just in conclusion to this chart so that everybody understands it. This is simple arithmetic. This is not smoke and mirrors. This takes their numbers, their assumption, their claims about what their budget resolution does and adds them up correctly. They claim that they are providing for a tax cut over 5 years of \$200 billion, so we adjust their tax cut of \$150 billion by \$50 billion to show and allow for a tax cut of \$200 billion, which is what they claim on the floor and in committee.

In addition, they claim on the chart that they just showed and through comments that they have just made that they too will have a pharmaceutical drug benefit for Medicare beneficiaries. They assume costs of that, they have it in a reserve fund, it is \$40 billion. If they are going to claim it, they have to count it. They claim it, but do not count it. We count it. Add the \$50 billion, add the \$40 billion, adjust for debt service, and in 2003, the surplus of which we are all so proud which we want to protect, we do not want to backslide into Social Security, the surplus virtually vanishes. In 2004, there is a \$6 billion deficit. We are \$6 billion into Social Security again if this resolution is adopted. In 2005, it is down to \$2 billion, and the subsequent years are just as bad. That is the consequence.

Now, we have tax cuts in our budget resolution, the Spratt substitute, the Democratic budget resolution. We provide for \$50 billion net tax cuts over 5 years and \$201 billion net tax cuts over 10 years. We think those are reasonable; and we believe that if our colleagues do the tax cuts that they are talking about that they are claiming, they are back in deficit, and that is why this rule should be voted down. Because it waives what we tried to establish as a major point of order last year in the lockbox when we said, we cannot bring a resolution, we cannot bring an appropriations bill.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, just to be sure both sides understand, could we

have a statement of the times again, please?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) has 5 minutes remaining; the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell my colleagues what is amazing about the chart we just saw. It is all made up. In fact, the numbers do not even add up. Talk about slipshod.

Let me tell my colleagues how they put these numbers together, and I give them credit for actually explaining how they come up with this chart. In their document, they say figures 2002 to 2005 are interpolated by the Democratic staff. That means made up, interpolated. Extrapolations for the second 5 years made by the Democratic staff. In addition to that, my good friend, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), on November 2 of last year, said that we will be \$17 billion into the Social Security account, which, of course, never happened.

□ 1200

So he was wrong last year about arguing we were going to be into Social Security. His staff made up the numbers with extrapolations and interpolations. I am going to start including that language in my vocabulary.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to engage the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, in a colloquy with respect to the points of order contained in the budget resolution.

The first point of order prohibits the inclusion of directed scorekeeping language, and the second prohibits the consideration of advanced appropriations above \$23 billion in the fiscal year 2001.

My question is: Does either point of order preclude the consideration of H.R. 2563, a bill that provides advanced contract authority for the Woodrow Wilson Bridge?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would say no, there is absolutely no point of order that precludes consideration of H.R. 2563.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would further engage the gentleman from California. Does either point of order preclude the inclusion of H.R. 2563 with directed scorekeeping language in an appropriations bill?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that, while the new di-

rected scorekeeping point of order would affect the timely consideration of H.R. 2563 with directed scorekeeping language, there are several other points of order that would currently apply. I would make a commitment to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) that we will work together to craft a rule that would remove all obstacles to consideration of this important bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's assurance.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. KASICH.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to complete the thought that the Republican budget does not use extrapolations and interpolations to cook numbers and make things up and make claims that never come true.

We will have an ending of the Social Security earnings limit. It will be paid for through this bill. It passed the House. It passed the Senate. It will be signed into law.

The fact is that, by the time we are at the end of this summer, we are going to have in the vicinity of \$250 billion worth of tax relief for every American who pays taxes without any extrapolations, interpolations or any other hyperbolations that the Democrats may want to lay on this floor today. But they are my friends, and I appreciate their ingenuity. They are just wrong.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am going to be calling a "no" vote on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule to allow an up-or-down vote on Governor Bush's proposed tax cut. There has been a good bit of discussion about where the House stands on those tax cuts. I think the House should have the opportunity to go on record and end the speculation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment I would offer be printed immediately before the vote on the previous question. The vote on the previous question may be the only opportunity the House has to vote on Governor Bush's proposal.

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

There was no objection.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSS

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOSS: Page 2, line 10, after "comply with" insert "clause 3(b) or".

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, this amendment waives clause 3(b) of House Rule 13, which requires each committee report to include specific vote information from that committee's markup

session. All Members are familiar with that.

This amendment is necessary to address an inadvertent technical error in the report of the Committee on Budget to accompany H. Con. Res. 290. Specifically, on page 88 of the report, the roll-call vote on the motion to report the concurrent resolution fails to indicate how the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) voted, although her vote is reflected in the total vote.

Again, this is an inadvertent technical error in the report that is not intended to be captured by clause 3(b) of House Rule XIII.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I include the amendment that I previously referred to, as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 446

On page 3, line 5, after "Rules" strike the period and add the following:

"or the amendment printed in section 3 of this resolution which shall be treated as if it were the last amendment printed in part B of said report." and

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

Section 3. Amendment to be offered by Representative Markey of Massachusetts.

Amend section 4 to read as follows:

SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

Not later than May 26, 2000, the House Committee on Ways and Means shall report to the House a reconciliation bill that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to accommodate tax relief of \$10,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, \$483,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2002 through 2006, and \$1,269,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2010.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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 will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of agreeing to the amendment and to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 203, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 67]

YEAS—220

Aderholt	Barton	Boehlert
Archer	Bass	Boehner
Armey	Bateman	Bonilla
Bachus	Bereuter	Bono
Baker	Biggart	Brady (TX)
Ballenger	Bilbray	Bryant
Barr	Bilirakis	Burr
Barrett (NE)	Billey	Burton
Bartlett	Blunt	Buyer

Callahan	Hoekstra	Radanovich	Klink	Moran (VA)	Shows	Ford	Lewis (CA)	Scarborough
Calvert	Horn	Ramstad	Kucinich	Murtha	Sisisky	Fossella	Lewis (KY)	Schaffer
Camp	Hostettler	Regula	LaFalce	Nadler	Skelton	Fowler	Linder	Sensenbrenner
Campbell	Houghton	Reynolds	Lampson	Napolitano	Slaughter	Franks (NJ)	LoBiondo	Sessions
Canady	Hulshof	Roukema	Lipinski	Neal	Smith (WA)	Frelinghuysen	Lucas (KY)	Shaw
Cannon	Hunter	Rogan	Larson	Oberstar	Snyder	Gallely	Lucas (OK)	Shays
Castle	Hutchinson	Rogers	Lee	Obey	Spratt	Ganske	Manzullo	Sherwood
Chabot	Hyde	Rohrabacher	Levin	Olver	Stabenow	Gekas	Martinez	Shimkus
Chambliss	Isakson	Ros-Lehtinen	Lewis (GA)	Ortiz	Stark	Gibbons	McCrery	Shows
Chenoweth-Hage	Istook	Roukema	Lipinski	Owens	Stenholm	Gilchrest	McHugh	Shuster
Coble	Jenkins	Ryan (WI)	Lofgren	Pascrell	Strickland	Gillmor	McInnis	Simpson
Coburn	Johnson (CT)	Ryun (KS)	Lucas (KY)	Pastor	Stupak	Gilman	McKeon	Sisisky
Collins	Johnson, Sam	Salmon	Luther	Payne	Tanner	Goode	Metcalf	Skeen
Combest	Jones (NC)	Sanford	Maloney (CT)	Pelosi	Tauscher	Goodlatte	Mica	Smith (MI)
Cook	Kasich	Saxton	Maloney (NY)	Peterson (MN)	Taylor (MS)	Goodling	Miller (FL)	Smith (NJ)
Cooksey	Kelly	Scarborough	Markey	Phelps	Thompson (CA)	Goss	Miller, Gary	Smith (TX)
Cox	King (NY)	Schaffer	Mascara	Pickett	Thompson (MS)	Graham	Moran (KS)	Souder
Cubin	Kingston	Sensenbrenner	Matsui	Pomeroy	Thurman	Granger	Morella	Spence
Cunningham	Knollenberg	Sessions	McCarthy (MO)	Price (NC)	Turner	Green (WI)	Myrick	Stearns
Davis (VA)	Kolbe	Shadegg	McCarthy (NY)	Rahall	Towns	Gutknecht	Nethercutt	Stenholm
Deal	Kuykendall	Shaw	McGovern	Rangel	Turner	Hansen	Ney	Stump
DeLay	LaHood	Shays	McIntyre	Reyes	Udall (CO)	Hastings (WA)	Northup	Sununu
DeMint	Largent	Sherwood	McKinney	Rivers	Udall (NM)	Hayes	Norwood	Sweeney
Diaz-Balart	Latham	Shimkus	McNulty	Rodriguez	Velazquez	Hayworth	Nussle	Talent
Dickey	LaTourette	Shuster	Meehan	Roemer	Vento	Hefley	Ose	Tancredo
Doolittle	Lazio	Simpson	Meek (FL)	Rothman	Visclosky	Herger	Oxley	Tanner
Dreier	Leach	Skeen	Meeks (NY)	Roybal-Allard	Waters	Hill (MT)	Packard	Tauzin
Duncan	Lewis (CA)	Smith (MI)	Menendez	Rush	Watt (NC)	Hilleary	Paul	Taylor (MS)
Dunn	Lewis (KY)	Smith (NJ)	Millender-	Sabo	Waxman	Hobson	Pease	Taylor (NC)
Ehlers	Linder	Smith (TX)	McDonald	Sanchez	Weiner	Hoekstra	Peterson (MN)	Terry
Ehrlich	LoBiondo	Souder	Miller, George	Sanders	Wexler	Horn	Peterson (PA)	Thomas
Emerson	Lucas (OK)	Spence	Minge	Sandlin	Weygand	Houghton	Petri	Thompson (MS)
English	Manzullo	Stearns	Mink	Sawyer	Wise	Hulshof	Pickering	Thornberry
Everett	Martinez	Stump	Moakley	Scott	Woolsey	Hunter	Pitts	Thune
Ewing	McCrery	Sununu	Mollohan	Serrano	Wu	Hutchinson	Pombo	Tiaht
Fletcher	McHugh	Sweeney	Moore	Sherman	Wynn	Hyde	Porter	Toomey
Foley	McInnis	Talent				Isakson	Portman	Traficant
Fossella	McIntosh	Tancredo				Istook	Pryce (OH)	Turner
Fowler	McKeon	Tauzin	Ackerman	Jackson-Lee	McDermott	Jenkins	Quinn	Upton
Franks (NJ)	Metcalf	Taylor (NC)	Crane	(TX)	Pallone	John	Radanovich	Vitter
Frelinghuysen	Mica	Terry	Dixon	Lowe	Royce	Johnson (CT)	Ramstad	Walden
Gallely	Miller (FL)	Thomas	Greenwood	McCollum	Schakowsky	Johnson, Sam	Regula	Walsh
Ganske	Miller, Gary	Thornberry				Kasich	Reynolds	Wamp
Gekas	Moran (KS)	Thune				Kelly	Riley	Watkins
Gibbons	Morella	Tiaht				King (NY)	Rogan	Watts (OK)
Gilchrest	Myrick	Toomey				Kingston	Rogers	Weldon (FL)
Gillmor	Nethercutt	Traficant				Knollenberg	Rohrabacher	Weldon (PA)
Gilman	Ney	Upton				Kolbe	Ros-Lehtinen	Weller
Goode	Northup	Vitter				Kuykendall	Roukema	Whitfield
Goodlatte	Norwood	Walden				LaHood	Ryan (WI)	Wicker
Goodling	Nussle	Walsh				Latham	Ryun (KS)	Wilson
Goss	Ose	Wamp				LaTourette	Salmon	Wolf
Graham	Oxley	Watkins				Lazio	Sanford	Young (AK)
Granger	Packard	Watts (OK)				Leach	Saxton	Young (FL)
Green (WI)	Paul	Weldon (FL)						
Gutknecht	Pease	Weldon (PA)						
Hansen	Peterson (PA)	Weller						
Hastings (WA)	Petri	Whitfield						
Hayes	Pickering	Wicker				Abercrombie	Delahunt	Jones (OH)
Hayworth	Pitts	Wilson				Allen	DeLauro	Kanjorski
Hefley	Pombo	Wolf				Andrews	Deutsch	Kaptur
Herger	Porter	Young (AK)				Baca	Dicks	Kennedy
Hill (MT)	Portman	Young (FL)				Baird	Dingell	Kildee
Hilleary	Pryce (OH)					Baldacci	Doggett	Kilpatrick
Hobson	Quinn					Baldwin	Dooley	Kind (WI)
						Barcia	Doyle	Klecza
						Barrett (WI)	Edwards	Klink
						Becerra	Engel	Kucinich
						Bentsen	Eshoo	LaFalce
						Berkley	Etheridge	Lampson
						Berman	Evans	Lantos
						Blagojevich	Farr	Largent
						Blumenuauer	Fattah	Larson
						Bonior	Filner	Lee
						Borski	Forbes	Levin
						Boswell	Frank (MA)	Lewis (GA)
						Boucher	Frost	Lipinski
						Brady (PA)	Gejdenson	Lofgren
						Brown (FL)	Gephardt	Luther
						Brown (OH)	Gonzalez	Maloney (CT)
						Capps	Gordon	Maloney (NY)
						Capuano	Green (TX)	Markey
						Cardin	Gutierrez	Mascara
						Carson	Hall (OH)	Matsui
						Chenoweth-Hage	Hall (TX)	McCarthy (MO)
						Clay	Hastings (FL)	McCarthy (NY)
						Clayton	Hill (IN)	McGovern
						Clement	Hilliard	McIntosh
						Coburn	Hinchee	McIntyre
						Condit	Hinojosa	McKinney
						Congers	Hoefel	McNulty
						Costello	Holt	Meehan
						Coyne	Holt	Meek (FL)
						Cramer	Hoolley	Meeks (NY)
						Crowley	Hostettler	Menendez
						Cummings	Hoyer	Millender-
						Danner	Inslee	McDonald
						Davis (FL)	Jackson (IL)	Miller, George
						Davis (IL)	Jefferson	Minge
						DeGette	Johnson, E. B.	Mink
							Jones (NC)	Moakley

NOT VOTING—11

Ackerman Jackson-Lee McDermott
Crane (TX) Pallone
Dixon Lowey Royce
Greenwood McCollum Schakowsky

□ 1237

Mr. CUNNINGHAM and Mr. KNOLLENBERG changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS).

The amendment was agreed to. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 194, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 68]

YEAS—228

NAYS—203

Abercrombie Clyburn
Allen Condit
Andrews Conyers
Baca Costello
Baird Coyne
Baldacci Cramer
Baldwin Crowley
Barcia Cummings
Barrett (WI) Danner
Becerra Davis (FL)
Bentsen Davis (IL)
Berkley DeFazio
Berman DeGette
Berry Delahunt
Bishop DeLauro
Blagojevich Deutsch
Blumenuauer Dicks
Bonior Dingell
Borski Doggett
Boswell Dooley
Boucher Doyle
Boyd Edwards
Brady (PA) Engel
Brown (FL) Eshoo
Brown (OH) Etheridge
Capps Evans
Capuano Farr
Cardin Fattah
Carson Filner
Clay Forbes
Clayton Ford
Clement Frank (MA)

Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoefel
Holden
Holt
Hoolley
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Klecza

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Coble
Collins
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla

Bono
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey

Cox
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley

NAYS—194

Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchee
Hinojosa
Hoefel
Holt
Hoolley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)

Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Klecza
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McGovern
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-
McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley

Mollohan	Rivers	Strickland
Moore	Rodriguez	Stupak
Moran (VA)	Roemer	Tauscher
Murtha	Rothman	Thompson (CA)
Nadler	Roybal-Allard	Thurman
Napolitano	Rush	Tierney
Neal	Sabo	Towns
Oberstar	Sanchez	Udall (CO)
Obey	Sanders	Udall (NM)
Olver	Sandlin	Velazquez
Ortiz	Sawyer	Vento
Owens	Scott	Visclosky
Pascrell	Serrano	Waters
Pastor	Shadegg	Watt (NC)
Payne	Sherman	Waxman
Pelosi	Skelton	Weiner
Phelps	Slaughter	Wexler
Pickett	Smith (WA)	Weygand
Pomeroy	Snyder	Wise
Price (NC)	Spratt	Woolsey
Rahall	Stabenow	Wu
Reyes	Stark	Wynn

NOT VOTING—12

Ackerman	Jackson-Lee	Pallone
Crane	(TX)	Rangel
Dixon	Lowe	Royce
Greenwood	McCollum	Schakowsky
	McDermott	

□ 1253

Mr. PORTER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Pursuant to House Resolution 446 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 290.

□ 1256

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution (House Concurrent Resolution 290) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2005, with Mr. BOEHNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

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

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) each will con-

trol 1 hour of debate on the Congressional Budget.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, one more time, it is probably going to be about five more times, I want to go through what we are presenting in this budget today. If I can just take us back a few years. I mean, it is pretty astounding that a Congress that was increasing spending through the roof, having deficits in the neighborhood of several hundred billion dollars, could reverse itself today under a policy that we believe as majority Republicans that, if we could just restrain the growth of the Federal Government, we could contribute mightily to the growth of this economy. That, in fact, has happened.

Starting in 1995, we made a commitment that we would relieve the burden that has been placed upon our children's backs. We do not believe that at the end of our lives our children should show up for the reading of the will to find out that what mom and dad left them was a big bagful of bills totalling into the trillions of dollars.

So we made a commitment that, frankly, was pretty amazing. As for me, I have held public office now for approaching 25 years. For those that gasp at that number, do not worry, I am leaving at the end of this year. I am going to retire. As you can see, I am, you know, tenderly young, even though I have been here so long. But what I can tell you, I can tell my colleagues that in politics, in the 25 years that I have been involved with it, it is very seldom that I have been able to see public officials put aside their own self-interests and instead adopt the community interest, the interest of the country.

We did that starting in 1995. And we had a rough road. We were outwitted at times. We were outspoken at times. We were out-PR'd at times, but that is soft stuff. That is not about results, and that is not about policy, and that is not about programs.

We kept our eye on the ball. And the eye on the ball was to balance the Federal budget. And starting in 1995, with our rollercoaster ride of emotions to try to get to a balanced budget, we demonstrated our commitment. I believe the chairman of the Federal Reserve, who sets the interest rates policies for this country, noted our commitment and gained confidence in what result we would produce here on Capitol Hill; and as a result, he lowered interest rates, which, of course, has allowed this economy to grow in a spectacular fashion with the wealth generated from this economy being shared by all Americans.

We get to 1997, and we make a budget agreement with the administration; and what we find in 1998 is the first balanced budget in a generation. In 1999, we wrote a budget that for the first time in my lifetime kept our mitts off the Social Security surplus.

The leadership of many members of the Committee on the Budget, most notably the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER), with assistance of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN), and the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU), there was an effort being made to say that we should not any longer grab the Social Security surplus and use it for anything other than protecting Social Security; that we should not take that Social Security surplus and use it on running any other department agency and bureau, because it is the people's money.

In 1999, we were able to achieve something that was even more significant than the balanced budget, it was not just balance the budget, but also put ourselves in a position where we would safeguard Social Security, keep our hands off it, put an electric fence around it, and say that the Social Security money should only be used to pay the benefits of Social Security recipients and kept in surplus to pay down the public debt until we solved long term the Social Security problems for both our baby boomers and their children.

□ 1300

For the second year, we will protect Social Security in that fashion. With the efforts of my good friend, the gentleman from the State of Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), we will bring to this floor a bill that will provide that the politicians in this town cannot grab Social Security for any other purpose than paying down debt or paying benefits. That is a significant accomplishment, Mr. Chairman.

We are also very aware of the fact that the American people are saying, in an era of surpluses, we not only want Social Security to be protected but we would like Medicare to be strengthened.

I must say that Medicare is a program that is in trouble. I must say that the next President, elected next January, whether it is a Republican or a Democrat, must work with the Congress of the United States, leave the demagoguery, the name calling, and the political hyperbole behind, and begin to deal with the two giant issues of Social Security and Medicare so that we do not end up in generational warfare.

We are setting the stage for that to be able to happen, to solve that problem long term. We are strengthening Medicare; we are going to reform Medicare. We are going to improve Medicare, and with those reforms and improvements we will also provide for our neediest senior citizens a prescription drug benefit.

Now, we know that there are many seniors, and think about it for a second, they need the prescription drugs; they need to go to the pharmacy and

many times it is a choice between the utilities, the trip down the street, the meal or a drug that their doctor has prescribed for them.

We believe, as Republicans, and I think are joined by our friends on the other side of the aisle, that our poorest senior citizens must have access to prescription drugs. This budget will provide it, while at the same time encouraging the preservation, strengthening, and reforming of Medicare; two significant accomplishments.

Thirdly, we also do something for our children. We will reduce the total publicly held debt over the next 5 years by \$1 trillion. In 1995, our guiding star were the children, to lift that burden from their backs, to not ring up more debt, to begin to reduce the national debt. We already have a headstart on paying down that publicly held debt. Last year, we paid it down in the vicinity of \$100 billion, but over the next 5 years we are going to have more momentum, and we achieve it by restraining the growth of spending in this town.

We do it and we take those savings and we use a large chunk of it, \$1 trillion, to begin to pay down the publicly held debt.

I say today that we achieve it in large part by restraining the growth of government. Now people might call us names and say we are heartless. I have to say that when the Agriculture Department, the Justice Department, the Education Department, the Pentagon, and the Agency for International Development cannot even have their books audited to figure out how they are spending their money, is it not time we get back on the reform agenda and send money back home to people and to pay down some of the debt?

My great friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), told me that in the bowels of the Department of Education there are 48 VCRs operating day and night to record television shows, and yet they cannot even add up their books.

Think the days of thousand-dollar hammers and screwdrivers and bolts are gone? Wrong. The Pentagon loses ships; they do not know where they are. Yet, they say we cannot restrain spending in this town? They are wrong, because they have gotten too addicted to the Potomac fever. They need the antidote, and the antidote are our children and our seniors.

So we restrain the growth in public spending, and we pay down a trillion in the public debt; and that then leaves us room for tax relief. Who does the tax relief go to? It goes to our senior citizens who are punished because they decide to go to work and earn more money so they can have more for themselves and more for their grandchildren.

We eliminate the penalty that they are now exposed to that says if they earn money they lose Social Security benefits. We also say to our farmers, our small businesspeople, that at the

end of the day when they leave this earth they should not have to visit the undertaker and the IRS on the same day; that we are trying to ease the tax on inheritance, which is double and triple taxed. We are trying to say that if someone works a lifetime to build something, something I would like to build for my children Emma and Reese, that at the end of my life I would like to give them the fruit of my bounty, the fruit of my toil. Whatever burdens my wife and I experience, we want to pass on the good results to my children, and the Government should not take 55 percent of everything I have earned to spend it on what? More VCRs in the bowels of the Department of Education? I think not.

We want tax fairness for families. When people get married, they should not be punished for having a union. Today, if one pays their taxes individually, in too many cases they will have a lower tax burden to the Federal Government different than if they get married. We believe that that tax burden ought to be ended. We ought to ease the marriage penalty, and this House has already voted for it.

In addition to that, we believe that if one is self-employed they should be able to get the same insurance opportunities and the same tax provisions that are available to large companies so they can afford health insurance for themselves. So the fact is that we are going to have a variety of tax-cut measures that will pass this House, but these tax-cut measures come, once we have secured Social Security and Medicare and paid down some of the national debt, we want to send money back; we want to get it out of town because I want us all to understand one thing. If people get bigger, government gets smaller. If government gets smaller, people get bigger.

I believe in the 21st century, in the Information Age, on the edge of an incredible revolution, that it is the individual that we prize; that it is the individual who is paramount in our society, not bureaucracy and bureaucrats and standing in line. It is about speed. It is about innovation. It is about excitement.

The more power we have in our pockets, the more we can do for ourselves and our communities and our schools and our children; and that is why we are committed to cutting taxes, not at the expense of our seniors, not at the expense of our children; but we believe every day that we should reduce the size and scope of this Federal Government. Let it do the things that people cannot do or business cannot do for itself and use government in a limited fashion.

We believe we need to restore America's defense. Now, we do have a very strange time where we have a department whose books cannot be audited, yet we are giving them more money. Why? Because we do not want our people in uniform to pay the price for sloppy management inside the Pentagon.

But I must say there is a crusade building in this House, on this side of the aisle, that we want that building changed; we want to force the services to work together; we want accountability and we intend to make every effort to secure that.

We will also strengthen support for education, trying to send more Federal dollars to meet the Federal mandate of special education. School districts are handicapped because the Federal Government ordered them to carry out a task but never provided the money. Because of the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS), the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU), and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), we are going to provide more money for special education; and because of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) we are going to make sure that the remaining dollars are sent to the classroom so that flexibility is provided to our educators.

In addition, we are going to improve the National Institutes of Health and basic science research, because we think it is a priority of the Federal Government. It is a proper role for the Federal Government, and we are committed to the efforts to eliminate cancer, to improve the treatment for heart disease, to be able to deal with the pain that families experience in Alzheimer's. Yes, we are going to spend more money on the National Institutes of Health, and we are going to spend more money on basic science, because it was through basic science programs in the Pentagon that we got the Internet. It was not invented by any politician. It was developed through a basic science initiative so that computers could talk together through the Pentagon. Basic science is a proper role of this Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, we are going to hear this budget called a lot of things: risky, reckless, irresponsible. They are code words, for me. They are code words for more bureaucracy, more standing in line. Is there anything you hate more than standing in line? More frustration, higher taxes. The fact is that there will be charges that we are somehow affecting these programs for the elderly. It is false.

The proof is in the pudding. We have secured them, like no one has in a generation.

The fact is, we believe that this budget that invests in limited priorities in the Federal Government, reduces the public debt, transfers wealth that we have given to government back to people and secures the programs not just for our seniors but for baby boomers and their children. We believe this is a budget that is consistent with the economic development that is going on in America today. There really is no reason for Members not to come and in a unanimous fashion support this budget.

I would ask my colleagues to think carefully about it. I think it is an outstanding blueprint, and I think it is consistent with those that believe in

limited government, in strong economic growth in the private sector. So I would urge support of the Republican budget proposal.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, we have come a long way in 8 years. We have come from a deficit in 1992, a record deficit of \$290 billion and deficits projected as far as the eye can see, to a surplus computed the same way of \$175 billion and that has underlaid this phenomenal economy.

We are now at a fiscal fork in the road. We have wiped out the traditional deficit, the deficit in our annual budget. We have created surpluses in place of those deficits as far as the eye can see, but those surpluses only exist because of the way we keep books. We keep a cash set of books. If we had accrual accounting instead of cash accounting and if we recognized our liability to the Social Security program and the benefits promised to those working today and to the Medicare program and the benefits that it entails, we would be booking substantial costs to both of those programs; and I do not think we would be in surplus. We would be in deficit again.

There are many differences between our budget, the Democratic substitute, and their budget, the Republican budget. The resolution is on the floor today, but the main difference is this: we recognize our liability to Social Security and Medicare. They do not, and I will say why.

Our budget generates savings, too. We have a cumulative surplus over the next 5 years of \$48 billion; over the next 10 years of \$365 billion. We take the \$365 billion surplus, a substantial share of it over the next 10 years, and we direct the Committee on Ways and Means to provide legislation so that \$300 billion of that surplus will be taken out of the general fund and contributed to the Medicare Trust Fund so that it will be more solvent than ever; we think more solvent to the tune of at least 10 additional years.

□ 1315

We further direct the Committee on Ways and Means to reconcile legislation so that in 2011, 10 years from now, the total amount of debt savings that we are able to achieve because we have accumulated these surpluses over 10 years, the total amount of debt service, the reduction in interest on the national debt, will be computed, and that amount will then be transferred from the general fund to the Social Security trust fund for a period of years such that we can extend its life by 15 years. Those proposals have been made by the President. We put them in reconciliatory language in our budget.

They simply do not have anything. They are saying they are going to leave the Social Security surplus alone, and we are too. Good policy, and we agree.

They are saying they will pay down \$1 trillion of debt. So will we, using the Social Security trust fund. But we are going further. We are extending the life of both programs, and that is the main difference between us and them.

We have shown in this budget resolution that we are presenting that we can cut taxes, by less, but significantly. We can pay down debt, \$48 billion over the next 5 years, \$365 billion over the 10-year period in time. We can do all of these things and still provide for the reasonable needs of our country. \$20.5 billion more for education, for example, in our budget than their budget. More for community development. In fact, they cut community development by nearly \$2.5 billion between this year and next year. The Community Development Block Grant, the Economic Development Administration that means so much to many of our districts, they slice it, \$2.5 billion. We plus it up. More money for law enforcement in ours.

There is also an account that is vitally important, because this is not spending, this is an investment, more money for science, more money specifically for the National Science Foundation.

You know, Mr. Chairman, when we had our markup in the Committee on the Budget, one of our Members from Princeton, from New Jersey, who is a professor of physics at Princeton and knows something about science, offered an amendment to the budget markup which would have added \$2.8 billion over 5 years. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) made that amendment, \$2.8 billion over 5 years, \$675 million a year to Function 250, which provides for the National Science Foundation.

The Holt amendment was rejected. There was a compromise reached such that the committee did give him \$100 million plus-up in the mark. But, you know, the arguments of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) began to resonate apparently with the majority. Over the last week, something happened.

Last night, haunted by the persuasive arguments that the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) made in our committee last week, a majority had some kind of an epiphany, because they came around, and after rejecting his requested increase in NSF, they put \$3 billion, exactly what he wanted, even more, in the National Science Foundation function.

Mr. Chairman, in light of that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), to explain what we have also put in our budget resolution to accommodate an increase in scientific research and exploration.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend, the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to see that the budget does not amount to a fiction. What we want is to see that we can

maintain the kind of robust economy that stands behind our projections. We want to have an economy with real productivity growth. And what is behind that? New ideas and smart workers. It is necessary ingredients.

I thank the ranking member for the kind remarks, and I would like to extend my thanks to the chairman and to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) for helping to prevail on our colleagues to see the benefit of my amendment.

The strong economy that we enjoy today is due in large part to previous investments in research and education, and the increase that we now see in the budget at the 11th hour, or actually it was the 2 a.m. hour last night, in research, is most welcome. But that is only part of what we need.

We should approve the Democratic substitute budget which will provide for increased funding in education as well.

The Republicans' budget cuts the purchasing power of education by \$8.5 billion over 5 years, it freezes funding at the 2000 level for 5 years, it would reduce funding for 316,000 low-income students to receive Pell Grants to attend college. Head Start would have to cut services to more than 40,000 students.

The Democratic alternative budget, on the other hand, rejects this Republican freeze for educational funding. It provides \$4.8 billion more for education for 2001 than the Republican budget. Over 5 years, the Democratic budget provides \$21 billion more than the Republicans.

So we have made a partial fix in research, but we need to do more in education, so that we can have the new ideas, the well-trained workforce, necessary for the kind of productivity growth that we have been enjoying.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) for a colloquy about prescription drugs.

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

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into a colloquy with the distinguished ranking member.

Somewhere in this budget there is supposedly a reserve of \$40 billion that is supposed to take care of Medicare and the pharmaceutical benefit and whatever, but I cannot seem to find it. Could the gentleman explain to me where that is?

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, this budget resolution, the Republican resolution, sets up a so-called reserve fund. It basically says if and when the Committee on Ways and Means reports a prescription drug benefit for Medicare, along with, coupled to, Medicare reform, whatever that means, then \$40 billion is provided for that purpose.

Unlike their resolution, our resolution has reconciliation language. That is the whole purpose of having the reconciliation power vested in the Committee on the Budget. We can use this resolution to tell committees they should change basic law to provide for things like drug benefits. We have directed it and we have put up \$40 billion also.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, if I could further inquire of the distinguished ranking member the chances, I would like to ask the gentleman's opinion of the chances of the Committee on Ways and Means passing a prescription drug benefit, when just recently the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN) offered an amendment to provide a discount on prescription drugs to seniors at no cost to the Federal Government and every Republican voted no, and every Democrat, of course, voted yes. So the Republicans voted, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH), the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER), right down the line, they voted to deny seniors a discount on prescription drugs when it would have had no budget impact at all.

Now, given that kind of compassion, and this is a word that comes out of Texas, given that kind of compassion, what do you think the chances are that the Republican-led Committee on Ways and Means would vote out a prescription drug benefit that would help anybody?

Mr. SPRATT. I take it the gentleman's question is rhetorical.

Mr. STARK. Oh, no, it is a question that I hope the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) will answer to the seniors in Florida, and that the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) will answer to the seniors in Arizona, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH) will answer to the seniors in Pennsylvania, and that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) will answer to the seniors in Illinois, because they have denied their own constituents the chance to buy these prescription drugs which they so vitally need at no cost to the Federal Government.

What kind of assistance is that to your constituents, I ask the gentleman rhetorically? And the answer is they do not want any prescription drug benefit. They do not want to save Medicare as we know it. I think that should be pointed out in this debate today.

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

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

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Chairman, I just would like to follow up on the great comments made by the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) and our ranking member, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

In 1965, this Congress took a bold move in policy. It set forth a program called Medicare, because the highest costs that were encountered by our seniors was the hospital stays. They deliberately went out and determined that, indeed, we as a budget, we as a Congress, should in fact develop that kind of a program.

Today, 35 years later, the highest costs that are being encountered and incurred by our seniors is the cost of prescription drugs. Yet when we put forward a program, a real program of reform, on how to pay for and provide for prescription drugs for our seniors, the Republicans on the Committee on the Budget turned it down.

As a matter of fact, what they did was they put together a double count kind of system of providing \$40 billion for Medicare reform and prescription drugs, but they counted it in another fashion as a surplus. So they have double-counted it.

We indeed then put forward a program of providing \$40 billion strictly for prescription drugs so that the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) and the Committee on Ways and Means and all the members of the Committee on Ways and Means could truly vote on and pass legislation that would reduce prescription drugs costs for our seniors.

We have been denied that. But, more importantly, our seniors have been denied that. This budget that is before you today does not provide one penny for prescription drugs. As a matter of fact, since they already made a mistake of \$20 billion on the Social Security earnings limit portion of this budget, you know where that reserve fund will go to? \$20 billion of it will go to making up for that mistake. Then we have even less for any kind of Medicare reform or prescription drugs.

Each one of us in our district knows the anecdotes, knows the stories, of seniors who have gone without paying their rent or paying for food to buy prescription drugs or the reverse. It is time to change that kind of situation for our seniors and make a bold move in leadership to truly give prescription drugs an opportunity to be lowered and to benefit our seniors.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. PRICE.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, recent calls for biennial budgeting have claimed that the budget process around here is broken and needs fixing. Well, I would like to suggest that the problem is less one of process, and more one of a failure on the part of the majority to produce realistic budget resolutions. What we need is not endless tinkering with the budget process. What we need is to use the existing process responsibly.

The Republican budget resolution before us today repeats patterns that are all too familiar to us from fiscal 1999 and fiscal 2000. It makes highly unrealistic domestic spending assumptions,

like those that led to last year's budgetary train wreck. It relies on false assumptions about the level of cuts which can be absorbed by critical domestic accounts.

The only way the Republican plan can make room for its exorbitant \$200 billion in tax cuts over 5 years—and that goes up to \$1 trillion over 10 years—is to drastically undercut domestic programs that are critical for working families and for the most vulnerable among us.

In 2001 the Republican plan would cut non-defense domestic spending by \$7 billion, compared to a freeze at the 2000 level. When you account for inflation, this represents \$19.7 billion, or a 6.4 percent cut in purchasing power, from our current level of activity. By 2005, the Republican plan would cut non-defense domestic spending by \$39.4 billion or 11.5 percent relative to the funding necessary to keep pace with inflation.

Mr. Chairman, we need to remember that since 1962, non-defense appropriations have grown by 2.8 percent annually above the rate of inflation. From 1996 to 2000, the Republican Congress has increased non-defense spending at an average rate of 2.5 percent above inflation. So how can we realistically expect to suddenly reduce non-defense spending, not only below the level needed to maintain constant purchasing power, but below even the current year's nominal spending level? The answer is we cannot expect to do that, we should not, and we are not being honest with ourselves if we suggest that we can.

I am not talking here merely about cuts to domestic programs in a generic sense. It is easy to talk about belt tightening, and we indeed do need to press the war against waste and fraud and abuse. But what is at stake here are large cuts to programs that serve as essential safety nets which help struggling families help themselves. We are talking about cutting 310,000 people out of the Women, Infants and Children nutrition program. We are talking about making Pell grants to 316,000 fewer students by 2005. We are talking about eliminating more than 40,000 children from Head Start.

By contrast, Mr. Chairman, the Democratic resolution is realistic and it is responsible. Under the Democratic alternative, we would pass our appropriations bills on budget, on time. Unlike the Republican resolution, we would extend the solvency of both Social Security and Medicare, and we would mandate the addition of a prescription benefit to Medicare. We would buy back publicly-held debt, not only with the entire Social Security surplus, but, unlike the Republican plan, with \$365 billion of the non-Social Security surplus. And we would create room for a reasonable and well-targeted tax cut.

□ 1330

The Democratic plan is well-balanced, by reducing debt, protecting and

strengthening Social Security and Medicare, providing targeted tax relief, and maintaining our investments in public education, research, transportation and affordable housing.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to adopt the Democratic alternative.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ).

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of my distinguished colleague's budget proposal which will provide prescription drug coverage and better access to the Department of Defense health system for Medicare-eligible military retirees.

This legislation upholds the obligation; and yes, we do have an obligation to those who have served. In Orange County alone, we have over 100,000 military retirees, and we need to provide these Americans the access to health care they deserve. It is time to do it, and this bill does it.

Fortunately, our society has been blessed with many leaders who imparted the values of leadership, responsibility, and loyalty while wearing the uniform of this country. For without their dedication to duty, we would not enjoy the many freedoms that America has to offer. Congress should keep the promises made to these brave men and women. We should vote yes on the Spratt substitute.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Connecticut for yielding me this time.

I would just like to bring us back down to earth and talk about what this budget achieves. This budget that we are talking about here protects 100 percent of the Social Security surplus; it strengthens Medicare with a prescription drug plan by setting aside \$40 billion; it retires the public debt by the year 2013; it promotes tax fairness for families, farmers and seniors; it restores America's defense systems; and it strengthens our support for education and science.

But what I would like to focus on today is Social Security. I think it is important to note where we have been on Social Security. Well, over the last 30 years, the Federal Government has been taking money out of the Social Security Trust Fund and spending it on other government programs. In fact, just last year alone, the President of the United States gave us a budget last year where he said, I want to take 62 percent of the Social Security Trust Fund and dedicate that to Social Security, but take 38 percent of the Social Security Trust Fund out of Social Security to spend on other government programs.

Well, last year we said enough is enough. Mr. Chairman, 100 percent of Social Security should go to Social Security.

So last year the President basically said, let us take \$52 billion out of the

Social Security Trust Fund, spend it on the creation of 120 other Federal Government programs.

Well, if we take this year's budget and take last year's rhetoric, we can see the difference between the two parties. Last year's rhetoric was this: a number of Members from the Democratic side of the aisle said on the same day, the Republican budget already dips in to the Social Security Trust Fund by more than \$18 billion. The Republican budget has already spent \$13 billion of the Social Security Trust Fund. The Republican budget raids Social Security by \$24 billion. Another Member on the next day said the Republican budget takes \$17 billion out of the Social Security Trust Fund. All remarks last year by Members of the other side.

Well, let us take a look at actually what happened. Last year, in 1999, guess what happens? We took zero money out of the Social Security Trust Fund. We locked away every penny of the Social Security Trust Fund. We are doing it again this year, and we are going to bring budget language to the floor that says never again will Congress go back to the days of raiding the Social Security Trust Fund.

Mr. Chairman, if we look at the President's budget, if we take out his Medicare cuts, if we take out his tax increases, the President is sending us another budget that takes \$60 billion out of the Social Security Trust Fund.

Let us look at the facts. Let us not believe the hype. We have already stopped the raid on the Social Security Trust Fund, and we are going to continue to stop the raid on the Social Security Trust Fund.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I believe we are at a crossroads in our Nation's history. In front of us is every opportunity for a future so bright, so filled with promise that our children and grandchildren have a chance to live in a Nation where every person truly has the opportunity to reach their fullest potential, a Nation where every child is educated in a modern school, in smaller classes with an excellent teacher; a Nation where people who have worked a lifetime can retire with security and without worries; a safe Nation with guns off of our streets and away from our schools. We can achieve these things if we make the right choices today.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues, this Republican budget makes all the wrong choices. Its main goal is a \$1 trillion tax cut that snuffs out the aspirations of all but the wealthiest among us. It cuts 310,000 low-income babies and mothers off the nutritional assistance they use to buy things like milk and baby food. It takes away home heating assistance from 164,000 poor families. It cuts financial aid from hundreds of thousands of students. It ends Head Start for 40,000 preschoolers.

It does not extend Social Security and Medicare, not even for a single day. That is no way to lift people up, to give them a chance to make a brighter future.

Great nations recognize that families in trouble are families with untapped potential, not problems to be swept under the rug.

Mr. Chairman, we can pay off our debt, save Social Security and Medicare, give our children the education they deserve, and our seniors the retirement they have earned, and lift people up to join in the prosperity and opportunities of this country. But we cannot lift people up if they are buried under the mountain of debt the Republican plan would pass along to our children.

Mr. Chairman, let us reject the short-sighted choices of the Republican budget and pass a Democratic budget that will help us get to that even brighter future that is now well within our reach.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), a member of the Committee on the Budget as well as the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Protect 100 percent of the Social Security surplus, strengthen Medicare with prescription drugs, retire the public debt by 2013, promote tax fairness, restore America's defense, and let us strengthen and support education and science.

Let us talk Medicare. Here come the me-too Democrats. That is not what they were saying a month ago. The me-too Democrats a month ago were rushing in and saying the President has a fantastic prescription drug benefit. Well, let us look at that. Let us see what the prescription drug benefit did.

Well, the President in the first year cut Medicare. No money left for prescription drugs. Second year, \$2 billion, but the President's plan did not start yet. The third year, a \$100 million increase for Medicare according to the President's budget; no room for prescription drugs.

What does the Republican plan do? Mr. Chairman, \$40 billion set aside for Medicare, and what do the Democrats do? Last night, rush in with a substitute, saying oh, me too, me too, me too. I want to give a prescription drug benefit that is real, not the President's that is not real, that cuts Medicare; and let us look at some of those cuts.

In order for the President to fund his Medicare benefit, it increases beneficiary costs, it cuts kidney dialysis, cutting prescription drug payments, cutting hospitals.

Let me tell my colleagues something. Out in rural America, out in Iowa, you close my hospital, you do not have health care, let alone the President's fake prescription drug benefit that did not even go into effect until 2004. So do

not come in here and “me-too,” 2 months after the President stood right up here and promised America a drug benefit that was not even real. Do not come here 2 months later and claim credit for a prescription drug benefit that is a “me-too” with our Republican budget.

We welcome our colleagues in a bipartisan way to solve this problem, but do not tell us that this is where you have been, because you have been cutting benefits under Medicare. The President’s plan did that. It is not real. Vote for the Republican plan for Medicare.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to answer the gentleman and say, if the gentleman’s proposal is real, why did he not put reconciliation directly to the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on the Budget? If your proposal is real, why did you not say here is \$40 billion, not here is a reserve fund, if you can reform Medicare and if you can report a bill?

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, last year the Republicans in the House of Representatives beat their chests mightily to talk about a \$792 billion tax cut over 10 years. That tax cut was so fiscally irresponsible that it was rejected throughout the country. We are back this year with the same situation, except now we will not even talk about it.

In our Committee on the Budget hearing I asked our chairman, what was the price tag over 10 years for this tax cut? I could not get a straight answer. But today, I understand that number has been put out here before the body. It is \$200 billion over 5 years.

Now, the question that the public deserves to have the answer to here, and we ought to answer it for ourselves, is what is the 10-year cost of this tax cut?

Well, last year the \$792 billion tax cut was \$156 billion over 5 years. We are talking about \$200 billion over 5 years. So the math is pretty simple. We are looking at a \$1 trillion tax cut over 10 years.

Now, there are those up here that think we ought to use the projected surplus for massive tax cuts and some that want to go on a spending spree, and I reject both positions. We should take the lion’s share of the projected surplus and use it to pay down this massive Federal debt. Why should we focus on paying down a \$3.47 trillion Federal debt?

Consider these facts: in 1999, we spent \$230 billion in interest payments, 13 percent of our discretionary spending. That is \$3,644 per every family in America with four people. That is more than we spend on Medicare; it is slightly less than what we spent on national defense. Think of the things that we could do by paying down the debt and not having that interest payment. We can do a responsible tax cut. We spent

\$60 billion last year on education. We spent \$230 billion in interest payments.

Paying down the debt has also been an offense to our wallets at home. Several economists, including the chairman of the Federal Reserve, Alan Greenspan, have said, that as we pay down the debt it has a positive impact on interest rates, as much as 2 points. Take a homeowner in my home State of Florida with a \$115,000 mortgage. If his or her interest rate goes down by 2 points, that is a reduction of \$155 a month in their mortgage payment. That is a better benefit than most of the tax cuts that are being proposed up here.

Mr. Chairman, let us stop playing games with the future of America.

This budget is not a responsible step towards paying down the debt and extending the solvency of Social Security and Medicare. In fact, under this plan, the Social Security surplus will be spent as early as 2004. The public does not want gargantuan tax cuts at the expense of paying down the debt and preserving Social Security and Medicare, and we should reject the resolution for that reason.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU), a distinguished member of the House Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, we have a Republican budget on the floor here today, and it cannot be emphasized enough. It sets the right priorities; it protects every penny of the Social Security surplus. It sets aside \$40 billion for Medicare and makes sure that there is enough for prescription drug coverage for those that need it. It retires public debt. It promotes tax fairness by eliminating the marriage penalty, by making the Tax Code more fair for those seeking to purchase health insurance or send their children to school. It restores the strength of our defense system, and it invests in education and science as well.

The previous speaker spoke a little bit about the importance of retiring public debt, and I think he spoke the truth. It is important. It does help lower interest rates, and it does make a difference in our economy. But I think it is also important to remember where we started.

The President was not setting aside every penny of the Social Security surplus a year ago; he was not making the commitment to pay down the debt that we have in this budget. Just 1 year ago, the President suggested that we spend 40 percent of the Social Security surplus. We have come a long way, and what a difference just a year makes.

□ 1345

In 1998, we paid down \$50 billion in public debt. In 1999, over \$80 billion in public debt retired. Last year, when the critics on the other side of the aisle said, no, you are not going to set aside every penny of the Social Security sur-

plus, we proved them wrong. We not only did it, we paid down over \$160 billion in debt.

With this Republican budget, we will bring the 4-year total of debt retirement to over \$450 billion. Paying down debt to protect our future, to lower interest rates, to keep the economy growing, it does make a difference on every home mortgage someone has. It does make a difference in lowering the cost of college loans and lowering the cost of an automobile loan. It helps keep interest rates low, and it helps protect America’s savings.

When one’s interest rates are lower, those are funds that one never even has to send to Washington. We are paying down debt, over \$450 billion in the most recent 4 years. But over the next 5 years, we will pay down over a trillion dollars in debt, paying down that debt to protect the public.

Now, the critics say, well, maybe we could pay down more debt if we did not cut taxes. We could pay down more debt if we did not eliminate the marriage penalty and kept penalizing married couples. We could, but that would be wrong. We could pay down more debt if we did not get rid of the Social Security earnings limit. We could, but that would be wrong. We could pay down more debt if we did not give individuals health insurance deductibility. We could, but it would be wrong.

We set aside over a trillion dollars over the next 5 years, and we can criticize and harangue and suggest that maybe we should keep raising taxes so that we can spend more.

My colleagues have heard the code words, risky scheme. My colleagues have heard the code words, it is a dangerous plan. Taxes are not high enough. The fact of the matter is those are code words for spending more and for keeping more of the money that the public sends here.

We are paying down over a trillion dollars in 5 years, and that is why my colleagues should support the Republican budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL).

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, the budget resolution in front of us today has a misguided focus. It double counts. It cooks the books. It does not have enough debt reduction. It has unrealistic assumptions in terms of cuts and domestic programs. It has risky tax cuts, risky indeed. Because they are simply too big, and they risk the future of Social Security.

If the Republican budget resolution is fully implemented, it would use up all of the surplus funds and threaten the future of Social Security. But if it is not fully implemented, if they cannot make the domestic spending cuts of 10 percent over 5 years that they include in this document, then they are directly going to raid Social Security.

That is an important subject for us to focus on.

All of us know how important debt reduction is. There is bipartisan agreement on that fact. The question is who accomplishes it. Debt reduction is important. This year, 12 percent of our budget is going to pay interest debt service on our debt, \$224 billion. That money crowds out private sector investment. It keeps interest rates artificially high.

If we can reduce that debt, we can free up money for tax cuts or other spending needs. If we can reduce government borrowing, then the private sector interest rates will be kept lower, and we will strengthen our economy. But we have got to have a realistic budget.

The Republican budget resolution in front of us calls for 10 percent reductions in domestic discretionary programs. That is across the board. But they pick on some particularly important programs such as the community in regional development function that would have a reduction in purchasing power over 5 years of one-third.

I do not believe there are enough votes on that side of the aisle to do that. I hope there are not enough votes on that side of the aisle to do that because of the pain that would cause.

Two years ago, I was a county commissioner, and I was dealing with community development block grants in a wealthy county, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, which this year will get \$7.5 million in CDBG grants. It gets about \$20 million in requests from the townships, the bureaus, and the housing groups, the nonprofits in Montgomery County.

So the county commissioners can fund one-third of those requests presently. If this budget goes through and across-the-board cuts are made as envisioned by the Republicans, that money is going to drop 20 percent. Over 5 years, it will drop by one-third. We are not meeting the needs of the public. This budget does not work. We have got to vote "no" on it.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, our budget protects 100 percent of the Social Security surplus, 100 percent. It does it in the next year's budget just as it is doing in this year's budget just as we did not spend any Social Security money last year. It strengthens Medicare with prescription drugs. We set aside \$40 billion in the next 5 years. It retires debt, \$1 trillion in the next 5 years. We have already retired \$302 billion. It promotes tax fairness for families, farmers, and seniors.

The GOP tax plan ends the marriage penalty, repeals Social Security earnings limit, reduces the death tax, expands educational savings accounts, increases health care deductibility, promotes tax breaks for poor communities, and strengthens private pension

plans. We set aside \$200 billion in the next 5 years, just 2 percent of the budget in the next 5 years.

The Clinton plan came in with \$96 billion of gross increases in taxes. The Republicans had zero. We do not have any taxes.

The Clinton plan increases taxes \$10 billion in the next year. We provide tax relief of \$10 billion in the year.

The Republican tax relief plan, over the next 5 years, \$200 billion for the marriage penalty, the death tax, the educational savings account, health care deductibility, the community care renewal, and pension reform. We set aside \$50 billion in potential update. We want to make sure it is locked up for paying down debt or tax relief. We do not want it spent by the Democrats on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, the Republican majority's fiscal year 2001 budget resolution before us today tests the bounds of fiscal reality while failing the tests of fiscal responsibility.

The Republican budget resolution is premised upon an unsustainable tax cut of \$250 billion over 5 years and \$1 trillion over 10 years, which absorbs the entire on-budget surplus and then some, while requiring untenable, unreasonable cuts in nondefense discretionary programs. These cuts amount to 11 percent in real terms in the funding of such things as community and regional development, health care, and the environment.

Further, the Republican budget does nothing to address the need for a prescription drug benefit and Medicare, does nothing to extend the solvency of Social Security and Medicare. If fully implemented, it fails to adequately reduce the debt.

In short, Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget is designed solely to provide huge tax cuts at the expense of proper investment and human resources and prudent debt reduction.

The Republican budget assumes that nondefense discretionary spending will be cut by \$363 billion over 10 years, cuts such as 1,000 FBI agents, 800 Drug Enforcement Agents, and hundreds of Border Patrol Agents.

It means a retreat from our bipartisan efforts to double the funding for the National Institutes of Health. It means cutting Pell Grants for kids to go to college and Head Start for kids to begin to learn.

In reality, we know the Republicans will never achieve these cuts for two reasons. First, the American people oppose them; and, second, the Republicans themselves oppose them.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, between 1995 and 2000, Republican Congresses have increased discretionary spending faster than the rate of inflation. The majority knows that

these cuts will never occur, but they provide cover for their huge tax cut which will ultimately eat through the on-budget surplus and into the Social Security surplus at the expense of Social Security solvency.

On Medicare, the Republicans offer lip service to the public's desire to a new prescription drug benefit with the so-called \$40 billion reserve. During the Committee on Budget markup, that reserve was spent several times on prescriptions, Medicare reform, and debt reduction. But the fact is we can only spend it once.

Finally, the Republican budget fails in debt reduction. If fully implemented, the Republicans will use none of the on-budget surplus to pay down debt and spend a portion of the Social Security surplus for their tax cut. If history is any judge and the Republican majority fails to make huge discretionary spending cuts they propose, it will spend even more of the Social Security surplus.

So, Mr. Chairman, the budget before us will ultimately lead the Nation back to debt finance spending, doing nothing to extend the life of Social Security and Medicare, failing on prescription drugs for seniors, and failing on paying down the national debt adequately.

The Democratic substitute offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) is a far better fiscal plan for the Nation. It provides for tax relief, debt reduction far more than the Republicans offer, and investment in the Nation's priorities of education, health care, the environment, and economic development.

The Democratic substitute does so in a way which is fiscally prudent and solvent, dedicating 100 percent of the Social Security surplus and 40 percent of the on-budget surplus to paying down the national debt, \$400 billion more than our Republican friends.

I encourage my colleagues to oppose the Republican budget resolution and adopt the resolution of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 32½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) has 34 minutes remaining.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the vice chairman of the Committee on Budget.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, we are here today to discuss a budget which Republicans have put forward that, number one, is going to protect Social Security, 100 percent of the Social Security surplus. We are going to strengthen Medicare, and we are going to provide our Medicare beneficiaries with a real meaningful prescription drug plan.

We are going to retire over the next 5 years, under this budget, \$1 trillion. By the year 2013, we are going to pay down all of the public debt that this country now owes.

We are going to promote tax fairness for families, for farmers, for small

business people, and for seniors. We are going to restore America's defense. We are going to strengthen support for education and science.

I want to concentrate just a minute on the area of national defense. Let us look at where we were when this new majority came in in 1995. When the current administration and the Democratic Congress took over back in 1993, the budget for defense that year was \$282 billion. Over the next 2 years, this administration and the Democratic-controlled Congress reduced spending for defense by \$20 billion, down to \$262 billion.

Well, what was the effect of that reduction in spending? Well, let me show my colleagues what happened. We have reduced the number of Army divisions from 18 to 10. We have reduced the number of fighter wings in the United States Air Force from 24 to 13. We have reduced the number of ships in the United States Navy from 546 down to 333.

Well, since this majority has been in control, we have been about the business of providing more money for the national security of this country. We have taken the Clinton budget since 1996 alone, and have increased it by almost \$40 billion. This year, again, in the current budget that we are debating today, we are going to add \$1 billion over the President's request for defense.

What are we doing with that money? Let us look at what we are going to do with that money. We today are competing in our military services with every Fortune 500 company in the country. We have got to provide our folks with the quality of life in the military services that is second to none, and we are going to do that.

We are going to provide them with pay raises. We are going to provide them with better housing. We are going to provide them with better recreational opportunities to be able to continue to attract the finest men and women that America has to offer.

We are going to make sure that, from a readiness standpoint, that those folks are the best trained forces in the world today; that our folk in the depots have the parts to repair the equipment; and that our forces are equipped with the latest technologically advanced weapons systems that the world has to offer.

We are the world's greatest country in large part because we are the world's strongest military power. This Republican budget maintains that commitment to the national security of this country.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would say in response to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), by my reading of their budget, it pluses up the President's budget \$1 billion this year and no more than \$300 million in the out year. It basically tracks the Clinton budget.

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

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Democratic alternative to the budget resolution offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT). As a veteran, I urge my colleagues to support this alternative which keeps the promises to our veterans.

We have debated on a lot of different issues in the Committee on Budget, which I am a member of: education, national defense, social security, Medicare, health care, and a plan to retire the national debt.

□ 1400

But the fact is the Democratic alternative offers us more hope and more opportunity to accomplish our goals and objectives for the 21st century.

For 2001, the Democratic alternative provides \$22 billion in appropriations for veterans' programs, \$100 million more than the Republican plan. Over 5 years, the Democratic alternative provides \$1 billion more than the Republicans.

In addition, the Democratic budget provides for an expansion of the Montgomery GI Bill education benefits, a key recruiting retention tool for the Armed Services. The value of these benefits has failed to keep up with the rising cost of higher education. Our budget increases the basic monthly GI bill benefit to nearly \$700 for 2001, a 25 percent increase for the benefit level in current law.

Our veterans are growing sicker and older each year. As a result, their health care needs only will grow in the years to come. It is imperative that we fund the various mandates included in the Millennium Health Care and Benefits Act, which the overwhelming majority of my colleagues supported last year.

In addition to increasing funding for health care benefits, our alternative also provides for an increase in the benefits available to veterans under the Montgomery GI Bill. The erosion of purchasing power severely hampers the effectiveness of these education benefits in recruiting and retention at a time when all branches of the military are falling short of their recruiting goals.

America and our veterans need a Montgomery GI Bill for the new millennium. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this alternative budget resolution.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), a member of the Committee on the Budget and a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

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

What does a Republican budget mean for our families? Very simply, it means that we start moving towards a debt-

free Nation for our children. Now that we have balanced the budget, we will eliminate the \$3.6 trillion public debt over the next 13 years.

It means a more secure retirement for our seniors. We stop the raid on Social Security, and we protect the Social Security surpluses into the future; a stronger effort to find cures for cancer and other life-threatening diseases, and a safer world while we fulfill our promise and our pledge to those who made it that way.

It also means more education dollars for our classrooms. It means more money for our kids; more money for learning, instead of bureaucracy and red tape.

We are committed to funding special education. We are committed to funding Title VI. What does that mean? It means that we are going to fund innovative education program strategies, the area that gives local school districts the most flexibility in educating their kids and spending their dollars to meet their needs.

We are going to make sure that we keep our commitment to those areas that have Federal facilities, military facilities, by increasing impact aid. These are areas that we are committed to because when we fund them, it gives flexibility to local school districts to meet the needs of their children and their schools.

It is a sharp contrast to the President's direction. The President's direction builds on the failed Washington approach which has given us 760 education programs spread over 39 different agencies, an education department that for 4 years will fail its audits. They have already failed two audits; they are going to fail the next two.

We give the Department of Education \$35 billion per year to help educate our kids, and the thanks that we get is a department that does not even commit to the basics of balancing its books and providing us with a clean audit. They have failed two, and they are going to fail the next two.

They have a theft ring operating within the Department of Education requiring a vigorous investigation identifying where their computers and their electronic equipment is going.

They recently printed 3.5 million forms for financial aid. Only one problem, they printed the wrong ones. They recently notified 39 students that they got a great scholarship. The only problem is these 39 students did not qualify.

This is an agency that is out of control. We need to move away from the failed bureaucracy here in Washington and move these dollars to people who know the names of our children and empower them to make the decision for learning environments that will enable them to learn and succeed.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. RIVERS).

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Republican budget

proposal as it is presented here today and in support of the Democratic proposal.

I am particularly concerned that the Republicans are not near as generous with American students as they claim to be. In fact, the Democratic proposal offers \$20.25 billion more in spending for America's students than the Republican proposal on the floor at this time.

I am also concerned that the Republicans will actually do damage to many of the programs we support in this country. For example, much of the Republicans' claimed increase for special education exists on paper only. Although they claim to provide a \$2.2 billion increase for 2001, only \$200 million in real spending increases will be available to America's schools.

And this sleight of hand grows dramatically over the next 5 years. Despite claiming that they will add \$20.3 billion in budget authority, this hollow \$11 billion promise, they will have only \$9.3 billion available in real dollars; this hollow proposal will not buy one book; it will not hire one teacher; it will not pay for \$1 toward spending for special education.

But more importantly, as the Republicans put together this package, they are going to hurt other educational programs. If we follow their proposal and say that any additional monies are going to go to special education, what we find is that the other elementary and secondary education programs must be frozen at 2000 levels. What does that mean? It represents a real cut in purchasing power of almost 9 percent by the year 2005.

This represents a real loss of 316,000 fewer low-income students who could get Pell Grants, and Head Start would have to cut services to more than 40,000 children and their families. They are not raising educational spending. They are hurting educational programs.

Instead, I would urge Members to support the Democratic proposal which increases education funding. As an individual who served for the better part of a decade on a local school board, I am pleased to support the Democratic proposal. I believe the programs we are advancing will offer support to the activities of local school boards. We will, in fact, supplement, rather than supplant, the hard work that is going on in communities all across the country.

The Democratic proposal provides real spending increases, unlike the Republican proposal. The Democrats will provide dollars to move forward on the President's promise to hire 100,000 new teachers. The Democratic increase is enough to continue that 7-year initiative, and we can expect we will be able to support about 49,000 teachers in the third year of funding. Research has proven that adding new teachers and reducing class size produces real improvement in student achievement.

Democrats also provide dollars to renovate schools. The Democratic budget provides tax credits and funding to help low-income school districts to

make needed repairs to crumbling schools, something we know is a problem all across this country. It provides for loans and grants to leverage nearly \$8 billion for about 8,300 renovation projects.

We increase Pell Grants, Head Start, employment and training, and funding for all elementary and secondary education. Please support the Democratic plan.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN), a member of the Committee on the Budget, the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Republican budget.

I want to direct my focus to defense and to education in particular, because the Republican budget does support our military families, those that have been suffering from low morale. The quality of life in the military has been allowed to fall to historic lows over the last 8 years while deployments have risen to historic highs.

The Republicans began to reverse this trend last year by following through with the first real dollar increases in defense in the last 15 years, and this year we will do it again. We are going to make those changes.

I want to talk specifically about an issue that not only affects our Nation's defense but our education as well, and that is impact aid. Impact Aid provides funding to educate children of our military personnel. Impact Aid gives parents that are serving in uniforms the assurance that their children are being educated while they are deployed throughout the world. The fine men and women of our Armed Services deserve the assurance that while they are away doing their job their children are being taken care of.

The Clinton-Gore budget wants to cut the funding by 16 percent this next year while providing for an overall increase in education spending. That cut is a slap in the face to the parents who are serving in the uniforms that serve our country.

The Clinton-Gore budget wants to cut education programs like Impact Aid that provide flexibility in and local control of education. Instead, it wants to increase the number of Federal mandates that are often left unfunded. Republicans want to invest in education by prioritizing their funding in a way that directly benefits children and allows local educators to make those decisions as to how that money is spent; whether it is in a classroom, whether it is for teachers, or perhaps new computers.

The Republican budget rejects new Federal mandates and prioritizes the best needs for our children. I urge adoption of the Republican budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume in response to the last speaker, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN).

Every President while I have served here has sought to reduce Impact Aid, and I agree with him that we should increase it. I would say to him that its chances of being increased are far greater under our budget, with \$20.5 billion over 5 years more for education, than their budget.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, this budget is based on a false assumption; and no better than Senator JOHN MCCAIN makes the observation that, indeed, this great surplus we think we have to give a big tax is problematic. Indeed, if we do that, we may indeed affect Social Security.

Mr. Chairman, this budget resolution before us promises much to farmers but delivers little. In this budget, programs for agriculture are weakened at a time when they should be strengthened. Discretionary spending for agriculture is cut. Resources needed to process claims and make timely loans are cut. Funds for programs to provide vital information to farmers are cut.

Over a 5-year period, this budget resolution cuts the purchasing power of agriculture by \$1.6 billion. At a time when the Department of Agriculture field offices face staff shortages and funding squeezes, at a time when farmers face long lines at the service counters and delays in getting needed assistance, this budget cuts agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, American farmers as we know them are in peril. Commodity prices are down. The cost of farming is up. Foreign competition is unfair. The farm safety net is virtually nonexistent, and many farmers have borrowed to the brim. Yet the very offices that can help them are understaffed and overwhelmed.

While this budget resolution offers larger farm payments, it withholds the resources to administer those same programs. This budget resolution, with its wizardry and magical acts, gives something; but guess what, at the same time it takes it away.

Mr. Chairman, there is an answer. The Democratic alternative provides \$4.7 billion more to agriculture in the fiscal year 2001. The Democratic alternative budget provides some \$213 million more for agriculture than this resolution does for this year. Over a 5-year period, the Democratic alternative budget provides \$1.8 billion more for agriculture than this provides.

This budget resolution gives farmers rights without any relief. It is a promise without any substance. It is an illusion. The Democratic alternative extends the solvency of Social Security and Medicare, repays the entire debt by the fiscal year 2013, and gives targeted tax cuts to working families.

□ 1415

The Democrat alternative is fiscally responsible. Mr. Speaker, reject this budget. Support the Democrat alternative. Our farmers and our citizens deserve better.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), a member of the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on the Budget, so that he can respond to what was just said.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) that ag and farmers deserve better. But I think it should be very clear that in our budget, unlike the budget of the President, we immediately put in \$6 billion for use and then we add another \$6 billion over the next 5 years for crop insurance to beef up that program. So, for the first time ever, we put in ahead of time \$6 billion right away.

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

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, as this first point shows, this Republican Congress has ended the 30-year, \$655 billion raid on Social Security.

As the next chart shows, regrettably, Congresses of the past raided Social Security to pay for unrelated Washington programs. This was wrong, and this Republican Congress has done something about it. Seniors deserve to have their Social Security protected.

First, Congress adopted the Contract with America that led to the first balanced budget in more than 30 years. We moved from \$200-plus billion deficits to surpluses by 1998. But we knew and the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman KASICH) and the Republican leadership and the American public knew that we could do more.

With their support, the House passed, despite the opposition of the Clinton-Gore administration, legislation I sponsored, the Social Security lockbox, by an overwhelming 416-12 vote.

As this next chart shows, last year President Clinton and AL GORE only agreed to set aside 62 percent of the Social Security surplus and proposed to spend the other 38 percent, or \$52 billion, of Social Security on risky spending schemes. But we knew 62 percent was not good enough and refused to allow this reckless Social Security raid to continue.

Even with the overwhelming endorsement of the Social Security lockbox vote, again this year the Clinton-Gore administration budget would have raided the Social Security Trust Fund by an additional \$60 billion when the tax hikes and budget gimmicks were taken out.

The budget resolution we are considering here today reinforces our Social Security lockbox for fiscal year 2001 and beyond. I urge my colleagues to support our seniors by protecting their Social Security benefits, vote for this Republican budget resolution.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to introduce the subject that the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Armed Services, is going to address, because it deals with a major

difference between our resolution and their resolution.

Our resolution contains \$16.3 billion over the next 10 years specifically earmarked for health care initiatives for military retirees over the age of 65.

Our alternative includes the funding that would be necessary to cover the major provisions of H.R. 3655, a bill that was introduced by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) who is the ranking Democrat on the Military Personnel Subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) who is the ranking Democrat on the House Committee on Armed Services, and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR).

Over that 10-year period, our Democratic alternative provides \$5.4 billion in Function 550 for a prescription drug initiative and \$10.9 billion in Function 570, the Medicare function, to provide for what we call around here Medicare subvention, to make military retirees over the age of 65 able to use their Medicare benefits at military treatment facilities. This is a major initiative and a major distinction between our budget and their budget.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I am curious how much time the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) yielded to himself. How much did he consume?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) consumed 1½ minutes.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON).

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Spratt budget alternative that is offered this afternoon.

As a ranking member of the House Committee on Armed Services, I believe this alternative is the only one that addresses the critical need to improve access to health care services for our men and women in uniform and for our military retirees who have given so much to the Nation in the past.

I also want to express my disappointment that the Kasich budget does not provide adequate funding for our military. In my view, it shortchanges the military by at least \$12 billion this year.

But let me speak about the Spratt budget and the military health care. Today I speak for those young men and young women, their families, and the military retirees who have given so very much to our Nation, because they are entitled to the best health care available from our Government.

The Spratt substitute is the only one that meets the obligation we owe our active duty members, our military retirees, and their families. I am pleased that the Spratt substitute embodies a bill that the gentleman from Hawaii

(Mr. ABERCROMBIE) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) and I have introduced, H.R. 3655, to provide access to quality health care services for our retirees and for active duty and their families.

H.R. 3655 is supported by the Military Coalition, an organization comprised of 28 nationally prominent associations representing more than 5½ million current and former members of the seven uniform services.

The Spratt substitute provides for a comprehensive approach to address the problem of access to military health care, particularly for retirees and family members over the age of 65. It includes a comprehensive mail order and retail pharmacy benefit for all military retirees. It includes an expansion of the Medicare subvention program so that Medicare-eligible retirees may be treated at military hospitals and have the cost of their care reimbursed by Medicare.

It includes the elimination of co-payments for active duty family members under TRICARE so that our active duty service members will have fewer out-of-pocket expenses.

It also includes expansion of the TRICARE program to remote locations so the service members not near military hospitals may receive better, more affordable health care.

Overall, this Spratt substitute provides over \$16 billion over 10 years for military health care.

How many times, Mr. Chairman, have we heard military retirees say, do something to live up to the obligation? This does it. This provides the money therefor.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds to say that, in our defense budget, we are going to be adding \$17.4 billion more to our defense.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) a member of the House Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Science and the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), my understanding is, I read in the Democrat Spratt budget that my colleagues are putting in the same amount that the President did at \$306.3 billion, and the Republicans are putting \$307.3 billion into the defense. How they divide it up, we were not as articulate as our colleagues are, but just the fact that we are upping them one on the military budget.

I would yield to the gentleman, but I only have a minute to talk about what I need to talk about, and that is where we are going on Social Security.

Too often I think Republicans want to move ahead and do not look back to how much they have accomplished. And what we have accomplished is significant since 1995, when we took the majority. We actually for the first time in almost 40 years quit using Social Security surplus for other Government programs.

What has happened is, in 1995, we were looking at on-budget deficits of approximately \$300 billion. Today we have a surplus. We are moving ahead in the right direction.

I am disappointed that this budget, Republican, Democrat, nobody else, deals with the huge problem of really fixing Social Security. The Democrat budget says they are extending the life of Social Security and Medicare by 13 years and 10 years, respectively, but actually what they are doing is adding just two more giant IOUs to those trust funds. It does nothing to fix the program. That has got to be the challenge in the years ahead.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that the Kasich budget has not one cent in that budget for the military retirees and the Spratt budget does.

We have got to think of our military retirees. They have given us so much.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I agree. If the Spratt budget is the same as the budget of the President budget, we add an additional \$1 billion to up that budget by, I think, \$18 billion.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON).

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) please explain that, in his budget, we do take care of military retirees, as opposed to the Kasich budget, which does not.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to say that that is absolutely correct and to further clarify the difference, the very slight difference, between our resolution and theirs, the budget of the President and theirs.

Over this year and next year, their budget would add \$1 billion for defense. It would increase the President's request of \$16.4 billion up to \$17.4 billion.

When the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) says they provide \$17.4 billion, that is a billion more than the President requested.

By the way, the President's request is \$24.4 billion more than we provided for defense in 2001 when we did the Balanced Budget Agreement of 1997.

Over the 5-year period of time, both budgets provide about \$1.6 trillion. The difference between our budget and theirs over that period of time is less than one-tenth of one percent.

When my colleagues add what we just provided, we are adding \$16.3 billion on top of that, on top of that \$1.6 trillion, \$16.3 billion to go to military retirees and to be reconciled and designed for application to them by the House Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA).

Mr. BACA. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget contains tax breaks for the wealthy while ignoring working Americans, which I think is an irresponsible and not a fiscally oriented budget that looks toward the future.

I believe the budget that has been presented right now from the Democratic side has specifics in terms of the dollars for each of the areas. I am not going to go into depth in that area, but I will go into areas that I feel impact our area.

The Republican budget cuts down domestic spending. The Republican budget cuts down the FBI agents and Drug Enforcement agents. This will open up a season for drug dealers. We already have enough drug dealers in our streets.

College scholarships. It will cut down college scholarships. This presents an opportunity of hope for many of our individuals to go to school. Many of our individuals will be dropping out if we do not provide the assistance.

The Republican party cuts down the air traffic controllers. We are already having a lot of problems with our flights every day, and every day we are looking at the emergency on that level. So if we cut down the funding in that area, look at the impact it has on many of us who fly in that area.

Programs for women and children. Women and children will be out on the streets. We look at the services that we need to provide there. There will be more latch-key kids with nowhere to go in my area or many other areas. There will also be a burden on our churches to take care of these individuals because we have not provided the assistance.

By contrast, the Democratic plan would invest in education. And it is a high priority. Education is the foundation. It affects behavior and attitudes. It prepares us for the working force of the 21st century. It reduces class size. It builds more schools. It provides scholarship opportunity. It protects our seniors. It provides affordable drug prescription. It preserves Social Security and Medicare that is very important to a lot of our seniors. And our seniors know that that is the one issue that they very much care about when we are talking about Social Security and we are talking about Medicare and protecting them.

□ 1430

It eliminates the marriage penalty on low-income households. It invests in public safety. It helps veterans as we just discussed earlier. Democrats have a responsible budget. It pays down the debt before spending and emptying the bank account. The Democrats look at the future. It saves for a rainy day, it is a sensible budget, it deals with tax relief, it deals with opportunities for all individuals of America. It provides for our children, our senior citizens, those who are less fortunate, for the middle class and for all working Americans.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. FLETCHER), a member of the Committee on the Budget as well as the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, I think one of the things that we need to come back and look at is that when the Democrats controlled Congress, we had deficits approaching \$200 billion a year. Now we have surpluses, a surplus last year of \$178 billion that we have used to pay down the publicly held debt. And so even the fact that they can have this discussion about talking about paying down the debt, it amazes me; and it is because of the work of the Republican Congress that they have been even able to talk about paying down the debt, which was really not part of their dialogue until we were able to balance the budget and to have the surpluses.

What does this budget do? First, it protects Social Security. Remember last year when the President wanted to spend 38 percent of Social Security on more and bigger government? We are saving 100 percent of Social Security. We are strengthening Medicare and prescription drugs, setting aside \$40 billion for that over the next 5 years. The President had a plan. He has a plan that puts zero in next year, the year after that zero, the year after that zero and then the last 2 years of his plan, he begins to put in some money.

When you watch his plan, the cost skyrockets. Why? Because you have working people, a bricklayer, a teacher paying taxes to buy prescription drugs for the Ross Perots of the world. But we have set aside \$40 billion for prescription drugs and for Medicare for help with our hospitals back home that we will be able to provide targeted relief for those who need it in a fiscally responsible way.

We also plan on retiring the public debt by 2013. Who wants to see a child born here and have the debt of \$20,000 upon their back? We are going to eliminate that publicly held debt that has been passed on by the minority for years to our future generations. We are going to strengthen and support education. We put more money into education, more flexibility, more money coming right back to the classrooms where it can be used most effectively with local control.

We promote tax fairness for families, farmers and seniors. It is interesting, they are talking about the huge tax breaks. What we are talking about is tax breaks that have to do with relief and fairness. I can remember them talking about not wanting to pass the marriage penalty tax, not wanting to relieve that \$1,400 penalty. We have been able to set aside money to make sure that our taxes are more fair while we are paying down the debt and certainly restore America's defense.

Let me say additionally, we are adding money to basic research and

science, hoping to find cures for disease like cancer, diabetes, Alzheimer's disease. We have consistently increased our support for the National Institutes of Health well above what the Democrats have proposed.

I am very pleased with this budget. I certainly encourage my colleagues to vote against the Democratic budget and for the Republican budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend from South Carolina for yielding me this time. The budget speaks to priorities. The Republicans are not very subtle as to what their priority is all about. It is about a tax cut. We know that this budget, their budget, says that that is their top priority. We do not have the details as to how it would specifically be organized, but all we have to do is look to last year and know that it will be an irresponsible tax cut, reckless and benefit the most wealthy. And we know that it jeopardizes the Social Security and Medicare and our ability to reduce our national debt.

We could take a look at what Senator McCain said when he said it is fiscally irresponsible to promise a huge tax cut that is based on a surplus that we may not have. To bank it all on the unending surpluses at the possible risk of the Social Security trust fund is our fundamental disagreement. We could not agree more with Senator McCain.

Now, we have an alternative. The Democratic alternative makes it clear that our priority is to protect Social Security, Medicare, and reduce our national debt, to have targeted tax relief to those who really need it, to make sure that we can continue our investments in education and the priorities that are important for our economic progress to continue. Fortunately, the budget that the Republicans enacted last year did not become law. The irresponsible tax cut was vetoed by the President. It is interesting that that veto message was never brought up before this body for a veto override, because I think my Republican colleagues know how reckless that really was.

Mr. Chairman, we are going to have a choice in a few moments to speak to what we think the priority should be for our Nation. Should we put tax cuts first or should we put the Social Security Medicare and continuing our economic prosperity first? I urge my colleagues to defeat the Republican resolution and to pass the substitute.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond with no disrespect, but I think some of what I heard was almost silly. The bottom line is we are reducing taxes in the next 5 years by 2 percent of total revenues. Out of \$10 trillion, the gentleman from Maryland thinks we cannot afford \$200 billion of tax cuts, some of which many of his members have even voted for. Of course we can afford to reduce

taxes 2 percent. And we are doing it after we are paying down our debt. We are doing it after we are dealing with Social Security. We are doing it after we pay for Medicare payments and prescription drugs.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), a member of both the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I rise in strong support of the resolution today. I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) for the work that he has done. I wish the chairman luck in his future endeavors. He has made a substantial difference here, and his leadership has been extraordinary.

The Republican budget pays down \$1 trillion in debt, protects Social Security, strengthens Medicare, and increases funding for defense and education. With these priorities fulfilled, it is time to give back to Americans their hard-earned money. Promoting tax fairness is the subject. When the Government is running continuous on-budget surpluses and CBO is forecasting surpluses far into the future, it is now time to provide tax relief. If we cannot return the overpayment of taxpayers' money now at a time when we have surpluses and a strong economy, when can we?

It is obvious that money left in Washington will be spent. Why do I say that? The Clinton-Gore budget creates 84 new Federal programs, increases spending at twice the rate of inflation, and despite our surpluses the administration again proposes to raise taxes and fees on working families. Our Republican budget would return the surplus back to the American people who earned it and who deserve it.

The Republican budget provides at least \$150 billion in tax relief, including the recently passed marriage penalty relief and small business tax relief. A very responsible \$60 billion will be included for additional tax relief or further debt reduction. Let us look at facts. Facts are facts. American taxpayers are overpaying the Federal Government. This money does not belong in Washington, not to Washington bureaucrats. The budget is paid for by the hard work and the sweat of the American worker. With the strong economy and the Federal Government in the black, it is our responsibility to provide tax relief. The Republican budget is a responsible plan for our Nation's future. I urge my colleagues to support this budget resolution.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS).

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Budget Committee budget recommendation for fiscal year 2001. As was said by previous speakers, this is quite an extraordinary event which we can produce over a period of less

than 5 years a budget that goes from deficit to not only to going to surplus but protecting 100 percent of that surplus for Social Security while strengthening Medicare and providing the resources that are necessary to provide prescription coverage for seniors; retiring potentially the entire public debt by the year 2013; at the same time promoting tax relief for families, farmers and seniors; providing significant increases in defense; and strengthening support for education and science.

I am here specifically to talk about one aspect of education that is of particular interest to me, and that is funding for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, commonly known as special education. When I came to Congress in 1996, total funding was just a little bit more than \$3.5 billion, or about 5 percent of the total 40 percent mandated as required by law. I am pleased to say that in this budget this year, we have incorporated instructions to the appropriators to increase special education funding by a full \$2 billion, which is almost 100 percent of what the entire funding was when I came to Congress in 1996.

Full funding of special education is good education policy. It is good policy for communities, for families, for school administrators, for those who are affected and participate in IDEA programs; but most importantly it is also a form of tax relief. For us to have failed to meet this unfunded mandate for so many years is inexcusable. What we do in this budget is move a long way towards meeting that obligation.

I stand here today as a proud supporter of the budget plan that we have here before us today; and for American families, for taxpayers, I urge the adoption of this budget.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY MILLER), a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of the House budget resolution. The American people need to know what we are really talking about here, \$1.8 trillion of your money. The money does not belong to government. It is the money we took from you and you have asked us to spend wisely or allow you to keep it, in many cases. What we are talking about today and what the other side is arguing against is allowing you to keep a little of your hard-earned money. What we happen to think does not matter. It is what the American people happen to think and what they say.

I would like to read part of a letter written to me by Mr. Todd Kolber of Upland, California. His dad was a physician; his dad was raised poor and worked his way through college. He specialized in chemotherapy to help people with cancer. His father passed away. He wrote me:

"I am the son and executor of the estate that he worked so hard saving for and didn't get to enjoy. Today I am

going to have the pleasure of writing two checks totaling nearly \$1 million divided between the State and Federal Government. This is the most revolting and disgusting thing that I have ever had to do. When the CPA told me how much money the death penalty imposed on my dad's estate, I literally almost threw up. I was sick to my stomach."

Mr. Kolber closes with the following question:

"Can you write me back with even one good reason that validates the usurpation of \$1 million that was left by my dad to my family?"

I cannot justify this tax of 50 percent on this family. I cannot justify this tax on any American citizen. For this reason I urge my colleagues to do what is right, the right thing for Mr. Kolber and his family and the right thing for you and the constituents of my district who will undoubtedly find themselves in the same situation at some time. I urge my colleagues to vote for the budget resolution that begins to dismantle this unfair tax that does nothing for grieving families. It is wrong. We need to change it. The debate here should be focusing on the fact that this is your money. It is not our money. We got this money because we took this money from you. We are saving Social Security. We are saving Medicare and Medicaid. It is time for you to save a little bit for your family. If you want to buy shoes or clothes or whatever you want to do, you should have your money to do that.

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

TODD M. KOLBER,
Upland, CA, March 7, 2000.

Representative GARY MILLER,
Diamond Bar, CA.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MILLER: Today marks the 1st day of the 9th month since my dad passed away. He was a physician specializing in chemotherapy treatments for cancer patients. He grew up in a very poor family in Brooklyn, New York, and he still managed to put himself through school and become a doctor, without the help of the government I might add. His plan was to retire this summer, after doing so much good for his patients and our community, and spend time sailing the 15 year old 27 foot sailboat he bought two weeks before he died. He paid untold sums of money in taxes throughout his lifetime while working to the age of 65, a requirement necessary to save enough money to retire at a financial level that a physician deserves. While paying 50% of his income in taxes to the government, money that might otherwise have been used to fund an early retirement, he died.

I am his son and executor of the estate that he worked so hard saving for and didn't get to enjoy. Today I am going to have the pleasure of writing two checks totaling nearly one million dollars divided between the state and federal government. This is the most revolting and disgusting thing that I have ever had to do. When the CPA told me how much money the death penalty imposed on my dad's estate, I literally almost threw up. I was sick to my stomach. As a result of my dad's strong desire to save for his retirement the majority of his estate is in Individual Retirement Accounts and you know the tax consequences that creates when dis-

tributed to heirs, right? After all is said and done, the government will have taken over 50% of my dad's property and money.

I adamantly believe that the government's only societal role is to protect the rights, lives, and property of the law abiding. Period. All socialized legislation beyond that is an unnecessary intrusion into my life and a waste of my money.

The government already confiscates too much money through taxation by means of Income tax, Property tax, Capital Gains tax, Gasoline tax, Social Security tax, Medicare tax, Telephone tax, Hotel tax, Airline Ticket tax, Energy Tax, Entertainment tax and numerous other hidden Excise taxes that I continuously pay.

Having stated that, and inasmuch as you are supposed to be representing me, can you write me back with even one good reason that validates the usurpation of one million dollars that was left by my dad, to my family?

Sincerely,

TODD M. KOLBER.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCI).

□ 1445

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would like to point out that we are probably \$200 billion or plus each year having to pay interest on the debt that we do have. I think what we need to do, and we owe it to the American public, is to reduce the debt and the interest on the debt that they are paying for and that we are all paying for and the children are going to be paying for and to begin to be responsible in addressing those issues in not allowing for a very large tax cut to benefit the very few in America at the expense of everybody else in America.

We know from hearing from small business people if we can reduce an interest rate by 1 point over a 30-year note that we are going to be able to save them \$25,000 on \$100,000. And businessmen are telling me if you do more to reduce the interest rates, to reduce the rates and the interest on the debt, that is going to mean more business for me, more purchases that people are going to be able to make, and by keeping our economy strong.

We have to keep our economy strong, because our economy has produced the benefits that we are now enjoying, and it was the American public through the hard work that they have been undergoing that have given us this opportunity; and we should not do it and jeopardize it on a very risky large tax scheme that does nothing for prescription drugs, that does nothing on the interest on the debt, that does nothing to preserve and protect Medicare or strengthen Social Security.

We need to be able to make sure that those are the programs that we take care of and the interest that we take care of, not on a very risky tax scheme that is going to benefit very few people.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS), a member of the Committee on Armed Services and Chairman of the Republican Conference.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. I thank my friend from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, we hear that giving people their money back is a risky thing. It is a risky thing for the economy not to give people their money back, because what happens is, if those dollars stay here in Washington, we then grow the Government and create more government; and then we have to take more money from the American people to feed those new government programs.

It is an amazing thing to me that someone would say that it is risky to give people their money back when you consider that the economy, the strength of the economy is driven by, or 70 percent of the economy is driven by consumer spending. So when you give people their money back to buy appliances, to buy food for the kids, to buy cars, or to buy new tires, to buy a new washer and dryer, to make the house payment, that is good for the economy. That is not risky.

Again, I repeat, it is risky to leave that money here in Washington. I think the Committee on the Budget has come up with a very responsible budget. It takes care of 100 percent of the Social Security surplus. It strengthens Medicare and prescription drugs.

It sets aside about \$40 billion for the prescription drug benefit, retires the public debt by 2013. I think it is important that we pay down the public debt, that we get rid of that public debt and not strap our kids and our grandkids with that. It promotes tax fairness for families and farmers and seniors. So it benefits our farmers. It eliminates the marriage tax penalty.

We set aside a dedicated reserve fund of \$50 billion for tax and debt relief only, rejects the \$96 billion gross tax increases over the next 5 years by the Clinton and Gore budget, restores America's defense, puts more dollars in national defense, and strengthens support for education and science.

Again, I think the Committee on the Budget has come up with a very responsible budget.

One thing before I sit down, Mr. Chairman, I want to add, I just had a press conference with the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman KASICH), about 10 or 11 of us; we had a press conference talking about the waste, fraud and abuse and what the General Accounting Office has found in our Federal agencies. We looked through some of those reports.

We have a Dow that is approaching 11,000. The economy is good. Unemployment is low. And I hope we do not get complacent, because our economy is doing good and we have surpluses; and it still does not mean that the Federal Government is not wasting money or abusing taxpayers' dollars.

We should be good stewards of taxpayers. We have a lot of waste and a lot of abuse in this government that we can go at and go after and even create

more tax revenue for the American people.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I would say to my good friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS), here is what we are concerned about. Here are the risks that we are really concerned about. The gentleman claims that he generated an on-budget surplus of \$110 billion, but he is also claiming a tax cut of \$250 billion. We have spread that tax cut out at the same rate as the gentleman increases the \$150 billion tax cut over time. And when we look at the bottom line, when we add in the gentleman's \$40 billion for Medicare, prescription drugs, add in the additional 50 for additional tax cuts, the surplus vanishes in the year 2003. It goes into the red in 2004 and stays in the red in 2005.

The bottom line, instead of being \$110 billion of cumulative surplus instead is \$11 billion and declining, because it has been in a deficit for 2 years. We are back in the Social Security fund, back into Social Security in 3 years if the gentleman does it this way. That is what is risky. That is what concerns us.

If somebody will show us this arithmetic is wrong, we will listen; but until then, we say this is what the budget leads us to, dangerously close to being in deficit again, back into the Social Security Trust Fund.

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

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Connecticut for yielding me the time.

I would like to actually take a look at some of the numbers that the minority staff continues to bring on the floor of Congress. If you take a look at the numbers, they are trying to tell us that we are dipping into the Social Security surplus.

Take a look at these numbers. These numbers they made up. These numbers they made up. These numbers right here, the costs of the Medicare plan, they do not even add up on their chart. If you look at this chart, in their report, I noticed they took a little bit out of this on the chart.

They say, on this chart over here, that the figures in the year 2002 to 2005 are interpolated by the Democratic staff. In Webster's dictionary, interpolate, that means to alter by text, by insertion of a new matter deceptively or without authorization.

They go on to say that the extrapolations for the second 5 years are made by the Democratic staff.

Well, Mr. Chairman, if we take a look at these numbers, they are wrong. The numbers on the surplus are wrong. The numbers that they are making up are wrong. The numbers do not add up. It is an extrapolation. It is an interpolation, which the definition is simply stated here in Webster's Dictionary.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would ask the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) a question.

Mr. Chairman, what the gentleman is reading, the quote, is the footnotes in their own documents?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, yes, absolutely.

Mr. SHAYS. So these are their own words?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Yes.

If we take a look at the chart that the minority staff has prepared, the footnote of these two quotes on this chart, the figures on this chart are interpolated by Democratic staff. They are extrapolations for the second 5 years made by the Democratic staff.

If we look at the dictionary, interpolation means insert new or spurious matter in this manner, meaning insert, estimate or find an immediate term deceptively or without authorization.

That is what we see here with these numbers. They do not even add up their totals. The numbers that they are taking from the Republican budget, if we look at the Republican budget, they are different numbers. This does not add up.

Mr. Chairman, it is the same thing. Last year they said we were raiding Social Security. Guess what? We stopped the raid on the Social Security trust fund. Last year they said we were going to take \$17 billion out of Social Security when we debated this bill last year.

Guess what happened? For the first time in 30 years this Congress actually stopped the raid on Social Security and put 100 percent of the Social Security money back in the Social Security trust funds.

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

Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman please tell us then what is the year-by-year impact of the \$200 billion tax cut over the next 5 years so that we can put it in the chart correctly and we can tell what the bottom line properly is?

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) to respond.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that the gentleman has recognized that his numbers are interpolations; that his numbers are estimates.

Our numbers add up. Our numbers on the 5-year spendup, our numbers on the tax relief, do add up. If we take a look at the gentleman's surplus numbers, taken out of our budget, they are lower numbers as well. They do not add up.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has a year-by-year breakout for the \$150 billion tax cut.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, yes, we do.

Mr. SPRATT. For the \$50 billion tax cut that is additional to that, the gentleman has no year-by-year breakout. That is all I am asking for, if we could see the year-by-year breakout of the \$50 billion tax cut, too.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, to respond to the gentleman's question, in his chart he says in the first year that we have zero tax cuts. If we take a look at page 29 of the bill, we actually have \$5 billion in tax cuts.

So looking at the legislation that we are here voting on right now, the chart that the gentleman has prepared is actually in error by \$5 billion in the first year alone.

Mr. SPRATT. Well, we know that because the chart was changed last night at 1:00 a.m., and we received that information then.

We have adjusted the numbers, added the \$50 billion to the \$150 billion, and increased it at the same rate that the \$150 billion tax cut was increased.

Using that method of interpolation, the budget is still \$5 billion in deficit by 2004 and a billion dollars in deficit in 2005. We are using the gentleman's same numbers, the gentleman's same proportionate increases each year and we come up with that result.

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), who is a member of both the Committee on Science and Committee on Agriculture, as well the Committee on the Budget.

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

Mr. Chairman, this has been an interesting debate but it almost is as if there is an echo in here. This debate certainly sounds like debates we have had around this House. Every year when the budget comes up, many of the same expressions, we are hearing terms like exploding tax cuts, risky tax cuts. Somehow I am not really certain what a risky tax cut is and especially when we look at what we are doing with this budget. All we are really doing is making room to eliminate the marriage penalty tax.

Now, nobody wants to debate that because we all know that it is incredibly unfair to say to married couples that they have to pay extra taxes just because they are married.

I do not think it is risky for us to say we are going to make room in our budget to eliminate that unfairness over the next 5 years. That is not risky.

Then we hear always, and this is a common refrain, that this is a tax cut for the rich. Well, I think the only tax cut that they can be talking about, because certainly what is being said is not that married people, just because they are married they are rich. Perhaps what is being talked about is reducing or eliminating the estate tax.

Now, currently, as we all know, it does not take very long for a small

business person or a farmer to reach that threshold where their estate is going to pay 55 percent, 55 percent.

That is confiscatory.

How can it be risky to say it is wrong to say to a farmer or a small business person, to their families, that we are going to take away 55 percent of their estate after they reach a certain level?

If the tax relief that we have put into this bill is looked at, it is absolutely fair.

I am reminded of the story and I said it the other day, of the little red hen. Nobody wanted to help bake the bread.

No one wanted to help create the surpluses, but it is amazing how people argue about who is going to get the biggest slice.

This budget, Mr. Chairman, is absolutely fair, and for the first time in my adult lifetime we are actually allowing the Federal budget to grow at a slower rate, in fact about half the rate of the average family budget. If we do that over the next 5 years, if we control Federal spending, we are going to create big surpluses. Some of that surplus ought to go back to the people who pay the taxes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my disappointment that once again our friends on the other side have chosen to offer what I consider to be a very irresponsible and unrealistic budgetary mirage rather than a real budget based upon real values.

Rather than work toward our common objectives, they have again put irresponsible tax cuts first. They have offered a budget that puts Social Security at risk, and for the same reasons backed off their proposals last summer, in 1999, in that particular budget, when they saw that Social Security was at risk.

Senator MCCAIN has repeatedly said this is a, quote/unquote, "fiscally irresponsible approach."

□ 1500

There is a simple question here: Are we better off now than we were 8 years ago? Are we better off with the fiscal discipline and key investments we started in 1993? The answer is yes, and we should not fail our values by endorsing the failed policies of the past.

Most importantly, the budget from our friends on the other side proposes cuts that just will not happen. Do they believe that by October of this year Head Start will be cut by 40,000 kids? Do they believe that if we provide for 300,000 less college students for Pell grants over the next 5 years, that that will be a part of the final budget? And do they believe that cutting home energy assistance to 160,000 families will actually be a reality in October? This budget is irresponsible. It is not a base from which to do our work here.

We believe in tax cuts, we believe in paying down our debt, we believe in allocating money for veterans health care and prescription drugs for seniors. We can do that. We should do it together. We agree on it.

Let us get down to business and do something today that will actually be useful when decisions must be made later this year. Let us adopt a budget blueprint that embraces all of our values, not one that ignores them.

I ask that Members support the Democratic substitute.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, could the chairman tell us who has the right to close and how much time is remaining on each side?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) has 6 minutes remaining, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 6½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Connecticut has the right to close.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN), a member of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services and the Committee on Science.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Minnesota a little while ago talked about the story of a little red hen. I was reminded of a different story. It is a story about the rooster who used to get up every morning and crow right before the sun came up. One morning the rooster overslept, and the sun came up anyway and the rooster was shattered and crushed.

I think our friends on the other side in the minority are like that rooster. They have been crowing, as they have been every year, about how Republican plans would hurt the debt, hurt Social Security and set us back. Yet, every year we have made great progress.

Here we are again. We are here today on the threshold of a chance to make history, paying down the debt, strengthening our retirement security system, making major new investments in the programs that families care about. With our budget plan, we will make sure that every family has the tools and the opportunity to pursue the American dream, and we do it in a responsible fashion, built on conservative values and conservative priorities.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this great budget plan.

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

Mr. Chairman, one more time let me put our chart up. The reason we had zero in allocating the \$50 billion tax cut to 2001 is that is what your resolution provided, until last night at 1 o'clock. Your resolution now provides \$5 billion, no more in that particular year.

We have, therefore, taken that single number, the only one you provided in breaking out the tax cut, and we have increased the \$50 billion tax cut at the same rate that your \$150 billion tax cut

increased it every year. The same proportion.

When you do that, in 2001 the tax cut becomes \$15 billion. In 2002, the total tax cut becomes \$29 billion. In 2003, it becomes \$41 billion. In 2004, it becomes \$55 billion. In 2005, it becomes \$59 billion. The total tax cut over that period of time is \$200 billion.

As a result, using simple arithmetic, as a result of those adjustments, just trying to figure out how your \$200 billion tax cut would distribute, we get a bottom line that is \$5 billion in deficit in the year 2004, and in the year 2005, still negative, minus \$2 billion. You are back in deficit, back in the Social Security surplus.

If these numbers are wrong, come change them.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and the Committee on Small Business.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of the Committee on the Budget and have not been part of the process that caused this incredible debt that caused this high taxation or that has caused repeated raids on the Social Security system, but I am proud to be part of the solution.

I am proud to support this budget which strengthens Medicare. I am proud to be part of this process that pays down the national debt. I am proud to support this budget that provides tax relief in the areas of marriage penalty tax, death tax, education, health care, and repeal of seniors' earning limitations.

I am proud to support this budget which strengthens national defense, strengthens education funding, aggressively attacks waste and fraud.

Lastly, I am proud to support this Republican budget which strengthens and protects Social Security and permanently ends the raid on that. I am proud to do that, Mr. Chairman, as the father of three children, because I am proud to give them the future and America's children the future they deserve.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as I said at the outset, we have come a long way since 1992 when the budget was in deficit \$290 billion. We have wiped out the deficit. Now we stand at a fiscal fork in the road, deciding whether or not we take on the second biggest and toughest problem, and that is the long-term solvency of Social Security and Medicare, or whether we take another fork and ignore those particular problems.

We have presented to the House a budget resolution which cuts taxes, not by as much as our Republican colleagues, but it is a significant tax cut, \$50 billion net tax cut over 5 years, \$201

billion over 10 years. We provide for tax cuts. We also pay down our mountainous national debt, at long last, \$48 billion over 5 years in debt reduction, \$364 billion over 10 years in debt reduction.

But we go further. Given the opportunity that we have, we step up to the problem of the long-term solvency of Social Security and Medicare by transferring over the next 10 years \$300 billion into the Medicare trust fund, extending its life by 10 years, and then by transferring funds from the general fund into Social Security and extending its life by 15 years.

We do this, and at the same time we provide for things that the country needs. I come from a district where there are a lot of military retirees. I have heard their complaints about the kind of commitment we have made to them and the extent to which we have kept it. So, consequently, we have made room in our resolution to provide for a major increase in retiree health care benefits. We are going to say to them, Medicare subvention, we can do it. If you want to use your Medicare benefits at a military treatment facility, we have provided for it in this resolution.

Furthermore, for those over 65 who do not have a drug or pharmacy benefit anymore, we are going to reinstate it. We are going to fully fund the Abercrombie-Skelton bill.

When you look at these things, the \$20.5 billion for education, the additional amounts we provide for law enforcement over and above what they provide, the realistic level of funding we provide for community and regional development, as opposed to their cut, which is \$2.5 billion in CDBGs, EDA and these agencies that help us help the hardest hit parts of our country, there is no question about it, we have not just a balanced budget in the sense that the bottom line is in the black, thank goodness, but it is balanced as to its priorities. It is the better budget of the two, and I urge support for it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. PRICE.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the gentleman in a colloquy here about this tax cut debate we have been having.

I understand that one of our friends on the other side said there was no such thing as an irresponsible tax cut. That is a dangerous view. In fact, the tax cut proposed by George W. Bush, the Republican presidential candidate, seemed to fit that category very well, because our Republican friends refused to even allow us to vote on it in the Committee on the Budget.

This chart indicates where we are with these various tax cut proposals. The Republican tax cut proposal that is included in this budget would use the entire non-Social Security surplus and take us into deficit, into borrowing from the Social Security surplus to the

tune of \$68 billion over the 10 year period. It would just barely avoid doing that over the first 5 years and be \$68 billion in the red over 10 years.

The Bush tax cut is even more irresponsible, \$136 billion into the red in 5 years, and \$376 billion over 10 years. So, it is not surprising, I suppose, that our Republican friends would not permit a vote on that.

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

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I think that is a good presentation of exactly the point we have been trying to make all day long. We have called it risky and dangerous. What we are talking about is skating on thin ice. For the first 5 years, this resolution, which has \$200 billion of tax reduction in it, comes perilously close to putting us back into deficit. If we do, we are back into the Social Security trust fund.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the Democratic alternative does have responsible tax relief, targeted at the marriage penalty, targeted at the need to get school construction moving in this country, targeted at a number of important priorities. But it is balanced and responsible. That is the key point. It is balanced with the other priorities of shoring up Medicare and Social Security and paying down the national debt. It is that sort of balance that I think is missing in our Republican friends' resolution.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina has 15 seconds.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, in the time remaining, I would urge every Member to look in earnest at these two proposals. We have made the House a budget proposal that pays down the debt, provides for tax relief, but also provides for the real needs of this country.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut has 3¼ minutes to close this portion of the debate.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, only in Washington when you cut taxes by \$200 billion in a \$10 trillion revenue stream would people call it irresponsible.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU).

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, it is never easy to put together a budget that spends \$1.8 trillion. It is difficult to bring together all of the Members on this floor on either side of the aisle, talk through priorities, make trade-offs and set forth a blueprint that talks about our broad vision for where this economy ought to be headed, for where Federal spending ought to be headed and for what we ought to be doing to protect the taxpayers of this country. But the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) has provided tremendous leader-

ship to the Committee on the Budget; and I think it is worth reviewing, not just the record that he has established in setting these priorities, but where this budget is really going to take us.

Let us cut through the rhetoric a little bit and talk about what our priorities are. First and foremost, it is to set aside every penny of the Social Security surplus. This is not old hat. This is not an idea that Democrats or Republicans have been talking about for 4, 5, or 6 years. It was just last year that Republicans responded to the President's call to spend 40 percent of the Social Security surplus with a commitment that no longer will we take funds out of the Social Security surplus, that we will set aside every penny. We did it despite the calls of critics that we would not be able to do it. We did it because we had the will and determination to put forward spending bills that achieve that goal.

What else does this budget do? It sets aside funds for Medicare, for prescription drug benefit. We have heard a lot of scare tactics about losing benefits, Medicare or Social Security, trying to intimidate Members of this House, trying to intimidate the American people. But the fact is we have set aside \$40 billion. If you just take a look at the allocations for Medicare, the red showing the President's set-aside for Medicare, the blue slowing the Republican plan for Medicare, there is a dramatic difference. If we have the wherewithal and will to pass bipartisan legislation in the Committee on Ways and Means, we will achieve historic Medicare reform and deliver that prescription drug benefit to those seniors in need.

□ 1515

Set aside Social Security surplus, protect Medicare, and pay down debt.

Look at the record on debt relief. This is not a projection; this is what has actually been done. In 1998, \$50 billion. In 1999, over \$80 billion. This fiscal year, \$163 billion. Despite the fact that the critics on the other side said we were going to dip into the Social Security Trust Fund surplus, we did not. Over 4 years we have paid down over \$450 billion in debt. It keeps interest rates low, it keeps the cost of one's home mortgage or car loan low, and that money never has to be sent back to Washington.

Critics say we could pay down more debt if we did not cut taxes. Well, of course, we could pay down a little more debt if we did not cut the marriage penalty, if we kept penalizing married couples; but that would be the wrong thing to do. If we did not eliminate the Social Security earnings ban, we could pay down a little bit more in debt, but that would be the wrong thing to do. If we did not give individuals health insurance deductibility just like we give to big corporations, we could pay down a little bit more in debt, but that would be wrong. We are supporting this historic tax relief for Americans, not because of what it does or does not add

up to, but because of eliminating the marriage tax penalty, eliminating the death tax, because giving individuals health insurance deductibility is the right thing to do.

Even with this historic tax relief, we pay down debt over the next 5 years. Mr. Chairman, \$1 trillion in debt paid down over the next 5 years. What a historic achievement, bringing public debt from over \$3.9 trillion to well under \$3 trillion over the next 5 years. That achievement will not just serve fiscal responsibility or serve our budget priorities well, but it will serve the American people well.

Mr. Chairman, this is the right set of priorities for America, from paying down debt and cutting taxes to investing in defense and funding our special education mandate. I urge my colleagues to support this vision, this set of priorities, and support the Republican resolution.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to this Republican Fiscal Year 2001 Budget Resolution and in strong support of America's home healthcare agencies and patients. This resolution is skewed and misguided. It is a framework for disaster and for a return to the deficit spending of the 1980s. It is a political document designed to further the Majority's ill-advised tax cut agenda. Instead of focusing on strengthening Social Security, improving education, and extending Medicare, this budget will place our surplus in jeopardy through the risky tax cut scheme that was vetoed last year. I challenge the Republicans to take a stand for America and fund the programs Americans depend on.

One of those programs is home healthcare, which received some of the worst cuts in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (BBA). Home healthcare is vital to millions of people across this country. It allows patients to recover from illness or surgery and to receive treatment in the comfort of their own homes and in the security of their own families, instead of having to move into a nursing home or stay in a hospital. In addition, treating patients at home saves money for Medicare in the long run.

Home healthcare received attention last year because there was a pressing need to restore funding for ailing home healthcare agencies. This need has not diminished. An important provision in last year's budget resolution expressed support for delaying the automatic 15 percent cut in home healthcare funding upon implementation of the Prospective Payment System (PPS) and for the enactment of the PPS in a timely fashion. At the end of the year, the BBRA included a one-year delay of the 15 percent cut, in part due to the language in the Budget Resolution.

Today we are debating the FY 2001 Budget Resolution, and while I will not support final passage because of the misguided policies outlined in this resolution, I am somewhat encouraged by the home healthcare language it includes. However, I believe it is time for the Majority to show some courage and dedicate specific funds for home healthcare agencies.

This Budget Resolution contains a Sense of Congress that "Congress and the Administration should work together to avoid the implementation of the 15 percent reduction in the prospective payment system and ensured timely implementation of that system."

Instead of a Sense of Congress, I challenge the Majority to include \$5 billion to eliminate the 15 percent reduction. It is time for the Majority to admit it made a mistake with the BBA and begin to fix that mistake.

I am extremely disappointed that the Republican Majority does not recognize the damage done by the BBA, especially to home healthcare. We are living in the most prosperous time in this nation's history. Our seniors deserve better than this budget.

Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. Chairman, today I address H. Con. Res. 290, the Republican budget resolution for FY 2001. Further, I would like to discuss the opportunities that the Blue Dog substitute provides. I am working to amend some of the inequities in the resolution drafted by my Republican colleagues.

In 1993, when President Clinton first came to office, the deficit stood at \$332 billion. Beginning with the Deficit Reduction Act in 1993, the Administration worked its way to a surplus. By Fiscal Year 1998, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) reported that total revenues exceeded spending by \$70 billion, producing the first surplus in almost 30 years. This surplus allowed us to move our attention beyond the deficit and onto other pressing national problems.

Mr. Chairman today seniors make up a greater percentage of our population than ever before. The generation that made this nation great—that lifted us out of an economic depression, won both world wars and the cold war—is retiring by the millions and in need of care. This trend will continue with the fast-approaching retirement of the baby boom generation, placing an unprecedented strain on Social Security and Medicare—programs created by the Democrats for the people.

Medicare, the primary vehicle of health care for seniors, is threatened with insolvency by 2008. Population increases, coupled with rising health costs, have threatened to annihilate this program. However, we have an opportunity to change this.

The Blue Dog substitute, which I support, pays heed to these vital programs. This substitute promotes responsible budgetary policy by reserving half of the on-budget surplus for debt reduction and saving the entire Social Security surplus. While the Republicans budget uses the surplus for irresponsible tax cuts, we save Medicare and Social Security. We also establish a Medicare reserve of \$40 billion over 5 years that could be used to finance reforms that extend solvency, create a prescription drug benefit, or allow for additional health care provider relief. Further, we take care of our rural health care programs by increasing funding for discretionary health care programs by \$4.6 billion over the Republican budget.

The Blue Dog substitute will put the government on the path to completely eliminate the publicly held debt by 2012, one year earlier than the goal set forth by the President. Because the Republican plan spends the Social Security surplus for other purposes, it reduces less debt. Federal reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan has stated that paying down the debt is crucial to preparing for the fiscal hurdles that face Medicare. It's clear that social Security, Medicare, Social Security and the national debt are intricately linked.

Mr. Chairman, another thing I simply cannot overlook is the lack of funding that the Republican budget resolution provides for education

programs. The substitute I am supporting provides \$15 billion more funding over the next five years for education than proposed in the Republican budget. These funding increases are targeted toward education reform initiatives. Although our children have no legislative voice, they represent our nation's future and deserve an investment in their education today.

Our budget should not only educate our children, but also protect their security in an increasingly dangerous world. I support a budget that will give this nation an appropriate level of military readiness. Mr. Chairman, several renegade nations have recently completed successful nuclear weapons testing. Although the Cold War has ended, the nuclear arms race continues to this day. With this concern in mind, the Blue Dog substitute provides \$15 billion more in defense budget authority (over 5 years) than the Republican budget. In addition, the Blue Dog substitute takes care of veterans by providing funding for prescription drug benefits.

The Blue Dog budget also meets the agricultural and energy needs of this nation—areas of crucial importance in my district of East Texas. The Blue Dog substitute increases the baseline for mandatory agricultural programs by \$23.6 billion over the next five years, in addition to providing \$6 billion for assistance in fiscal year 2000. This increase provides funding for crop insurance legislation, long-term agricultural safety net and income support programs, and agricultural research. In contrast, the Republican budget does nothing to increase the agricultural baseline beyond the minimum necessary to fund crop insurance reform.

While the Republican budget cuts the energy function by \$2.2 billion, the Blue Dog substitute includes funding for research to increase domestic energy production, develop alternative energy sources, and promote energy conservation. The Blue Dog budget prioritizes funding for energy initiatives critical to the economic vitality of this nation.

Although I have only highlighted a few differences between the Republican budget resolution and the Blue Dog substitute, it should be obvious that they are significant. I encourage my colleagues to vote for the blue Dog substitute, a budget with responsible priorities. This is our opportunity to vote for comprehensive fiscal change and support a budget that will improve the lives of our fellow Americans.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise tonight to say a few words about the budget resolution. Unfortunately, I will not be able to vote for the resolution or any of the five alternatives put forth before us tonight, because none of them have a good combination of debt relief and spending priorities.

The Republican resolution offered by Mr. KASICH shortchanges important domestic programs by cutting non-defense discretionary spending by \$6.9 billion over 2000 levels. This would mean that over 300,000 students will lose their Pell grants for college, and that almost 2,000 FBI and DEA agents will lose their jobs. In addition, the Kasich resolution does not provide near enough money for debt relief. Virtually all economists, including Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan, have argued that there is almost no better way of improving the government's finances than reducing the debt. That is also why I am opposing the Democratic, Black Caucus, and Progressive

Caucus alternatives, because they do not reserve enough money for debt reduction.

In contrast, while I support the Blue Dog's position on using one-half of the surplus debt reduction, I believe that their high spending on defense—even higher than the Kasich resolution—jeopardizes other discretionary spending. Specifically, I am particularly opposed to the Blue Dog substitute because of the cuts in transportation spending. Under this proposal, and that of the CATS substitute and the Black Caucus substitute, it would not be possible to honor the commitments Congress made in TEA 21 and AIR 21 transportation bills, thereby risking the safety of millions of motorists and air travelers.

I appreciate the hard work and effort that my colleagues put into their respective proposals, but unfortunately, I do not feel that any of these proposals have the right mix of savings for debt reduction and funding for our nation's infrastructure needs. Moreover, this and other recent budget resolutions have been composed of blue smoke and mirrors that do not reflect year-spending agreements. Rather, it is unfortunate that the budget resolutions have been and will continue to be breached during appropriation's negotiations between Congressional leaders and the White House. Hopefully, this and future Congress will break that cycle and lead us into the 21st Century in a fiscally responsible manner.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this Budget Resolution because I believe that, in this time of great prosperity and urgent needs, we can do better. We should be voting on a bipartisan and realistic budget resolution.

Instead, we have a resolution that doesn't secure the future of Social Security and Medicare, and doesn't focus on critical education, health, and consumer safety needs.

Under this resolution, our federal commitment to education would be \$4.7 billion under the President's budget. The increases proposed are solely for elementary and secondary education, leaving no increase for critical needs in school modernization, professional development, Title I, and higher and adult education.

Under this resolution, the NIH would receive a lower increase than necessary to continue our bipartisan effort to double funding for the world's premiere biomedical research institution. And this increase would mean that other, equally worthy health programs at CDC, SAMHSA, HRSA and related agencies would be at or below a freeze.

Under this resolution, programs like LIHEAP—so desperately needed this winter—would serve 164,000 fewer low-income families. Pell Grants would go to 316,000 fewer students by 2005; and more than 40,000 kids would be denied access to Head Start by 2005.

The fact is that this budget resolution sets us against each other. We cannot have tax cuts of the extraordinary magnitude being discussed unless we make deep cuts in programs that millions of Americans rely upon.

I believe maintaining a strong defense and providing meaningful tax relief does not need to come at the expense of vital programs that help get kids through college, translate scientific discoveries to patient care, and help families raise healthy kids. No one wins when we set program against program.

I hope we can avoid that destructive game and work together to provide strong support to

the important and worthy efforts that Americans are calling on us to support. Together, we can improve the lives of the American people.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, the greatest magician of all time was Harry Houdini. He was the first person to do the Straight Jacket Escape. In that one, Houdini allowed himself to be tied up in a straight jacket and hung upside down from the eaves of a tall building. Invariably, Houdini found some sensational way to escape.

The Republican majority has turned the budget process into an annual escape act. Each year, the Republicans march down here and tie themselves up in a straight jacket budget. Then they spend the next few months trying to escape from it. Invariably they fail and they resort to budgetary sleight-of-hand, smoke and mirrors and accounting gimmicks. Invariably, the appropriation bills are not passed and we are left with a last minute, take-it-or-leave-it, catch-all budget that funds most of the government.

This year's Republican budget is no exception. The budget the Republican Majority is advancing today is completely unrealistic. It calls for a \$150 to \$200 billion tax cut, but the only way they can achieve this is through draconian cuts in discretionary spending, which even they won't be willing to vote for when the appropriations bills reach the Floor.

The fact is that if the Majority actually implemented everything in their budget, the tax cuts would significantly exceed the projected non-Social Security surpluses for the next five years. This is irresponsible. We should use the budget surpluses to pay down the debt and extend the solvency of Social Security and Medicare.

The bottom line is this: The GOP budget is a straight jacket that Houdini himself couldn't escape from. I urge my colleagues to reject the Majority's budget and adopt the Spratt Substitute.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, when I was growing up near Detroit, the Four Tops had a hit single called: "It's The Same Old Song." Well, that could be the title of this Republican Budget Resolution. Because when you listen closely to what they're proposing you'll hear is the same old song they were singing this time last year.

What's in their budget? Over \$1 trillion dollars in tax cuts for the wealthy over 10 years. And who gets stuck with the tab? You guessed it: America's families do.

Sound familiar? It ought to: this is what the Republicans tried to peddle to the American people last year. It's the same old song.

Well, I've got some news for the Republican leadership: the American people weren't dancing to it then and they're not dancing to it now. And what made their proposal a bad idea last year makes it an even worse one today.

It's the fact that while they wrote a tax cut for the rich into their plan, they wrote America's working families out.

Mr. Chairman, when I listen to working families back home in Michigan they're not telling me they want to cut taxes for the rich. No. What they're telling me is that they want to see us start paying down the debt. They're telling me they want us to strengthen Social Security.

What they're telling me is they want us to make Medicare efficient and modern—and that includes making sure it offers a prescription drug benefit.

But this budget plan not only fails to address any of those priorities—it would tie our hands so we couldn't respond to them in the future. And, if that's not enough, it would also slash needed investments to the tune of \$114 billion dollars. That would knock the stuffing out of our efforts to provide clean drinking water and promote energy conservation.

It would rob us of the resources we need to enforce environmental protection laws the way they ought to be. And it doesn't stop there.

Under their plan, the WIC nutrition program would have to turn away three-quarters of a million pregnant women, new moms, babies and little children.

Mr. Chairman, if that's what George W. Bush calls compassionate conservatism I'd hate to see the other kind.

It's the same old song—and today we're saying that America's families deserve better.

What America's families want is a sensible, balanced budget that invests in America's future, not some "golden oldie" of a budget that would only repeat the mistakes of the past. What working families back home in Michigan want is a budget that's responsive—and responsible. We want a budget that enables us to strengthen Social Security. A budget that allows us to modernize Medicare. We want a budget that gives us the ability to pay down the national debt. Those are the priorities of the families I listen to.

And while the Republicans talk sometimes like they know the words—proposals like this remind us that they just can't carry the tune.

I urge you to vote "no" on the resolution.

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the American people have told us exactly what we're here to do: we are here to retire the national debt so our children aren't forced to pay our bills, we are here to maintain a balanced budget, we are here to ensure the long term solvency of Social Security and Medicare, we are here to relieve the tremendous burden from our nation's seniors by including basic prescription drug benefits in Medicare, we are here to invest in our children's future. We are here to offer prudent, targeted tax cuts for America's working families.

H. Con. Res. 290 abandons the middle-class family, disregards the plight of America's senior citizens, and sacrifices our hard won fiscal discipline. H. Con. Res. 290, if adopted, will spend us right back into deficit, thus jeopardizing the Social Security trust funds, and will fail to stabilize Medicare or improve the quality of health care. Not one single dime will be used to reduce our national debt. In fact, by 2004 the budget must dip into the Social Security trust funds in order to finance the massive tax cuts for special interests sought in the Republican measure.

Mr. Chairman, in 1999 our Federal Government spent 13 percent of its entire budget just paying off the interest on our national debt. Because of the Budget Act of 1994 and our continuing fiscal discipline to maintain a sound economy, we can pay off our debt by 2013. This must be our top priority. H. Con. Res. 290 jeopardizes paying off the debt and continuing our strong economy.

Mr. Chairman, I support the Spratt substitute because it pays down the debt, ensures the solvency of Social Security, invests in our children, and includes prescription drug coverage in Medicare. Throughout my district I am approached by seniors who express their frustrations with having to choose between medically

needed prescription drugs and putting food on their table. Whether these seniors live in the public housing complex at Brush Creek Towers in the economically depressed central city or in the more affluent part of my district in Lee's Summit's John Knox Village, the astronomical cost of their medications is forcing them to make an impossible choice: food or medicine. This must not continue.

I strongly encourage my colleagues to reject H. Con. Res. 290, and vote to protect the Social Security trust fund. We must pay down the national debt. We need to ease the burden on our seniors and invest in our children, and provide for modest, prudent, targeted tax cuts for working families. Let's do what's right for the future of America.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican budget resolution.

In order to make room for \$150 billion of irresponsible tax cuts, the Republicans cut budget authority for nondefense discretionary programs by a total of \$138 billion over 5 years below the baseline needed to maintain program levels. As a result, this would among other things: Cut 310,000 low-income women, infants, and children off WIC assistance in 2001 alone, and more in years thereafter; cut 1,000 FBI agents and 800 Drug Enforcement agents by 2005; cut LIHEAP to only 164,000 low income families in 2001, just as oil prices are skyrocketing; provide Pell grants to 316,000 fewer low-income students by 2005; eliminate Head Start for more than 40,000 children and their families by 2005; and raid the Social Security surplus to pay for its tax cuts.

It is time for the Republicans to stop trying to cut taxes on the backs of America's seniors, working families and children.

It is also time for the Republicans to stop claiming that we can't afford to spend more on important programs, like education and health, when they are pouring more and more money into defense.

We have 11 million children who are not covered by health insurance; we have a Head Start program so chronically underfunded that only 2 out of every 5 eligible children can get in; and we have 26,000 schools—serving 14 million kids—that need major repair or replacement.

This past fall, 53.2 million U.S. students returned to school. For the fourth year in a row, we set a record for enrollment rates—447,000 more children than last year. And public high school enrollment is expected to increase by 11 percent between 1998 and 2008—on top of a 16 percent jump since 1988.

Schools are straining to accommodate the influx of students, setting up classrooms in trailers, hallways and closets. The U.S. Department of Education estimates that 6,000 new schools must be built by 2006, at a cost of billions of dollars, to handle this overflow.

Yet the Republicans have chosen to cut non-defense discretionary spending, like education.

Furthermore, 46 percent of today's schools lack adequate electrical wiring to support the full-scale use of technology. And our schools are still suffering from a digital divide. Schools with 90 percent or more of minority students have less access to computers—17 students per computer compared with only 10 students per computer in schools with less than 25 percent minority students.

Yet, instead of focusing on these important issues, the Republicans are increasing defense spending by \$17.4 billion.

The biggest percentage increase in the DOD budget (11 percent) is not for what is really needed, like pay raises or operations and maintenance. Countless numbers of our soldiers are on food stamps, but the Republican budget focuses more on building new weapons than helping to retain our soldiers, and to improve their quality of life.

Our long-term national security depends not just on how many bombs and missiles we build, but how well we can retain our soldiers and how we can prepare our children for the highly-competitive global economy they will face.

The Democratic alternative focuses on these important issues. It focuses on the needs of Americans by: Extending the solvency of both Social Security and Medicare and protecting 100 percent of the Social Security surplus; providing a voluntary prescription drug benefit for all schools through Medicare and issuing reconciliation instructions to the Ways and Means Committee to make it real; providing more debt reduction than the Republican budget by not spending all of the on-budget surplus. The Democratic alternative maintains on-budget surpluses for the next ten years, unlike the Republican budget. Thus, the entire debt would be eliminated by 2013 under the Democratic alternative; maintaining funding for non-defense discretionary programs at the level needed to adjust for inflation; Providing targeted tax cuts to average families of \$78 billion over five years and \$263 billion over ten years, and offsetting this cost by closing corporate loopholes and shutting down corporate tax shelters; and, by including initiatives to extend access to health care and health insurance and reforming the health care system for military retirees.

What we do in this budget will affect more than what we do next year—it will affect what we do years down the road.

We must prepare for our future. We must provide security for our Seniors. We must support our working families, and we must invest in our children. The Democratic alternative does that.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the Republican proposal and to support the Democratic alternative.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in proud support of a responsible Fiscal Year 2001 Budget Resolution put forth by this Republican Congress. This budget provides the blueprint to do great things this year, including: Balancing the budget for the second consecutive year, eliminating the public debt by 2013, safeguarding Social Security, increasing defense spending, setting aside \$40 billion for Medicare reform and prescription drug coverage, increasing elementary and secondary education funding by more than 9 percent and much more.

The Clinton-Gore administration's budget, submitted to Congress on February 7 this year, increases discretionary spending by over \$39 billion. That is an increase of more than twice the rate of inflation—evidence that the Clinton-Gore-Gephardt alliance continues to support a "government on autopilot" approach.

Mr. Chairman, that is simply irresponsible. There is plenty of fat that can still be trimmed off Uncle Sam. Just because we have increas-

ing surpluses does not mean all Government spending is responsible or justified. We need to continue to address the billions of dollars lost on waste, fraud, and abuse. We need to eliminate those programs that don't work and are a burden to the American taxpayers. This budget resolution will do that by restraining federal spending, setting aside funds for paying down the debt and saving Social Security.

This budget resolution will allow Americans to keep more of their hard earned dollars and allow us to keep our promises to the nation's youth, small businesses, parents and seniors.

In closing Mr. Chairman, I strongly encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the Fiscal Year 2001 Budget Resolution.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Chairman, today, the House will vote to approve a Republican budget resolution which will set the priorities for spending in the next fiscal year. I will join many of my colleagues in opposing this irresponsible plan.

I have many concerns about the resolution. It fails to take the necessary steps to keep our economy going strong so that all parts of our country can benefit. It does not meet our national priorities of paying down the debt, preserving Social Security, providing targeted tax cuts for working families, and making crucial investments in important areas.

The majority's resolution calls for spending \$114 billion less on domestic programs than is required simply to keep up with inflation. This could have a devastating effect. It would require us to stop providing LIHEAP assistance to 164,000 families; to cut-off 310,000 low-income women, infants, and children from WIC assistance; to give Pell grants to 316,000 fewer low-income students; to end Head Start services for more than 40,000 children and their families by 2005. These cuts do not match our national priorities, especially as we enjoy a significant non-Social Security surplus for the first time in decades. Moreover, at the same time it erodes support for important safety net programs, the majority's resolution provides for a \$250 billion tax cut over the next 5 years, which could grow to up to \$1 trillion over 10 years. These cuts are not targeted to working people, but rather would benefit primarily those who are most wealthy. I could not support such a plan.

Instead, I supported a substitute plan which would have paid off the national debt by 2013, provided \$50 billion in targeted tax cuts, invested in domestic priorities, and extended the solvency of Social Security and Medicare. This plan struck me as being more balanced with regard to maintaining our fiscal discipline and planning for future needs. Unfortunately, it did not prevail.

We are fortunate to be enjoying a robust economy which has resulted in significant budgetary surpluses. Instead of splurging on expensive giveaways, we need to maintain fiscal discipline and keep an eye toward the challenges that are coming our way. Social Security and Medicare will soon be facing serious financial problems due to the huge demographic shift that will occur when the baby boomers retire. We must act now to prepare for that reality.

I also believe that we should use more of our surplus to retire our national debt. Currently, the federal debt is about \$5.5 trillion. In 1998 alone, we paid about \$243 billion just in interest on that debt. By paying down the

debt, we could free up tens, if not hundreds of billions of dollars for more productive use. In addition, it would prepare the country for future fiscal challenges.

I am not opposed to tax cuts. The plan that I supported includes \$50 billion in targeted cuts. Last year, I voted for approximately \$100 billion in tax cuts that were signed into law. However, the \$250 billion plan contained in this year's budget resolution runs the risk of not only eating up the entire budget surplus, but some of the Social Security surplus as well.

As we continue work on the budget this year, my goal remains to ensure that we maintain fiscal discipline to keep our economy going strong, to shore up Social Security and Medicare, to pay down the national debt, and to provide adequate funding levels for our domestic priorities. I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to achieve a budget of which all Americans can be proud.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this Member rises today to express his support for H. Con. Res. 290, the FY 2001 Budget Resolution, as approved by the House Budget Committee.

This budget resolution proposes \$596.5 billion in total discretionary spending for fiscal year 2001, a \$10.5 billion increase which amounts to half of the rate of inflation. In fact, the spending limits for most of the five budget alternatives offered today are relatively close in total spending. This Member votes for H. Con. Res. 290 only with the expressed understanding the resolution presents an overall guidance to the House on spending and revenues which he supports. However, this Member views the spending breakdown by categories as only advisory; he does not agree with several areas of this part of the committee's recommendations. Therefore this Member does not view himself as committed to the detailed budget function breakdown included in H. Con. Res. 290. Indeed, this Member intends to ask the leadership to make certain different recommendations to the Appropriation Committee as allocation decisions are made among its subcommittees.

Having said that, this Member is pleased that H. Con. Res. 290 provides an increase for the category education, training, employment, and social services programs. The resolution also includes a necessary increase for Medicare. Moreover, the budget category for transportation is adequate to permit spending of accumulated dollars in the highway trust fund and aviation trust fund, so these funds will not be diverted for other purposes. This Member strongly supports that concept. Also very importantly, the budget resolution stipulates that if a portion of a FY 2001 tax relief is vetoed by the president, the vetoed amount must be allocated toward debt reduction, not additional spending—in effect creating a debt reduction "lockbox." In addition, H. Con. Res. 290 proposes to devote the entire amount of excess Social Security receipts (an estimated \$166 billion in FY 2001) to a lockbox to prevent these Social Security funds from being used to finance other government programs.

Importantly, there is \$8 billion over the next 5 years for crop insurance reform. It is this Member's hope that since the other body passed its version of crop insurance legislation today, we will have a conference committee appointed shortly and actually enact crop in-

surance reform well before FY 2001 begins. Furthermore, H. Con. Res. 290 includes \$6 billion for a reserve fund to address potential agriculture emergencies during FY 2000. This fund will allow Congress the flexibility to quickly address agricultural emergencies within the framework of the budget throughout the year.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, this Member supports the Budget Committee version of H. Con. Res. 290 and urges his colleagues to vote "aye."

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the budget resolution before us today.

This resolution, like many in recent years, makes unacceptable cuts in domestic discretionary spending to pay for unwise tax cuts and increased defense spending. This bill would hold domestic discretionary spending \$114 billion below inflation over the next five years. That means that a number of important Government functions would be short-changed—maybe education, maybe veterans, maybe scientific research, or maybe air traffic control. I don't think that we should short-change any of those activities. In fact, I think that we need to invest more in the federal programs that will make this country safer, healthier, and more productive in the future.

In addition, this budget fails to do enough to pay down the national debt and shore up Social Security and Medicare. By providing such a large tax cut, this budget consumes the projected on-budget surpluses in just a few short years. In fact, according to Representative John Spratt, Ranking Member of the House Budget Committee, the tax cuts provided for in this budget resolution would start eating into the Social Security Surplus by 2004. That means the Government would pay down less on the debt than it otherwise would. That means the Government would do less to strengthen Social Security and Medicare. And that means that a comprehensive Medicare prescription drug benefit would be much harder to enact. I believe that paying down the debt and fixing Social Security and Medicare must come first.

Finally, I would like to point out that Congress has not adhered to similar budget resolutions passed in the last few years. It couldn't—these budgets required unrealistic and unacceptable levels of spending for important domestic programs like education and health care. Many Members, myself included, have pointed out how unrealistic these budget resolutions were when the House considered them in past years, but the Majority pushed them through without regard for our concerns—concerns which with hindsight appear to have been correct.

In conclusion, I urge my colleagues to reject this unrealistic and unwise budget. Instead, let us work together to produce a budget resolution which pays down the debt, strengthens Social Security and Medicare, provides a Medicare prescription drug benefit, and invests in the health and education of our people.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge support for H. Con. Res. 290, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001.

The budget allocations for transportation contained in this resolution are fully consistent with the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st century (TEA 21) and the Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st century (AIR 21).

As a result, this budget resolution keeps faith with the American taxpayer and preserves the integrity of the transportation trust funds.

TEA 21

The resolution allocates to the Appropriations Committee sufficient budget authority and outlays to fully fund TEA 21, thereby ensuring that highway trust fund revenues are used for their intended purpose of improving our Nation's highway and transit systems.

In addition, the function 400 allocation in this resolution is sufficient to restore in fiscal year 2001 the 0.38 percent across-the-board cut that was imposed on highway and transit programs in fiscal year 2000.

Last year's Omnibus appropriations bill applied this cut to the highway and transit budget categories even though highway and transit spending was within the levels established by the TEA 21 firewalls. In effect, highway and transit spending was cut to cover a funding breach in the general discretionary budget category.

The House leadership has assured me that these funds will be restored in fiscal year 2001 so that, over the two-year period from 2000–2001, the link between highway trust fund revenues and spending that was established in TEA 21 will be maintained.

Not only does the resolution fully fund TEA 21, it assumes that all TEA 21 funds will be used according to the formula distribution that was agreed to in TEA 21.

The resolution also assumes that highway and transit programs are held harmless from, and not reduced by, technical differences between Office of Management and Budget and Congressional Budget Office scoring of the TEA 21 firewalls. Similar to last year, these technical scoring differences will be accommodated in a manner that does not reduce the guaranteed spending levels below those provided by TEA 21.

AIR 21

Regarding aviation, the budget resolution allocates to the Appropriations Committee sufficient budget authority and outlays to fully fund AIR 21, thereby ensuring that the taxes and interest credited to the airport and airway trust fund each year are used for their intended purposes and that the general fund contributes its fair share toward meeting aviation funding needs.

The 18 percent general fund contribution that is assumed both in AIR 21 and in this budget resolution is far less than the historical average of 30 percent.

It is important to note that this budget resolution ensures sufficient resources to fully fund Federal Aviation Administration operations, as well as aviation capital programs, and it does so without reducing funding for any other transportation program, such as Coast Guard and Amtrak.

This is because the function 400 allocations in this resolution have been increased to accommodate the funding increases in TEA 21 and AIR 21 without requiring reductions in any other function 400 programs.

Therefore, it is simply not accurate to say that TEA 21 or AIR 21 will force the Appropriations Committee to reduce funding for FAA operations, Amtrak, on Coast Guard. Funding for all of these programs has been accommodated within this budget resolution.

I congratulate the Budget Committee for restoring honesty to the budget process, and ending the use of the transportation trust funds to mask the deficit or fund other, non-transportation programs.

Given the commitment of the Senate majority leader and the chairman of the Senate

Budget Committee to fully fund AIR 21 without affecting other transportation programs, I am confident that the conference report on the budget resolution will likewise be fully consistent with TEA 21 and AIR 21.

Again, I urge you to support the fiscal year 2001 budget resolution as proposed by Chairman KASICH.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the budget and to highlight the need for budget accountability in our federal agencies. Waste, fraud and abuse is rampant under the Clinton-Gore Administration and has plagued my own congressional district. \$300,000 toilets and half-million dollar federal employee housing in Yosemite National Park demonstrate the gross misuse of taxpayer dollars by the National Park Service. This is an outrage.

The budget before us today provides federal agencies with needed funds. It is now up to the Administration to eliminate the blatant fiscal irresponsibility found in these agencies. By operating more efficiently, federal agencies can accomplish their purpose without flushing taxpayer dollars down \$300,000 toilets.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Republican Majority's socially and fiscally irresponsible budget resolution for fiscal year 2001. I strongly support the Democratic substitute, and urge Members to do the same.

This bill is socially irresponsible because it cuts non-defense discretionary spending \$114 billion below inflation over the next five years. It does so in order to fund a fiscally irresponsible tax cut that could balloon to as much as \$200 billion in five years, and over \$1 trillion in ten years. This bill hurts the most needy Americans whom the Republican Party has traditionally ignored. It benefits the most wealthy, as well as the Republicans' special interest friends.

Let's take a close look.

Under the Majority's bill funding for critical education, training, employment, and social service programs is either frozen or cut, producing significant reductions in current service levels. Only special education is spared the sledgehammer. For example, by fiscal year 2005, 40,000 fewer children would be able to participate in Head Start; and 164,000 fewer low-income families would be able to receive LIHEAP assistance. In just one year, 316,000 fewer low-income students would be able to receive Pell Grants; and 310,000 fewer low-income women, infants, and children would be able to participate in the WIC program.

The bill would also slash Title I funding, forcing school districts to provide services to a smaller number of low-income students. The Clinton/Clay class size reduction initiative would be cut, leaving school districts with fewer resources to hire and train new teachers. After-school and summer programs established to help improve student achievement and reduce juvenile crime would be cut back, undermining vital school reform efforts.

Clearly, this budget abandons those most in need of Federal support. It also fails to address important national priorities such as securing Social Security and Medicare, and paying down the debt. None of this is necessary. The Democratic substitute shows why. Our substitute cuts taxes, but does so in a manner that targets the benefits to working families. Our substitute provides sufficient resources to invest in education and develop our communities. Our substitute would make Social Security

and Medicare strong and solvent, while reducing the debt and preserving the hard-won budget surplus.

Mr. Chairman, for these reasons, I urge the rejection of the Republican Majority's budget resolution, and urge the adoption of the Democratic substitute.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the GOP's Budget Resolution. Once again, we are confronted with a Republican budget that inserts risky tax cuts in place of a sound federal budget and the general welfare of our nation. The current reality of budget surpluses presents this Congress with a historic opportunity to help ensure the solvency of the Social Security and Medicare trust funds, pay down the national debt, and make necessary investments in our public infrastructure and education system. Yet, the Republicans continue to adhere to the mantra that tax cuts should drive the Congressional agenda, even with the certain risk of future deficits that results from such action. Moreover, they continue to show an inexplicable willingness to shortchange critical spending programs for millions of Americans to help pay for these tax cuts.

This second session of the 106th Congress should have at least learned from the mistakes of the first. Last year's GOP budget denied reality and insisted upon tax cuts beyond the performance of the growing economy. Finally, last November, after the public had resoundingly rejected those tax cuts, and through unusual manipulation of budgetary gimmicks, we were able to come to agreement. Today, just four months later, the Republicans seem to want to resuscitate that legislative farce.

Despite widespread public opposition to last year's irresponsible tax schemes, the Republicans are again seeking to facilitate large tax cuts. Numerous reports and studies have shown that these tax proposals will disproportionately benefit a very small, wealthy segment of Americans. In addition, these tax cuts will grow exponentially over the next ten years, completely obviating future surpluses and jeopardizing the fiscal prudence that has allowed us to start paying for our burgeoning national debt. Congress should be seeking ways to help all Americans share in this time of prosperity, not exacerbating income disparities between rich and poor. It is particularly unfortunate that the Republican leadership is prepared to implement cuts to environmental programs, Head Start, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Coast Guard, anti-drug activities, and the National Park Service to realize misguided tax breaks.

As another example of the skewed priorities in this Republican budget, five miles the resources have been dedicated to tax cuts as for a Medicare prescription drug benefit, and nothing has been devoted to the solvency of the overall Medicare program. Millions of Americans have no prescription drug coverage and the insurance that does exist is in many instances inadequate. Yet, this budget does little to address the financial burden of escalating drug costs or improve access for millions of middle income seniors. Furthermore, the Republican prescription drug proposal is a contingent fund, which means there are no guarantees. Without a substantial investment in Medicare, a new wave of retirees will quickly overburden the program. Congress should take advantage of this booming U.S. economy

and ensure that this critical program is modernized to meet the needs of our nation's seniors.

Not surprisingly, this budget blueprint also fails to take any steps to extend the solvency of the Social Security program. In fact, this resolution is completely silent on the most important insurance challenge facing older Americans. Republicans have repeatedly rejected President Clinton's proposal to dedicate a portion of debt reduction savings to Social Security solvency, even though non-partisan actuaries have certified that the President's plan significantly extends the lifespan of the program. Still worse, this resolution fails to save the entire Social Security surplus solely for debt reduction. Walling off the surplus allows the federal government to pay down the national debt and then channel interest savings to other government programs. The so-called GOP "lock box" has broken hinges.

Education is a key area of investment in our future and in the engine of economic success that drives our nation. On the surface, the increase in funding for education seems like a step in the right direction. However, virtually all of this increase is for special education. The GOP plan essentially freezes funding for all other education initiatives, and that translates into a \$1.1 billion cut in purchasing power for higher education, social service, and employment training programs. Make no mistake, ensuring the success of children with special needs should be a priority, but focusing only on this segment of students shortchanges the other education programs. All of our children could benefit from initiatives such as reducing class sizes, modernization of facilities and greater financial support for higher education. Unfortunately, this budget plan simply does not allow enough dollars to implement these important programs.

The Pentagon budget continues to mushroom and consume over half of the total discretionary expenditures. With this resolution, defense spending would increase each year until reaching a whopping level of \$328.9 billion in FY 2005. Of course, under the Republican plan, these increases in defense spending will be accompanied by decreases in other domestic social programs. Now is the time to reassess our national security goals and show that a strong military does not preclude other important spending initiatives. We need to eliminate unnecessary pork projects and Cold War era programs, reduce the U.S. nuclear weapons force to the START III level of 2,500, stop any further production of the budget busting F-22 fighter jets, and finally abandon the unsuccessful deployment of a national missile defense. We need smart soldiers and sailors, not just more smart weapons.

This budget resolution also reduces the government's ability to spend additional funds on important environmental initiatives. Funding programs such as the Lands Legacy Initiative would go a long way toward helping communities around the nation develop smart growth strategies, preserve open space and restore off-neglected urban parks. While this resolution fails to look toward the future to solve today's problems, it also fails to look back at the huge maintenance backlog in our national parks. As a result, our parks will have to wait indefinitely for badly needed upgrades to facilities that serve millions of visitors each year.

The United States imports more crude oil now than at any other time in this nation's history, and gasoline, diesel and heating oil

prices are reaching an all time high. Congress must develop solutions to reduce our dependence on foreign oil through energy research and conservation programs. Instead, this budget resolution reduces funds for these programs by almost one-third. The rise in home heating oil prices has also left our low-income families struggling to keep their homes warm. While energy bills have almost doubled as a result of price increases this past winter, the Republican's want to cut access to LIHEAP, an important federal heating assistance program. The volatility of the oil market is too great to rely on low heating oil prices to get our needy families through cold, harsh winters.

The budget resolution also does little to solve the many hardships that our family farmers face. Our nation is built upon and around an agrarian society, and owes much of its success to this agricultural sector. The resolution, which is akin to patching the holes in a boat when the hull must be replaced, provides money to farmers, but not to those who need the economic assistance most. It is inflexible and unworkable.

Finally, in regard to housing and community development allocations, the GOP budget is unrealistic at best or destined to gut core programs at worst. The very lack of specificity in most cases within the different functions should not give anyone comfort. For example, under Function 370, which covers housing credits, the allocation could lead one to wonder if the billion dollar slight will harm the Federal Housing Administration (FHA), one of the most successful homeownership programs in the world. Although the FHA has contributed to record homeownership rates by providing the opportunity for millions of Americans to own their first home, the GOP continues to attack this program!

As written, though I would again point to the lack of specificity, Function 450, Housing and Regional Development, could do nothing less than gut core rural, suburban and urban community development. Assessing only across the board reductions, CDBG, a core component of community upkeep and revitalization, faces a \$1.1 billion cut in purchasing power and a \$1 billion cut below the FY 2000 freeze level.

I am particularly concerned about Function 600, Income Security. While there may have been statements that the Section 8 outstanding would be fully renewed, a similar attitude to that taken in the past could prevail, whereby Section 8 continues to serve as a honey pot for those looking for money to spend on other, non-housing programs. Furthermore, presuming a full renewal of Section 8, this function is woefully inadequate to meet the needs in other accounts under this function. People will face serious harm if Congress were to actually implement the goals as encompassed by this GOP budget.

In sum, the budget does nothing to address the affordable housing crisis being faced across this nation. It does nothing to further community and economic development in neighborhoods across this nation. And it places in jeopardy the lives of millions of Americans who are served by the programs of housing, community development and homeownership.

I urge all members to vote no on this GOP budget resolution, as it does not reflect the priorities of the American people to strengthen Social Security and Medicare, reduce our na-

tional debt, and invest in necessary and important public programs.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the "Straight Talk Express!" As you all will recall, the Presidential candidate from my home state, Arizona, took to the campaign trail and gave our country some "Strait Talk" on some important issues, including campaign finance reform, health care reform, veterans programs, defense spending, deficit reduction, and massive tax cuts.

But of all his "Straight Talk," Candidate MCCAIN made one point perfectly clear. He called it irresponsible to propose and implement massive tax cuts in this time, or even in the near future. He believes, as do many people in this Chamber, that any significant tax reduction will only weaken Social Security and Medicare. And while it may give the wealthiest one percent of the people in our nation more spending change, it will do nothing to stimulate the economy, it will do nothing to pay down the debt which continues to drain precious funds away from important programs that can really help people, it will do nothing to ensure that a strong Medicare program exists as the baby boom generation begins to age, and a huge tax cut will do nothing to shore up a Social Security that many claim will be broke in thirty years.

But Candidate MCCAIN went a step further. He not only said that a huge tax cut will weaken Medicare and Social Security, he said that huge tax cuts will actually hurt Social Security and Medicare. And this doesn't mean it will hurt these programs—these words "Social Security" and "Medicare." What it means is that it will hurt people. It will hurt the elderly woman in Yuma, Arizona who is trying to decide if she should turn off her air conditioner so she can pay her doctor, or if she will be able to go to the drug store and get her much needed medicine and still have enough to eat at the end of the month. It will hurt the elderly widower in Phoenix who has been saving for months, maybe even years, to finally visit his grandchildren in Tucson, but then has the unexpected illness that keeps him at home because he can't afford to pay his rent and his doctor's bills and his drug store bill.

My point is simple. We can talk of cutting taxes all we want, but, according to the "Straight Talk Express," such a tax cut will cut into Social Security and Medicare. It will cut into the daily lives of our parents, and our grandparents, and it will cut into our own lives in just a few years when we reach that age of dependence.

This Republican budget makes irresponsible tax cuts. Over the next five years, this budget cuts \$150 billion worth of taxes, with another \$50 billion "reserve tax cut fund," for a total of \$200 billion in tax cuts. And there is another \$40 billion "reserve fund" set up for Medicare reforms. If both these "reserve funds" are used as the authors of this Resolution intend, it will mean the Social Security surplus will be breached. We might give a little to Medicare, but it will be at the expense of Social Security. And while we give some wealthy businesses and super wealthy individuals a little extra money in their pockets, we will be taking it from the pockets of the elderly.

But worse, over the next ten years, it is projected that this budget resolution will cut taxes by \$750 billion, with another \$250 billion in a tax cut "reserve fund." This is a \$1 trillion tax cut! One trillion dollars!

Mr. Chairman, I support tax cuts. I support tax cuts when they make sense for our economy. When we needed to stimulate our economy and put some capital on the streets, we have done that, and I have supported it. And I could support tax cuts now, if I knew they were going to help that elderly lady in Yuma and that elderly man in Phoenix, and the plumber in Tucson who is trying to make this house payments and keep his two kids in good clothes and maybe put a little something away in case they have the opportunity to go to college. But I can't support this huge, massive tax cut proposal that I know will only go to line the pocket of multi-millionaires.

We should take this money, this \$1 trillion, and use it for our people.

We should use it for education. We should make sure that every child in this country has a fair and equal chance to use his talents and intelligence and knowledge to make us a stronger nation in the long run. We should try and give every eligible child the opportunity to attend college. We should make sure that every child is taught to read, that every child is given the chance to learn about, enjoy and appreciate the arts and music, that every child has a place to go after school where he feels safe and can continue to learn. We should make sure that every child is given a fair chance to learn English and is not penalized because he can't. We should make sure that every child can go to a school where he is not afraid and his parents are never concerned that a classmate has come to school with a gun. We should make sure that every child is attending a school where the teachers still care and are trained in the newest techniques and are still motivated when they look into the wonders gleaming from a kid's eyes when he finally "gets" the math problem.

Could we not even give just a portion of this one trillion dollars to education?

And a trillion dollars would go a long way in our hopes of solidifying a strong and viable Social Security system beyond 2032. We have spent almost four years around here talking about how Social Security is going broke, yet we never do anything about it, except put it in a "lockbox" that is not made of steel, but only of worthless words. It's time to put our money where only our words have been. Let's take some of this \$1 trillion and put it into Social Security and Medicare. Let's take the advice from the "Straight Talk Express" that rolled through this whole country winning the hearts and minds of people. They know we need to do something to strengthen Social Security. The people know we must do something to stabilize Medicare. Let's do it. And we have \$1 trillion to use.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, we can use some of this \$1 trillion to pay down the debt. When President Carter left office we owed \$930 billion. When President Bush left office we owed \$4.1 trillion. We borrowed ourselves out of a recession. And now, the American economy is the strongest economy in the history of civilization and we have the opportunity to pay back some of that money we owe. Our alternative is to continue to use more than ten percent of our money to pay only the interest on this debt. But this budget resolution only ignores this responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, the Presidential candidate from Arizona and I do not agree on a lot of things a lot of times. But we do agree that these will be irresponsible tax cuts. Let's use

this money wisely. We owe it to ourselves, we owe it to our elderly, and we owe it to our children.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Fiscal Year 2001 Budget Resolution.

Building on last year's historic \$1.7 billion increase in funding for veteran's health care, this year's budget continues to increase our commitment to veterans by providing an additional \$1.3 billion.

Last year, I hosted the largest town meeting in the history of the Texas Hill Country. Over 1,400 veterans and concerned citizens came together to discuss the Administration's short-changing of veteran's medical care. The message was clear: veterans will stand up for what is right. And what is right, Mr. Speaker, is full funding for veterans' medical care. This budget moves us in that direction.

The Kerrville VA Hospital in my district provides health care to more than 16,000 veterans in Texas. This is just one hospital among hundreds across the nation that veterans depend on for their health care needs. With the \$3 billion increases in the last two years, veterans can be assured that the high quality health care they deserve will continue.

Responsibility tells us that this finding is necessary. Commitment and dedication is what the men and women of the armed services have given to our country, and commitment and dedication to our veterans is what this budget rightly gives.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). All time allocated for the Committee on the Budget has expired.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), as now the designee of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), and the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) each will control 30 minutes on the subject of economic goals and policies.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to show my colleagues a couple of charts regarding the budget. Last year, the President gave us a budget which said, he wanted to take \$52 billion out of the Social Security surplus to spend on other Federal Government programs. We countered with a different budget which said, put all of the Social Security surplus back into Social Security. At this time during this debate on this bill last year, we had so many Members of the other side coming to Congress on the floor saying, we are going to raid Social Security. The Republican budget will raid \$13 billion from Social Security. The Republican budget will raid \$18 billion, \$24 billion, \$17 billion from Social Security.

Well, Mr. Chairman, here is what actually transpired last year.

For the first time in 30 years, this Congress stopped the raid on the Social Security Trust Fund. So when we hear the rhetoric now that we will be raiding Social Security again, remember

they said that last year and here is what happened. We raided nothing from Social Security. In fact, for the first time in my lifetime, for the first time in 30 years, this Congress in 1999 stopped raiding the Social Security Trust Fund.

If we look at all past years dating back to 1969, the red ink, Congress, the President, both parties, I might add, dipped into the Social Security Trust Fund. Now, that is what we are offering the American people, an extension of this policy, of not raiding the Social Security Trust Fund.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) and myself will be bringing legislation later this year to make sure that never again will Congress go back to the days of raiding the Social Security Trust Fund, that every dime we pay in Social Security taxes will actually go toward paying off our national debt and paying back the debt we owe to Social Security so Social Security can be a program that is solvent, not just for the current generation, but for the baby boomer generation and for their children.

Many things have been talked about regarding what the Democratic plan has done for the Social Security solvency of the Social Security Trust Fund. The President gave us a plan. Well, here is exactly what the President and the Democratic budget does with the Social Security Trust Fund. It simply takes a credit card and increases the credit limit. What they are doing is putting \$300 billion of IOUs into the Social Security Trust Fund. It is illusory. It creates the illusion that we are going to increase the solvency of Social Security; yet according to the GAO, according to the Congressional Budget Office, it does not put one more penny into the Social Security Trust Fund. It gives us the illusion that we are fixing Social Security when, in actuality, here is what they are doing. They are taking the U.S. Government credit card, they are taking the limit and they are adding to it.

They are not changing the income to Social Security. They are simply saying, we are saving Social Security, extending solvency from the year 2034, crossing that out and making it solvent to the year 2050 by simply raising the credit limit on the Social Security credit card from \$7.8 trillion to \$28.6 trillion. No new income to Social Security, no changes in the Social Security program, just more IOUs into the Social Security Trust Fund, which gives the illusion of reform; but what in actuality it does is simply raise the credit limit to the Social Security credit card. It does nothing to reform Social Security.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, I think it is very important to note, what did the President propose this year? Last year the President said, take 38 percent out of the Social Security Trust Fund, or \$52 billion to spend on other government programs. This year, the President said, he is in favor, he agrees with

the Republican Congress that we will stop raiding Social Security; but in order for the President's budget to add up, in order for the President's budget to work, to stop him from actually raiding Social Security, he does this: he takes the estimated surplus; then he increases taxes by \$96 billion; he increases user fees by \$19 billion; he cuts Medicare, skilled nursing facilities, home health agencies, hospitals; he cuts Medicare by \$18 billion; and he has phantom interest savings of another \$17 billion; cuts to Medicare, tax increases by \$60 billion to keep the President from raiding Social Security.

If Congress, which it wisely will do, I believe, on a bipartisan basis, rejects these tax increases and Medicare cuts, then the President's budget will have raided Social Security by \$60 billion.

This is what we are dealing with. We are simply trying to take rhetoric and divide it with truth. The truth is, this Congress, for the first time in a generation, last year actually stopped the raid on the Social Security Trust Fund. The other side said that would not be possible; the other side said it was not happening, but it did happen.

This budget attempts to do the same thing and move on to it, for once and for all, forever, stop raiding the Social Security Trust Fund, so that when one pays their Social Security taxes, it actually goes to Social Security. Pay off our national debt. This budget over the next 5 years alone pays off \$1 trillion in national debt. If people are still paying their taxes after we stop the raid on Social Security, after we put money back into Medicare for prescription drugs and paid off our national debt, if they are still overpaying their taxes, the President is proposing to create 84 new government spending programs.

We are saying no to that. We are saying give hard-working Americans, working families their money back, by making the Tax Code more fair and simpler if they still overpay their taxes.

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

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Many years ago distinguished legislators, Senator Humphrey and Congressman Hawkins, had the Humphrey-Hawkins bill which was to deal with unemployment and the right of all Americans to participate in our economy and the largest that this country has to offer. We have had success. Currently unemployment and inflation are low, and the average wages are rising; productivity is growing, and there is cause to celebrate. These economic gains were due largely to the policies of the last 7 years. But we may have met the numeric targets of Humphrey and Hawkins, but we still have a lot to do to meet the overreaching goals which the Joint Economic Committee is charged with researching and analyzing.

Despite the prosperity that we have experienced, the average after-tax income of the wealthiest families grows

faster than that for all Americans. Some of my colleagues would like to argue that the Tax Code should not be used to redistribute income to the poor, and I will buy that; but we should also stop using the Tax Code to redistribute income to the rich, such as we have been doing.

Today, 2 million or 3 million people took home as much after-tax income as 100 million people in the lowest 38 percent of our population combined. That does not seem right. We have been ignoring these 100 million people. It has led us to some serious problems.

As the Republican budget would call for increasing defense \$17 billion above the administration's request and above, in many instances, the request of the Defense Department branches themselves, this additional \$17.5 billion could, indeed, provide Head Start to 2 million additional children; it could provide child care to 8 million additional children; it could provide, in addition, good high-quality 21st century after-school to close to 35 million additional children. Think what we could do for our children if we were willing to forego just one new weapons system that indeed the armed forces say they do not want.

In addition to being a budget-buster, this excessive defense spending forces us to shift priorities away from feeding and clothing and educating children, caring for the sick, the elderly and the poor. The Republicans, of course, have a solution to this problem: cut non-defense discretionary spending by 6 percent or \$115 billion. Where are they going to get that money? Well, they are going to cut 310,000 low-income women off of WIC just next year. The Republicans will deny child care to over 12,000 children of working parents in 2001; they will eliminate Head Start services for more than 40,000 children and their families by 2005; and they are going to cut emergency energy assistance to 164,000 low-income families.

Now, that may be compassion, but with compassionate senior-friendly friends like that, who needs enemies?

The Republicans say they set aside money for reforming Medicare, but they did not; and as I said before, every Republican on the Committee on Ways and Means voted against providing a prescription drug benefit to seniors at no cost. This was free.

Now, I would invite the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), for instance, who has a lot of seniors in his district, to explain to the seniors. Come to the floor, I say to the gentleman from Florida, and I will give him time, and tell the seniors in Florida why he will not give them a discount on their prescription drugs such as we get, say, for the Veterans' Administration. Or the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) where we have a lot of seniors to come and say why he voted against providing a drug benefit to seniors in Arizona, or the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON), and why she voted against it for seniors in

Connecticut, or the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH), why the seniors in Pennsylvania should be hamstrung and have to pay twice the reasonable cost for their prescription drugs because he voted against a provision to provide a discount to seniors for their prescription drugs, and it would have no cost.

I know the Republicans do not want to spend any money and take it away from the tax cuts they want to give to the rich, but why can we not help all of the seniors at no cost? I would like any Republican to stand up and explain to the seniors of America why they oppose giving them a break on their prescription drug benefits. To me, that is not compassion, that is indifference and arrogance. The only answer could be is that they want to help those pharmaceutical companies, with big campaign contributions, to continue to make their outrageous profits on the backs of our poor elderly citizens. And to campaign for the White House on the basis of compassion with that kind of a record, to me, is a travesty; and I am sure that the American people will see through it.

□ 1530

The Democrats will offer several budgets. We are a broader coalition. We include more people. We have more than just rich people in our party.

My colleagues will hear some disagreement, and there will be different votes this afternoon. None of the budgets offered will increase defense spending, and particularly on unneeded, unwanted weapons and, in many cases, weapons that have been proven not to work. None of the budgets will cut programs to the needy and the elderly and children in our country at the rate the Republicans will.

This is a priority that we are establishing. This budget tells one what one's legislators believe in. Look at it carefully. The Democrats believe in helping all Americans in closing the income gap and educating our children and providing prescription drug benefits and good health care to all Americans.

The Republicans would give it to the 2 or 3 percent richest people and the largest campaign contributors only and let the poor people and the innocent children take the hind most. If that is what my colleagues want, and there may be some very rich people in the country who want it, fine, vote for Republican. But for those of my colleagues who want to help our seniors and children and provide education and medical care to all Americans, they better support the Democratic budget, because it is the humane, decent American thing to do.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I guess I should begin by suggesting to the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) that that was

about the best political speech I ever heard on the floor. I am not sure what it had to do with the budget, but it was a great speech anyway.

The purpose of the Humphrey-Hawkins section of this budget debate is to reflect on perhaps what the economy is doing and what it is that the Federal Government has done in some way to effect that. I would just like to reflect on those thoughts for a few minutes here.

Mr. Chairman, the performance of the economy in recent years has been very, very strong, and I think that all Americans have noted for one reason or another, either because they watched job growth, perhaps they watched the rate of unemployment fall, or perhaps they have watched income go up. But the performance has been strong and people are working all across the country. It is very encouraging.

During the expansion, the Federal Reserve's policy has been gradually moving to price stability and has resulted in declines of inflation, which is hardly perceptible today, and as a result, lower interest rates, and, of course, the lowest unemployment in many decades. Those things have happened all at the same time.

Now, let me repeat, we do not usually hear about low rates of inflation, low unemployment, and low interest rates all at the same time. That is a very interesting phenomenon, and I think one that we ought to say if we have done something collectively to make that happen that, maybe, we ought to continue to do the things that made it happen.

The thrust of this policy has been very successful. Although I have some differences with recent explanations of Fed policy overall, over the last 2 decades, we have seen very successful economic growth with the exception of one 9-month period in 1990, 1991. The health of the economic performance has also generated higher than expected revenues for the Federal Government.

As a result, we get to have this discussion today about how we are going to spend money over the next fiscal year in the atmosphere of surpluses. State and local governments have also enjoyed a fiscal bonus from the combination of positive economic trends.

The benefits of the United States economic growth have also been seen outside the country, and this has produced very positive results for the citizens of our country as well as citizens of many other countries.

All of this, including the role of Chairman Greenspan, is more or less well recognized by most Americans. What is less well known is the specific policy framework which the Federal Reserve has used to achieve the positive results that I have just described.

Chairman Greenspan's exceptional leadership of the Fed is associated with the framework of policy-making known as inflation targeting. That is right. The Fed has had its sites set on

creating an environment in which low rates of inflation will take place.

As the chairman and I have discussed at previous JEC hearings, the Federal Reserve has essentially adopted an informal policy of inflation targeting and used it to gradually reduce or squeeze inflation out of our economy.

Now, serious discussion of this policy might be useful to explain what the Fed under Chairman Greenspan has done and how it has fostered the extraordinary economic expansion we enjoy. Personal judgment and wisdom have played an important role, and that, of course, is the personal judgment of Chairman Greenspan. But the framework for policy-making is even more important. The success of Fed policy is a combination of several factors, but more understanding is needed about the basis of the policy framework itself.

Formal inflation targets are a narrow range of permissible increases in a broad-priced index expressed as annual percentage increases. For example, an inflation target could be defined as an increase in a retail price index of between, say, zero to 2 percent. We have been within that zero to 2 percent on many occasions for the last couple of years.

Price stability improves the operation of the price system and promotes economic and efficient growth.

As noted previously, during this expansion, inflation has been reduced, but unemployment has fallen as well. Low employment and low inflation, low rates of inflation are mostly unheard of or have been mostly unheard of in economic circles until the last decade or possibly a little bit longer.

In addition to its successful monetary policy, recently the Federal Reserve has made further strides toward increased transparency. Another important factor.

Perhaps my colleagues have noticed with me, however, that things have begun to change just a little. We have had five interest rate increases in the last year by the Fed.

In recent months, the public explanation of Federal policy has increasingly tended to shift from trends in price measures to tight labor market conditions and excessive economic growth related to GDP. In other words, the Fed now appears to be less targeted on inflation and more targeted on economic growth and potential GDP growth.

In other words, the recent explanations of Fed policy are reminiscent of the notion of a Phillips curve trade-off, which essentially said that good economic growth always causes high rates of inflation. We have proven over the last decade that that is false, and, yet, there are indications that the Fed is returning to that framework for some reason.

This shift towards the view that solid labor market and economic conditions may increase the potential for inflation seems to be associated with the

changing composition of the Federal Reserve Board. As new members have come on board, things have begun to change.

Although Chairman Greenspan has relatively new colleagues on the board that seem to have a somewhat Keynesian perspective, I hope he is able to avoid the mistakes that this point of view is prone to produce.

I hope that we will be able to continue on the path that we have, which has produced this budget situation where we can debate this budget in terms of a surplus rather than the deficits that persisted for so many years.

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

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The question is on the motion to rise offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 245, noes 165, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 69]

AYES—245

Abercrombie	Costello	Hilleary
Aderholt	Cox	Hobson
Armey	Cubin	Hoekstra
Baca	Cunningham	Horn
Bachus	Davis (VA)	Hostettler
Baker	Deal	Houghton
Baldacci	DeLay	Hulshof
Ballenger	Diaz-Balart	Hunter
Barcia	Dickey	Hutchinson
Barr	Dingell	Hyde
Barrett (NE)	Doolittle	Isakson
Barrett (WI)	Dreier	Istook
Bartlett	Duncan	Jenkins
Barton	Dunn	Johnson (CT)
Bass	Ehlers	Johnson, Sam
Bateman	Ehrlich	Jones (NC)
Becerra	Emerson	Kasich
Bereuter	English	Kelly
Biggett	Eshoo	Kildee
Bilbray	Everett	Kind (WI)
Bilirakis	Ewing	King (NY)
Bishop	Farr	Kingston
Blagojevich	Fletcher	Klecza
Bliley	Foley	Knollenberg
Blunt	Fossella	Kolbe
Boehkert	Fowler	Kuykendall
Boehner	Frank (MA)	LaHood
Bonilla	Franks (NJ)	Largent
Bono	Frelinghuysen	Latham
Brady (TX)	Gallely	LaTourette
Bryant	Ganske	Lazio
Burr	Gekas	Leach
Burton	Gephardt	Lewis (CA)
Buyer	Gibbons	Lewis (KY)
Callahan	Gilchrest	Linder
Calvert	Gillmor	Lipinski
Camp	Gilman	LoBiondo
Campbell	Goode	Lucas (OK)
Canady	Goodlatte	Manzullo
Cannon	Goodling	McCrary
Capps	Goss	McInnis
Capuano	Graham	McIntosh
Castle	Granger	McKeon
Chabot	Green (WI)	Meehan
Chambliss	Gutknecht	Metcalf
Chenoweth-Hage	Hansen	Mica
Coble	Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)
Corn	Hayes	Miller, Gary
Cornub	Hayworth	Mink
Collins	Hefley	Moakley
Combest	Herger	Moore
Cook	Hill (MT)	Moran (KS)
Cooksey		

Morella	Rohrabacher	Sweeney
Myrick	Ros-Lehtinen	Talent
Neal	Roukema	Tancredto
Nethercatt	Ryan (WI)	Tauzin
Ney	Ryun (KS)	Taylor (NC)
Northup	Salmon	Terry
Norwood	Sanford	Thornberry
Nussle	Saxton	Thune
Obey	Scarborough	Thurman
Ose	Schaffer	Tiahrt
Oxley	Sensenbrenner	Toomey
Packard	Sessions	Trafigant
Paul	Shadegg	Upton
Pease	Shaw	Vitter
Peterson (PA)	Shays	Walden
Petri	Sherwood	Walsh
Phelps	Shimkus	Wamp
Pickering	Shuster	Watkins
Pitts	Simpson	Watts (OK)
Pombo	Sisisky	Weldon (FL)
Porter	Skeen	Weldon (PA)
Portman	Skelton	Weller
Pryce (OH)	Smith (MI)	Whitfield
Radanovich	Smith (NJ)	Wicker
Ramstad	Smith (TX)	Wilson
Regula	Souder	Wise
Reynolds	Spence	Wolf
Riley	Stearns	Young (AK)
Rogan	Stump	Young (FL)
Rogers	Sununu	

NOES—165

Allen	Hinojosa	Payne
Andrews	Hoeffel	Pelosi
Baird	Holden	Peterson (MN)
Baldwin	Holt	Pickett
Bentsen	Hoolley	Pomeroy
Berkley	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Berman	Inslee	Rahall
Berry	Jackson (IL)	Rangel
Blumenauer	Jefferson	Reyes
Borski	John	Rivers
Boswell	Johnson, E. B.	Rodriguez
Boucher	Jones (OH)	Roemer
Boyd	Kanjorski	Rothman
Brady (PA)	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Brown (FL)	Kennedy	Rush
Brown (OH)	Kilpatrick	Sabo
Cardin	Klink	Sanchez
Carson	Kucinich	Sanders
Clay	LaFalce	Sandlin
Clayton	Lampson	Sawyer
Clement	Lantos	Scott
Clyburn	Larson	Serrano
Condit	Lee	Sherman
Conyers	Diaz-Balart	Shows
Coyne	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Cramer	Lofgren	Smith (WA)
Crowley	Lucas (KY)	Snyder
Cummings	Luther	Spratt
Danner	Maloney (CT)	Stabenow
Davis (FL)	Maloney (NY)	Stark
Davis (IL)	Markey	Stenholm
DeFazio	Mascara	Strickland
DeGette	Matsui	Stupak
Delahunt	McCarthy (MO)	Tanner
DeLauro	McCarthy (NY)	Tauscher
Deutsch	McGovern	Taylor (MS)
Dicks	McIntyre	Thompson (CA)
Doggett	McKinney	Thompson (MS)
Edwards	McNulty	Tierney
Engel	Meek (FL)	Towns
Etheridge	Meeks (NY)	Turner
Evans	Menendez	Udall (CO)
Fattah	Millender-	Udall (NM)
Filner	McDonald	Velazquez
Ford	Miller, George	Visclosky
Frost	Minge	Waters
Gejdenson	Mollohan	Watt (NC)
Gonzalez	Moran (VA)	Waxman
Gordon	Nadler	Weiner
Green (TX)	Napolitano	Wexler
Gutierrez	Oberstar	Weygand
Hall (OH)	Olver	Woolsey
Hall (TX)	Ortiz	Wu
Hill (IN)	Owens	Wynn
Hilliard	Pascrell	
Hinchey	Pastor	

NOT VOTING—24

Ackerman	Greenwood	Murtha
Archer	Hastings (FL)	Pallone
Bonior	Jackson-Lee	Quinn
Crane	(TX)	Royce
DeMint	Lowey	Schakowsky
Dixon	Martinez	Thomas
Dooley	McCollum	Vento
Doyle	McDermott	
Forbes	McHugh	

□ 1601

Messrs. FATTAH, PASCRELL, and MORAN of Virginia changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. PICKERING, HILLEARY, LEWIS of Kentucky, LIPINSKI, BLAGOJEVICH, BALDACCI, BONILLA, COSTELLO, LARGENT, KILDEE, and Mrs. ROUKEMA changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. OXLEY changed his vote from "present" to "aye."

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. LATOURETTE, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con.Res. 290) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2005, had come to no resolution thereon.

□

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE— SELECTION OF HOUSE CHAPLAIN

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Based on press accounts examined by the Chair, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) is recognized for 1 hour on a question of personal privilege.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I come to this well today following a long period of prayerful consideration. I want to talk to you about the choice of our next Chaplain, a man whose job it is to ask God's blessing on our work.

When I became your Speaker last year, I stood in this very spot and said that this House needed to heal. Impeachment had hardened the hearts of too many of our Members and ruptured the trust necessary for effective legislating.

Frankly, we had made progress toward that end. We successfully worked together to bring economic security to our country. We worked together to strengthen our schools and our national defense. And, working together, we lowered our rhetoric from this well and we returned some sense of civility to this chamber.

When I first heard that our current Chaplain wanted to retire, I decided I wanted to build on that growing sense of trust. Instead of simply appointing a Chaplain, as some of my predecessors had done, I appointed the largest and most bipartisan search committee in the history of this House.

I want to take a moment to describe that process because it has been much distorted in the last 4 months.

I knew that finding the right person would be difficult. Many religious

faiths are represented in this House, and many of you had candidates you believed would be good for the job.

The Search Committee the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) and I created was asked to review the many applicants and to send to the leadership up to three unranked candidates for final consideration.

I suppose that the committee could have ignored those instructions and sent us only one candidate because they believed he or she far superior, that they stood out above all the other applicants. But they did not.

In fact, I learned early and recently that the search committee discussed that very option and rejected it. Instead, the committee, under the able leadership of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), a Catholic, and the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY), a Presbyterian, selected three outstanding candidates: Reverend Robert Dvorak, Father Tim O'Brien, and Dr. Charles Wright.

These names were sent to us in alphabetical order. There was no ranking of candidates. There was no first choice of the committee, as some would have the public believe. And, in fact, there could not be a first choice because the committee never set out to select a first choice.

The report to this House by the bipartisan co-chairman of the committee makes this fact abundantly clear. The truth is simple: each of the three candidates was deemed as acceptable to the search committee.

Along with Majority Leader ARMEY and Minority Leader GEPHARDT, I interviewed the three candidates sent to us by the bipartisan search committee. I was looking for a kind person with a caring heart. I was looking for a person who had extensive counseling and pastoral or parish experience. And I was looking for a person who Members of Congress could take their problems to and find reassurance and wisdom.

I was not looking for a particular denomination or faith, and I did not make my selection based on a candidate's religious doctrine or the past history of other House Chaplains. I was trying to be fair to all candidates.

While I found all three candidates to have impressive credentials, I was most impressed with the pastoral experience and personal warmth of Dr. Charles Wright, who for years has ministered to the needs of the Capitol Hill community. And, in addition, he had years of experience in the inner city, as well as the international community. He spent a long time trying to break down the walls of apartheid in South Africa and to seek common understanding between blacks and whites.

I made my selection based on that experience and the qualities that I found in him. No one other than the candidates themselves influenced my decision. Any suggestion to the contrary is simply wrong.

After the interviews and a period of reflection, I consulted with majority

leader and the minority leader twice before I made my final decision.

In the first discussion, one preferred Dr. Wright and one preferred Reverend Dvorak. In the second discussion, one preferred Dr. Wright and one preferred Father O'Brien. The choice was not unanimous. But both signed off on the choice of Dr. Wright, and we issued a joint press release announcing the selection. I thought we had reached consensus.

Following our joint press statement, there were immediate charges of anti-Catholic bigotry. I was surprised and disappointed. Since there was no bias in the decision, I assumed that the disappointment held by some that a Catholic was not chosen would go away when people understood the truth. But I was wrong.

I then thought that once the search committee issued their report and laid out the facts of the selection process that the controversy would be over. Sadly, the facts were ignored and the controversy continued to be stoked.

It was then that I realized that a far more serious effort was afoot. Some were trying to take political advantage out of what was essentially a spiritual decision and charged me with anti-Catholic sentiment.

Is there anti-Catholic sentiment still alive in our country? In fact, is there anti-religious bias alive in our country? Sad as it is to admit, I believe the answer to both these questions may be yes.

This bias comes in many shapes and sizes. Whether it be television shows that hold the church in contempt, the activist who desecrates St. Patrick's Cathedral, or the so-called "artists" who denigrate important religious symbols, my friends, that is anti-Catholic and anti-religious bias.

Certainly, there are those who differ with some of the views held by the Catholic Church; and even some Catholics respectfully disagree with some Church positions.

I agree with the Catholic Church on many things. I agree with the Catholic Church that we should protect the unborn. I agree with the mission of the Catholic schools to help so many Catholic and non-Catholic students get a values-based education.

I wholeheartedly support the Catholic Church's great work to help the poor. And I believe that the Vatican should have a seat at the United Nations.

I have the greatest respect and admiration for the Pope, who has done so much to bring peace to our troubled world and played such a critical role in ending the scourge of communism in Eastern Europe.

I am a patient man. In my role as Speaker of the Whole House, I believe I should try to be especially patient and seek compromise and not confrontation. But even I did not easily take in stride carelessly tossed accusations of bigotry. Where I come from, such slander is an ugly business. I can only conclude that those who accuse me of anti-