

the gentleman from Illinois all of the reasons why this is needed. The disappointment is that we have not been able to move it faster within USDA, but it is certainly my hope that all of those who may be in the category of "foot-draggers" within the various agencies and various employees of USDA might take this legislation and the support of many at USDA and recognize that we will have some additional opportunities this year to do more in this area of information technology, and, in doing more, we will be able to serve our farmers more efficiently.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all of those who have been involved in this legislation; and I urge the support of it.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would join in urging my colleagues to support this legislation. It is very true that farmers in many respects are some of our best users of computer technology and the Internet, and it is time that the Department that is designed to support their efforts moves into the 21st century, as the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) indicated.

□ 1530

So I strongly support this bill. I thank the gentleman for his efforts in this matter.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 777, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 777, the Senate bill just considered.

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

There was no objection.

□

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5 p.m.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 5 p.m.

□

□ 1703

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.

□

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 290. Concurrent Resolution 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 message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the resolution (H. Con. Res. 290) "Concurrent resolution 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," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BOND, Mr. GORTON, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. CONRAD, and Mr. WYDEN, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

□

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 1501, JUVENILE JUSTICE REFORM ACT OF 1999

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 1501 tomorrow.

Pursuant to clause 7(c) of rule XXII, I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 1501. The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Conyers moves to instruct conferees on the part of the House that the conferees on the part of the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 1501, be instructed to insist that the committee on conference meet and report a committee substitute that includes both:

One, measures that aid in the effective enforcement of gun safety laws within the scope of conference and, two, common sense gun safety measures that prevent felons, fugitives, and stalkers from obtaining firearms and

children from getting access to guns within the scope of the conference. Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Congresswoman JULIA CARSON, Congresswoman JUANITA MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Congresswoman CAROLYN MCCARTHY are cosponsors of this motion.

□

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H. CON. RES. 290, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XXII, and by the direction of the Committee on the Budget, I move to take from the Speaker's table 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 the appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2005, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH).

The motion was agreed to.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. SPRATT

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct the conferees on the budget resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SPRATT moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 290 be instructed, within the scope of the conference,

(1) to insist that the tax cuts set forth in the reconciliation directives in the concurrent resolution be reported on September 22, 2000, the latest possible date within the scope of the conference, and to require that the reconciliation legislation implementing those tax cuts not be reported any earlier, thereby allowing Congress sufficient time to first enact legislation to reform and strengthen Medicare by establishing a universal Medicare prescription drug benefit, consistent with section 202 of the Senate amendment and provisions in section 10 of the House concurrent resolution, recognizing that more than half of Medicare beneficiaries without drug coverage have income above 150 percent of poverty as officially defined; and

(2) to recede to the lower and less fiscally irresponsible tax cuts in the Senate amendment, which do not include a reserve fund for additional tax reduction contingent on improved projects of future revenues, in preference to tax cuts of \$200 billion or more as embodied in the House-passed Resolution, which Chairman Kasich identified during Budget Committee markup and House debate on the budget resolution as a paydown' on the tax cuts proposed by Governor George W. Bush, in order to conserve the budgetary resources needed for the universal Medicare prescription drug benefit and for debt reduction.

Mr. KASICH (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent

that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am offering this motion to instruct the House conferees on the budget resolution, basically to say to the conferees, let us put the Medicare drug prescription benefit first and foremost, ahead of everything else. Let us do it ahead of the tax cuts. Let us put it on a priority schedule, let us go first with it.

Just today we read in the newspaper that Medicare beneficiaries who do not have drug coverage typically pay at least 15 percent more than those who have the benefit of insurance. I have the experience just a week or two ago with visiting a pharmacist in my district who by mistake had received a billing from an HMO intended for an HMO in Atlanta, Georgia. And when he opened it up, he saw what the HMO was paying for drugs like Zocor and Vasotec and Cumadin, as opposed to what he was paying, and the difference between what he was paying and charging his customers at his pharmacy and what the HMO was paying was as much as 65 or 70 percent in favor of the HMO in certain cases. That is not right.

Mr. Speaker, when we combine that with the fact that drug costs are going up at a rate that is two or three times the rate of the increase in health care generally and the elderly, those over 65 and on Medicare have a greater need for prescription drug benefits than anybody else, we have a crisis on our hands. One cannot go to any senior citizen center in my district, and I dare say this is true across America, without having someone relate some really sad and affecting story about their problem with obtaining prescription drug benefits.

We just had a study done by Boston University School of Public Health, they found that a significant fraction of the prescriptions that are written by doctors for their Medicare patients are never filled, they cannot afford it. This is a problem that is not only pressing, it is becoming urgent.

We need to deal with it now. Before we turn to tax cuts, before we turn to other major budget decisions, we should put this one first and foremost and try to fit it into our budget. In our budget, the Democratic budget, we did it the standard and time-honored way. We said let us have reconciliation directions to the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Commerce, the two committees with jurisdiction, and tell them, "By a date cer-

tain, get your act together. Here is \$40 billion for the first 5 years, \$155 billion for the second 5 years; within the limits of these resources, report to the floor a prescription drug benefit that will begin to take effect next year for Medicare beneficiaries." That is the way to do it.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) chose a less compelling way of doing it. He put \$40 billion in a trust fund, so-to-speak, a reserve fund, and said if the Committee on Ways and Means is able to come up with a bill that reforms Medicare structurally or does Medicare reform, then it can also use this \$40 billion to report a drug bill. I would have preferred and did prefer something much more compelling than that, but at least the gentleman put the \$40 billion on the table. The Senate has done something similar.

What we are saying now is let us not just do this for show, let us not just do this to tantalize the elderly citizens in our district with the prospect of getting prescription drug coverage. Let us do it in earnest. We can do it right now by passing a motion to instruct our conferees to go to conference and say to the conferees, prescription drug coverage will come first, and principally this will come first ahead of tax cuts.

One of the problems I have with the Republican budget resolution is it puts tax cuts first and foremost, ahead of everything else. Now, our budget resolution provided for \$50 billion in net tax cuts in the first 5 years, and \$201 billion over the 10-year period of time. We are for tax reduction and tax relief too, but we also had other priorities that we wanted to serve, and not to do tax cuts to the exclusion of those.

The problem we had with their resolution as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) presented it, their budget resolution, the tax cut could easily go up to \$250 billion over the next 5 years. We showed by charts in the well of the House, if it went that high, if it went over \$200 billion, we not only could not fund the \$40 billion for the prescription drug benefit, you would risk putting the Social Security trust fund in danger again.

We are saying, put the tax cuts second. Do the prescription drugs first. Get in earnest about prescription drug coverage. Do that, and then by a date certain, report your tax bill to the floor; and we will take it up in due course. But, in first course, let us do prescription drugs.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we want to go back just for a second and review precisely what was contained in this Republican budget proposal that passed the other day.

As Members will recall, the first thing we did was to protect 100 percent of the Social Security surplus. That is the first time, I believe in my lifetime, that that has been done, where the government will not take money from the

Social Security surplus to fund any other programs.

The second item that we did was we strengthened Medicare and, in fact, created a \$40 billion fund. And this fund is available for the purposes of funding a prescription drug program that will pass through the Committee on Ways and Means.

First of all, I would hope that the wealthiest of our seniors would not qualify for this program. Children in many respects have the lowest priority in America, and it is a tragedy that our children are neglected. I begin to wonder if they are neglected because they do not vote or we do not value them. We value them with our rhetoric, but many times we do not value them with our actions.

The fact is that a prescription drug benefit for seniors that are in need of that benefit because they cannot afford it would be right. But what we would not want to do was take resources that can be used either to make families stronger through tax cuts or other programs that may be developed to help our children, to use those dollars to fund the Medicare program for wealthy senior citizens.

□ 1715

We would not want to do that. This does not make any sense here in the 21st century. Members might also recall that we had other actions in there, including paying down \$1 trillion of the national debt, and in addition to that, tax fairness.

I must say that it would be a mistake for us not to have passed that earnings limit exclusion program so that our seniors who want to go out, who want to work, who want to be independent, do not lose social security in the process. Thank goodness we pushed that program through. We intend to push other programs like that through, including the easing of the marriage penalty.

So we want to be able to have a process that allows us to pass these tax bills that help various segments of our society, and we believe that is consistent with our program to strengthen Medicare and to provide a prescription drug benefit.

What is interesting is that President Clinton himself has no prescription drug benefit in 2001 and 2002. In fact, he makes very significant reductions in Medicare in order to pay for what program he is going to create in 2003. Frankly, Democrats ought to be embracing this program if they would like to see a strengthening of Medicare. They ought to be really embracing the Republican budget, because we get about it right away.

Also contained in the Democrat motion to instruct are the incendiary words "irresponsible tax cuts." To me, that is an oxymoron. There is no such thing as an irresponsible tax cut. There are plenty of irresponsible government spending programs, but I do not think there is such a thing as an irresponsible tax cut.

I do not know what we would call an irresponsible tax cut. Is it something that lets families keep more of what they earn? Is it something that lets a senior keep more of what he or she earns, rather than being penalized through reductions of their social security benefits? Is a fiscally irresponsible tax cut one that provides relief to married couples? If people get married today, they can get punished because they get married. They pay more in taxes. Is that fiscally irresponsible?

How about for a small businessman who works a lifetime to build a pharmacy, like my friend, Max Peoples in Westville, Ohio, or friends of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) in Janesville, Wisconsin? They work a lifetime, and then when they die, they have to visit the undertaker and the IRS on the same day.

How about reducing or eliminating the death tax so people who work a lifetime can pass their legacy on to their children, rather than having to pass it on to the Federal government?

I do not know what it even means when we talk about a fiscally irresponsible tax cut. It does not make any sense to me. It seems to me as though we ought to stay with the Republican budget plan. That Republican budget plan will keep our mitts off of social security, something that my friends in the majority party were not able to do for 40 years. It is going to strengthen Medicare and provide a prescription drug benefit starting in 2001.

I am told it will be very soon that Republicans in the House will unveil their bill. I hope it will be means-tested. We will pay down \$1 trillion of the publicly-held debt by 2013. We will continue to promote tax fairness for families, farmers, and small businesses.

There is no reason to fix something that is not broken, so I would request that the Members on both sides of the aisle defeat the motion to instruct the conferees offered by my good friend, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), who I have, by the way, a lot of regard for. He is a very smart man, a very nice man, and I wish everybody would know him and be the recipient of his kindness and intelligence.

But on this motion, I am forced to say that we should object, stick with the Republican budget. It will be the better budget for our seniors, for our children, and frankly, for Americans across the country.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his compliments, but I would point out that a tax cut that precludes us from obtaining the very priorities they set out in their budget is potentially an irresponsible tax cut. A tax cut, which we showed here in the well of the House, which would take us perilously close to invading social security again surely is not one that we want to un-

dertake. Yet, we are concerned that the gentleman's resolution leads us in that very direction.

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

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to instruct conferees. We simply say, before any tax cut, and certainly it is irresponsible to make sure that we have a tax cut before we achieve the goals that we want to achieve.

One of the goals stated was that we would have a prescription drug benefit. Therefore, before any tax cut is enacted, we must make sure that our senior citizens, especially those rural citizens who live in rural communities without access to health care, and who pay, by the way, for their medicine higher rates than those in other urban areas, we make sure that they have the medicine and the ability to pay to be free of pain and to live a comfortable life. That is essentially basically and fundamental, that we make sure that our program is enacted before we have a serious and a large tax cut.

Older Americans and people with disabilities without drug coverage typically pay 15 percent more for the same prescription drugs as those with insurance. Many seniors do not have drug coverage at all, and therefore, this particular bill is essential for life and the quality of life that seniors deserve.

The gap between drug prices for people with and without insurance discounts nearly doubled, from 8 to 15 percent, between 1996 and 1998. Uncovered Medicare beneficiaries purchased one-third fewer drugs than those who are covered, but they paid twice as much money. They are denying themselves a prescribed prescription for their health care, but yet, they pay twice as much out of pocket.

Overall, all of these beneficiaries have an annual out-of-pocket cost that is twice as high as those, and with fewer medications.

Chronically ill uninsured Medicare beneficiaries spend over \$500 out of pocket for that same coverage. Rural beneficiaries are particularly, particularly vulnerable because the infrastructure to provide that health care is not there.

From what I am hearing, if there is to be an insurance model, I can tell the Members that we do not have the structure, the HMOs, nor do we have other structures that can make this accessible to rural citizens. Rural Medicare beneficiaries are over 50 percent more likely to lack prescription drug coverage for the entire year than urban beneficiaries.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this motion to instruct. It is urgent, it is timely, and it is vital to the health and welfare of many millions of senior citizens.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

(Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to first discuss what this motion to instruct actually does. The motion to instruct right now talks about having a prescription drug plan immediately, but I find it interesting to note that the minority side, when advancing prescription drug legislation in the Committee on the Budget, was proposing a prescription drug plan very similar to the President's plan which did not begin until the year 2003.

More importantly, it dedicated a little over \$34 billion to enacting prescription drug legislation when the Committee on the Budget, the majority's plan, dedicates \$40 billion for prescription drugs beginning immediately.

Let us go back and remember that the minority side was proposing a prescription drug plan dedicating less resources starting in 2 years versus the Republican plan, which dedicated \$40 billion starting immediately.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about some of the benefits of this budget plan. For 30 years, for 30 years this institution, Washington, D.C., has been raiding the social security trust fund. People have been paying their FICA taxes, it has been going into social security, and people in Washington have been taking that money and spending it on other totally unrelated items.

This budget seals that trust fund. This budget says, not a penny of money should come out of social security. Instead, we are going to pay off the debt and fix the problems we have with social security. That is what we are trying to do here.

So what happened last year when the President brought his budget here on the House floor in the State of the Union Address? He called for dedicating 62 percent to the social security surplus, and 38 percent of social security would go to finance other government programs.

Last year we said, that is enough. We should dedicate 100 percent of the social security surplus to social security. That is in fact what we have achieved. If we take a look at what we have done over the last 2 years with this Congress, we have paid back so much debt that we have actually stopped the raid on the social security trust fund beginning last year.

This budget completes that. This budget says no longer will we go back to the days of red, no longer will we go back to the days of taking money out of the social security trust fund to spend on other programs that have nothing to do with social security. Instead, we are going to pay off our national public debt, we are going to put money back into social security, and we are not going to let politicians dip into the social security trust fund.

Last year when the President brought his budget to the floor, he wanted 62 percent in social security and 38 percent out of it. He called for

creating 84 new government programs, 84 new government programs in this year's budget, and significantly increasing 160 other government programs, for a grand total of 244 new programs and higher spending on new programs in Washington coming from the social security trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, we have actually achieved a historic goal here. We have stopped the raid on the social security trust fund. Let us build on that success. Let us continue to do that. Let us pass the Republican budget and say no to the motion to instruct.

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

Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman has done is, with his charts there, he has set up a straw man. He has attacked a budget that was never before the House. The minority side's budget, the Democratic side's budget, called for \$40 billion beginning in 2001 for a Medicare prescription drug benefit. And not only that, to say it once again, we did it the good old-fashioned way that worked. We said to the Committee on Ways and Means, by a date certain, here is \$40 billion. Report out, bring to the floor a resolution, a bill that will provide prescription drug coverage.

They did not have that kind of language in their resolution. Theirs was totally iffy. That is what we are trying to do here today, stiffen the resolve of the conferees and see to it that we do indeed get some legislation that will provide a drug benefit.

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

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the reason this is such an important set of budget instructions is that this House is balanced on a very interesting policy point: Should we provide a tax-supported prescription benefit package for all senior citizens, or should we do what the Republicans are talking about, and that is, find the poorest ones and say, here is a little welfare program. Go on and down and register at the welfare office, and you can get the drug benefit?

The President has proposed that we put a package that covers all senior citizens. Some of us are not very satisfied with the President's plan because it is not very generous, but at least, at least it covers everyone. For us to come out and pass a budget and say that, in the last resort, if we have a little money left after we have passed all these tax cuts we are going to give a little drug benefit, that is simply not good public policy.

The Senate has picked the number of \$140 billion in tax cuts. I personally think that is too much. I do not think we need that. I would rather pay down the debt.

However, if they are going to do it, let us take the conservative number in the Senate, the conservative number in

the Senate, instead of this liberal wild spending on the Republican side in the House, and use that money to give a benefit for all senior citizens.

Now, when we go out and realize what the average senior citizen spends out-of-pocket, my mother is a perfect example. She lives on the minimum social security benefit, along with 9 million other widows in this country, \$888 a month. She spends \$400 for where she lives and where she gets her food, okay?

□ 1730

Now she has \$400 and she on average across this country is spending \$200 a month, \$2,500 out of pocket, for pharmaceutical costs in this country. That is simply inexcusable.

We can fix it, but it should be for all senior citizens because even those who have the benefit now, because of the fact that they work for some company or they have the insurance policy or whatever at the moment, may lose it and then where are they? My view is that we should not drive seniors into poverty before we help them with their pharmaceutical costs.

Any sensible person looking at the Medicare program today would say the single biggest problem that we have not dealt with has been the issue of pharmaceutical costs.

I think that it makes sense to take the Senate number. The Senate is not overly generous, but at least we would have the \$40 million for a universal benefit.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, it is pretty obvious that over the weekend the Democrats did a poll. They rush in here with a motion to instruct conferees on the budget resolution with a time stamp on here of 3:45, not too long ago. The ink is not even dry on this. They rushed in here with this motion to instruct conferees. What does it say? It says, know what? We are getting our brains beat in on this prescription drug benefit. The Republicans beat us when it came to the budget resolution; they are beating us when it comes to public relations on prescription drugs because they know that our original proposal did not have a thing.

The President's proposal did not have a prescription drug benefit. The original proposal that the Democrats brought forth in the Committee on the Budget did not have a prescription drug benefit that started until the

third year. In fact, it cut Medicare. Oh, no, we didn't cut Medicare on beneficiaries. We cut it on providers is what they will say.

In my area, as the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) was saying, in rural areas those kind of cuts will be devastating. They may say in the third year that they have a prescription drug benefit; but when all the rural hospitals close, they do not have health care.

Well, this is the situation: we put into our plan instructions that suggest that there is only one thing that the Committee on Ways and Means can do with this \$40 billion. It can either reform Medicare and provide a prescription drug benefit or nothing else can happen to that money except it can be used to pay down the debt. That is it.

What do the Democrats suggest? They came in with a technicality on the floor right at the end of the budget debate, and they said but we have a better motion to instruct. They say the Committee on Ways and Means has to use it. Guess what? If they do not, it does not go to debt reduction; it does not go to tax relief. Guess where it can go? To a risky spending scheme that the Democrats have put in place for the last 40 years that wasted social security, that brought us to the point in time where we had this massive debt in the first place, and now they want to start all over again.

Mr. Speaker, this is the situation: this is not just a little drug benefit, as my friend, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT), suggested. This is the only drug benefit that is going to pass this particular year because we are not going to pass a drug benefit where the money, if not spent, can be used for other risky spending schemes. We are not going to use this money for anything else except for reform of Medicare and for prescription drugs, different than what the Democrats' plan does.

So instead of voting for this motion to recommit that was drafted just a few hours ago, after it is obvious the Democrats took a poll this weekend, let us vote against this motion to instruct conferees, which would gut the Medicare reform proposal, which would gut the prescription drug proposal, and which would not recognize that in 5 days we have tax day and Americans all over the country have been paying their taxes. This thumbs their noses at the taxpayers of America.

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

Mr. Speaker, once again let me inform the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) that we in committee we did not offer a resolution. We brought our resolution to the floor, and it had \$40 billion over 5 years; \$150 billion over 10 years for prescription drug coverage; and it was in reconciliation, mandates to the Committee on Ways and Means, with a date certain for getting it done.

When we were in committee marking up their budget resolution, we took

their iffy, mushy language and we said let us convert this to a mandate, let us send it to the Committee on Ways and Means, and we offered to make it reconciliation language and they refused it. They rejected it in committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me make a couple of points. First of all, to my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), I took no poll over the weekend; but I can say when I was running for Congress 6 years ago, going to senior citizen centers throughout southeast Harris County, Texas, I ran into more and more seniors who said the biggest concern they had was the cost of prescription drugs, and the problems that they had of having to choose between buying their groceries at the end of the month or buying the pharmaceuticals that were being prescribed to them by the doctors. That was the issue, and that was the poll. That was a real poll.

Now let us talk about what this motion to instruct is. I do not think my friends on the other side have read it. All we are saying, if they look at the budget resolution, throughout the budget resolution it is very clear on which dates the Committee on Ways and Means shall, shall report tax reconciliation language. When we look at the Medicare language in there, it says if, it says whenever, but it certainly says nothing about a date certain of what it should be.

My colleagues on the other side have felt the need to use placards. I do not like these. I wish that we would ban these from the floor; but if we are going to use them, I am going to show what the Republican prescription drug plan under Medicare is. It is right here, right here. Now the American people can see it as well. It is laid out pretty clearly what the Republican plan is. There is no Republican plan.

Here is the problem: there are about 70 legislative days left in this Congress. We still have not passed a budget resolution. We have not passed any appropriations bills. We passed a number of tax cutting bills, generally scoped toward the upper-income levels, but we do not even have a prescription drug bill from the Republican side. So I do not know how they think we are going to get this done; and, in fact, their budget resolution does not think we are going to get it done because it says if, whenever.

What Democrats are saying today, what Democrats are saying is let us make prescription drug benefits for all senior citizens as certain as they want to make tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans among us. That is what this resolution is about today. I do not see how they can be against this. It all fits within the budget numbers that both

sides use. It does not touch one dollar of the Social Security surplus, we are quite certain on our end.

Their tax cut plan, it can get into the Social Security surplus later on, but most of my colleagues will be gone by then so all we are saying right now is let us put prescription drug benefits for senior citizens on par with their tax cuts, and let us tell the Committee on Ways and Means that they have to come up with a bill and bring it up before this Congress adjourns.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for offering this resolution, and I commend it to all of my colleagues.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU).

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to take the debate back to the fundamentals of this budget resolution and away from a lot of the rhetoric, some of which we have just heard.

Let us talk about what is really in the budget resolution and what is not. First and foremost, we set aside every penny of the Social Security surplus. Now there is a lot of rhetoric on the other side about whether do we protect all of Social Security, do we not protect all of Social Security? This budget resolution does it, and it does it for the second year in a row.

We had a budget that was put up by the minority last year that spent 40 percent of the Social Security surplus. We have ended that problem in budgeting, set aside every penny of the Social Security surplus. We set aside \$40 billion for prescription drug coverage for Medicare beneficiaries.

Now it is true there is no formal piece of legislation before this body right now, but that is reflective of the fact that we know we have to work on a bipartisan basis to try to put together a good piece of legislation, not just one that provides prescription drug coverage for Medicare beneficiaries but one that reforms and strengthens the program and hopefully gives those beneficiaries more options and more choices.

We pay down the debt. We actually set a course to pay down the entire public debt by 2013. We have tax relief in this legislation. Of course, we do. We try to make the Tax Code more fair by getting rid of the marriage penalty, getting rid of death taxes, repealing the Social Security earnings limit, and giving individuals full deductibility for their health insurance, and we also invest in defense and education.

I want to focus a little bit in the minute or so remaining, however, on the debt relief I spoke about, because if one travels anywhere in this country, people recognize that it is important that we continue the process of paying down the public debt.

Here is what we have done in just the past 3 years: in 1998, we paid down over

\$50 billion in public debt; in 1999, last year, we paid down over \$80 billion. This year we will pay down \$163 billion; and, in fact, over the 4 years, including this budget year that we are debating now, 2001, we will pay down over \$450 billion in debt.

That is because of the determination of this Republican Congress to set aside funds, not just for social security but also for debt retirement and to keep that debt going in the right direction.

Now the minority has said repeatedly in this very debate we should get rid of all of these tax cuts, get rid of any tax cuts and pay down more debt. Of course we could do that. We could decide not to repeal the penalty that seniors pay if they choose to continue working and pay down a little bit more debt, but if we did that it would be wrong. We could decide not to eliminate the marriage penalty, to keep penalizing married couples simply because they choose to get married, and pay down a little bit more debt, but if we did that it would be wrong. It would be wrong to sustain a Tax Code that is so unfair.

We could refuse to give individuals health insurance deductibility, but that also would be wrong. We could decide not to give individuals health insurance deductibility and pay down a little bit more debt, but again that would simply be the wrong approach to take.

We need a Tax Code that is more fair. We need to continue to pay down debt, and we need to recognize that what is important is that just as one views their home mortgage, if they have additional income, additional funds, they do not pay down their entire home mortgage in one year. They might put a little bit more toward that mortgage, but what is most important is that they pay down a little bit every year, a little bit with every payment. They reduce the size of the mortgage gradually, and they keep the country and their own budget on a course of fiscal responsibility.

I urge my colleagues to reject the motion to instruct.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would respond to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU) by saying that if he has a \$250 billion-plus tax cut instead of \$147 billion, which is what the Senate has proposed, that is \$103 billion less debt reduction and \$103 billion less to work with, fewer resources to work with to provide for a Medicare prescription drug benefit, and that is what this debate is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 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. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Republican members of the Committee on the Budget were not there during the process they were going through then when we actually passed a resolution that they promoted, but they refuse to understand the actual alternative that we have proposed.

I offered the amendment, I offered the budget amendment in the committee that actually would provide for the prescription drug benefit. Nowhere in our amendment, nowhere in our resolution, did we require this program to begin in 2003.

My dear colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), talked about that this would not start for another couple of years. That is not the truth. The Democratic amendment, the proposal that we put forth, would simply instruct the Committee on Ways and Means to begin immediately to provide a \$40 billion benefit for prescription drugs for our seniors.

What came out was a plan that I referred to here as the Bentsen plan that he referred to earlier. This chart that I show right here is the Republican plan for prescription drugs. It was mushy, as our ranking member said. It had nothing to it, no substance whatsoever. They proposed a plan that did nothing for prescription drugs.

Back in Rhode Island where I come from, many seniors who have worked all their lives are facing now \$5,000, \$6,000, \$7,000 and even \$8,000 a year with prescription drug costs. A small contractor by the name of Paul Smith and his wife Judy came to me and said, I am 70 years old and my wife is 66. I have to go back to work part time to pay for my \$8,300-a-year worth of prescription drugs.

We as Democrats and Republicans should not tolerate that whatsoever. We should be working together to make a plan that is truly a plan, not a white piece of paper.

What we have proposed is simple. Give the money to the Committee on Ways and Means to come up with a proposal right now. We are not adverse to tax cuts. As a matter of fact, our proposal was to have over \$50 billion worth of small business tax cuts, but prioritize our business before the Committee on the Budget; put our seniors first.

Those people who cannot afford prescription drugs should have a plan, not a blank piece of paper, and that is what the Republican proposal is.

□ 1745

It has no substance, no plan, no direction.

Today, what we are asking with this motion with regard to instructing conferees is put our seniors first, put our seniors above all of those other groups that really are begging us for tax cuts, but provide our seniors with a benefit for the prescription drugs.

I recently completed a commission to report on Rhode Island that showed the comparison between what our seniors

pay and what our pets pay for the very same prescription drug. The very same prescription made by the same manufacturer, the same FDA requirements, the same dosage was 83 percent cheaper for my dog than my mother. We treat our pets better than we treat our senior citizens when it comes to prescription drugs.

How can we not have a plan? How can we tolerate a white piece of paper? How can we tolerate what my colleagues have put forward? Vote to approve the motion to instruct conferees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Does the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) claim the time from the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) who claimed the time from the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH)?

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time for purposes of control.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

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

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is we are going to protect 100 percent of Social Security. We did that last year, the first time since 1960. We are doing it in this year's budget, and we are going to do it in next year's budget, the plan that we are bringing forward.

We are strengthening Medicare and prescription drugs. We are setting aside \$40 billion to implement our ultimate plan. It is no different than the motion to instruct the conferees. It is basically a blank paper. It sets aside money like we do. We retire the public debt by the year 2013, and we promote tax fairness for families, farmers, and seniors, and restore America's defense and strengthens support for education and science.

Our GOP plan ends the marriage penalty. It is interesting, the Democrats voted for it, but I guess they do not want to cut taxes, but they voted for it. It repeals Social Security earnings test. They voted for it but say they do not want to set aside money for a tax cut. We reduced the death tax. They voted for that, many of them. We expand educational savings accounts. We increase health care deductibility. We provide tax breaks for poor communities. We strengthen private pension plans.

What interests me, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) called this an irresponsible tax cut. It is interesting because, in the next 5 years, we have \$10 trillion of revenue. We want a tax cut of \$200 billion. That is 2 percent of all revenue. What is irresponsible about reducing taxes 2 percent? Maybe it is irresponsible that we are not doing more.

Then I heard this was wild spending. Only the gentleman from Washington

(Mr. McDERMOTT) could call tax cuts spending.

I will tell my colleagues what I think is irresponsible. The President increases taxes by \$10 billion in the first year of his plan. We cut it by \$10 billion. We ultimately set aside \$200 billion for a tax cut. We lock in \$150 billion. We set aside a reserve of \$50 billion. If there is a potential surplus, we will have another \$50 billion, just slightly over 2 percent of all revenues that will come in the next 10 years.

No, a tax cut is not irresponsible unless it is not enough. It is certainly not spending, as the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) would call it. It is a tax cut. We give it back to the American people.

The bottom line, we set aside \$40 billion for the Committee on Ways and Means to bring forward a Medicare plan, a Medicare plan that will have prescription drugs payments for our seniors. That is what we do, and that is why we are so strongly in support of our plan.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I stand in favor of this motion to instruct, which would tell the conferees to make a Medicare prescription drug benefit a higher priority than a tax cut that would override all other priorities.

This motion to instruct conferees rejects the House's fiscally irresponsible \$200 billion tax cut which our Republican friends describe as a down payment on the \$483 billion plan outlined by Governor Bush, a tax cut that would eat up the entire non-Social Security surplus and begin to eat into funds borrowed from Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, we can afford a modest tax cut, but we cannot afford the kind of tax cut that would compromise the future of Social Security and Medicare. We need to address the future of Medicare. We need to address the deficiencies of Medicare. The most striking deficiency, the most important deficiency is its failure to cover prescription drugs.

We need a prescription drug benefit now, not later. Prescription drugs now account for about one-sixth of all out-of-pocket health spending by the elderly. Almost 40 percent of those over age 85 do not have prescription drug coverage.

Spending and utilization of prescription drugs is growing at twice the rate of other health spending. Between 1993 and 1998, spending for prescription drugs increased at an annual rate of 12 percent compared to about 5 percent for other kinds of health spending.

So this motion to instruct conferees takes the lower tax cut number in the Senate resolution so that the tax cut does not use all of our budgetary resources. Then it instructs conferees to use the latest date possible for tax cuts, September 22, so Congress will have time and will have the resources

to enact a Medicare prescription drug benefit before it acts on the tax cuts.

Mr. Speaker, let us put first things first. Let us support this motion to instruct conferees.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, seniors in my district are very concerned about the costs of prescription drugs, and they are glad that we will be addressing that issue this year. But seniors in my district are also very concerned about being able to pass along the fruits of their labors to their children, because many of the seniors in my district are farmers and ranchers and small business people, and they are weighed down by the effects of the death tax and their inability to pass along what they have worked for all their lives to their children and grandchildren. Many of them are still involved in their farms and ranches and small businesses. So as taxes go higher and higher, their costs of production go higher, and it is harder for them to make a living. So tax relief is an important part of this bill for seniors and for their children and for their grandchildren.

The budget resolution that the House passed is a good balance that includes a prescription drug benefit and tax relief, and it also includes strengthening our country's defense. This budget resolution increases defense spending 6 percent over last year. It helps us do a better job of taking care of our people.

But we know that more money alone doesn't solve all of our problems. We also have to reexamine our commitments and all of the deployments around the world. We have to address the fact that, in fiscal year 1998, \$24 billion of defense spending is in unreconciled transactions. We do not know where it was spent.

We have got to do a better job of making sure our money is spent smarter and more effectively, and this budget resolution as well as the continuing activities of this committee will help get us in that direction.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, America is completely entranced by the television show, "Who Wants to be a Millionaire?" I think that is the game that is being played out here on the floor today. The Republicans, they are starting the game kind of with the faster finger contest.

So what they do is they put a chart together, and they list six things that they want to accomplish. They want to protect 100 percent of Social Security. They want to strengthen Medicare. They want to retire the public debt. They want to promote tax fairness. They want to restore America's defense, and they want to promote education.

Now, the trick in the fastest finger contest is which order does one think the Republicans are going to put the answers in. Because we think and the

American people think that the Republicans are really playing a different game. They think, as we do, that the real game on the Republican side is who wants to help a millionaire?

So number four down here, yes, they want tax fairness for families, but the families they are talking about are the families in the country club. They want big tax breaks. So answer number one for them is helping the wealthiest families in the country with a big tax cut. But the Democrats, we are saying our answer is, who wants to help the elderly? Who wants to help the sick? Who wants to help kids get an education.

So we are moving up those issues up to number one, two and three. That is what the Democratic resolution says out here on the floor.

Let us make sure that we get this answer correctly, because there should be no taxation breaks before medication benefits for senior citizens in our country. We should ensure that the list, which is up here as a wonderful set of objectives that the Republican Party is listing, but they do not tell us what their priorities are. It tells us nothing about what they want to do first.

If we look back to past history, their first and primary objective is cutting social programs, especially for senior citizens in our country so they can have the biggest tax breaks for those that have been most benefited by the enormous prosperity of the 1990s.

So do not kid ourselves. This is all about who wants to make more money for more millionaires in our country. That is the game which the Republicans are playing. The Democrats are just making sure that we get the order first, prescription drugs to senior citizens before more tax breaks for millionaires.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) seek unanimous consent to reclaim his time?

Mr. SHAYS. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) controls the time.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I remind the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) that the first two tax cuts that went through were ending the marriage penalty so that young couples would not have to pay \$1,400 more, and ending Social Security penalty, which I think the gentleman voted for, hardly cuts tax for the wealthy.

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Connecticut for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the budget passed by this Chamber provides the framework and the foundation for continued prosperity. We know where the Republican priorities are. In 1993, I came to Wash-

ington. I came to Washington because I watched the other side spend the Social Security surplus for 40 years. We are now on our way to the 3rd year balancing the budget by not spending one dime of Social Security.

The Republicans have their priorities right. We are going to strengthen Medicare by setting aside \$40 billion for a prescription drug program. We are going to work at retiring public debt rather than accumulating public debt as we did for 40 years. We are going to promote tax fairness for families, farmers, and seniors. We are going to restore American defense. We are going to strengthen education in America.

I want to talk a little bit more about how we strengthen education in America. We have seen one approach to strengthening education, which is creating program after program after program here in Washington, throwing \$35 billion into an agency that cannot even keep its own books. It cannot balance its own books.

What does that mean? It means that it does not even think enough about our kids to make sure that every dollar that we invest in education makes it into a classroom, makes it to a child where it actually can make a difference.

There is a better way. Rather than having an education bureaucracy in Washington which is mandating to local school districts and to parents how to spend their educational dollars, the Republican plan, we maintain the funding, we increase the funding, but we give it to the school districts in a way that gives them maximum flexibility.

We increase funding for the Individuals With Disabilities Act. As we give the school districts and local districts more money, it frees up their money to move those dollars to the areas that they feel are most important.

We preserve funding for the Innovative Education Program Strategies. What is this? This is a very flexible block grant back to local school districts. It says we trust them to take some of this money and allocate it to the things that they think are most important. The President has not even requested funding for this program since 1994.

We reject cuts in impact aid. This is where money flows to local school districts because they have a significant impact because of Federal programs and facilities in their districts. We increase spending for Pell Grants. The Pell Grant program helps lower income students attend college.

□ 1800

There is a clear difference. One program says we are going to invest in Washington; the other says we are going to invest in our local schools and our local kids.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on this side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentleman from South

Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 6 minutes remaining; and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the gentleman from South Carolina for this motion. I rise to endorse it and ask my colleagues to accept it.

My district showed a definitive difference in the amount of monies paid by senior citizens for prescription drugs. It was higher in the 18th Congressional District in Houston than in Canada and in Mexico.

We find that those who are 85 years old, 40 percent of them do not even have the ability to pay for any drugs. They have no benefit whatsoever, and we must realize that seniors are living longer.

We also find that seniors are paying twice as much for their prescription drugs if they are Medicare beneficiaries and they do not have that provision, and so they are buying one-third less drugs. What does that mean? It means sicker seniors. That is what it means. Mr. Speaker, these are individuals who have worked hard in our communities.

Then we find the cost of our prescription drugs, the amount of money our seniors pay, is far more than any other health need that they have. And this, I would say to my colleagues, begs for us to have a prescription drug benefit under the Medicare provisions.

I do not know why it is so difficult. This is something we should support. I cannot go home and tell my seniors in the 18th Congressional District that in the United States of America they cannot have a drug benefit; but yet in Mexico and Canada prescription drugs are cheaper.

I would say it is time now to support this motion to instruct, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the Spratt motion to instruct the conferees on the budget resolution. The Spratt motion sets the stage for enacting a Medicare prescription drug benefit or other legislation to improve Medicare before the reporting date for a tax cut reconciliation bill by setting September 22 as the date for reporting a tax cut bill protected by reconciliation. Furthermore, the Spratt motion recedes to the Senate's slightly smaller tax cut and also recede to the Senate by dropping the reserve fund language in the House-passed resolution that provides for an additional \$50 billion in tax cuts.

While the Republicans propose large tax cuts over the next 5 years and reconcile the Finance and Ways and Means Committees to report legislation, Republicans do not show the 10-year cost of this tax cut which could be as large as the \$792 billion that the Republicans proposed and the American people rejected in 1999. Moreover, the Republicans do not intend to strengthen or support Medicare due to the fact that there are no reconciliation instructions to require legislation that would

actually use the \$40 billion "reserve" earmarked in the budget resolution. In addition, the Republicans have cut non-defense appropriations while defense significantly increased.

For the third consecutive year Republicans have chosen to provide large tax breaks for the wealthy. This budget resolution provides at least \$200 billion in tax breaks over the next 5 years for the financial elite of America. Furthermore, this resolution is a major down payment for George W. Bush's proposed trillion-dollar tax scheme. I will not stand by while our children's future is bankrupted to fund this irresponsible budget resolution.

This budget contains deep cuts in domestic spending by \$114 billion over the next 5 years; fails to provide anything to strengthen Social Security or Medicare; cuts nondefense discretionary spending by \$19.7 billion in 2001 and \$138 billion over the next 5 years below the level needed to maintain purchasing power after adjusting for inflation; and pretends to reserve \$40 billion for a Medicare prescription drug benefit contingent upon essentially turning Medicare into a voucher program. Republicans have used slight of hand to hide the facts of their irresponsible budget by showing the effects of proposed tax cuts for only the first 5 years and not the full 10-year projections commonly used during the last 4 years.

I am disappointed in the budget resolution because I do not believe that it provides adequate investment in our Nation's future. America's future depends on that of her young people—in providing them adequate resources and opportunities to become our future leaders including providing them education and access to adequate health care.

The budget resolution provides inadequate resources for the education of our young people. I firmly believe that we must focus our attention and our energy on one of the most important challenges facing our country today—revitalizing our education system. Strengthening education must be a top priority to raise the standard of living among American families and to prolong this era of American economic expansion.

Education will prepare our nation for the challenges of the 21st century, and I will fight to ensure that the necessary programs are adequately funded to ensure our children's success.

We must provide our children access to superior education at all ages from kindergarten to graduate school. Recent studies emphasize the importance of quality education early in a child's future development. And yet despite these studies, the Budget Resolution still inadequately funds programs that would provide for programs targeting children in their younger years.

In addition, we need to open the door of educational opportunity to all American children. It is well known that increases in income are related to educational attainment. The Democratic budget alternative rejects the Republican freeze on education funding and allocates \$4.8 billion more for education for fiscal year 2001, than the Republican budget. Over 5 years, the Democratic Party demonstrates its commitment to education by proposing \$21 billion more than the Republican budget resolution.

The Congressional Black Caucus [CBC] offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute that promised to invest for the future of our Nation. The CBC substitute is a budget

that maximizes investment and opportunity for the poor, African-Americans, and other minorities. This Budget for Maximum Investment and Opportunity supports a moderate plan to pay down the national debt; protects Social Security; and makes significant investments in education and training.

The CBC budget requests \$88.8 billion in fiscal year 2001 for education, training, and development. This is \$32 billion more than the Republican budget provides. The CBC substitute proposed a \$10 billion increase over the President's Budget for school construction. Other projected increases include additional funding for Head Start, Summer Youth Employment, TRIO programs, Historically Black Colleges and Universities, and Community Technology Centers. In an age of unprecedented wealth the CBC has the vision to invest in the American family and not squander opportunities afforded by a budget surplus.

I will not support the failed policies of the past. Senator McCain has best characterized this budget resolution as one that is fiscally irresponsible. I support a budget that invests strengthening Social Security; provides an affordable prescription drug benefit for all seniors; helps communities improve public education with quality teachers, smaller classes, greater accountability and modern schools; and pay down the national debt. These are the policies that invest in our children and in the future of our Nation in the 21st century.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 20 seconds to just remind my colleagues that I was here for 13 years, and I never saw in a Democrat budget any prescription drugs. In the Republican budget we have prescription drugs.

It is interesting to note that my colleagues on the other side want to make it universal, so they want to give millionaires prescription drugs. Somehow that does not bother them. So I guess they like some millionaires and not others. I guess taxes, whatever.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER).

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to outline the six points of the Republican budget plan and compare it a bit with the Democrat plan, or the plans they have had over the last 30 years when they were in power.

Number one. Last year the House of Representatives passed a measure that I sponsored, the Social Security Lockbox, by an overwhelming 416 to 12 vote. This budget reinforces that effort by ensuring that Social Security dollars will not be spent on unrelated programs. It protects 100 percent of the Social Security.

In this budget all of the \$166 billion Social Security surplus is off limits to Clinton-Gore spending. This will be the second year in a row that Republicans have protected the Social Security surplus.

Secondly, we are strengthening Medicare with prescription drugs. It sets aside \$40 billion to help needy seniors to be able to afford their prescription drugs; and at the same time, it rejects the \$18.2 billion Clinton-Gore Medicare cuts. The other side would like to cut Medicare.

Point three. Our Federal public debt stands now at \$3.6 trillion. This equates to \$56,000 for the average family of four. This year, nearly \$1,000 in taxes from every man, woman, and child in the United States will be used just to pay the interest on the debt. The Republican budget resolution leads our Nation on the path towards eliminating public debt by paying off \$1 trillion over the next 5 years. Our budget discipline has already repaid \$302 billion since 1998.

Mr. Speaker, those are numbers; but paying off the public debt is not just about numbers, it is about people. It is about the future of our Nation. It is about children living in my northern California district and elsewhere in our Nation that are saddled by this debt unless we pay it off. This budget takes the bold step for ourselves and future generations by taking on the challenge to pay off this national public debt.

The next point it promotes, point number four, is tax fairness for families. Farmers and seniors. This is not for fat cats, as the other side would have us believe. It provides for those in the House-passed marriage tax penalty provision who, on average, pay \$1,400 extra just because they are married.

It also provides for a small business tax relief and education and health care assistance amounting to \$150 billion, and it rejects the \$96 billion growth tax increase over the next 5 years in the Clinton-Gore budget.

Number five. It restores American defense 6 percent more than last year for our overdeployed armed forces. The GOP defense budget provides \$1 billion more than the Clinton-Gore plan.

And finally, number six, it strengthens support for education and science, 9.4 percent more for elementary and secondary education, and IDEA increases of nearly \$2 billion. Also, it fights cancer, AIDS, diabetes, and other diseases with \$1 billion more for NIH, as well as \$1 billion extra for basic research in biology, science, engineering, and math.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good budget resolution; and I urge my colleagues to reject this motion to instruct.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACC).

Mr. BALDACC. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, let us put first things first. First things first are the seniors who cannot afford their medications; who are cutting their pills in half, cutting the potency, thereby running the risk that they do not get better earlier. Those are the people who we are trying to put first; the people who cannot afford their prescription drugs because they are too expensive.

We have developed all this taxpayer-funded research, and the people who are supposed to be benefiting from it cannot even afford the drugs once they are developed. We need to put first

things first, and this motion puts first things first.

Our seniors are being forced to choose between food, fuel, and prescription drugs. A study that just came out showed that those paying 15 percent more than anybody else are the ones who do not have the insurance or on Medicare. The ones that are the most vulnerable are the ones paying the most.

Mr. Speaker, these are individuals who have contributed to their communities. They have sacrificed; they have worked for their families and lived their whole lives and tried to make their families and their communities better. They are the most vulnerable amongst us, and they are the ones we should help first. Not a very large tax break providing for the very wealthy people to be able to enjoy, but the most vulnerable amongst us who need our care and support in their prescription medication, who have led a full and productive life for their families and their communities.

Mr. Speaker, this motion is putting first things first.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I believe I have the right to close.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) is recognized for 2¼ minutes.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I would have to say this is the most overused chart I think I have seen on the House floor in maybe a dozen years. It is used by the Republicans and the Democrats alike. And we would like the Democrats to use it more and keep repeating our themes because we think it is really a good message.

In fact, I was in Reading, Pennsylvania, the other night and I made a talk; and I never really talk about the budget but I talked about the budget, and I said, "I want you to know what is in it because I am so amazed that we were able to accomplish the fact that we are going to keep our mitts off Social Security and keep that surplus there and use it to fix Social Security for three generations of Americans. Not just the seniors, but the baby-boomers and particularly the kids, who are really at risk."

And we are going to strengthen Medicare. Frankly, Medicare has got to become a much more free market program. And we have to provide supplements in private savings accounts in order to really solve the Medicare problem long term. But at this point we want to strengthen it, and we want to make sure our seniors have access to the prescription drugs because, frankly, we may be able to avoid surgeries, for example, and have a more inexpen-

sive way of keeping people healthy through the use of prescription drugs.

But we certainly do not want people of real means to qualify for another entitlement program offered by the Federal Government that, frankly, takes away from people who are more needy.

We pay down \$1 trillion in the publicly held debt. That is better than Regis Philbin did if we add up all his shows together. We are going to pay down \$1 trillion in the publicly held debt, and we are going to cut taxes. And we are going to cut taxes for people who pay taxes.

I am in favor of that. I am not a big fan of cutting taxes for people who do not pay any taxes. So we are going to have a program that will help the family farmer and the small businessperson. We are going to help the married couples. We are going to help everybody who is out there paying taxes and let them pay a little less and get this government to clean itself up a little bit.

We are going to restore America's defense. We do not want our troops to be up against the wall without the training money they need, the basic supplies that they need.

And, finally, we are going to strengthen support for education. We believe in basic science. We love the human genome project. As one philosopher once said, advanced science is sometimes indistinguishable from magic. And the fact is that human genome project almost looks like magic; it is so amazing and it offers so much hope to everybody.

So with these six principles, we do not think we ought to change course. We think we are headed in the right direction. We think this will strengthen America, will strengthen our families, our communities; and so I would ask my colleagues to reject the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina.

Let us stay the course and get this budget done and offer something to the American people that I believe will improve their lives.

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

This whole debate began when the President sent us a budget and said let us do prescription drug coverage; there is a gaping hole in the comprehensive care we ought to provide in Medicare. And I absolutely agree with that.

When the Republicans brought their resolution to the Committee on the Budget, they provided for prescription drug coverage in an iffy conditional kind of way. The usual procedure in a budget resolution, the one tool we have to get something done on the Committee on the Budget, is to impose reconciliation instructions on the committees of jurisdiction, to tell them by a date certain to report out language to the House floor so that we can act upon the purpose that we have set for ourselves.

We, in our resolution on the Democratic side, did just that. We resorted to the time-honored tool of reconciliation and said to the Committee on

Ways and Means and to the Committee on Commerce, reconcile the budget; here is \$40 billion for the first 5 years, \$155 billion over the next 10 years, establish a prescription drug benefit for Medicare.

That is all we want to do today. We want to take this iffy, mushy language now in this resolution and stiffen it up. We want to stiffen the spine and resolve of the conferees and tell them, go to conference determined to see that the first order of business of this House is not tax cuts, it is a prescription drug benefit. Then they can turn to tax cuts. We do not rule that out.

We provide in our budget resolution for tax reduction of \$50 billion over the next 5 years, \$201 billion over the next 10 years, and we say in this resolution recede to the Senate tax proposal, which is \$147 billion.

Why do we say that? Because, Mr. Speaker, going back to a chart I used repeatedly when we argued this resolution, we think that the other side is coming perilously close to putting us in the position of being back in the red, back into the Social Security surplus once again.

The budget resolution the Republicans brought to the floor produces, according to their numbers, a surplus of \$110 billion over 5 years, provided they can hold discretionary spending below the rate of inflation to the tune of \$117 billion over 5 years. A very big proviso.

□ 1815

But if they then go from a \$150 billion tax cut to a \$200 billion tax cut, that \$110 billion is reduced by 50. And then if they do the prescription drug

benefit at 40, they take another 50 off. They are down to a \$110 billion surplus over the next 5 years. By our calculation, Mr. Speaker, they will have a \$10 billion surplus next year, but every year thereafter they will have a zero surplus.

They are skating on thin ice. They are putting us in danger of invading the Social Security surplus again. And when that crunch comes, prescription drug coverage will never get done. That is why we say do it first.

Now, this is simply a test of their sincerity. If they are earnest, if they are sincere, if they really want to do prescription drugs, vote for this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following chart for the RECORD:

THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET RESOLUTION USES UP THE ENTIRE SURPLUS—AND MAYBE MORE

[All figures exclude the Social Security surplus; negative signs indicate savings; dollars in billions]

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	Five years	Ten years
CBO Surplus w/o Social Security	27	15	29	36	42	48	171	893
Tax cuts (before use of "reserve")	10	22	31	42	45	150	750
Non-defense cuts including timing shifts	12	-16	-13	-21	-30	-37	-117	-377
Defense	3	2	2	3	2	12	23
Farm payments	6	1	1	2	2	2	7	18
Extend expiring Customs Service fee	-1	-2	-3	-13
Medicaid/CHIP access and benefits	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	1	2
Interest costs of policies	(1)	1	1	2	3	4	11	75
Surplus claimed by Republicans	8	17	16	20	24	33	110	415
Reserve for \$50 billion additional tax cuts	5	10	10	10	15	50	250
Reserved for Medicare "reform" and drugs	2	5	8	11	14	40	155
Interest cost of reserves	(1)	1	2	3	4	10	80
Surplus/Deficit(—) when reserves are used	8	10	0	0	0	0	10	-70

¹ means "less than \$½ billion".

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion.

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Con. Res. 282, by the yeas and nays; H. Con. Res. 228, by the yeas and nays; S. 777, by the yeas and nays; and the motion to instruct conferees on H. Con. Res. 290, by the yeas and nays.

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

□

DECLARING AMERICAN G.I. "PERSON OF THE CENTURY" FOR 20TH CENTURY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 282, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 282, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 397, nays 0, answered "present" 1, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 111]
YEAS—397

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird

Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett

Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry

Biggert
Billirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham

Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske

Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchee
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde