United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 25, 1999 No. 48

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Chaplain, Reverend James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We are grateful, O God, that You have made the heavens and the Earth and have breathed into us the very breath of life. As we express our petitions this day may we do so with humility and wisdom as we face the decisions that affect the lives of others. We earnestly pray for peace in our troubled world, and may Your spirit, gracious God, be with all those who face danger and suffering. May Your blessings surround all people, may Your grace be sufficient for every need and may Your love ever bind us together. In Your name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TRAFICANT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 774. An act to amend the Small Business Act to change the conditions of participation and provide an authorization of appropriations for the women's business center program.

H.R. 808. An act to extend for 6 additional months the period for which chapter 12 of title 11, United States Code, is reenacted.

H.J. Res. 26. Joint resolution providing for the reappointment of Barber B. Conable, Jr. as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

H.J. Res. 27. Joint resolution providing for the reappointment of Dr. Hanna H. Gray as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

H.J. Res. 28. Joint resolution providing for the reappointment of Wesley S. Williams, Jr. as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET—FISCAL YEAR 2000

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 131 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 131

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. 68) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2009. 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 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. The amendment specified in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The concurrent resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. No further amendment shall be in order except those printed in part 2 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 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. All points of order against the amendments printed in the report are waived except that the adoption of an amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment. 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, as amended, to the House with such further amendment as may have been adopted. 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 2000.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), 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 only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 131 is a structured rule providing for consideration of H. Con. Res. 68, the budget resolution for fiscal year 2000.

H. Res. 131 provides for three hours of general debate with two hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, and one hour on economic goals and policies 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. The rule also considers the amendment printed in part one of the Committee on Rules report as adopted upon adoption of the rule. The rule also makes in order only those amendments printed in part 2 of the Committee on Rules report to be offered only in the order specified, only by the Member designated, debatable for 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by a proponent and an opponent, and 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 as adopted, it is not in order to consider further substitutes. This is a very important point, because Members need to know that there will not be any king of the hill or queen of the hill procedures used here today. There are no free votes.

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

The rule also provides and permits the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to offer amendments in the House to achieve mathematical consistency pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Budget Act. Finally, the rule suspends the application of House rule XXIII with respect to the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 131 is a conventional rule for consideration of the budget resolution and provides for the consideration of a number of substitutes, including the Blue Dog budget offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE), the Democratic substitute offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), and President Clinton's budget. It strikes me as odd that the Committee on the Budget Democrats would not offer the President's budget for consideration, and that as a result, Members on our side of the aisle had to offer it to get it considered.

Mr. Speaker, this budget takes advantage of this historic opportunity to save Social Security by ensuring that 100 percent of the money destined for the Social Security Trust Fund remains in the trust fund. That is $1.8 trillion over the next decade for retirement security. The President's plan only sets aside 62 percent of the funds destined for the Social Security Trust Fund, about $100 billion less than the Republican plan. Our budget strengthens Social Security and ensures that big spenders can no longer raid the fund to pay for their big government spending programs.

Mr. Speaker, after saving Social Security and Medicare, the real question is, what should we do with the remainder of the surplus? We say, give it back. When previous Congresses could not figure out how to run the government, they turned to the American people for more taxes. Now that we have a surplus, the big spenders do not want to give the people a refund. They want to spend it on new, wasteful, bureaucratic programs.

I welcome this debate because it will speak volumes about the differing opinions on the role of the Federal Government in the lives of the American people.

A few months ago, we received a preview of this debate when the President said, and I quote, we could give it all back to you and hope you spend it right, closed quotes. But the President then proceeded to explain that he really should not give back the surplus because Federal Government bureaucrats could make wiser choices with your paychecks than you could.

That is the ideological conflict we are dealing with today. Our budget is designed to provide more freedom and more power to the American people. The President's budget is designed to keep taxpayer money controlled inside of the Washington, D.C. bureaucracy.

The Republican budget expands upon our efforts to provide every American with as much personal freedom and liberty as possible. We simply believe that individuals make much better choices about their lives than bureaucrats do.

The President's position on taxes illustrates his belief that the government makes wiser choices with the paychecks of the American worker. In a budget that weighed 12 pounds and was 2,800 pages long, the Clinton budget did not contain any real tax cut. In fact, his budget proposal actually included billions of new taxes and fees.

Today, your tax rate is about 2 percent lower than it was 2 years ago because Congress provided the first Federal tax cut in 16 years. Yet Federal tax revenues still comprise a record percentage of Gross Domestic Product. In fact, Americans pay more in taxes than for food, clothing and shelter combined.

The President responded to this growing tax burden by stating, ''Fifteen years from now, if the Congress wants to give more tax relief, then let them do it.''

Well, if waiting until the year 2014 to get a tax refund does not appeal to people, they will be pleased to know that the Republican budget states that the surplus does not belong to government. The Republican budget will provide $800 billion in tax relief, including $10 billion to $15 billion in the first year. It is a reaffirmation of our belief that the American people know best how to spend their money.

The President's budget, which the Democrats would not even offer today, spends $341 billion of the Social Security surplus over 10 years, it breaks the balanced budget caps, and proposes $30 billion more in outlays than allowed under the law in just the first year.

It should be noted that despite the President's rhetoric, his budget actually cuts Medicare by $11.9 billion over 5 years. The Republican budget rejects the President's Medicare cuts, including those he proposed for certain prescription drugs.

Even the President's own Comptroller General, David Walker, has criticized the Clinton Medicare proposal for essentially doing nothing to alter the imbalance between the program's receipts and benefits payments. The President's $11.9 billion cut in Medicare and his fiscal shell games are endangering the quality of our seniors' health care.

Conversely, our budget locks away all of the Social Security trust fund surpluses for the Nation's elderly to save, strengthen and preserve Social Security and Medicare.

This budget continues our determined efforts to provide more security, more freedom, and less government to the American people. In its entirety, our budget is a common sense plan to provide security for the American people by preserving every penny of the Social Security surplus, return overtaxed paychecks to those who earned it, pay down the national debt, rebuild our Nation's defense, and improve our public schools.

Mr. Speaker, this Republican budget reaffirms our belief in the Ronald Reagan adage that it is not the function of government to bestow happiness upon us. Rather, it is the function of government to give the American people the opportunity to work out happiness for themselves. That is why this budget resolution is written in such a way to provide more freedom to American families and communities by returning money, power and control back to them.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fair rule. I urge my colleagues to support it so that we may proceed with the general debate and consideration of this historic budget resolution and the substitute resolutions.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me the customary half hour, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, people are starting to get their hopes up with this budget. With the new surplus and the new millennium, it looks like anything is possible. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, they

are in for a huge disappointment. Last week's unveiling of my Republican colleagues' new budget proved to be more of the same: All bad ideas.

Despite predictions of Medicare and Social Security catastrophes looming on the horizon, the Republican budget does nothing to extend the life of either Social Security or Medicare for even one day. But it still manages to siphon $775 billion into tax cuts for the richest Americans, instead of investing in education, health care, to prepare this country for the next century.

□ 1015

Like Nero, Mr. Speaker, the Republican budget fiddles while Social Security and Medicare burn.

The chief actuary of the Social Security Administration has said this budget will have virtually no effect on the date that Social Security becomes insolvent. It will just make sure that it goes broke on schedule. That is not me speaking, Mr. Speaker. That is the chief actuary of the Social Security Administration.

In contrast, the Democratic budget has a lock box which will protect Social Security until the year 2050 and protect Medicare until the year 2020. My Republican colleagues propose a plan that is less secure than the Democrats', and Treasury Secretary Rubin recommended that the President of the United States veto it.

Because in reality, Mr. Speaker, the Republican lock box is more of an open till. The differences do not stop there.

The Democratic budget reduces the debt more than the Republican budget every year that it is in effect. The Democratic budget provides $40 billion more for veterans' health care over the next 10 years than the Republican budget. Mr. Speaker, we made our veterans a promise. We must keep that promise. America's fighting men and women risk their lives for this country. They deserve the very best health care, the best services we can give them. But my Republican colleagues will not allow a vote, will not even allow a vote on the Clement veterans' amendment.

The Democratic budget provides more for defense spending over the long run than the Republican budget because, in the later years, my Republican colleagues had to choose between defense spending and tax cuts. What do my colleagues think, Mr. Speaker? They chose the tax cuts.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, the Democratic budget still manages to provide some balanced tax cuts and keep our economy from slipping back into deficit. The Republican budget, on the other hand, will create a whole new deficit by the year 2014.

The Democratic budget does more to reduce class size and modernize our schools than the Republican budget, which will cut spending for Head Start, cut spending for Pell Grants, and cut money for work study.

The Democratic budget protects important programs like WIC, which the Republican budget cuts by so much that 1.2 million women, infants, and children will lose their benefits next year; 16,400 of them live in my home State of Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, the WIC program provides essential nutrition and education during the early years of the childrens' development in order to make sure that they start school ready to learn. If we do not give them good nutrition when they are very young, we lose our chance forever.

Some of my Democratic colleagues tried to make sure that we got that chance. But this rule does not make in order the DeFazio amendment on the progressive budget, the Clement amendment on the veterans budget, or the Mink amendment on education.

This rule does make in order the Shadegg-Coburn amendment which some people are equating with President Clinton's budget. They say it reflects some CBO comparison. Mr. Speaker, I want to make something perfectly clear. The Shadegg-Coburn amendment looks as much like President Clinton's budget as I look like Gwyneth Paltrow.

Looking at this budget, we would think that my Republican colleagues have very sharp memories when it comes to bad habits that gave us the budget deficits in the 1980s and the tripling of our national debt. Now that our budget finally is in the black, we should be very, very careful about repeating those mistakes.

So I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, we will make in order the Clement amendment to take care of our American veterans. Our veterans deserve every bit of care we can give them. This country made them a promise. This country should live up to that promise.

Yesterday's U.S.A. Today says, ''If your Member of Congress comes home this weekend bragging about having adopted a responsible Federal budget, don't you believe it.''

So I urge my colleagues to defeat the Republican budget. Today's vote gives us an unprecedented chance to protect Social Security, to protect Medicare for the next generation. Mr. Speaker, let us not let that chance go by.

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the 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, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Atlanta for yielding me this time and appreciate his fine leadership in this effort.

This morning, as the House opened, since we did not go through one minutes, a lot of us were here to listen to the prayer delivered by the Chaplain. The Chaplain said, ''One of the things that we have to do here is face the challenge of those decisions that will affect the lives of others.'' This issue of the budget is a very serious one, and it cannot be taken lightly. That is why I am extraordinarily proud of, not only the process that we have gone through for consideration of these different budgets, but the budget itself that is the underlying effort that was put forward by the Committee on the Budget.

When we think about the impact on lives of others, we think about retirees and those who are looking towards retirement. We are making history today when we do in fact pass the committee's budget, which I believe we will do.

We are locking away Social Security money for Social Security and ending what has been at least a 3½ or 4 decade long practice of raiding Social Security for other spending.

I have got to enter into the RECORD at this point, Mr. Speaker, a letter that has come from the AARP, the American Association of Retired Persons. In it is made very clear that there is a high level of support and recognition that our plan to lock away Social Security does in fact provide the greatest opportunity for us to address the needs of retirees.

The letter is as follows:

AARP,
March 24, 1999.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: AARP believes it is important to protect Social Security's growing reserves and is pleased that the House Budget Resolution provides that protection. Over the next ten years, Social Security is projected to contribute $1.8 trillion of the unified surplus. Preserving Social Security's reserves not only allows our country to better prepare for the impending retirement of the baby boom generation, but also gives us greater financial flexibility to enact long-term reform in both Social Security and Medicare once the options have been carefully considered and their impact understood. In the meantime, maintaining Social Security's trust fund assets helps reduce the publicly held debt, further strengthening the economy.

We are also pleased that the Resolution does not call for reconciliation in the Medicare program. Much work remains to be done to strengthen and modernize Medicare—work that must be taken on judiciously and on a bipartisan basis. Currently, however, the program is still absorbing the impact of the changes enacted in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. Until such changes are fully understood, we should move cautiously in making additional changes to the program.

The Association remains concerned that the constraints on domestic discretionary spending will place an inordinate burden on low-income programs such as elderly housing and home energy assistance. Inevitably, these caps will lead to difficult choices in providing for appropriations for these important programs and may need to be reconsidered in light of pressing needs.

The Resolution now before the House continues to move this year's budget process forward in a constructive manner. AARP is committed to working with the House on a bipartisan basis to achieve a Budget Resolution that takes advantage of the opportunities that come from a surplus and at the

same time continues the course of fiscal discipline that our nation has worked hard to achieve.

Sincerely,

HORACE B. DEETS.

Our budget actually devotes $100 billion more than the President's budget to save, strengthen, and secure and preserve Social Security and Medicare. Unfortunately, the President's budget cuts Medicare by $11.9 billion. We maintain the spending discipline that brought us the balanced budget while, unfortunately, the President's package exceeds the caps by $30 billion.

After locking away the Social Security and Medicare funds, we returned the rest of the surplus to the American people in tax relief. That is something I think is very important to recognize, that we have an overcharge that has taken place, and that overcharge should in fact be provided as a rebate, and that is exactly what we do.

On the other side, the President's budget in fact raises taxes by $172 billion. In fact, the President has said that Congress should not even consider providing tax relief for over 15 years.

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

Mr. DREIER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), my chairman, my very dear friend, keeps alluding to the President's budget. We did not propose the President's budget. The gentleman's Members proposed the President's budget so he is using the President's budget as a straw man. We do not want any part of the President's budget.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think the gentleman from Massachusetts has made an extraordinarily wonderful point when he says he does not want to have anything to do with the President's budget.

We made the President's budget in order for consideration when we move ahead for debate for a very important reason; and that is, I believe that the President was very serious when he submitted his budget to the Congress.

I find it very interesting that the budget of the President's had to be offered by Republicans. Why? Because not one single Member of the President's party chose to step forward and endorse, support, and propose this budget that I am proudly talking about and juxtaposing to the proposal that has come from the Budget Committee.

So I will continue, if I can, to talk about more reasons why Democrats do not even want to offer the President's budget.

Our budget actually pays down $450 billion more in public debt than the administration's budget does. For those on the other side of the aisle who have looked back to the days of liberal rule of the Congress and budget deficits which went as far as the eye can see, we are making in order, as I said, this old-fashioned tax-and-spend last budget that the President submitted for this Congress, the 20th Century.

I think it is unfortunate that the President chose to do that. But we have to take seriously what the President has submitted to us. That is why our Republican colleagues, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) will in fact be offering that.

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

Mr. DREIER. I am happy to once again yield to the gentleman from South Boston, Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, as I said, the chairman and I are very friendly.

Mr. DREIER. And we agree on a lot of things, too.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a letter from the director of OMB, and I would just like to read a couple statements. It says, ''As you know, Congressmen SHADEGG and COBURN will be offering a substitute amendment as the budget resolution on the House floor today. This amendment is being characterized as the President's budget. The administration has not been consulted in the development of this amendment. It is our understanding that it is based on a set of assumptions and is quite different from those presented in the President's budget. Therefore, this is not the President's budget.''

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), my friend, for his very valuable contribution.

I hope that the spirit that was raised as a question from the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Budget earlier this morning to me will be recognized, and I am trying to give time over to the other side of the aisle because I know that the gentleman said that he wanted to have, in fact, longer than the 40 minutes. Although I have got to tell my colleagues, as chairman of the Committee on Rules, I have had Democrat after Democrat who has come up to me and said, ''Gosh, don't you think, after 10 hours of debate, maybe tonight we could complete this budget process?'' That is exactly what we are trying to do.

Frankly, I do not have to leave here tonight or first thing in the morning, but I have got so many Members on the other side of the aisle who are urging us to complete this. Let me say, I know that there is great time. I have tried to yield as generously as I can to the ranking minority member.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DREIER. If there is one question, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, it is down the gentleman's alley. I would like for him to elaborate, to explain this so-called trust box that my colleagues are proposing. It is my understanding that the basic protection is a rule of order here on the House floor. As the gentleman knows, as the chairman of the Committee on Rules, he is in the business of waiving points of order every day of the week.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, we have no intention of waiving that one, I should say, and we do plan to have in fact this locked up. It is the first time in history that we have ever attempted to do that. That is what this Congress is doing.

So I hope that, if my colleagues look at the litany of proposals that have been put forward, I am very happy that we have got the President's budget, we made the Spratt budget alternative in order, and we made the Blue Dog budget in order.

Of the alternatives that we are going to have, all three of them were authored by Democrats. So I have got to say that I think we are being very fair, very balanced, and I look forward to a vigorous debate on that.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the President is not reputed for his accounting. I remember a Bush budget that was offered word for word that only got 30 votes.

I am going to vote ''no'' against everything. I will tell my colleagues why. We have an approaching $200 billion trade deficit, and there is still no address to the critical negative balance of payments.

Number two, neither party secures Social Security. My colleagues can waive rules. They can take lock boxes and throw them out windows. I submit a little bill that says we should amend the Constitution that says it is illegal to touch Social Security. We did it for limiting President's terms. We did it to allow popular vote for Senators. We in fact prohibited alcohol in this country. What is more important than Social Security?

So I will listen to the debate. But, quite frankly, the Republicans should have offered word for word President Clinton's budget, and it would have been soundly defeated.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that President Clinton's budget was put on the Senate floor yesterday and defeated 97 to 2.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), a member of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me the time, and I rise in support obviously of this very good rule to bring the budget forward.

□ 1030

First, though, Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for all my colleagues when I say good luck, Godspeed, and we are behind our young men and women who are overseas today doing the very hard work of this Nation's national security in their mission in Yugoslavia. We are all praying for their success, for a safe mission and a quick return home.

Mr. Speaker, as has been described, this rule is a fair and balanced approach to the very important debate we are about to have for the Nation's fiscal year 2000 budget. I know that some of our colleagues will be disappointed this rule does not allow for every proposed amendment. But what we have tried to do is craft a rule that allows for several different approaches to be debated so that all the major issues, all of the major issues, can be addressed today. I think we have succeeded on that point, as we will hear in the 10 hours of debate that will ensue.

In addition, I point out to my colleagues who have expressed specific concern about the need to boost defense spending levels, even beyond what the Committee on the Budget has provided, that we have in fact taken that advice and this rule will incorporate an enhancement of defense spending in the base text of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the budget brought forward today by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, is a positive blueprint for where we should be headed as we assess our Nation's finances in the new millennium. The budget outlines our unwavering commitment to preserving Social Security and Medicare, living within budget caps, caps we set for ourselves in 1997, and providing real tax relief to the American people.

We know there is a great temptation among some who see the term ''surplus'' and who conclude that we should be boosting the budget of all sorts of government programs. But we are committed to maintaining discipline, even in the face of that kind of temptation, by first meeting our obligation to ensure the retirement security and the national security of the American people. They are counting on us and we are doing it.

Once we have accomplished those goals, we propose to give something back in the form of tax cuts to the American people. With all the numbers we will be hearing today, and all the rhetoric and spin that will come forward, to me, once again, this debate here in Congress boils down to fundamentally different competing visions of where America is headed in the millennium.

We propose less government and more control by American families of their own hard-earned resources. The administration, and some of our Democrat colleagues across the aisle, propose ever more government and ever more taxes, and we will hear it here today. It is really just that simple.

This is a healthy debate for us to have, and this rule allows for plenty of opportunity for all voices to be heard. I congratulate the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), for bringing this rule forward, and my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER), for his beautiful support for it today, and I urge the support of all my colleagues for this rule and the underlying resolution.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to the comments made by my friend who just left the microphone and to the claim that we are to have 10 hours for debate. I wish someone would explain. I count 5 hours, if we do not count the rule. We get 5 hours of debate after the debate on the rule is finished.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, we did a calculation, and my guess is we will be out of here about 8 o'clock tonight. I suspect we are not doing anything else today, so I assumed it would be about 10 hours.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Does vote time count as debate time; is that what the gentleman is telling me?

Mr. GOSS. I think some of the better debate takes place during the vote time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Well, I think if the gentleman wants to look at the record, we have 5 hours for debate, not 10 hours of debate, after the rule is completed.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, I will correct my statement to say that we will be applying 10 hours of our day today to this subject.

Mr. MOAKLEY. It is still not a correct statement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, for all Americans, we are now in the ''Goldilocks economy''. It is not too hot, not too cold, just right, everywhere but on the Republican side and their CBO numbers. Over there it is the ''Mamma Bear economy''. It is always too cold.

So their CBO numbers right now have the American economy growing at 2.3 percent for this year. Forget the fact that the economy grew at 6.1 percent for the first quarter. Forget the fact that everybody else in America is projecting 3 or 4 percent growth. And guess what that means? That means we have to cut back on how much we can help out on Medicare, how much we can help out on education, how much we can help out on the environment.

The CBO was off by $100 billion in 1997. They were off by $75 billion in 1998. And they are off by at least $50 billion this year. And in July of this year, when the money shows up, guess where it is going. It is going for a tax break for the rich. This money is in something which the Republicans, Senator DOMENICI, is calling right now, he is calling it a tax reduction reserve plan.

That is the Republican plan, a skeleton key for their lock box this July that will take $50 or $60 billion for tax breaks for the wealthy. No money for Medicare, no money for education, no money for the environment, but money for those tax breaks. That is the secret plan. That is what this is all about.

They continue to have the remarkable ability to harness voluminous amounts of information to defend knowingly erroneous premises. This debate is a fraud.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). All Members will be reminded that references to Members of the other body are prohibited by House rules.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to point out that it was President Clinton who said on this floor in his first State of the Union that he wanted to use CBO numbers, much to the applause of all the Democrats in this Chamber.

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

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

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear that this Republican budget has many and serious deficiencies. It is also true of the rule.

The rule, for example, will not allow us to direct our attention to the needs of American veterans. The rule does not allow us to have an amendment come to the floor which will allow us to debate the issue of health care for American veterans. The rule does not allow us to provide very drastically needed additional funds to provide for the health care for the men and women who went to war for this country.

Why do the Republicans refuse to allow us the opportunity to provide adequately for American veterans? It is a tiny amount of money that is needed. It will not disrupt the budget.

Please, I implore my colleagues, make in order as part of the rule an amendment which will allow us to debate the issue of veterans' health care and finally allow us to provide the funds that are necessary to provide for the health care of American veterans at veterans' hospitals across this country.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

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

The question before the House is how do we safeguard Social Security, increase military spending, cut taxes for

the wealthy, and balance the budget without devastating cuts in everything else that is important to many Americans, from veterans' programs to education to law enforcement? The answer is we do not, and we cannot honestly.

On the Republican side they have revived with gusto the magic asterisks of the Reagan years, which are so-called undistributed cuts, meaning we do not know what to do, we are punting, and we will figure it out later, but there will probably be a whole bunch more cuts or we will not deliver on these promises. One or the other has got to give.

Unfortunately, the other budget alternatives before us also come up short in those areas. I tried to offer a progressive budget alternative that was balanced, did not offer tax cuts to the wealthy, protected those programs important to Americans, with modest reductions in the military, and it was not allowed.

It was an honest budget and it was not allowed. It did not have any magic asterisks that say we do not have the slightest idea how we are going to do this, we will just put something in that says we will figure out how to cut later.

This is a dishonest budget with a dishonest debate without a progressive alternative.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. CLEMENT).

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me this time, and I thank the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the rule and to this budget resolution for many reasons, but I want to concentrate on the veterans. Veterans are very important to us because we know how much they have sacrificed in order for us to be free.

I offered an amendment in the Committee on the Budget, as well as an amendment in the Committee on Rules, asking for $1 billion for the veterans for fiscal year 2000 over and above what the Republicans had requested, which was only $900 million. What I requested was exactly what the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP), the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, recommended to the Committee on the Budget that was adopted but rejected by the Committee on the Budget. They went with the lower amount.

It is interesting, when I asked the question in the Committee on the Budget, ''Why did we go along with the lower amount?'' ''Well, the uncertainties of the veterans' programs in the future,'' was the answer.

Well, we know what is happening in Kosovo right now. We also know that a lot of people could get hurt and killed in Kosovo. We know about all the regional and ethnic conflicts in the world that will continue in the future as well, because we know about our civilization and we know about the struggles for freedom and for fairness. And we also know that we have an obligation to our veterans to do everything we possibly can to help them in time of need. But are we? The Republican budget ignores this recommendation.

In fact, the resolution actually decreases veterans' funding over the next 10 years by $3 billion. This is simply wrong. In an era with budget surpluses, it is unconscionable to deny our veterans the funds they so desperately need. Yes, we are going to increase the defense budget, which I strongly support, but we are going to deny our veterans.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Paralyzed Veterans of America, Disabled American Veterans, and the American Legion have expressed their strong support of both my amendment as well as opposing the rule. These groups represent millions of veterans across our country who are suffering because their hospitals do not have adequate funds to provide the quality care that they deserve.

For 4 consecutive years the veterans' budget has been essentially stagnant. This means the same inadequate funding for health care, more reductions in full-time employees, and new initiatives without new funding to pay for them. Veterans are growing older and sicker each year and cannot survive on a flat-line budget. The pattern has to end. Vote against the rule, help the veterans of this country once and for all.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the minority whip of the Democratic party.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I came back from Hershey, Pennsylvania and I said to myself, I am going to try to work together to keep my anger from spilling over on the floor. And I think I have done a good job this week. But I cannot, on this issue, stand by and not express my extreme displeasure on the way the veterans of this country have been dealt with in this budget.

There is no reason why the Clement amendment should not be made in order; why it was treated the way it was in the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and throughout this whole process. I came here 22-plus years ago, and the Vietnam veterans back then could not get a decent hearing on anything; on Agent Orange; they could not get a decent hearing in this Congress on outreach counseling.

We put together a group called The Vietnam Veterans in Congress and we went to work on that stuff, and we finally got some things and justice done for those veterans. And we are back at the same old game here today: $3 billion in cuts in the Republican budget. And I might say, while I am talking about their budget, the President's budget is not much better. They are both lousy in terms of our veterans.

We have people in this country who have sacrificed, who have put their lives on the line day after day, month after month, year after year, fighting right now in Kosovo and in Serbia, without the knowledge that they are going to have the benefits that they need in health care and other things when they get out of the service.

Over the top of the building which houses the Department of Veterans Affairs are written the words ''To care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan.'' Those words are meaningless if we do not put our dollars and our hearts behind those words, and we are not doing it. We are not doing it, and it is wrong.

There is a crisis in health care for our veterans in this country. If my colleagues talk to the people who run these hospitals anywhere in America, they will hear that the veterans are not getting the service they deserve. And it seems to me it is only just and right that we vote down this rule so the committee can go back and do its work, and not cut veterans' benefits by $3 billion while we increase Star Wars and all these other things, while we provide tax benefits for the wealthiest people in this country.

It is not right, it is not just, and I hope my colleagues on this side of the aisle and on that side of the aisle will reject the President's budget on this and the Republican budget on this.

□ 1045

The veterans' organizations are in agreement with us on this. The DAV, the VFW, the Paralyzed American Veterans, AmVets, the organization that I belong to, Vietnam Veterans of America, say ''no'' on this rule.

Vote ''no'' on this rule so we can get a decent budget for the people that are fighting for our country right now.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and in opposition to this budget and in support of our Nation's veterans.

This rule does not even allow the veterans of America to have a vote on the budget that they recommended to us to take care of their health needs, to take care of the cemetery needs, to take care of all of the issues which have been left up in the air in the last few years' straight-line budget.

The Democrats in the Committee on Veterans' Affairs could not even have their amendment to raise the budget by $3.2 billion, which is what the veterans advocate. We were not even allowed a vote in our committee. We went to the Committee on Rules to ask for a vote on this on the floor. The Committee on Rules did not give us a vote.

The veterans of this Nation fought for our country's democracy, fought for

freedom of speech, fought for the right to be heard. And yet their budget is not even allowed to be heard on any committee or on the floor of this House.

Reject this rule. Reject this budget. Vote ''yes'' for American veterans.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, let us be clear. This budget is a disaster for American veterans and this rule is a disaster for veterans. And that is why this rule is being opposed by almost every major veterans organization in the country, including AmVets, the Blinded Vets, the DAV, the Paralyzed Vets, the VFW, and the Vietnam Vets.

The truth is that the President's budget for veterans is totally inadequate and the Republican budget for vets is even worse. It is unacceptable to me that in a time when some Members of this body want to give tens of billions of dollars in tax breaks to the wealthiest people in this country, we cannot come up with $3 billion to protect medical care for veterans all over this country.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, by a unanimous vote, the Senate did the right thing and they raised the amount of money available to vets. We need to defeat this rule, send it back, so that we can join in the Senate and say ''yes'' to our veterans and make sure they get the medical care to which they are entitled.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) has 10½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that the consideration of this budget has gotten so partisan. Because I tell my colleagues, this area of veterans' health care is an area where we ought to be able to reach bipartisan agreement, as the other body did in a 99–0 vote last night.

We ought to be improving the President's budget in the area of veterans' health care, and instead the Republican budget makes it worse. Over the next 5 years it would cut discretionary spending for veterans, which primarily goes to health care, a total of $400 million below nominal 1999 levels.

Long-term care issues are going to be increasingly important as our veterans population ages. Making the Adult Day Health Care program permanent could be unobtainable if this resolution is passed.

I fought hard on the Committee on Appropriations for increases to the VA medical research budget, increases that could not be maintained if the Republican budget passes. Mental health services that are funded through our veterans' centers and which need to be expanded would have to be cut back if the Republican resolution is adopted.

The majority leadership owes this House the opportunity to have a vote on this critical funding. The gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. CLEMENT) deserves a vote on his amendment. Vote against this rule. Vote for the Democratic substitute.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER).

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule, and I also rise in support of the Republican budget.

Listening to the rhetoric from the other side, one would think that the Republican budget cuts veterans' funding. Actually, the Republican budget increases veterans' funding by $1.1 billion. It is the Clinton-Gore budget that cuts veterans' funding, particularly veterans' health care funding.

Why I support the Republican budget is pretty simple. The Republican budget reflects Republican values of good schools, low taxes, and a secure retirement. It is interesting, when we compare the Clinton-Gore budget with the Republican budget, this is really an historic day.

The Clinton-Gore budget raids the Social Security Trust Fund by $341 billion, cuts Medicare by almost $12 billion, cuts veterans' health care, whereas the Republican budget does something that the folks back home have asked for for almost 30 years. We wall off the Social Security Trust Fund.

How often have I heard in a town meeting or in a senior citizens center folks saying, ''When are the folks in Washington going to stop dipping into the Social Security Trust Fund for other purposes?'' Our budget puts an end to that. We wall off the Social Security Trust Fund and say hands off.

The President wants to spend over $300 billion in Social Security Trust Fund surpluses on new government spending, not Social Security. We protect Social Security in this budget. We do provide for small tax relief. And I believe we should eliminate the marriage tax penalty. That should be our top priority when it comes to tax relief for families.

The Republican budget pays down the national debt. We increase funding for education by over $1 billion more than the President requests in his budget, and we provide over a $1 billion increase in funding for veterans' health care.

I also want to point out the Republican budget rejects the Clinton-Gore cuts in Medicare that hurt our local hospitals.

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

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

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, let me first of all make the point that in both fiscal year 1998 and fiscal year 1999, the President of the United States in his budget recommended cuts in veterans.

Many of my colleagues who—well, let me not characterize some of their comments, because I get very concerned when politicians play on the fears of people in this Nation. We have seen it exhibited on this floor in regard to Medicare. We see the administration trying to play on the fears of our seniors on Social Security and Medicare, to the point where a Democratic member of the United States Senate said that they only care about politics, they do not care about the seniors. We see the same kind of rhetoric out here today on veterans.

I wish I had heard a little bit of talk about this when the President's budget director came up to the Committee on the Budget, when it came to the issue of the veterans. For the last 2 fiscal years, the President has recommended cuts in veterans' health care. We recommended increases. Now in this next fiscal year, of course, we have increased the funding for the veterans by $1 billion.

Now, people come down here and they make an argument there ought to be some amendment in order. I have been in the Congress now, this is my 17th year. Since 1995 we have been in the majority. I never saw amendments made in order. In fact, I did not even see the old majority let a lot of budgets in order.

The fact is, in the last 3 years, we have significantly increased funding for veterans' medical health care. I think the time has come for politicians as we head into the next millennium to stop using the politics of fear in order to scare people, in order to use it as a club.

They have this seminar down at Hershey where we are supposed to have greater comity, to be able to get along better. Well, we should. Maybe that ought to extend to the American people so that we are not beating them up every day and playing to their worst hopes and fears.

The fact is, at the end of the day we do better for veterans in this budget than the President did. And this will be 3 years in a row that we have done a better job than the President has, and at the same time will protect Social Security and Medicare and provide tax relief to the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will advise that the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) has 6½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ).

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, during recent days Members of both parties have spoken very reverently about our sailors and soldiers and Marines, showing their concern for our troops deployed overseas. And I join them. But, unfortunately, they are not doing it here today.

And unfortunately, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) left. There is not $1 billion over Clinton's budget. There is $900 million over Clinton's budget in their budget today. And the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) forgot to tell them the other half, that in the subsequent 4 years they eliminate $3 billion from the budget of the veterans. He should tell them the truth.

And while he is doing that, it is not a small, modest tax break. In that budget, in the first 4 years, there is $142 billion in tax breaks for the richest in this Nation. And in the next 5 years, they add another $437 billion, most of which goes to the wealthiest in this Nation. Yes, my colleagues, $779 billion in tax breaks for the richest in this Nation, and they cannot find $3 billion for our veterans. Shame on this House.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) a member of the Committee on Rules.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of this fair and balanced rule. It provides for a full and free debate of our Nation's budget priorities.

The House will have the opportunity to debate not only the Republican budget proposal but also the President's budget, as well as two other budgets offered by House Democrats. That is right. Out of the four plans we consider today, three were written by our Democratic friends.

I would like to take a moment to recognize the hard work of my friend from Columbus, Ohio (Mr. KASICH). He is a tireless advocate of balanced budgets, fiscal discipline, and the Republican principles of smaller government and lower taxes. The GOP budget resolution embodies these values.

First and foremost, Mr. Speaker, the Republican budget is honest. It comes to terms with our Nation's true budget situation by recognizing that the surplus that everyone is talking about is really Social Security money. Instead of spending this money, the Republican budget locks away 100 percent of the Social Security surplus to be used only for Social Security benefits, debt reduction, or Medicare reform.

Secondly, the Republican budget is responsible. In 1997 the Republican Congress and President Clinton agreed to a historic balanced budget agreement that has steered our Nation down the path of economic prosperity. In the Republican budget we honor the balanced budget deal we made with the President by sticking to those limitations. Promises made, promises kept; and our country will be better for it.

Further, the GOP budget provides Americans with security today and in their future by investing in our national defense and the education of our children. We wish we could do more in these areas, and we will do more as our budget situation improves and additional resources become available.

It is today's fiscal discipline that will ensure those resources materialize in the future. When a true budget surplus is achieved, Congress will have the flexibility to bolster our Nation's defense budget, prop up special education, and check off some other items on our wish list.

For Republicans, this wish list includes some long-awaited tax relief for American taxpayers. I, for one, am amazed that the tax rate in America is at its highest level since World War II. These high taxes have real effects on real people's lives. Am I the only one receiving mail and phone calls from students, newlyweds, and young parents who are trying to get ahead in life, only to be set back by crippling tax bills?

One man from my district who was downsized, out of his job, is being taxed at the rate of 28 percent on his severance pay. In frustration, he wrote to me asking why the government is hitting him while he is down. He is trying to put two kids through college. Meanwhile, the government is taking $700 from him while he is unemployed.

□ 1100

I cannot explain the government's greed, but I can tell him that the Republican budget anticipates giving back some of that surplus to the people who earned it so they can spend their money as they see fit on their priorities.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule, which gives ample opportunity to debate the priorities of both Republicans and Democrats.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS) the ranking member on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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

The irony of today is that as many brave American servicemen and women are joining with our allies in a military campaign to bring an end to uncontrolled aggression, Congress is turning a deaf ear and a blind eye to the health care needs of its veterans.

The budget resolution for next year provides a modest $900 million increase in funding for veterans' health care. This increase is one-half the increase recommended by the Republican majority of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. It is less than one-third the total increase for VA funding supported by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs Democrats.

Would Members of Congress want to rely for their health care on a health care system as underfunded as the VA's? I doubt it. But Congress apparently has a different, lower standard for health care for our servicemen and women.

Even more troublesome is the fact that its supporters tell us time and time again that it provides an unprecedented increase in funding for veterans' health care. What they fail to say is that the Republican budget provides an unprecedented decrease of $1.1 billion for Veterans' Affairs in fiscal year 2001.

After years of inadequate funding under both Democratic and Republican administrations, a consensus exists today for the added funding needed to provide veterans with the highest quality health care and other benefits and services that they have earned.

As Republican Members of the House have said, ''We must keep our promises to the veterans.'' I agree. Approving additional funding for veterans' health care as proposed in the Clement substitute and other budget alternatives would do that and would be an important step for this Congress to take if Congress is going to do more than simply talk the talk on veterans' issues.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this year's budget falls far short of providing the funds needed to honor our commitments to our servicemen and women. Even with the increased support last week by the Committee on the Budget, funding for fiscal year 2000 is $2 billion short of what is needed to provide for our veterans' health and well-being.

The budget falls short in keeping up with medical inflation in our aging veterans population. As our veterans grow older, we must dedicate funds to expand health care programs, expand home and community-based services, build more veterans nursing homes and, yes, build more veterans cemeteries.

Veterans are in a budget disaster. Let me say, there is no surplus when your bills are not paid. Let me repeat that. There is no surplus when all of your bills have not been paid. The veterans have paid their bills, they have served us well. All of us, when the veterans come here, we talk a great talk. It is now time to walk that walk for the veterans.

Mr. Speaker, this year's budget falls well short of providing the funding needed to honor our commitment to our service men and women. Even with the increase voted last week by the Budget Committee, funding for Fiscal Year 2000 is 2 billion dollars short of what is needed to provide for our veterans health and well being.

This budget falls short in keeping up with medical inflation and an aging and vulnerable veterans population. As our veterans grow older, we must dedicate funds to:

1. Expanding long term care programs;
2. Expanding home and community based services;
3. Building more veterans nursing homes; and
4. Building more veterans cemeteries.

Veterans are in a budget disaster.

The Budget Committee increased the figure for veterans health care by $1.1 billion dollars last week. Given the 3.9 percent rate of health care cost inflation, this is still a flat-line budget. Given the new initiatives VA is to be tasked with, this is still a flat-line budget. A flat-line budget is still a budget reduction.

We've all heard talk about giving away the budget surplus. There is no surplus when all

the bills have not been paid. Last week, many of us on the Veterans' Affairs Committee who see this need spelled it out in detail in our ''Additional and Dissenting Views and Estimates.''

This was after Mr. EVANS attempted to introduce a proposal within the Committee calling for adding 3 billion dollars to the Administration budget. That debate was not permitted.

Mr. Speaker, this was not a partisan effort. It was a simple statement of dollars and common sense. We need an opportunity to present the case to the full House for more funding for veterans programs.

Mr. Speaker, this is still not a partisan effort. In all fairness, we need a rule that allows such a discussion.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY).

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I have worked well with the Republicans since coming to Congress. I think it is important to try to work together. But what this Republican budget does is cross that line of reason. This is a bait and switch budget. Republicans are saying with one hand, look at all the good things we are doing over here and then with the other hand they are cutting programs and not telling you what they are doing.

Let me give my colleagues an example. Education. They say, ''Well, we're increasing education,'' and they are in spots. But on the other hand they are cutting in the year 2000 $1.2 billion of the education budget.

Democrats are extending the life of Social Security to the year 2050. The Republicans make doing nothing about extending the life of Social Security just sound good. The same is true for the Medicare budget. The life of the program is not extended one day under this bait and switch budget.

All of this so they can talk about a tax cut. Now, I support tax cuts, but I think a $779 billion tax cut is too much while we have ignored the fact that we are not adding one day to Social Security or Medicare solvency.

Oppose the rule on this bait and switch budget.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. WISE).

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, budgets are about priorities. That is where this Republican budget falls so short. It fails to adequately protect Social Security with the guarantees that are needed. It does nothing to protect Medicare, to extend it beyond its insolvency date of 2008. And, Mr. Speaker, on veterans it falls woefully short.

I come from the State, West Virginia, with the highest number of veterans per capita in the Nation. I cannot go back and point to this budget and say that I voted for it. Today, Mr. Speaker, the next generation of veterans are being forged in the fire over Kosovo. Yet this budget does not say to them, we recognize that sacrifice. Yes, it gives an increase of $900 million the first year, trails off and disappears in the years to come. This is a totally inadequate budget for veterans.

So we want to talk about priorities. Bad on Social Security, bad on Medicare, woefully short on veterans. This is not about families and veterans. This is a bad priority, Mr. Speaker, and it is a bad budget. I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, every day I rise, come in and listen to people come to the well and talk about how they support the troops. Well, I think that every surviving troop becomes a veteran and that is not acknowledged in this bill.

Regardless of what is being said, even the veterans have read this bill and they understand that they have not been treated well. We have homeless veterans, we have dwindling health care being offered to the veterans. It is unconscionable that we present a budget like this that treats our veterans in the fashion in which they have been treated in this budget. There is no real future for America that is reflected in this budget, you see, because education has been cheated, Medicare has not been addressed. We have got a lock box that has a trap door. The guardians of the privilege, they are doing well in this budget. They are taking care of the rich in this budget but they are ignoring the working people of this country. This is Robin Hood in reverse.

I ask everyone to vote against this rule.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), a colleague on the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, what we are engaged in here today is the debate that always takes place in Washington, and that is over how much money can we spend, how much bigger can we make government, and then how we are going to fight to try and save this country.

The bottom line is there is no doubt that the choices today are clear. The President prefers the status quo. He prefers bigger government. And he prefers that the government be the answer or the solution to America's problems. Republicans place our faith in families, communities and the marketplace to solve our Nation's ills. This is just yet another chapter in the string of successes of what will be for this country and for the Republican Congress. Welfare reform, a balanced budget, and tax relief are all successes that this President and his party at one time or another fought vehemently and now campaign and act like they were their ideas.

The bottom line is that the Republican Party offers a simple message. There is only one way to speak honestly to the American people, and it is called discipline. It is called dedicating 100 percent of Social Security dollars for Social Security and Medicare. The Republican plan dedicates 100 percent. The difference between 100 percent and 62 percent will be clear to the American public. There is one thing that Democrats do do and that is that they fully fund big government. Their budgets increase government spending across the board. In fact, the President's budget busts the bipartisan spending agreement that we had just 2 years ago. He increases spending by more than $200 billion in new domestic spending, creating over 120 new government programs.

Mr. Speaker, our message is plain and simple. We will keep producing ideas worth being stolen by the Democrats, but we are going to take credit for this one. It is called discipline and doing what we said we would do.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking member on the Committee on the Budget.

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

This rule allows just 2 hours of general debate for a budget with $1.7 trillion of spending authority. That is a travesty. Let me tell my colleagues how this kind of haste makes waste, just one way that you can mask the numbers in a debate so short about a matter so complex as the budget. This budget, as now drafted, this Republican budget resolution, means that our military personnel will not get the 4.4 percent pay raise that the Joint Chiefs of Staff asked for and the troops thought they were promised by the President and the Congress. The Republican resolution does provide extra money for defense, but nothing for an increase in military retirement benefits, nothing for extra pay raises to help retain critical personnel.

Now, we were able to ferret this out because every pay raise requires a corresponding increase in the contribution to the military retirement trust fund, function 950 of the budget. Look at function 950 in their budget, the Republican budget. There is no entry, no adjustment, no provision for these major pay increases, these major retirement reforms that have been promised. They are in ours. We followed the President's lead. We did it right, they did it wrong.

You pass this budget and everybody is on notice. Unless you do the numbers in this resolution over, you are breaking faith with our troops. You are denying them the pay raises and the benefits that they have been told were coming. This is no way to treat the armed services. The same goes for the civil service. The same mistake has been made.

I yield to the gentleman from Virginia to explain that briefly.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, not only does this Republican budget resolution not fund military pay raises, but on a party line vote they refused to treat civilian Federal employees the same as military

employees as has been done for 50 years. It breaks a precedent, it is not fair to any Federal civilian employees around the country. It is a resolution that should be defeated.

Mr. Speaker, when the budget resolution was before the committee last week I offered an amendment which would have ensured that federal civilian and military employees received equitable and fair pay raises for the next ten years as they have for the last fifty years.

I expected that the amendment would be noncontroversial and pass. After all, the President recommended a 4.4 percent increase for military and civilian employees, and the Senate recommended a 4.8 percent increase for both.

So, I was surprised by the vehement objections raised by those on the other side of the aisle. It failed on a party line vote. Yesterday, I learned why.

You see, House Republicans do not support a fair pay raise for either the civilian federal employees or the military. They did not include any funding above the baseline for either the military or civilian retirement trust funds—funding which would be required if they favored a fair pay raise.

They couldn't afford it because of their $779 billion tax cut. Mr. Kasich admitted this yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, federal employees have contributed over $220 billion toward deficit reduction in the last decade in foregone pay and benefits. The sacrifices made by our military personnel in the name of deficit reduction have been significant.

We have downsized more than a quarter million civilian Federal employees over the last year, so those remaining must work much harder with far fewer resources.

The time has come to restore fair and equitable pay raises for these men and women who have dedicated their careers and, for many, their lives to serving their country.

Mr. SPRATT. Function 950 of this budget is fatally flawed. That is the best reason yet to vote against the rule.

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

I urge a ''no'' vote on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to make in order the Clement amendment which does increase the Veterans' Affairs function by $1.9 billion. We made a promise to our veterans and this country must keep our promise.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 131 TO BE OFFERED IF THE PREVIOUS QUESTION IS DEFEATED

TO MAKE IN ORDER AN AMENDMENT TO KEEP OUR PROMISES TO OUR VETERANS

On page 2, line 23, before ''.'' insert the following:

''or in section 3 of this resolution. The amendment in section 3 of the resolution shall be considered before the amendments in the nature of substitutes printed in the report, may be offered only by Representative CLEMENT of Tennessee or his designee, shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment nor to a demand for a division of the question''

At the end of the resolution, add the following new section:

SECTION 3.

Amendment to H. Con. Res. 68, as Reported

Offered by Mr. Clement of Tennessee

In paragraph (16) of section 3 (relating to Veterans Benefits and Services (700)) increase budget authority and outlays by the following amounts to reflect fundings for veterans' medical care:

(1) For fiscal year 2000, $1 billion in new budget authority and $900 million in outlays.

(2) For fiscal year 2001, $3.2 billion in new budget authority and $2.822 million in outlays.

(3) For fiscal year 2002, $3.283 billion in new budget authority and $3.106 million in outlays.

(4) For fiscal year 2003, $3.369 billion in new budget authority and $3.283 million in outlays.

(5) For fiscal year 2004, $3.456 billion in new budget authority and $3.423 million in outlays.

(6) For fiscal year 2005, $3.546 billion in new budget authority and $3.512 million in outlays.

(7) For fiscal year 2006, $3.638 billion in new budget authority and $3.603 million in outlays.

(8) For fiscal year 2007, $3.733 billion in new budget authority and $3.697 million in outlays.

(9) For fiscal year 2008, $3.830 billion in new budget authority and $3.793 million in outlays.

(10) For fiscal year 2009, $3.929 billion in new budget authority and $2.891 million in outlays.

In paragraph (1) of section 3 (relating to national defense (050)) reduce budget authority and outlays by the following amounts:

(1) For fiscal year 2000, $1 billion in new budget authority and $900 million in outlays.

(2) For fiscal year 2001, $3.2 billion in new budget authority and $2.822 million in outlays.

(3) For fiscal year 2002, $3.283 billion in new budget authority and $3.106 million in outlays.

(4) For fiscal year 2003, $3.369 billion in new budget authority and $3.283 million in outlays.

(5) For fiscal year 2004, $3.456 billion in new budget authority and $3.423 million in outlays.

(6) For fiscal year 2005, $3.546 billion in new budget authority and $3.512 million in outlays.

(7) For fiscal year 2006, $3.638 billion in new budget authority and $3.603 million in outlays.

(8) For fiscal year 2007, $3.733 billion in new budget authority and $3.697 million in outlays.

(9) For fiscal year 2008, $3.830 billion in new budget authority and $3.793 million in outlays.

(10) For fiscal year 2009, $3.929 billion in new budget authority and $3.891 million in outlays.

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

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

I predicted in the Committee on Rules meeting yesterday that the Democrats would trot out the veterans one more time and use them as a pawn in a political battle to try and force a vote. It is even more clear that they are pawns when we see that six people who spoke on behalf of the veterans today, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ), the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER), the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. Brown) are all members of the Progressive Caucus which has put its own budget forth in which they are cutting defense spending by nearly $220 billion over 5 years. In a time when 11,000 military families are on food stamps, they want to cut funding for the military even further, it seems that they are far more concerned about using the veterans as a political pawn than they are allowing our own active members of the military enough income to provide for food for their own families.

This has been trotted out virtually every year that I have been here. I have said that they would use the veterans on a vote against the previous question. I urge all Members to vote in favor of the previous question, to vote for a rule that gives a fair opportunity to be heard on several Democrat alternatives to the Republican budget.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following extraneous material for the RECORD:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON RULES,
Washington, DC, March 24, 1999.

Hon. DENNY HASTERT,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: As you know, H. Con. Res. 68, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for FY 2000, was filed by the Committee on the Budget on Tuesday, March 23. As reported, H. Con. Res. 68 contains matters within the jurisdiction of the Rules Committee.

Specifically, Section 5 (the Safe Deposit Box for Social Security Surpluses), which establishes a point of order against consideration of a budget resolution, an amendment thereto or any conference report thereon which provides for a deficit in any fiscal year, falls solely within the jurisdiction of the Rules Committee. Although the Rules Committee has not sought to exercise its original jurisdiction prerogatives on this legislation pursuant to section 301(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Committee has discussed these provisions with the Budget Committee. It is the understanding of the Rules Committee that the Leadership has scheduled the resolution for floor consideration on Thursday, March 25. In recognition of these facts, I agree to waive the Rules Committee's jurisdiction over consideration of this legislation at this time.

Nevertheless, I reserve the jurisdiction of the Rules Committee over all bills relating to the rules, joint rules and the order of business of the House, including any bills relating to the congressional budget process. Furthermore, it would be my intention to seek to have the Rules Committee represented on any conference committee on this concurrent resolution.

Sincerely,

DAVID DREIER.

THE PREVIOUS QUESTION VOTE: WHAT IT MEANS

The previous question is a motion made in order under House Rule XVII and is the only parliamentary device in the House used for closing debate and preventing amendment. The effect of adopting the previous question

is to bring the resolution to an immediate, final vote. The motion is most often made at the conclusion of debate on a rule or any motion or piece of legislation considered in the House prior to final passage. A Member might think about ordering the previous question in terms of answering the question: Is the House ready to vote on the bill or amendment before it?

In order to amend a rule (other than by using those procedures previously mentioned), the House must vote against ordering the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, the House is in effect, turning control of the Floor over to the Minority party.

If the previous question is defeated, the Speaker then recognizes the Member who led the opposition to the previous question (usually a Member of the Minority party) to control an additional hour of debate during which a germane amendment may be offered to the rule. The Member controlling the Floor then moves the previous question on the amendment and the rule. If the previous question is ordered, the next vote occurs on the amendment followed by a vote on the rule as amended.

DEBATE & AMENDMENTS ON HOUSE BUDGET RESOLUTIONS

[Fiscal year 1990–99]

Year	Budget Res.	Rule Number	General Debate Time	Amendments Allowed	Vote on Rule	Total Time Consumed [1]
1999	H. Con. Res. 284	H. Res. 455	3 hrs. (1 HH) [2]	3 (1–D 1–R)	Adopted: 216–197	6 hrs.
1998	H. Con. Res. 84	H. Res. 152	5 hrs. (1 HH) [3]	5 (3–D 2–R)	Adopted: 278–142	7 hrs.
1997	H. Con. Res. 178	H. Res. 435	3 hrs.[4]	3 (2–D 1–R)	Adopted: 227–196	6 hrs.
1996	H. Con. Res. 67	H. Res. 149	6 hrs.[5]	4 (2–D 2–R)	Adopted: 255–168	10 hrs.
1995	H. Con. Res. 218	H. Res. 384	4 hrs. (1 HH) [6]	5 (3–D 2–R)	Adopted: 245–171	9 hrs.
1994	H. Con. Res. 64	H. Res. 131	10 hrs. (4 HH) [7]		Adopted: voice vote	16 hrs.
		H. Res. 133		4 (2–D 2–R)	Adopted: 251–172	
1993	H. Con. Res. 287	H. Res. 386	3 hrs. (1 HH) [8]	3 (1–D 2–R)	Adopted: 239–182	13½ hrs.
1992	H. Con. Res. 121	H. Res. 123	5 hrs. (2 HH) [9]	4 (1–D 3–R)	Adopted: 392–9	11 hrs.
1991	H. Con. Res. 310	H. Res. 382	6 hrs. (3 HH) [10]	4 (1–D 3–R)	Adopted: voice vote	13 hrs.
1990	H. Con. Res. 106	H. Res. 145	5 hrs. (2 HH) [11]	5 (3–D 2–R)	Adopted: voice vote	12½ hrs.

[1] Includes hour on rule, general debate time, and debate time on all amendments. Does not include time taken on rollcall votes and walking around time.

[2] The 3 hours of general debate were allocated as follows: 2 hrs. Budget Committee and 1 hr. (HH) between Rep. Saxton of New Jersey and Representative Stark of California. Additional debate time on amendments was as follows: 1 hr. Neumann and 1 hr. Spratt.

[3] The resolution provided for an additional 20 minutes of debate controlled by Representative Minge of Minnesota. Additional debate time for amendments: 20 min. Waters, 20 min. Doolittle, 20 min. Brown, 20 min. Kennedy and 20 min. Shuster.

[4] Additional debate time for amendments: 1 hr. Payne, 1 hr. Orton and 1 hr. Sabo. The resolution provided for an additional 40 minutes of general debate, following the conclusion of consideration of the proposed amendments, divided and controlled equally by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Budget Committee.

[5] Additional debate time for amendments: 1 hr. Gephardt, 1 hr. Neumann, 1 hr. Payne and 1 hr. by the minority leader. The rule provided for a final ten minute period of general debate following the disposition of the amendments.

[6] In addition to the hour on HH, Reps. Kasich and Mfume was each given 1 hr. of general debate time to discuss their substitutes. This was followed by 5 substitutes under ''king of the hill'' (1 hr. Frank, 1 hr. Solomon, 1 hr. Mfume, 1 hr. Kasich, 1 hr. for the final substitute identical to the reported budget resolution).

[7] The 4 hrs. of general debate were allocated: 2 hrs. Budget Committee, 4 hrs. HH, 2 hrs. to discuss the Mfume substitute, 1 hr. to discuss the Solomon substitute, followed by 4 substitutes under ''king of the hill'' (2 hrs. Kasich, 1 hr. Solomon, 1 hr. Mfume and 1 hr. Sabo (identical to the base resolution)).

[8] Three substitutes were allowed under ''king of the hill'' (30 min. Dannemeyer, 1 hr. Gradison, 8 hrs. Towns-Dellums).

[9] Of the 4 amendments allowed, the first was a perfecting amendment by Rep. Ford of Michigan for which 1 hr. was allowed, followed by three substitutes under ''king of the hill'' (1 hr. Dannemeyer, 1 hr. Kasich, 2 hrs. Gradison).

[10] General debate began on April 25th under an unanimous consent request agreed to on April 24th. Four substitutes were allowed under ''king of the hill'' (1 hr. Kasich, 1 hr. Dannemeyer, 2 hrs. Dellums, 2 hrs. Frenzel).

[11] Of the five amendments, one was an amendment by the Chairman of the Budget Committee, 30 mins., followed by 4 substitutes under ''king of the hill'' (1 hr. Dannemeyer, 3 hrs. Dellums, 1 hr. Kasich, 1 hr. Gephardt).

Source: Rules Committee Calendars (Note: HH stands for Humphrey-Hawkins debate which relates to the economic goals and policies underlying the economic projections assumed in the baseline of the budget resolution).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill because it prohibits the open and free amendment process that governs most of our budgetary and appropriations debates.

This debate that we will engage in later today is an important one for the American people. We will be deciding the future of our Social Security system. We will be deciding the fate of the Medicare system. Our constituents care about these programs, because they know just how valuable they are.

Earlier this week, I met with several senior citizens groups in my district, which resides in Houston, Texas. Without exception, each of them relayed their concerns to me that both the Social Security and Medicare systems should not have their benefits reduced in any way. They were also concerned about the longevity of both programs—and making sure that Medicare and Social Security will be here for their children, and their children's children.

This puts into proper perspective the gravity of our chore. Without a completely open rule, we cannot dissect the Republican resolution and directly address the concerns of our constituents.

Having said that, I am thankful that the rule contains provisions which allow for the debate of the Democratic substitute to this bill, sponsored by Ranking Member SPRATT. I only wish that we would have a more extensive debate on that amendment—meaning more than 40 minutes, so that my Democratic colleagues could voice their support for the measure.

I urge each of my colleagues to vote against the rule, and to vote for the Democratic substitute when it comes to the floor for consideration.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

□ 1115

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. 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.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, 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 resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 203, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 72]

YEAS—224

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Upton
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller

Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—203

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

NOT VOTING—7

Barr
Brady (TX)
Cummings
Emerson
Engel
Lowey
Stupak

☐ 1134

Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. BISHOP changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. PICKERING, HORN, STUMP, BISHOP and JONES of North Carolina changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 73, my voting card was not operable and is now being replaced. Had the voting card worked, I would have voted ''aye.''

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 194, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 73]

AYES—228

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boyd
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
John
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Minge
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Upton
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—194

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

NOT VOTING—11

Barr
Brady (TX)
Buyer
Emerson
Engel
Franks (NJ)
Gonzalez
Johnson (CT)
Lowey
Stupak
Weldon (PA)

☐ 1144

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I was unavoidably detained during rollcall Nos. 72 and 73 due to medical reasons. Had I been present I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall No. 72 and ''yea'' on rollcall No. 73.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 72 and 73, I was not present due to a

family emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Pursuant to House Resolution 131 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 68.

□ 1148

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 (H. Con. Res. 68) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2009, with Mr. CAMP 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, 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 control 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, today we offer the first budget of the next century and a new agenda for the new millennium. I think this is a great day for the House, because we have been able to move forward from an era not very long ago when, as we looked out across the horizon, the economic horizon of this country, we saw deficits as far as the eye could see.

The majority came into its position in 1995 when we first advanced the need for economic stimulus driven by tax relief, giving more power, providing more incentives for risk-taking, and at the same time a big dose of fiscal restraint; in other words, starting to get the Congress of the United States to live within its means.

The fact is that in 1995, Mr. Greenspan, the chairman of the Federal Reserve System, said that if you can offer a legitimate and credible plan to balance the Federal budget, he said that he believed that interest rates would decline by 2 points.

I must also remind Members that in 1995, as we assumed control of the House of Representatives, interest rates had been rising, the economy had been slowing, there was concern about unemployment. The fact that we laid down a plan that would begin to put our fiscal house in order, to put us in a position where the Congress of the United States would operate really like the American family, and that we would restore some of the incentives to risk-take, I believe that has contributed significantly to the economic gains that we have had in this country.

Now today, as we stand here, as I stand here in the well, we are about to pass a budget that not only captures the surpluses of Medicare and social security, but at the same time has the on-budget surpluses that so many people have sought for years.

In other words, when we take a look at the balance sheets of the Federal Government, both in the social security and Medicare accounts and in the non-social security and Medicare accounts, we have been able to achieve not only a balanced budget, but also some huge surpluses.

Let me say, at the outset, we are doing something that the Congress of the United States has never done: We are taking all the payroll taxes that we collect every day that are related to social security and Medicare and we are locking them into an account so that the politicians, Republicans and Democrats, cannot raid those accounts for any other spending item.

That money will sit in an account, and until we enact a plan that actually saves social security, that money will be used to pay down part of the Federal debt. Last year we paid down about $50 billion of the debt. Most Americans do not know that. This year we would anticipate paying down at least $125 billion of the national debt.

Of course, if I was a citizen listening to somebody in the well of this House make that claim, I would greet it with great skepticism, but the fact is that what I am saying is true. Last year the publicly-held debt was paid down by $50 billion, and in fact this year we anticipate at least $125 billion of the publicly-held debt to be retired.

That does not allow us to rest on our laurels, by any stretch of the imagination, because we must work every day to make the power of government less and the power of people greater. We need to run America from the bottom up, so people can have control over the education for their children, so that the baby boomers and the younger generation can have hope of having a decent retirement by having more control, so Americans can have more money in their pockets.

The fact is, as it relates to social security and Medicare, we know those programs have to be transformed, and not just to protect the retirement benefits of our seniors today. I would argue that that is a given. Because of a pay-as-you-go system, we know that the baby boomers are able to carry the load of their parents, but I want the moms and dads of this country to realize that the people who are really at risk are their children. I want mom and dad who are on social security and Medicare to realize that we are going to stand up and protect their benefits, but it is their children, their baby boomer sons and daughters, who are at risk.

We must have the courage to transform this system so that the benefits just do not accrue to our seniors today, but that our baby boomers and their children will also have retirement security. Sad to say that the President has taken a leave of absence on this. He is missing-in-action as it relates to the issue of social security and Medicare.

Just last week the Medicare Commission, headed by a member of his own party, was blunted by the action of the President. That Democrat, leader of this program to try to extend the life of social security and to reform it so it is available for the baby boomers, that Senator said last week that the administration and many in his party were more interested in using the issue of Medicare as a political weapon than they were interested in being able to transform and save Medicare, not just for today's seniors, but for the baby boomers and their children.

That is the worst of American politics, to use the threat of destroying economic security for our senior citizens to try to win votes. That is not what makes America great. What makes America great is not just to debate when Republicans and Democrats disagree, but the ability to search for a common goal, to preserve some of the vital retirement programs for this Nation, to keep the demagoguery out of this debate. Let us work together to try to extend the life of Medicare and social security.

At the same time, we are also honoring the 1997 budget agreement. The President breaks the spending caps. He breaks the discipline of the 1997 budget agreement. We will not do that. Not only will we not break the discipline of the 1997 agreement that has contributed to a stronger economy, but we will not raid the social security and Medicare trust fund the way the President does.

We have decided to save it all, and to take that and coordinate with that the 1997 budget agreement by having fiscal restraint. It is about priorities in America today. What we are saying is that the programs of defense and education ought to be top priorities in our budget.

There was a paper distributed on the floor with more misleading information about the fact that this bill does not include a pay raise for the military. That is false. That is patently false. I am beginning to believe that many people who stand in opposition to this bill are just going to ignore the facts. This is not going to be a debate about what is in the bill, this is a debate about what fictions we can create.

There will be provided for in this budget document a pay raise for our troops. The Committee on Armed Services will come to the floor and tell us that. We know that it is necessary to boost the spending for the military. That is precisely what we do in this bill. At the same time, we also believe we should emphasize education.

The fact is, in education we have provided more money than the President has, not just for defense but for education as well. As Members know, we are very interested in education flexibility, so that the school districts can manage their challenges better at the local level without having to have a bureaucrat a thousand miles away who does not even know what time zone it is in these local school districts to tell them how to manage their challenges.

In addition to all of this, Mr. Chairman, there is tax relief for the taxpayers. The fact of the matter is there are many on the other side of the aisle that bristle at the thought of a tax cut for Americans. It has become almost a philosophy, almost a mantra, to make the argument that there is something wrong with shrinking the size of the government and letting peoples' pocketbooks grow bigger.

I want to warn a number of my friends, it is not only wrong for the country but it is very bad politics to make an argument that the budget of the government ought to grow while our personal and family budgets ought to shrink, and that somehow we should pound our chests in self-righteous indignation at the notion that we want to work to cut the size of government and give more money to the American people.

□ 1200

If we are going to run America from the bottom up, if we are going to let Americans be able to pursue their hopes and dreams, Mr. Chairman, the more money that one has in one's pocket, the more one can control one's own destiny, the more power that one has. The smaller this amount becomes, the less power one has.

Power is a zero sum game. If one has less and the government has more, who has got the power? When the government has less and if one has more, who has got the power?

In our country today, as we approach the new millennium and we set the new agenda for the next century, what we do know is that the strength of America, harkening back to where our founders was, was a limited government; the dignity of the individual was to be preserved; that the individual in our society was what was most important in a Nation that recognizes that freedom is precious; and that that the future is ours.

So, Mr. Chairman, we intend not only to preserve Social Security and Medicare, we not only agree to prioritize the items of national security and education, but at the same time, we also believe that the American people ought to be empowered, that the American people ought to have more money in their pockets in order to provide, not just for themselves and not just for their communities, but for those that may live in the shadows of their communities who have less and cannot be ignored in America.

That is the great tradition of America. More in one's pocket means more for one's family. For those who have not been so fortunate, we have an obligation to take care of them.

So at the end of the day, Mr. Chairman, I think we present a budget for the new millennium that is right in pace with where the American people want to go. The American people hunger for more control over their lives and more power in order to fix the problems, to meet the challenges that they see every day.

This budget will begin to preserve and reform and transform the programs for economic security in our senior years, at the same time paying down some of the national debt and, most important, beginning to transfer again, continuing to transfer power, money, and influence from the institution of government into the pockets of people.

We will move forward on this. We will lay down a good marker as we enter the next millennium. We will set the pace and set the direction for what can be a glorious new century for, not just Americans, but for people all over the world who have come to see us as a model and as an example of the power of freedom and individuality and compassion and caring and vision.

Vote for the budget. Reject these alternatives and, at the same time, reject the President's budget and set ourselves on the right course.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I was trying to get the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) to tell us why Function 950 of his budget resolution provides no adjustment as it is required to do to provide for the pay raise, the extra pay raise for selected pay grades and officers and NCOs and for the military retirement benefits.

The fact of the matter is, Function 950, the military retirement account, where that charge needs to be made, is absolutely unadjusted in their budget resolution. So it does not provide for the pay raise and the benefits that our troops have been promised.

Let me go to the overarching subject, the budget, and the happy occasion that we find ourselves in today. I did not ever think that I would serve to see the day where we have surpluses as far as the eye could see. I think it is worth taking just a minute to track down the trail we have followed for the last 10 years that have led us to this happy set of circumstances.

In 1990, we had a budget summit that lasted 6 months. We finally brought it to the floor. It was defeated once. Then the Democrats put the vote up to pass President Bush's budget summit agreement. There were only 80 votes on that side of the aisle. It implemented discretionary pay caps, a pay-as-you-go rule, and the kind of disciplines that have served us well to get rid of the deficit. But it did not have any obvious effect because it was eclipsed by a recession.

In 1993, when President Clinton came to office, he found on his desk awaiting him the economic report of the President. In it, Michael Boskin, his Economic Council chief, said the deficit this year will be $332 billion. That was the baseline from which the Clinton administration began.

From that baseline, in 1993, we reduced the deficit with the Deficit Reduction Act of 1993, which had exclusively Democratic votes in the House and the Senate from $330 billion projected level, $290 billion actual level in 1992, to $22 billion in 1997.

Then our colleagues on the other side of the aisle joined with us, and we finished the job and wiped out that additional $22 billion of deficit and lay the basis for going into the next century.

It is critically important that we did this, because until we dealt with the year-to-year deficit, we could not deal with the next problem; and that is the problem, the challenge of an aging society.

Our society is getting older and older. I am a war baby. A huge generation of young people were born, babies were born in 1946 until 1964, and they will start retiring in about 10 or 12 years. When they do, they will put unprecedented strain on the most popular, most successful program ever invented by the government, the Social Security program, so much so that they may put in jeopardy its solvency by the year 2032.

The Medicare program, which runs a close second in popularity, is in even greater jeopardy because the cost of medical care is rising along with the demographic increases, and it, too, is threatened with insolvency in the year 2008.

We have an opportunity to do something about that. We have an opportunity to take the work we began in 1990 and 1993 and 1997 and deal with the next problem, which is a daunting challenge, preparing this country and this government for the burdens of the next century cast upon us by an aging society.

Our budget, the Democratic budget, rises to that challenge; theirs does not. We are going to have other speakers who will turn to this topic, but let me just give my colleagues the highlights and tell them what is the difference between us and them. I will give it to my colleagues in a nutshell.

We protect the Social Security Trust Fund. We proposed to protect the Trust Fund so that 100 percent of the payroll taxes coming into it are spent exclusively for the benefit of that particular program for the first time probably in 30 or 40 years. We propose to do it by

directing the Treasurer of the United States to take that percentage of payroll taxes not needed to pay benefits that year and to buy down public debt.

How does that happen? That means that, when the obligations come due in 2020 and 2030, the Treasury will be in better shape than ever because it will have lower debt and lower debt service to meet those obligations.

We also, unlike the Republicans, do something about Medicare, because we see Medicare and Social Security as linked together. We extend the life of Medicare, the solvency of the Medicare program from 2020. They leave it as it is. They leave it in a lurch.

We are still opposed to huge tax cuts in the out years, $143 billion in the first 5 years and $450 billion plus in the second 5 years, rising to as much as a trillion dollars between 2009 and 2014, which will drain the budget dry of the funds needed to do something about the Medicare program.

Do my colleagues want to know the difference between us and them? Look at the Trust Fund account for Social Security. In our plan, Social Security will have $3.4 trillion more money at the end of 15 years. They will add $1.8 trillion. We are twice as good as they. With Medicare, we add $400 billion. To their Trust Fund, they add a paltry $14 billion.

There are significant differences. If my colleagues care about meeting the challenge in the next century, this is a budget resolution to vote for.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 14 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI).

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, Social Security is probably the most important program Americans have had over the years. It takes care of the senior citizens of America. As anybody knows, if we did not have Social Security today, half the senior population would live in poverty.

One-third of the benefits of Social Security go to families that have the bread winner disabled or perhaps dies. So many children who no longer have a mother or father who are the bread winners in that family can still go on to school and perhaps college. This is a very, very critical program.

What the budget of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) does is adds 18 more years to that program so that it will be solvent to the year 2050, 50 more years of solvency total. The Republican plan does not add one year to that solvency.

As we continue this debate, it is my hope that the Republicans respond to the March 13 letter from the actuary of the Social Security, Mr. Harry Ballantine of which everyone bases their conclusions on.

In that letter, in the second paragraph, he says,

> The proposal of the Republicans would not have any significant effect on the long-range solvency of the Social Security program under the intermediary assumptions of the Trustee's report. Thus, the estimated long-range actuarial deficit of 2.19 percent of taxable payroll and the year of combined trust funds exhaustion would not change.

So when we hear that the Republicans are saying they extend the life of Social Security by protecting the money, they do not. In fact, they can use the money for a tax cut. They can use it for a tax cut. So bear in mind what this is all about, this debate, is to protect Social Security, and the Democratic bill does that.

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

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) for yielding me this time. I particularly want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for providing us with this alternative.

When we talk so much, as both sides have, about Social Security and Medicare, the people back home are listening to us and saying, have they really given us a solution? The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has done that, and the Democratic alternative has done just that.

He has said let us take aside all of the surplus that we are getting in the area of Social Security, dedicate it to Social Security and Medicare, and make sure we come up with a fix, a solution. Set the money aside and take away the rhetoric of tax cuts and additional discretionary spending. Solve these problems first before we go home.

Medicare is perhaps one of the most aching problems that is out there, home health care, prescription drugs. People each day are asking us in both Democratic and Republican districts, how do we solve this?

It is indeed a problem back home in Rhode Island, because I know home health care agencies, the most cost effective, efficient agencies are going out of businesses. People that need the kind of home care, that is the least costly home care, are not getting it and eventually ending up in nursing homes and hospitals.

I have a couple in Rhode Island that are 66 and 70 years old. Prescription drugs is something they never thought about when they retired. But after open heart surgery and bypass surgery, both of them, at age 66 and 70, are back working part-time just to pay for the $8,200 a year for prescription drugs they have to pay.

Seniors are doing without paying their rent, without paying for food, and sometimes not even paying for the prescriptions because the cost is so high. That is going to come back to all of us in terms of higher taxpayer costs.

We should not leave here until we resolve this problem. The only way to do it is, as the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has suggested, lock this money aside, not use it for all those rhetorical questions that are being asked all the time about tax cuts and discretionary spending, and fix the problem.

Let us bring us to a solution rather than continuing putting us in this rhetorical oblivion that will never come to a conclusion. End this problem now. Fix Medicare.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN).

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, Medicare and Social Security have improved the lives of millions of elderly and disabled Americans. Together they provide a vital safety net which millions of Americans rely on. However, while Medicare is projected to run short of funds in just 9 years, and Social Security will run short of funds by 2032, the Republican budget resolution does nothing to extend the life of Medicare or Social Security.

The Democratic budget alternative that will be offered later today will extend the life of Medicare through 2020 in addition to extending the life of Social Security to 2050.

□ 1215

Only after this commitment is fulfilled would we propose to spend money on high priority areas like health, education and the environment.

I believe firmly that I would not be standing before my colleagues today if it were not for Medicare. Social Security and Medicare together enabled my grandmother to live independently until she was 90 years old. As her primary caregiver for the last several years, I know the role Social Security and Medicare play in making ends meet, in protecting her from making sure that a medical crisis would not lead to financial ruin.

Medicare and Social Security are not just commitments we made to our seniors, they are commitments we made to families. And it is just as important to young people that we have Medicare and Social Security as it is to our seniors, because it keeps our families and our communities strong.

We have an historic opportunity to make good on this commitment. The budget decisions we make today will have enormous consequences for decades. The Republican budget resolution squanders this opportunity before us; the opportunity to reduce public debt while protecting the existence of Social Security and Medicare.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2¼ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means and a former member of the Committee on the Budget.

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

Mr. Chairman, when Franklin Delano Roosevelt proposed Social Security and worked for its passage, the Republican Party was dead set against it. When John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson said that having Social Security was not enough, if there was no health security and advanced Medicare, 90 percent of the Republicans in this Congress voted to reject it. When Bill Clinton was elected President, the Republican Party in this House elected a majority leader, my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), who said of Social Security, It is ''a rotten trick;'' who said of Medicare that he ''resented'' having to be a part of it as a compulsory government program.

So I suppose that against that backdrop the American people should take some confidence and some reassurance in the fact that Medicare and Social Security are even mentioned in this budget resolution. They are indeed mentioned in the resolution. When we look to the budget resolution to see whether there is any money to match the promises made, there is not $1 truly set aside for Social Security and Medicare to assure solvency into the future. All that the Republican budget resolution says is that these vital programs can go broke on schedule, which is not much help to the people of this country.

The second indication that we get out of this budget resolution of where the heart of the Republican Party is on these critical issues for hundreds of millions of American citizens who either benefit from these programs today or will in the future is to look to the instructions that they include in this resolution. What instruction do they have about Medicare and Social Security? They have one reconciliation instruction, and it is ''Give us our tax breaks.'' They say ''Give us our tax breaks.''

We say save Medicare and Social Security first. Do the fiscally responsible thing; pay down the debt, preserve these valuable programs, postpone the desire to help those at the top of the economic ladder to some future time, and help those Americans who want these systems preserved.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS), a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, today we have a very fundamental choice before us; we can pass the budget resolution that proposes a tax cut over 10 years of approximately $800 billion, or we can do first things first, and that is we can take up and pass the Spratt amendment, which provides a tax cut of about $137 billion but pays down the publicly held debt, the Federal debt, by more than $137 billion more than the Republican budget proposal.

Now, why is that so important? The first thing is it is the right thing to do for our children and grandchildren, and not for them to have to inherit this debt.

The second thing is, as we begin to prepare for the retirement of the baby boomers, of which I am one, and funding the solvency of Social Security and Medicare, we are going to need some of those funds to pay that.

Thirdly, and perhaps most important, one of the best things we can do to protect our economy right now is to pay down the Federal debt. As Chairman Greenspan has testified before the House Committee on the Budget, it has a direct bearing on interest rates.

In my home, Florida and Tampa, where the average mortgage for a homeowner is about $115,000, if we drop interest rates two points, down from 8 to 6 percent, that is $155 a month in that homeowner's pocket they would not otherwise have.

Paying down the debt and providing that type of tax cut, simple and immediate, to homeowners, to people holding student loans and car loans, is the right thing to do for our children and grandchildren and, most importantly, will help preserve the solvency of Medicare and Social Security as we begin to prepare for the retirement of the baby boomers.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), a member of the Committee on Commerce and also the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, this Republican bill is a complete fraud. That is the bottom line. They have got hundreds of billions of dollars for tax cuts, mostly for the rich, but not one penny to extend the Medicare trust fund, which is going bankrupt, by the way, in the year 2008.

Let us go back to their balanced budget of 1997. The premise was that we would have to cut Medicare and home health care, those are visits made to people's homes who have Alzheimer's and Parkinson's and other chronic diseases, $115 billion to give a $90 billion tax break for mostly the wealthiest in America.

Now we have this huge surplus. Now, what do the Republicans say? We are going to give that money back to the Medicare recipients; we are going to give that money back to the HMO health care recipients? No, they say, we do not have enough money for those people.

Now, the problem, of course, is that the programs were cut fraudulently, using numbers that were not accurate in 1997 in terms of the problem with Medicare. It turns out today that the CBO says that in fact they have found miraculously $88 billion more of savings in Medicare for this 5-year period, and they found an additional hundreds of billions of dollars of revenues that they did not project.

How much goes back to Medicare on the Republican side? They do not have a penny.

If we kick them in the heart over here, we are going to break our toes. They just do not want to help these old people on Medicare.

So, my colleagues, our substitute, with the effort to try to help those most vulnerable, the senior citizens within our society, intends on guaranteeing that Medicare is extended 10 extra years in solvency, so that the senior citizens in our country are going to be given the protection which they deserve.

My colleagues, the Republican substitute does nothing, nothing to help the solvency of the Medicare trust fund. Vote ''no'' on the Republican budget here today on the House floor.

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

Mr. Chairman, I was elected in 1970 and spent 15 years in the State legislature and spent 10 years here, and I have never seen a budget exercise like this one.

Last year, we have to remember, the Republicans did not pass a budget. They never got a budget resolution through the United States Congress. This year they said, we are going to do it, but we are going to do it by jamming it past people so fast they can never figure out what is happening.

We listened to a wonderful stump speech by the chairman of the committee today, but when he hands the budget to us 4 hours before and gives us two pieces of paper with the numbers on it, that is all we got, two pieces of paper, to spend $1.7 billion, I say this is a smoke and mirrors budget.

My colleagues can look at these pieces of paper and say there is anything in here. They can promise the world. They can promise veterans, they can promise old people, they can promise the National Institutes of Health, they can promise anything on these two pieces of paper, because there is no specificity. There were no hearings. It was simply, ram it through.

Now we come to the floor. We get 40 minutes on the Committee on the Budget to talk about this issue. Now, is that because we are busy tomorrow? No. People are going home. Could we have more time on this? No, the Committee on Rules said we have to be out tonight. Where are we going? I guess we are just going out for 2 weeks, yet we cannot spend another 1 or 2 hours on this issue.

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) is right. I sat on the Medicare Commission, and the Medicare Commission rightly turned down the proposal being jammed through by the Republicans to privatize Medicare, but they are going to do it here. This budget has no money in it to deal with the problems of Medicare.

What they are going to do is they are going to come in with their little voucher program. It is going to be called ''premium support.'' They are going to try to ram that out of the Committee on Ways and Means and run it through here and leave the old people holding the bag.

This is a bad budget, and I urge Members to vote against the Republican alternative.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS).

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) may yield time.

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped we were going to come to the floor today to talk about the real facts contained in the Democrat budget versus the Republican budget, but it appears we are getting off base here. But let us look at what the actual dollar numbers are when it comes to Medicare, and here they are.

We are going to put $1.8 trillion aside over the next 10 years to save and protect Social Security and Medicare. What does the President do? He is well below us, right down here.

These are the actual numbers, Members.

Mr. Chairman, today the House is going to consider a budget for the fiscal year 2000 that addresses the issues that matter most to American families. This budget, the first for the new millennium, safeguards Social Security and Medicare, addresses priorities such as education, defense and agriculture, and provides historic tax relief. This budget meets the challenges of the 21st century head-on by adhering to several bedrock principles, each of which is set forth right here.

First, we are going to lock away every penny of the Social Security surplus for our Nation's elderly.

We are going to set aside more money than the President to strengthen Social Security and Medicare.

We are going to create a safe deposit box to ensure that bureaucrats in Washington cannot get their hands on the Social Security Trust Fund money.

We are going to pay down more debt than the President's budget.

We are going to maintain the spending discipline that carries over from the 1997 Balanced Budget Act.

We are going to make national defense a top priority by providing additional resources for things such as pay raises which are specifically set forth in the budget.

We are going to provide the resources to train, equip and retain our men and women in uniform, who are in harm's risk as we speak today.

We are going to offer security for rural Americans by providing reforms in crop insurance and money to fund that crop insurance reform.

And we are going to enact historic tax relief. Yes, tax relief. And it is interesting that opponents of this budget would get up today and argue against tax relief. That is almost un-American, and I really cannot believe we are hearing that in the well today. But, yes, we favor tax relief, and we are going to support tax relief in our budget plan for hard-working Americans.

Mr. Chairman, this budget is consistent with the common sense conservative principles of encouraging our communities and individuals to grow from the bottom up, not from Washington down. This is a budget Americans can be proud of, and I urge all of my colleagues to support the Republican budget.

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

When I came here, we were paying interest on the national debt equal to about $52 billion. In the years I have been here that bill has gone up to $252 billion. Dead weight. Produces no goods and services for anybody.

We have got a proposal in our budget resolution that will drive that debt down $3 trillion. It is good for Social Security, it is good for the economy, it is good for the Federal budget, and it is good for our children and grandchildren.

□ 1230

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

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this chart shows where we were when Republicans took the majority in 1995.

For the foreseeable future, at that time, this government went deeper and deeper into debt—for as far as the economist could see. We came in, as the new majority, determined we were going to reduce and slow down spending. Look, we did it.

This is historic. I went back over the last 40 years. In every one of those years that the Democrats had control they used the surplus coming in from Social Security for other Government spending.

Please look, what we are doing now. We do not have to increase the national debt in this 5 year Republican budget. The President's plan, the Democrats' plan, has to increase the national debt. Their plan forces this country deeper into debt by $2 trillion more than the Republican proposal.

I want to say that again to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT). Your plan goes deeper into debt by $2 trillion more than the Republican proposal.

Nobody should just talk about the debt to the public. They have got to talk about the total Government debt. Because what we owe the Social Security Trust Fund is just as important as what we owe Wall Street.

I want to talk about the caps. The Republicans stay under the caps. The Democrat proposal does not stay under the caps. I am chairman of the Committee on the Budget Task Force on Social Security. That bipartisan task force is working very well together. But I just want to say very clearly that what we are doing for the first time in recent history, is not spending the Social Security surplus for other Government programs.

I mean, it is a giant step forward for saving Social Security. We are putting that money aside. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) says that they are saving Social Security by adding a giant IOU to the Medicare Trust Fund and the Social Security Trust Fund. That makes us go deeper into debt. It is not honest. It is a asset for Social Security but a deficit for the general fund. In short it is a mandate for future tax increases for our kids and grandkids.

All the review of the President's proposal that suggests that we can save Social Security by adding more IOUs—conclude it is smoke and mirrors. It is!

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

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

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, today we are debating the budget. In putting together a budget blueprint, it is important to remember that the Federal budget is an outline of priorities. It is not a detailed specification of every single appropriation bill that we are going to pass over the next year. The Federal budget is $1.7 trillion. The budget blueprint is intended to talk about what our priorities are as a Congress for the next year.

In trying to establish those priorities, the Committee on the Budget tried to answer three questions. First and foremost, what about Social Security and Medicare? Those on the other side have talked about these important issues; and we came back with the answer first we should set aside every penny of the Social Security surplus, every penny of that trust fund surplus, to strengthen and protect Social Security and Medicare.

As the debate goes on today, we will see time and again that we set aside more to preserve Social Security and Medicare than the President in his budget. We set aside every penny of the surplus for Social Security, not 60 percent as the administration suggested, because it is the right thing to do.

Second, we wanted to set priorities about the size and scope of the Federal Government. And we thought it was appropriate that we keep to the commitments of the 1997 Balanced Budget Act, a bipartisan agreement that set some control on the growth and scope of the Federal Government. Keeping those commitments again is an important part of the integrity of this budget resolution.

And third, what about tax relief? Right now taxes in this country are at a peacetime high. They have not been this high since 1944. And we thought it appropriate that, after we set aside 100 percent of the Social Security Trust Fund surplus, we ought to give back the additional surpluses to the American workers in the form of lower taxes.

This is about priorities, our priority of saving 100 percent of the Social Security surplus, against the administration's priority, if we can call it that, of

only setting aside 60 percent of the Social Security Trust Fund surplus. Our commitment and priority to keep to the promises we made as part of the 1997 budget agreement. The administration's budget breaks those caps by $30 billion. Our commitment to lower taxes once we have ensured that we protect the Social Security Trust Fund surplus. The administration's commitment to raise taxes by $100 billion. That is the wrong direction for this country.

In the end, this budget resolution pays down more debt, does more to protect Social Security and Medicare, and provides fair and honest tax relief. That is a set of priorities we can be proud of. It is a set of priorities that makes sense for the country. And that is why I am proud to support the budget resolution.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. RIVERS) and ask unanimous consent that she control the time for yielding to other Members.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in defense of fiscal responsibility and in support of the Democratic budget resolution and in opposition to the Republican budget resolution.

When I was elected to Congress, my highest priority was to balance the unified budget. We have apparently accomplished that goal. Now my highest priority is to pay down the publicly held debt and extend Social Security and Medicare solvency.

Mr. Chairman, a week ago the majority on the Committee on the Budget submitted two pages of numbers and called it a budget resolution. It is as much a budget resolution as a blank piece of paper is a Pulitzer Prize winning novel. The budget resolution is two pages, no explanation. Draconian spending cuts of $181 billion over 10 years are hidden in blue smoke and mirrors.

This budget says we are going to increase defense spending and education and cut other programs by $27 billion. It is not going to happen. The budget builds on the hope that the CBO can reestimate the base line just so we can put off until September either any cuts we have to make and either have a showdown or disaster like last year.

What this budget will do is bust the caps and the pay-go rules. The majority's budget resolution gives more priority to enacting an $800 billion tax break than paying down the debt. It does not stop Social Security and Medicare from going insolvent. It locks in nearly a trillion-dollar tax cut betting on a 15-year projection that, if the surplus does not materialize, will result in more deficits and more debt.

The Republicans say they are saving the surplus in Social Security in the trust fund, but they do nothing to honor the obligation to extending the life of Social Security and Medicare. Let us look at what Alan Greenspan has to say. He is adamantly clear that the best policy is debt reduction. Let me quote him.

''From an economic policy point of view I envisage that the best thing we can do at this particular state is to allow that surplus to run. What that means, of course, is that the debt to the public declines, interest costs on the debt decline, and in my judgment, that contributes to lower long-term interest rates.''

Make no mistake, the Democratic budget resolutions retires nearly three-quarters of a trillion dollars of publicly held debt. The Republicans' do not.

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, when asked about the rough-and-tumble world of politics, Margaret Thatcher said, ''Well, you don't tell deliberate lies, but sometimes you have to be evasive.''

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that there is considerable evasion in this budget. Starting with the issue that the Republicans claim to put aside all of the Social Security money for Social Security, in today's Wall Street Journal, page A–28, we find a very interesting article. The Wall Street Journal tells us that their commitment is essentially toothless and can be waived by a simple majority, which is done on the floor every day. This is the Wall Street Journal.

They promise us that certain programs will be taken care of, that certain groups will get the things they need. But they forget to tell us, or they evade telling us, that $52 billion of cuts have to be found over the next 5 years to provide what they have in their budget.

An earlier speaker talked about what was un-American. Well, I will tell my colleagues what is un-American, Mr. Chairman. What is un-American is not paying our bills, not dealing with our debts, not dealing with our existing obligations. And as a Nation, we have many: Social Security, Medicare, and a national debt that is nearing $6 trillion.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) mentioned that Alan Greenspan said unequivocally that the best way to deal with our current situation is to pay down the debt and to use both surpluses, on-budget and off-budget. The Democratic proposal here today puts more than $474 billion over the Republican proposal in the next 15 years.

The last piece of evasion that I want to speak to today is the suggestion that the tax cuts that are being proposed come purely from the on-budget surplus. That ignores the fact that as these tax cuts play themselves out over the years, by the year 2013 we will be dealing with an on-budget deficit and we will have to dip into Social Security money.

Now, that comes at a time when the existing obligations I was talking about, our baby-boomers, begin to retire, and it will be the greatest strain on our budget to provide for them.

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

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

It is so amazing. I mean, really, when it comes right down to it, both sides have done not a pretty good job of coming up with a budget. All right? I mean, there are only so many ways we can do it, with mandatory programs and discretionary programs. There are only a certain few ways we can do it.

And so what happened was the President sat down and he said, you know what? I can spend that Social Security surplus and I can have a whole bunch of new programs that I can pass out to people and make them feel good.

The Republicans sat down and said, you know what? For the first time since 1969, we are going to set all of it aside, 100 percent of the Social Security surplus, so that it is there not only for Social Security but it is there if we need to find a fix for Medicare. We set all of it aside. The President did not set all of it aside.

So what happens today? The last minute, the last opportunity, in run the Democrats, oh, but we did not mean that. We did not quite mean that. We can do better. We can do better than that. We are going to set 100 percent of it aside because they are. And so they rush in here at the last minute. Well, even their last-minute plan does not quite make it.

Let me show my colleagues something here. They are talking about debt reduction and how much they want to reduce the debt for their grandchildren and children, and we heard all sorts of speeches waxing philosophical about that. Let us look at the plan. The Republicans set aside more money so we can pay down the debt. The Democrats do not. Those are the facts. Yet they run in here and say, we can do better than that.

Let me tell my colleagues something else that is interesting here. When it comes to education, they say this is a priority. Look what we do. The Republicans, the Republicans, spend more time than the President, who stood up here for the State the Union address and said how he is going to support education.

Well, let me take my colleagues one example further. Special education. Special education. Since 1975, a program that the Democrats, to their credit, passed one of the most beautiful civil rights pieces of legislation in history, saying every American child

ought to be able to attend public school. And what did they do? They did not fund it. And they have not funded it since 1975.

□ 1245

For the first time, the Republicans are funding IDEA, special education, $1 billion extra in our budget than the President's for special education. Plus we are saying to governors and States who are crying to Washington to give them more flexibility for education, we are letting them spend excess dollars from welfare, we are giving them the ability to transfer funds from other education programs, and we are allowing them, if we get more money at the end of the year, this surplus may grow as everyone has talked about so far, in our plan we allow special education to get a little bump up. That is not in their plan, either.

Mr. Chairman, it just is amazing to me with the Academy Awards being last week how they can continue to win more Academy Awards for this budget.

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

Could I have the benefit of the chart of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the chart he just used that showed the President commits 62 percent of the surplus and you commit 100 percent of the surplus?

Mr. NUSSLE. The gentleman did not bring his own charts today?

Mr. SPRATT. That is 62 percent of the unified surplus which he quotes, $1.8 trillion. One hundred percent of the Social Security surplus, which is part of it, equals $1.8 trillion. They are the same thing over a different period. Over 15 years it works out to the same thing.

Mr. NUSSLE. That is the problem, if the gentleman would yield.

Mr. SPRATT. No, I cannot yield because I do not have the time to yield.

Mr. NUSSLE. He wants to use my chart but I cannot talk about it?

Mr. SPRATT. In a little while we will answer what he just said about education.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I hope he does.

Mr. SPRATT. Because I do not think the facts will bear him out.

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute. I believe there was another problem with the charts that were just shown to us in that while the speaker, I am sure he misspoke, when the speaker said he was comparing the Republican plan to the Democratic plan on the floor from House Democrats today, I believe he used numbers from the President's proposal and not from our budget today relative to debt reduction.

Secondly, the question of IDEA, special education, is one I am very interested in, because for several years I have offered an amendment to the Committee on the Budget as well as to the Congress to deal with fully funding IDEA, making the commitment that was passed so long ago real, to bring funding up to 40 percent of real cost. That was offered in the Committee on the Budget last week and to a person every Republican, including the gentleman from Iowa, voted against doing that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY).

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member of our Committee on the Budget for the terrific job he has done.

Mr. Chairman, if I could yield first of all to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we want to talk about education. There is a lot that is wrong with this Republican budget resolution. We need to discuss these issues in depth. The budget resolution is arguably the most important single decision we make here. It is the blueprint for how Federal resources will be used for the coming fiscal year and on into the future. So the Democratic and the Republican proposals we are considering here today need to be debated in depth. They are a study, in fact, in contrasting priorities.

The Republican budget would provide no help in extending the solvency of Medicare and Social Security. It falls short on veterans health care and crop insurance for our farmers and other critical needs. The Democratic alternative would extend the solvency of Medicare and Social Security, would provide more funding for critical priorities, would implement targeted tax relief, and would reduce the debt held by the public more than the Republican proposal.

Mr. Chairman, we want to talk especially about education, because nowhere is the contrast more stark than with education. Our Republican colleagues boast about providing some increase for elementary and secondary education, but, overall, funding for education and training would be cut by $1.2 billion from the nominal 1999 level in the Republican budget for 2000. The result would be drastic cuts in funding for other priorities like higher education and teacher training and Pell grants and Head Start. Over 5 years, the Republican budget cuts to education and training would result in a 6.9 percent decrease in purchasing power, and over 10 years the decline in purchasing power for education would be over 18 percent.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, one of the things that I find interesting about this budget is we were told absolutely education is increased. They did increase it for elementary and secondary education. But what they do not tell us is that they are cutting it in all other parts of education. They do not say specifically where they are going to cut those budgets. But it is cut over 10 years from this level by $36.5 billion. So they are cutting programs like Head Start and Pell grants and work-to-school programs. That is where the cuts are.

And so again it is one of those bait and switch budgets that they tell us we are doing great things over here and then they do not tell us what the other hand is doing, which is cutting education. This budget does not reflect that our school facilities are in a crisis situation. There was a study done by the engineers that said of all of our infrastructure, our school infrastructure is the one that is in the greatest need. We would not work in the schools that we send our children to.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) and the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) in a further discussion of this. It is important to get these facts out.

Is it not true that the Democratic alternative would make room for school construction? The kind of proposal that the President has made to give tax credits in lieu of interest on bonds in these low-income areas that need desperately to build or modernize facilities, or like the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) and I have introduced to target high-growth areas so that our kids are not going to school in trailers.

I come from a district where we have hundreds of trailers, thousands of kids going to school in these kinds of facilities. We need to get ahead of the curve in school construction.

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

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

Mr. HOLT. The Democratic budget does indeed provide for modernizing schools. In fact, it would provide tax credits that would allow modernizing of up to 6,000 public schools.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, one of the other things that I think is interesting to note, not only are schools in bad shape right now and we have talked about trailers. We have first graders that have to walk across an open area in Oregon where it rains all the time. This is not a wonderful thing to do to wash their hands or go to the bathroom. And some of the rooms are in such disrepair. Again, my colleagues would not work in that facility but we expect our children to learn in that facility.

The other thing that I think is interesting is there have been studies that have been done that show that, in fact, students do better in schools that reflect our society and are not in such disrepair. They do better when our schools are repaired.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Those studies are very convincing, that the students perform better when they are in first-rate facilities. It is not just an abstract issue. We have thousands of

kids going to school in these facilities. Often they are going to lunch at 10:30 because the cafeteria facilities haven't kept pace with the addition of trailers. They do not have adequate gym or restroom facilities. It simply is a misplaced priority to say that we cannot afford to do this. The Republican budget squeezes it out. The Democratic budget would make room for that kind of school modernization.

Let me ask my colleagues, also, to address the other major initiative that we are looking at in this Democratic budget: getting class size down and getting 100,000 new teachers in the classrooms of America. We made a start on that last year. What is it going to take to keep that going?

Mr. HOLT. If the gentleman will yield further, indeed, these are connected. Simple math will tell us, we cannot have more teachers and get the smaller class sizes in the early years unless we have the classrooms to put them in. And so this Democratic budget does allow for both of those, continuation of the hiring of new teachers, the 100,000 new teachers that we are calling for, we will continue down that line with the Democratic budget, in addition to providing for the loans for the construction and modernization of facilities.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. We are talking about a stark contrast in these budget proposals. The one makes room for reduced class size and for school construction and also lets us make good on what we promised last year when we passed the higher education act, opening up opportunity through Pell grants and an improved student loan program. The other budget makes a short-term increase in education over the long haul but would drastically decrease this funding.

Mr. HOLT. Unlike the Republican budget, the Democratic alternative does not cut higher education, training and social services in order to increase elementary and secondary education programs. That is a key difference.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. I used to be a teacher. I can guarantee my colleagues that smaller classroom sizes, you have much better performance by the students. Do not take just my word for it but go out and look at all of the research on this subject and you will find if we can get our classroom size to 18 and under, that students' performance goes way up. Not only does it go up, it stays up. We are trying to get it down in K through 3. But if you get it down, get that ratio down, the performance goes straight up and that performance stays up throughout their years in school.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. And the impact is the greatest in grades 1 through 3, is that right?

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Right.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the way my colleagues have chimed in here. There is no question that we are dealing with a stark contrast in many areas of this budget, but certainly in education. In dollar terms, the Democratic alternative next year provides $2.6 billion more for education and training, and then over the next 5 years we are talking about a $10.2 billion gap. It is a gap that we have got to close.

Vote for the Democratic alternative.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 45 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, the bottom line is, this Republican budget locks away the entire Social Security trust fund surplus for our Nation's elderly, the entire amount. We set aside more than the President to save, strengthen and preserve Social Security and as necessary Medicare as well. We create a safety deposit box to assure Social Security trust funds cannot be raided. We pay down more public debt than the President. We maintain the spending discipline for the 1997 budget act. We provide additional resources to properly train, equip and retain our men and women in uniform. And we will enact historic tax relief after we have solved Social Security for our children and our children's children. That is what we do. The President wants to spend more. The Democrats want to spend more. We do not.

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

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, this Republican budget brings honesty back to the budget process and ends a 30-year assault on our Social Security system. For the first time, every single penny of Social Security taxes will be locked up for Social Security and Medicare. Over the next 10 years, this budget saves $1.8 trillion for these two critical programs for our seniors and future generations.

As my colleagues can see on this chart, while the Republican budget saves every penny, 100 percent, of the Social Security surplus, the President's budget saves only 62 percent of Social Security over the next 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, saving just 62 percent of the Social Security surplus is not good enough. The President's budget spends $341 billion of this very Social Security surplus over 10 years and provides no Social Security reforms or protections.

Mr. Chairman, not a dime of the Social Security dollars Americans pay should be used for unrelated programs. Locking up the entire Social Security trust fund will help save, strengthen and preserve Social Security and Medicare, not only for seniors today but for future generations as well. We must repair Social Security forever, not just put a band-aid on the problem. This Congress cannot allow the Social Security program to be bankrupt. We cannot stand by and allow anyone, even the President, to raid Social Security just to pay for more Washington-run programs.

Save Social Security. Vote ''aye'' on this Republican budget.

□ 1300

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, before yielding to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say our colleagues are attacking the President's budget; it is not even on the floor.

Our resolution is on the floor. It commits a hundred percent, puts $1.8 trillion into the trust funds over the next 10 years as well.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I plan to yield time to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) as well because we want to address fiscal responsibility because we firmly believe that our budget is the more fiscally responsible. Mr. Chairman, what we have been presented by the majority is the baby boomer budget.

As my colleagues know, the real reason why we have this prosperity is because our parents put their lives on the line for democracy and free enterprise. That is why we live in a free and prosperous world. And now, we the baby boomer children must decide what we are willing to sacrifice for our children's future.

So what have we done with this opportunity? Mr. Chairman, one of the things we have done is to build up a $5 trillion public debt that we are about to leave to our children.

The critical test of the baby boomer generation is, are we going to be as responsible to our children as our parents were to us? Mr. Chairman, the answer is no if we do not pay down the Federal debt. The answer is no, as well, if we do not provide for their retirement security. That is why it is important to extend Medicare and Social Security.

But the budget that we have been presented with by the Republicans says after we die, after we have exhausted Social Security, there is nothing there left for our kids. It is exhausted in terms of Medicare in 2008; in terms of Social Security, by 2032. That is it; we have used it, we are set, and then it is up to our kids to take care of their own retirement security and to pay down the Federal debt.

That is why this budget, the one we are offering, is the far more responsible one because it reduces the public debt, it provides for the retirement security of our kids, and it also provides for the investment that our kids need to be able to fulfill their potential. It puts money into education, it puts money into training, it enables them to live in a safe environment.

This is by far the more responsible budget, the one that sustains the intergenerational legacy our parents left to us.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, this is a very serious debate. We are involved

overseas in a very serious effort, and we need to be serious.

I came here in June of 1981, and I was presented with a budget on this floor which I voted against, and I voted against it because I thought it would cause high deficits and high interest rates. I, frankly, was right. The 1981 budget that we adopted, which was sold to us as a budget that would do all sorts of good things for America, created $3 trillion in new debt, and tax cuts were enacted long before any Republican, as Dave Stockman said, was prepared to vote for the cuts to sustain the spending cuts to sustain those tax cuts, and as a result, and I heard the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) last night on the floor lamenting the fact that our grandchildren were put deeply in debt, they were by that 1981 program.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest to my colleagues that this budget is very much like that. It is very much like that in that it retreats from investments in the future, it promises tax cuts that will be unsustainable, and notwithstanding how many times our colleagues repeat they are saving Social Security commitment, it does not do what both the Blue Dogs' budget does, which I will vote for, which the Democratic alternative does, which I will vote for, and frankly offering the President's budget is simply a political charade in which we have participated in the past ourselves. And I understand that; we both have done that to one another. Ronald Reagan's budgets were presented 3 years during his presidency. Zero Republicans voted for it the first time, one Republican the second and 12 the third.

This is a serious debate, and we ought to commit ourselves to the American public to do real things. I suggest to my colleagues they ought to vote for the Democratic alternative and, as well, they ought to vote for the Blue Dogs' alternative because they do real things. They do not pretend; they do real things.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, if this was our parents making this decision, they would not be giving themselves an $800 billion tax cut. They would be providing for the retirement security of their children, they would pay down the debt that they incurred, they would fully fund the military pay raise, they would fully fund the education of their children, they would do right for America and make sure the next generation of Americans is better off than their generation and the benefits that they incurred from their own parents.

We have a progressive legacy, let us keep it. Let us not be so selfish and give ourselves a tax cut. Let us take care of our kids first.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to comment that when the President gave his budget address, everyone on that side of the aisle thought it was terrific, and now everyone is running away from it and denying they ever liked it.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

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

As my colleagues know, somebody once said, and it may have been the Vice President, that everyone is entitled to their own opinions, but they are not entitled to their own facts, and I want to talk about the facts because we heard earlier today, and there is some revisionist history that it was the, quote, minimal tax hikes of 1993 that brought about the balanced budget that we have today.

Mr. Chairman, I am not making up the facts. This is according to the Congressional Budget Office. This is the direction we were headed in 1995. The deficit was at about $200 billion. They were predicting that by 2009 we would have deficits approaching $600 billion, and worse, that included the Social Security surpluses.

Now where are we today?

Mr. Chairman, thanks to some of the fiscal discipline demonstrated by this Congress since 1994, we are headed in the right direction. Again, these are not our numbers. This is according to the Congressional Budget Office.

Now one of the things that we are debating here today is whether or not there should be tax relief for the average American family. Now somebody said earlier, and it is true, and this is according to the Tax Foundation, that Americans now pay the highest tax burden since 1944. Now our budget does not specifically call for tax cuts, but it does begin to make room for tax cuts because we believe Americans are overtaxed.

Mr. Chairman, the average American family, and again not according to us, according to the Tax Foundation, a nonpartisan group, the average family today spends more in taxes than they do for food, clothing, shelter and transportation combined.

Now we happen to believe that is wrong, and we may have a difference of opinion with our friends on the left, but that is the way we see it.

Now it has also been mentioned that our Democratic friends really do not want to talk about the President's budget, and I suspect this article, again not something that we said, this is according to the Investors Business Daily; what they said was balancing the books on the backs of the poor.

But this is what Investors Business Daily said, and again the source of the Tax Foundation, that under the President's budget plan he increases taxes over the next 5 years by about $45.8 billion. Now that is bad enough, but what is worse, almost 40 percent of those new taxes will be paid by families that earn less than $25,000 a year.

Now it is no wonder then that our Democratic friends do not want to talk about the President's budget.

In sum, our budget does four things:

First of all, Mr. Chairman, we say that every penny of Social Security taxes ought to go only for Social Security.

Second, we say that we are going to keep faith with the spending caps that we agreed to with the President in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

Third, we begin the process of actually paying down some of that debt. We will begin to pay off some of the debt that is owed to the public.

Finally, we make room for tax relief.

Now I know that does not sit well with some of our friends on the left, Mr. Chairman, but we believe that is important.

In sum, what this budget really does is that it ensures lower interest rates and a stronger economy well into the next century.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority whip.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, it is amazing how all we can talk about is the budget in 1981. This is 1999, and I just remind some of my colleagues that the budget since 1981 was controlled by a Democrat House and a Democrat Senate that refused to cut spending. The difference, as I answer my colleagues, is this is a Republican Congress that has brought fiscal discipline to the process. In fact, the Democrats are running as fast as they can away from the President's budget that he submitted this year. The Senate voted down yesterday by a vote of 97 to 2 the President's own budget. Why can they not even support the President's own budget? And by a vote of 99 to nothing, 99 to 0, could not even get one person to vote, the Senate rejected the President's proposal for the government to invest Social Security funds into the stock market.

Over the past 4 years, Mr. Chairman, the Republican Congress has worked very hard to balance the budget; the President took credit for it. Cap federal spending; the President took credit for it. Provide much needed tax relief to American families; the President took credit for it. The Republican budget plan for the year 2000 continues this shift to restore a solid American common sense to American government.

Now American families know how to balance their checkbooks, and they know how to stay within a budget. American families know the value of a dollar. There is no reason why this Federal Government cannot be as responsible as the average American family.

Over all, the Republican budget returns control to the American family by taking less of their money, setting very strict fiscal priorities and respecting spending caps. The Republican budget locks up 100 percent of Social Security surpluses for the first time since Social Security became a program. We are being honest about the Social Security Trust Fund. The Republican budget bolsters national defense by nearly $10 billion, and the Republican budget plans to reduce the national debt by 1.8 billion over the next

decade. And the Republican budget cuts taxes by $800 billion over 10 years.

Right down the line the Republican budget trumpets that fiscal responsibility is the wave of the future. This budget says loud and clear that Republicans want American families to keep more of their hard-earned money and send less of it to Washington forever.

When the Republicans took over Congress 4 years ago, the budget predictions had red ink spilled as far as the eye could see. Today, because of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 that we pushed through and the President took credit for, there are nothing but surpluses as far as the eye can see in the future.

Now some budget decisions are very difficult to do, and what we did not show with the Democrat Congress after 1981, discipline is hard, discipline is not always easy. But at the close of this century the Republican budget does it all. It cuts taxes, it reduces the debt, it saves Social Security, and it bolster defense.

So, Mr. Chairman, if we stick to our guns, America will be freer, it will be richer, it will be safer into the next century than ever before, so I urge my colleagues to vote for the Republican budget.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, let us be very clear about what our budget does and what their budget does not do. This chart tells my colleagues what our budget does. Our budget locks away the entire Social Security Trust Fund surplus, $1.8 trillion over the next 10 years, to save, strengthen and preserve Social Security and Medicare. We set aside $100 billion more towards Social Security than the President does. We are creating a safety deposit box to make sure that we do not raid the trust fund in the future. We are paying down $450 billion more in debt than the President is. We are also maintaining the fiscal discipline of the 1997 Budget Act. And the most important thing is that we are doing this honestly, we are not playing a shell game. Honest numbers are finally coming into town, into Washington. We are maintaining strong defenses, and we are recognizing a historic commitment to education.

□ 1315

What I would like to talk briefly about is our Social Security lock box, our safety deposit box. This is very important because no other budget proposal coming to the floor today, the President's proposal, the Democratic proposal, locks away Social Security.

If we take a look at this chart one moment here, we asked David Walker, the Comptroller General of the United States, to analyze the different Social Security proposals and in looking at the President's budget proposal he said, although the trust funds will appear to have more resources as a result of the President's proposal, in reality nothing about the program has changed. The proposal does not represent Social Security reform.

Here is what we are doing. We in our Republican plan are setting aside 100 percent of all payroll taxes, plus interest, for Social Security and Medicare. We save this money to support those programs, and what is more important we implement legislation that prevents future raids on Social Security by creating a lock box. The President's plan does nothing to do that. The Democratic plan does nothing to do that.

If we look at page 41 of our budget resolution, we have section 5, which sets up a safety deposit box legislation because Congress over the last 30 years has been raiding Social Security. There was nothing to stop Congress from raiding Social Security.

We are stopping the raid on Social Security. We are saying that beginning today, there will be no more raids on the Social Security trust fund and that in the future, we are putting a point of order to require a supermajority vote in Congress that any budget resolution ever coming to Congress again has to have a supermajority vote if it attempts to dip into Social Security.

We are essentially saying, we need discipline now to stop raiding Social Security but we want to make sure that future Congresses will not raid Social Security. That is why we have meaningful legislation, meaningful changes, in this budget resolution.

Now we are told that the President is not interested in passing legislation to prevent future raids on Social Security. In fact, the President raids the Social Security trust fund by $341 billion over the next 10 years. We raid zero dollars. We put all of it towards Social Security and Medicare.

So because we cannot get a statutory fix to stop the raid on the trust fund, because the President will not sign that into law, we are changing the rules in Congress. We are changing the rules in Congress so we will not raid Social Security, so that future Congresses will have to go after a higher threshold. If they try to bring a budget to this floor of Congress in the House and the Senate, they are going to have to take a supermajority vote to raid Social Security in the future.

Even though we cannot get a law passed by this President to prevent the raids on Social Security we are changing the rules in Congress so that Congress now and into the future will not raid Social Security.

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

Mr. Chairman, we keep having a red herring dragged across the path of this debate. The principal budgeting contention on the floor, the alternative to their budget is our budget and it commits 100 percent to Social Security, is backed up by a statute which requires the treasurer to take a certain percentage of payroll taxes to buy down public debt.

The general public probably does not understand, but points of order are honored in the breach on the House floor. We have a Committee on Rules upstairs which specializes in overriding points of order. It is a joke to say that a point of order provides any protection whatsoever.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL).

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to say regrettably that the Republican budget we are considering falls far short of what the American people need and what they deserve in terms of environmental protection.

We need to prepare our country for our children and their children. We need to prepare an America that has clean and vibrant cities, that has suburban areas not choked with automobiles and strangled by shopping malls. We need an America that has rural areas that are prepared to handle the necessary but dangerous pressure of development.

Simply put, the Republican budget does nothing to preserve our environment. The House Republican resolution for fiscal year 2000 provides $22 billion for discretionary natural resources and environmental programs. Our budget provides $23.6 billion.

The Republican level of funding is $1.3 billion less than this year's level of funding, and over 5 years the Republicans would cut funding $5.3 billion below 1999 levels.

The Sierra Club estimates that the Republican budget would stop up to 135 toxic waste cleanups under the Superfund program and would eliminate funding for the clean water action program.

The Democratic proposal gives our children a chance to grow up and raise their children in cities that are clean and safe, in suburbs that have coherent development patterns and provide park land and green space instead of chaos and confusion.

A recent series in the Philadelphia Inquirer demonstrates in the Philadelphia region that one acre per hour is being lost to development. In the last 30 years, the population in the Philadelphia area grew 13 percent; development grew 80 percent.

The Democratic budget would provide the tools for better regional planning, to improve water quality, to help local governments preserve open space, to reduce traffic congestion and clean the air.

Our proposal does not promote Federal planning. It does not promote Federal zoning. It is a good proposal, and I ask for support.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address the veterans' portion of this budget for awhile. The Clinton-Gore budget has been a total disaster for veterans' health care over the last few years. It totally has neglected veterans' health care in favor of other spending priorities by this administration.

Mr. Chairman, we are the second largest employer in the Federal Government. We have 173 hospitals to maintain, over 500 outpatient clinics, and this administration did not give us one dime increase this year in the area of health care.

This budget provides $1.1 billion in health care alone for our veterans. Their budget would require a massive layoff in VA health care and necessitate closing of some of our VA facilities that are needed to treat our needy veterans.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield just to make clear who ''their budget'' is, because our budget has $1.9 billion?

Mr. STUMP. I made it clear. I made it clear. I said the Clinton-Gore budget.

This Republican budget increase has the largest increase in history for veteran VA health care. I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, and the entire Committee on the Budget, that they have always been there when we needed them for additional health care monies, which we have had to ask for every year under this administration.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST), another distinguished Member and the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 68 before us today. In contrast to other documents, most notably the President's budget, this document underscores our commitment to the recovery and long-term economic health for production agriculture.

This resolution makes available a total of $6 billion in new agriculture funding authority over the life of the resolution. This should be viewed as nothing less than a triumph for American agriculture. They are in time of great need and we are working hard to create an adequate safety net to ensure their future.

I would remind my colleagues that the President promised crop insurance reform in his State of the Union address. Unfortunately, his budget proposed no new money or policy proposals that came forward, not one idea, not one dime, nothing.

The President has decided to turn his back on this problem so it falls to Congress to step up to the challenge, and we have.

The $6 billion in new agricultural spending in this resolution is the first infusion of funding for farmers in recent memory. This money will allow us to make permanent improvements in the tools farmers have available to manage the weather and price risks over which they have no control.

In addition to the $6 billion in new agricultural funding, the budget resolution creates generous tax cuts in fiscal year 2000 over the next decade. These reductions will allow Congress to continue working to provide American farmers and ranchers with tax relief, capital gains relief, estate tax reform and the creation of farm risk management savings accounts.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members on both sides of the aisle who care about the future of farmers and ranchers to support this budget resolution before us today because it is fair and responsible.

In behalf of American agriculture, I would like to extend special thanks to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. FLETCHER), the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) for the great work that they have done on the Committee on the Budget in behalf of the American farmer and rancher.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me once again say that our budget resolution, the House Democratic resolution, provides that same $6 billion a year but it has a special difference. Because this is a 10-year budget and we are running out the allocations for 10 years, we don't quit in 2004, 2005. Their budget stops the funding of the crop insurance program just as it is getting established. It, in effect, says to the agricultural committees, go find the necessary mandatory spending offsets in order to pay for it.

We provide $9 billion in the second 5-year period on top of $6 billion in the first to see that this is a 10-year commitment. The same with the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP). The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP), the excellent chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, sent to our committee a request for $1.9 billion a year, I believe. That is what we put in our budget. The Democratic budget provides what the Republican chairman of the committee requested; $1.9 billion a year for veterans.

Their budget gives a plus-up of $900 million, a billion dollars the first year in fiscal year 2000. But in 2001, 2002, 2003, it disappears. It is nonrecurring. It does not carryover. So it is plussed up a billion and then dropped back down again; dropped so much that over 5 years, their budget is $500 million for veterans below a 1999 freeze level. That is the way the numbers are being distorted out here.

Let me go back to education. In education, the budget of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), which they have touted as being a big plus-up in education, is $2 billion below the President next year; $3.9 billion below the President in 2001; $3.5 billion below the President in 2002; $2.1 billion in 2003.

What they say with ESEA and IDEA is we want to give a bigger allocation but it has to come out of the hide of other higher education programs; the whole function for education and job training. It is very improbable that they are going to be able to shove those other programs aside to make the kind of increases they are not providing because the function that they are providing for education as a whole does not increase over this period of time.

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE).

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for the last half hour has been complaining about how we have been talking about the President's budget. What did he do? He got up and talked about the President's budget.

In fact, there are three budget plans sitting over on that desk over there. There is only one over here. There is one Republican plan, and one Republican plan that does a good job in these areas, but the gentleman is picking from three different numbers over there. The gentleman has to make up his mind.

I understand the gentleman does not like the President's budget but the gentleman is like a long-tailed cat in a room full of rocking chairs right now running around trying to figure out how to run away from this President's budget. The gentleman has to make up his mind, I would suggest.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG).

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

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on the Budget, I rise today in strong support of the Republican budget resolution, H. Con. Res. 68. This budget prepares our country for the challenges of the 21st Century, and I commend the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman KASICH) and the Members of this committee for putting this altogether.

Over the next 10 years, the Federal Government is projected to run a budget surplus, as we have heard before, of $2.6 trillion. Our budget properly utilizes this windfall to strengthen the retirement security of the American people.

For the first time ever, 100 percent of the Social Security surplus, and maybe I should say that again, for the first time ever, 100 percent of the Social Security surplus will be locked away to strengthen Social Security and Medicare. Over the next decade, this will secure $1.8 trillion, $100 billion more than

the President's budget, to keep these two programs strong for current and future retirees. This is historic.

For years, Congress and the President have raided the Social Security trust fund to pay for wasteful government spending. With 77 million baby boomers nearing retirement, it is time to end this dishonest practice.

Our budget also provides the American people with tax relief that they need. Over the next decade, it cuts Federal taxes by $800 billion.

□ 1330

This tax cut, the largest since Ronald Reagan's first term as president, will strengthen working families and keep our economy moving forward.

Finally, this year's budget provides the resources to improve our schools and keep our military strong. If the United States wants the United States to be the world's strongest Nation, we must do a better job of educating our children, and we must ensure that our military forces are the best-trained and the best-equipped in the world. This year's budget takes a giant step forward in accomplishing both of these goals. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Democrat budget plan. It invests in health programs to serve all Americans. Our Republican colleagues talk about their commitment to health, but I challenge them to put their money where their mouths are.

The Democratic budget demonstrates our commitment to improving quality health care and access to health care for all Americans. The Republican plan shows once again their top priority, providing tax breaks for the wealthiest in this country.

We all support groundbreaking research at the National Institutes of Health. I support that effort, and the Republican budget does provide additional funding for the NIH.

But what our colleagues on the other side of the aisle do not seem to understand is that all of the research in the world goes to waste if people do not have access to health care. Their budget would slash funding for other health programs, like the Centers for Disease Control, Ryan White AIDS grants, maternal and child health, all in order to pay for their tax breaks for the wealthiest in this country.

More than 43 million Americans today are without health insurance. They seem to have fallen from our radar screen. The Democratic budget includes measures to expand access to health care. The Republican plan ignores the problem.

Many Americans struggle with no health insurance at all. Millions who do have insurance are fighting their managed care companies to have access to the care they need. The Democratic plan includes the Patients' Bill of Rights, real managed care that would put medical decisions back in the hands of those where it belongs, doctors and their patients.

Mr. Chairman, the Democratic budget alternative recognizes a key reality. If we are to save Medicare and social security for future generations, live within our spending caps, and continue to provide funding for vital health care programs in this country, we cannot afford to give tax breaks to the wealthiest members in this Nation.

I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic plan.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, as we look to the future, and that is what a budget does, we must evaluate where we are as a Nation. It has become clear to all of us that one of the most important principles that all Americans hold dear is the idea of security: fiscal security for our Nation; financial security for us personally, individually; educational security; security from attack from foreign nations; family security; and retirement security.

We need to take care of our growing aging population, and we must also look out for our young people, securing a solid and stable future for them.

We are at a crossroads today. What will the priorities of our Nation be? Will security be one of them? If we answer yes, then we must support the Republican budget, for our elders, our baby boomers, our Generation Xers, our Y Generations, all are relying on us to save social security and Medicare.

Mr. Chairman, the most responsible way of doing this is by supporting a plan that saves all of the social security surplus. By locking away 100 percent of the social security surplus, 100 percent, we preserve approximately $100 billion more than the President's proposal, more than the President's budget. By establishing this safe deposit box, we prevent a hungry bureaucracy from stealing from social security to pay for other programs, to ensure that retirement money is available for our elders, for our boomers, for our children, for our grandchildren. It is more than the President has offered, and we are doing the same with Medicare.

Speaking of the Democratic alternatives, the President, by comparison, does not have the trust of the Senate on his proposal. Instead of saving all of social security, the President would spend some of it. The Senate voted yesterday 97 to 2 to reject his plan. His plan of a government-run board investing social security funds in the stock market was rejected.

There is a better way. Support the Republican budget.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY MILLER).

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on the Budget, I rise to support House Concurrent Resolution 68. Our budget plan is the first ever to lock up 100 percent of social security payroll taxes and interest for the future. This is historic because over 10 years the Federal budget has been taking social security funds to pay for other spending programs.

In the year 2000, the GOP sets aside $137 billion, that is 100 percent of social security monies, for social security. The President pledges 62 percent of that, that is $85 billion, and $52 billion of social security money spent for other programs.

Between the years 2000 and 2009, we set aside $1.8 trillion for social security and Medicare. The President's budget sets aside $1.3 trillion for social security, and earmarks about $345 billion for Medicare. That is $1.645 trillion, over $100 billion less than our budget.

No matter how we add it up, $137 billion is more than $85 billion. No matter how we add it up, $1.8 trillion is more than $1.645 trillion. Two plus two does equal four.

Some on the other side who are using projections on the President's budget will save over 15 years, compared to our budget, over 10 years. That, as the saying goes, two plus two does equal five. No matter how you look at it, we are saving more for social security and Medicare than the President's budget saves over 10 years.

The President is not only missing-in-action on Medicare reform, he cuts Medicare by $11.9 billion. He is using a very strange strategy for claiming the high ground on Medicare. One, he cuts billions from Medicare. Two, he saves less than Republicans for Medicare. Three, he single-handedly stops bipartisan Medicare reform from the Medicare Commission. Four, he leaves us with the status quo. Five, he then claims to be the champion of Medicare.

If we look at the facts, we know that the Committee on the Budget resolution does more to protect social security and Medicare than the President has ever done. Also, anyone who votes for the President's budget is doing nothing short of stealing from social security and cutting Medicare. I urge all my colleagues to vote for the GOP budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Democrat alternative. The Democrat alternative is a budget resolution that fights for families, advocates for our children, stands up for our seniors, and is responsive to rural America.

The resolution before us abandons farmers and farm families. Recruiting and training sufficient numbers of qualified teachers is difficult throughout all of America, but it is particularly difficult in rural America. Working for better health care is difficult

throughout all America, but the problem is magnified in rural America. The lack of health resources and adequate health providers are harsh realities.

Farm life is hard, and the risk of injury and death is great. Income security is difficult in many parts of the United States, but in rural America, low earnings, slow investment, low economic development, and pockets of poverty are all too often a way of life. That is why we should all make sure we take into account the special needs of our farmers and our farm families.

Small farmers and ranchers are struggling to survive in America. Most are losing money and fighting hard to stay in the farming business. That is why the Democrat alternative increases discretionary spending for agriculture.

The resolution before us cuts discretionary spending for agriculture by $2.3 billion over 5 years. The Democrat alternative includes funding for agriculture research, education, and vital farming services. The resolution before us cuts those services.

The Democrat alternative continues crop insurance spending $14.6 billion more than the Republicans. The Republican resolution before us ends crop insurance in 2005. The Democrat alternative puts into proper perspective the needs of farm families and their communities.

It is an alternative that requires our support. It is an alternative that deserves our support. I urge all of our colleagues, both our Republicans and our Democrats, to support the Democratic alternative.

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

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to be part of this spirited historic debate today, historic because I believe that this plan before us represents the best news to come out of Washington in a very long time.

One year ago when I announced my run for Congress, I did so because I saw a bleak situation here in Washington: social security expected to be in the red in only 30 years, the tax burden on our families the highest it has been since World War II, and a national debt long overdue.

Today I can proudly tell the folks back home that we are addressing each of those critical challenges. It has also become clear that the minority will do and say anything to obscure these accomplishments.

Mr. Chairman, the proposal before us accomplishes what too many people said for too long was impossible.

Number one, our plan ensures that social security dollars are locked away, to be used only for social security. On the other hand, the President has proposed spending $52 billion of the social security surplus in the next year alone.

Number two, our plan allows working families to keep more of their hard-earned cash, with tax cuts growing only as our surplus grows. On the other hand, the President's budget proposes 80 new tax increases that will raise the tax burden on our families by over $172 billion.

Number three, and perhaps most important, this budget works to pay down our public debt, reducing it by some $1.8 trillion. That is $450 billion more than the President.

Some weeks back the President challenged this Congress. He challenged this Nation when he unveiled his plan. I want to offer my sincere thanks to the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman KASICH) for his hard work and guidance. The chairman has done well, we have done well, and with this plan, America will do well.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY).

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

Mr. POMEROY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a brief comment with respect to agriculture. I know that everybody has struggled with this budget, but the concern that I have is that we are currently unable to deliver the farm programs that we in Congress have identified as critical.

If we cut the Farm Service Agency any further, we are going to decimate our ability to deal with these programs, and I fear that the budget that the majority is proposing accomplishes just that.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, the words of my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, are precisely correct. There is a crisis in agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, these are desperate times on the farm. Therefore, I cannot understand why the majority's budget cuts discretionary spending in agriculture; cuts, in fact, that would amount to a reduction in more than $300 million this year alone.

To project out, the majority's budget would reduce the purchasing power of agriculture, the discretionary money is reduced to the extent that purchasing power would be reduced for the U.S. Department of Agriculture 33 percent over 10 years, 25 percent over 5 years.

The Republican budget is also a sham. I know that my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, has worked on crop insurance. There is funding for crop insurance for 5 years, and then it goes away altogether.

Looking at this budget, we can only conclude it is a sham. They purport to prop up crop insurance, but only for a few years. Then the money is zeroed out, resulting in loss of the crop insurance program or other deep cuts in other mandatory spending areas critical to propping up farming.

For the life of me, I cannot understand, when we have people that have farmed for generations being forced off their farms this Spring, not just in the area that I represent but across the country, we would have a Republican budget that cuts discretionary spending in agriculture, and then puts forward a crop insurance program but only funds it for a couple of years, 5 years, before the funding goes away altogether.

□ 1245

Let me tell my colleagues something, the Democratic alternative is different. We preserve funding for the discretionary account in agriculture. We are $400 million better next year alone, and we continue the funding for the crop insurance program, not just for 5 years, my friends, but on into the future altogether.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS).

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to remind the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE) and the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY), who are my friends, when it comes to agriculture issues, that we are talking about a 5-year budget that we are debating here today. So we fund agriculture for the 5 years of that budget. Next year we will have 5 more years. We will fund crop insurance for the additional out years as they come forward.

When my colleagues talk about cuts, what we are looking at is cuts which include the supplemental on top of the budgeted baseline numbers for last year. When we look at real numbers, there are no cuts. But I would remind my colleagues that the President's budget makes cuts in agriculture to the tune of 15 percent.

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

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

I rise today, Mr. Chairman, as a member of both the House Committee on Budget and the House Committee on Appropriations to say that, yes, this budget proposal is balanced; yes, it locks away all of the Social Security revenues into Social Security for the first time in a generation; yes, we increase veterans' benefits significantly over last year and way above the President's request; yes, we increase education funding above the President's request; yes, we protect Medicare and do not cut Medicare benefits as the President's budget does.

But I want to say that the goose that lays the golden egg called the budget surplus that we are here today to discuss is not us. It is the economy. The economy must be considered as we look at the fiscal discipline that I am here to talk about today as a member of the House Committee on Appropriations.

It is going to be hard later on, no question about it. But should we exert fiscal discipline? Listen. Chairman Greenspan, the guru of the American economy, has told us time and time again that, as we exert some fiscal discipline in this Congress, the economy

continues to improve. That is the goose that lays its golden egg. We need to feed that goose, feed that goose by exerting fiscal discipline, holding the growth of Federal Government spending below inflation in the last few years for the first time since 1969. That is the fiscal discipline that we must enter into. This budget does that.

It is going to be a tough year. But let me tell my colleagues, if we show the markets that, here in Washington, we are not going to spend foolishly or blindly any longer, the economy will continue, revenues will continue to sore, the budget surplus will continue to increase, and we will have good discussions here on the House floor of where to invest in the American society as opposed to those discussions we used to have about how to reduce the deficit instead of how to invest the surplus.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. CLEMENT), and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the Republican budget resolution. This resolution ignores the Committee on Veterans' Affairs' recommendation of a $1.9 billion increase for veterans funding. As a matter of fact, it actually decreases veterans funding over the next 10 years by $3 billion. Yes, it increases it the first year, but I think we need to make it very clear, under this budget resolution, the Republican resolution decreases it over the next 10 years by $3 billion.

This is simply wrong. In an era with budget surpluses, it is unconscionable to deny our veterans the funds that they so desperately need.

Veterans hospitals are being consolidated around the country, including Tennessee, due to the lack of sufficient funds. One of Iowa's three major veterans hospitals is threatened with closure. Florida's veterans hospitals are having to lay off employees and close some inpatient services.

I urge my colleagues on both side of the aisle to oppose this resolution.

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

THE INDEPENDENT BUDGET,
March 25, 1999.

Hon. JOHN M. SPRATT, Jr.,
Ranking Minority Member, Committee on the Budget, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SPRATT: On behalf of the Paralyzed Veterans of America (PVA) I am writing to offer our support for your budget alternative to H. Con. Res. 68. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) health care is facing an emergency—without desperately needed additional dollars the health care system relied upon by sick and disabled veterans will be forced to curtail services, close facilities, and lay off thousands of health care workers. The Spratt Budget Alternative recognizes the grave condition of VA health care and takes action to provide a remedy.

The Independent Budget has estimated that VA medical care, for fiscal year (FY) 2000, must receive a $3 billion increase over the President's budget submission. H. Con. Res. 68, although providing a $900 million increase over the Administration's budget, an increase which is taken away in FY 2001, does not provide the resources needed by the VA this year, and over the next few years. The Spratt Budget Alternative provides $1.8 billion over the Administration's budget for VA health care, and provides $900 million more than H. Con. Res. 68. In addition, the Spratt Budget Alternative provides over $2 billion more than H. Con. Res. 68 over the next four years, nearly $10 billion more over five years.

The Spratt Budget Alternative provides more of the resources that the VA needs if we are to provide sick and disabled veterans with the health care they have earned and the health care they need.

Sincerely,

AMVETS, Blinded Veterans Association, Disabled American Veterans, Paralyzed Veterans of America, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Vietnam Veterans of America, Inc.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER), a real fighter for veterans.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, this is a shameful budget for our veterans, and veterans across the country are angry. This budget breaks our contract with our Nation's veterans. We promised health care for life. But I will tell my colleagues, those who vote for this Republican resolution, their veterans are going to have to wait for months and months for appointments in a hospital, if it stays open.

We promised to care for the disabled, but the folks in my colleagues' districts are going to have to wait years to have those claims processed. We do virtually nothing for those of our veterans who are on the streets, those who want education, those who want training.

Over the life of this resolution, we have cut veteran benefits by $3 billion. This is shameful. This is unconscionable. I do not know how my colleagues wrote a budget resolution that says to those who have fought for us, who have fought to make this a democracy, who have fought to keep us here in the kind of condition where we have a surplus, say to them, ''Thanks, but no thanks. We are through with you.'' Vote no on this Republican resolution. Protect our Nation's veterans.

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER) who serves on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, the budget that we are considering today is a huge number to all of us; and we are talking about Social Security, Medicare, defense. A small part of it is the veterans number, but the veterans number is not a small part of the lives of veterans.

This number, the budget number for fiscal year 2000 in the Republican budget is not adequate. The veterans know it. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs, both Republicans and Democrats, know it. The VA hospital doctors and nurses know it.

The only people who apparently do not know that this number was inadequate were the Committee on Budget members who passed this budget number out. Not only is it inadequate for fiscal year 2000, but we are voting on a 10-year budget number.

While this number has $20.2 billion in fiscal year 2000, in 2001 it drops back to $19.1 billion, which is less than the current fiscal year.

I think that veterans' communities and veterans around the country need to know what this long-term budget process does that the Republicans have put on to this House floor today. The number is wrong. It is wrong this year. It is wrong for next year. Vote no on this Republican budget.

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ), the ranking member on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs' Subcommittee on Health.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, during recent days Members of both parties have shown their concern for our troops deployed overseas. Yet, Republicans have betrayed the men and women who have already served our country, jeopardizing the well-being of our veterans, and ignoring the values for which they fought.

Democrats have tried to fight for a VA budget proposal for fiscal year 2000, but the Republicans, a party still apparently wedded to the idea that the wealthiest Americans deserve another tax break, want to keep their promise to them and break their promise to protect veterans health care. The Republicans continue to put their commitment to their wealthy campaign contributors above America's commitment to our veterans.

Here is what the Republicans have said no to America: no to $475 million more for VA health care, no to $271 million in long-term care initiatives, no to $681 million in the Montgomery G.I. Bill.

Just so America understands, this budget is deplorable for veterans, and remember what they did today. Remember what they did today.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

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

First of all, as a veteran, I want to set the record straight. The President sent a budget up here that said zero, zero increase for veterans, and I thank my Republican colleagues for giving veterans an extra billion dollars.

But I want to talk about the overall budget. I sat on that Committee on

Budget for 6 years as a member of the minority. What a waste of time. Let me tell my colleagues, they did everything wrong, and it got us in the mess we are in.

So I am very thankful for this Republican budget today, because they do many things: preserve and protect Social Security and Medicare, they pay down the national debt, they maintain the fiscal restraint of the Balanced Budget Act, they provide tax relief, and they increase support for education and defense. That is what I want to emphasize, increased support for education and defense.

The House resolution provides $65.3 billion in budget authority for discretionary and mandatory spending in education, training, employment, and social services. They outdo the President. His is a 1999 actual. They go up another billion two in education.

Do my colleagues know what they do? They help us do what the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and I thought we might be able to do in a bipartisan effort in that 6 years on the Committee on Budget. They really put their money where their mouth is, and they put more money, as we increase the surplus, into special education, something my colleagues passed 23 years ago. They said they would send 40 percent of the excess cost back for the 100 percent mandate they sent. They sent 6 percent until I became chairman.

Thanks to the Committee on Budget and the appropriators, we have increased that by more than $2 billion, and they are ready to do more of that. That is what the local folks want to hear. The local folks want to hear that their property taxes do not have to go up, up, up in order to meet our 100 percent mandate in the area of special education.

So I thank the Committee on Budget. I thank them for doing something right, even though, for 6 years, I sat there as a member of the minority while they did everything wrong.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I served on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for 2½ years, and I learned a lot.

Republicans talk a lot about support for veterans; however, their support ends at the appropriations' door. This Republican budget gives a one-time increase which is not carried over into the next fiscal year. Smoke and mirrors again.

Over a 5-year period, the Republican budget resolution cuts discretionary funding for veterans by hundreds of millions of dollars. Over a 10-year period, the Republican budget resolution cuts veteran funding by $3 billion below the 1999 level.

In the area of health care, where our veterans are facing a medical emergency, the proposed budget includes several new health care initiatives, but guess what, without providing the necessary funds to support them.

Unless the veterans' health care system receives significant increases in funding, critical services will be cut, health care will be denied, facilities closed, and dedicated employees are out of work.

I have a full-time staff person dedicated to just working on veterans' complaints. Republicans, I want them to know they cannot look veterans in the face and tell them that my colleagues care about them when all my colleagues talk about is flag burning and desecration of the flag.

My colleagues need to be talking about the real issues of whether or not veterans are being taken care of, veterans who have served their times, veterans who my colleagues say they care about, whether or not they can come forward with a budget like this where they are denying them the kind of funding that is so desperately needed.

I ask my colleagues to reject this proposal, to reject the turning of our backs on the veterans who we claim to love so much, and do everything that we can to increase their funding. They have complaints that are not adjudicated. I ask my colleagues to do the right thing for veterans. Reject this Republican budget.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to remind the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) that we added $1 billion to veterans that the President did not provide.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, when I first came to Congress in 1993, the budget debate was a very different one. Under the current President, but a very different majority in Congress, we were faced with deficits as far as the eye could see.

□ 1400

The budget resolution brought before Congress then addressed these problems with a very different set of solutions. That 1993 legislation included the largest tax increase in history, significant increases in Federal spending, and it repeated the mistakes of the past by including continued annual deficits.

When the current majority took over, we inherited the same budgetary problems. Despite the 1993 tax increase, which was sold as the answer to the deficit, in 1995 the new majority still faced an unbalanced Federal ledger, escalating spending and future deficits stretching out as far as the eye could see.

But we proposed a very different set of solutions to those problems. We introduced a balanced budget that reduced Federal spending and provided tax cuts for the American people. As a result of that legislation, today our Nation's budget is balanced. We even have a unified budget positive cash flow, and it appears certain that we will have a real ''on budget'' surplus this year.

The budget resolution under consideration today continues the effort we began in 1995. It is balanced, it preserves the spending caps that we established in the balanced budget agreement of 1997, it ensures that 100 percent of payroll taxes, or $1.8 trillion, are preserved for the future of our retirement program.

It also allows the Congress to give back $800 billion in taxes to American wage earners. That tax relief is still far less than what the President raised through higher Social Security taxes and marginal rates in the 1993 tax increase legislation.

The Joint Committee on Taxation has stated that the President's 1993 tax increase will tax the working people of this country for over $850 billion over the next 10 years.

The budget resolution reported by the Committee on the Budget will balance the budget, it will preserve payroll taxes for the preservation of Social Security, it will hold the line on Federal spending, it will make a downpayment on repealing the President's 1993 tax increases, and it will reduce the public debt.

Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of this important legislation.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I address this body with a great deal of sadness, because last night, by a vote of 224 to 1, we pledged to support the troops. Today's budget breaks that pledge.

On this spot last night I asked Members to support the troops not just at that time but for all times, not only during deployment but during times of training and growing. Someone was not listening when the budget was put together.

The priority should be, is, as far as I am concerned, and will always be to take care of the troops; to take care of the young men and take care of the young women who go in harm's way for our country. This budget does not take into consideration or allow monies for the recommended and promised pay raise or change in reform of the retirement system. We have to do that. We must do that.

We cannot break our word, we cannot break our faith and trust in those young people. We must reject this budget because it does not do what we have promised. Despite some claims that the Republican budget funds the pay raise, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) said it would not.

I am pleased, however, that this morning, Mr. Chairman, the senior leadership of the House Committee on Armed Services, in a hearing, reiterated its strong support. Several of us spoke on both sides of the aisle in support of a military pay raise, and cleared up the confusion by the remarks of the chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. Chairman, this budget does not do it for the troops.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), and I say to the previous speaker that our budget does do it for the troops, and the gentleman from Texas will illustrate that point.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, there is no higher priority in this budget for me than making sure that our troops are taken care of and that there is a pay raise. For some reason, a number of opponents of this budget have come up with a variety of reasons to try to argue that it is not so.

I very much appreciate the gentleman from Missouri because I know his commitment to taking care of the troops is every bit as strong as mine. But what happens, for example, is that in some press accounts questions and answers get misrepresented.

The chairman of the Committee on the Budget, for example, was asked whether the full amount in Senate bill 4 was taken care of in this budget, and the answer to that, of course, is no. But I can tell the gentleman from Missouri, as well as all my colleagues, as well as all of those who are in the armed services, that this budget includes the pay raise for the members of the armed services. And as a member of the committee and a member of the subcommittee which has jurisdiction over that issue, there will be legislation within the next couple of months on this floor to implement that pay raise, as there should be.

I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, that this budget is so strong that some opponents of the budget have to dig pretty deep to come up with some reason to oppose it. It is clear, if we look at the numbers, that there is an extra billion dollars in here for VA; that there is money in here to take care of the crop insurance program; and that there is room in here for tax relief, which is so essential, I think, for the American people.

We have often heard it described that taxes are higher than at any point in the country's history except for the war year of 1944. Look at it another way. Under President Clinton, Federal tax revenue has gone up 52 percent faster than the personal income of this country. And in the last fiscal year it grew 70 percent faster. So what is happening is the regular middle class folks are getting squeezed. Their income is going up a little bit, but their taxes are going up far faster. They need the tax relief that is included in this budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I am very concerned about the budget resolution's promises on increases in defense. We have heard some claims of an increase of $8 billion in budget authority over the President's request, but this resolution provides almost no increase in outlay authority.

Now, I have served for 20 years on the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations, and I can tell my colleagues that when we are writing an appropriations budget, budget authority but no outlay to support it, we have nothing. The problem is if we do not have adequate outlays, we cannot do the 4.4 percent across-the-board pay raise and we cannot have the fix in the retirement benefits.

So I believe that this budget, that I think was presented with good intent, is fatally flawed. It is not going to do the job that the Joint Chiefs need to have done. It is not going to do the job that all of us on a bipartisan basis who support defense need to have done.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA).

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

This is really a great budget. Let us take a look at what this budget does. It allows the American people the opportunity to secure their future as we enter a new millennium.

It locks away the entire Social Security Trust Fund, the surplus that we are going to be gaining over the next 10 years, $1.8 trillion. We save it so that we can strengthen and preserve Social Security and, as necessary, Medicare.

We set aside $100 billion more than the President for Social Security and Medicare. We create a safe deposit box. What this means is that we prevent Congress from going and raiding those surpluses and using it for other spending.

We pay down $450 billion of debt held by the public; $450 billion more than the President. We maintain the spending discipline of the balanced budget agreement of 1997.

We allow the American people to secure their future by providing more for defense, by providing more for education, and providing the opportunity to enact historic tax relief.

This is the kind of plan that enables us to build on the success of the last few years and to prepare for the future. It is a wonderful budget to move forward.

The CHAIRMAN. Two hours on congressional budget debate having expired, 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 New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON).

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

Mr. Chairman, in the late 1970s a law was enacted called the Humphrey-Hawkins Act, and the purpose of it was to provide, among other things, for this Congress to have oversight over budgetary policy in terms of how it may or may not have a positive, or how it may have a negative effect, for that matter, on the economic performance in our economy.

And so I would just like to use some time, if I may, to take a break from Republicans blaming Democrats and Democrats blaming Republicans, to try to take an overall look at what has transpired to create this wonderful surplus that we have in this fiscal year and the surpluses that we are now able to anticipate in the coming years.

Let me first say that our current expansion is now the longest expansion in modern history during peacetime. I think it is well for all of us to take credit and give each other credit, to the extent that we can. Employment, income and wealth gains are impressive, and we are experiencing the lowest unemployment rates since the 1970s.

Sometimes we all like to exaggerate the impact, as if the world actually revolves around Washington, D.C. But the fact of the matter is that workers all across this country, business people, laborers, all share in being able to take responsibility for what has happened here. And our system itself, our system of free enterprise, has worked well.

Recently, in trying to take credit for some things that happened in our country, the Vice President took some ribbing for claiming that he was the inventor of the Internet, and his strong ties to the rural farmland of northwest Washington, D.C. all drew some chuckles. Well, as a matter of fact, I wish him well, but his comments and other comments suggesting that the administration invented the current economic expansion are just excessive.

Let me try to say what, after much study, the members of the Joint Economic Committee have concluded has happened. Yes, the Republicans can take credit for being the initiators of tax cuts. That started back in the 1980s. And with the exception of 1990, during the Bush administration, and 1993, during the current administration, taxes have been kept quite low. And, yes, we can give ourselves some credit around here for helping to control spending.

Those have been important factors but not, in my view, the primary one. I think I may surprise my colleagues when I try to give at least some credit, and maybe the majority of the credit, for what has happened to an institution that is not directly associated with the Congress of the United States. Of course, all my colleagues know I am referring to the Federal Reserve.

□ 1415

As a matter of fact, the key reasons for the expansion are not generally very well understood, and that is why I want to take this time, under the provisions of Humphrey-Hawkins, to at least express this view for the consideration of my colleagues.

One of the most important explanations for this record-setting and sustained expansion is the anti-inflationary monetary policy being pursued

by the Federal Reserve. Pursuing anti-inflation policy or price stability policy in a gradual, sustained manner has worked to lower inflation.

Who would have thought a decade ago that we could stand here today and say to America, inflation is almost zero? That is an impressive accomplishment brought about by the Fed. And interest rates have followed inflation downward and it has fostered economic growth.

This chart here to the left of me shows how inflation and interest rates have come down together. And anyone who tries to deny the positive effects of this on the economy has simply not got it straight. This is an extremely important factor. And I believe that, along with other policies, this has been a major stimulus to the growth that we have seen.

We have observed not only a lower rate of inflation, but also a lower rate of unemployment and healthy economic times all at the same time. As a matter of fact, during the last several years we have gone a long way to diffuse or to disprove an old theory that in the circles of economics is referred to as the Phillips curve.

This second chart demonstrates something that is perhaps not a new phenomenon, and perhaps there were a minority of people who believed that this could happen over time. But throughout recent economic history, there was a common belief among lawmakers and a common belief among some economists, perhaps many economists, that we could not have long-term, sustained economic growth without inflation. This period of economic growth has disproven that theory.

This chart shows that the unemployment rate, which is a by-product, of course, of good economic growth, has gone down, as inflation has, so that we now have historic low rates of unemployment and historic low rates of inflation. And again, we have to look across the street or downtown to the offices that house the members of the Federal Reserve to understand how this happened.

The Federal Reserve has simply pursued policies through monetary policies to gradually squeeze inflation out of our economy. And so, while it is neat for us to be able to say that we have done this through the budgetary process, and we have contributed to it some, and while it is very encouraging that we have been able to over the last two decades reduce the impact of taxes, the fact of the matter is that most economists today agree that this policy of squeezing inflation out of the economy, which has fostered lower interest rates, has been an extremely important factor.

Let me make four points. First, lower inflation works to lower interest rates. We have already demonstrated that here on our charts. Both long-term and short-term interest rates have declined and have done so with this lower inflation and with expectations that there is no inflation around the corner. While long-term rates recently have picked up some, they are not far from their historic lows as compared to interest rates over the last 30 years.

Interest-sensitive sectors of the economy, like housing and investments, have performed exceptionally well during this period because of low interest rates, again brought about by Fed policy on price stability and inflation.

The second point that I would make is that price stability works to calm financial markets and this helps to create long-term growth. Lower inflation fosters less volatility, less uncertainty and, therefore, more stability in financial markets. As a result, market participants tend to become more confident and more willing to invest and take risks and to innovate. And so we see this as an important factor.

Point number three: Lower inflation acts like a tax cut. Anytime we give more money or provide an opportunity for investors to have more money to invest and consumers to have more money to consume and savers have more money to save, we provide economic stimulus which works to create long-term growth. And in this case, lower inflation reduces the rates of interest rates and again we have seen a positive result.

Point number four: Lower inflation enables the price system to work better by reducing the noise and distortions in the pricing system. In other words, expectations of prices tomorrow being about the same as they are today because there is no inflation is an important factor in creating the atmosphere that we need for long-term growth.

So, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to point this out today because, as I sat here waiting for my time to come up, I listened to both sides blaming the other for this or that or the other thing. The fact of the matter is that this Congress, both Houses, the administration, have done some things correctly during the last couple of decades. But during this decade, if one wants to single out one element in our economic structure in Washington, D.C., to give the credit to, we honestly need to look at Fed policy.

Now, I will say one other thing, and that is that this policy of controlling inflation has worked so well that there are some of us who are looking at the possibility of amending the Humphrey-Hawkins act to provide that this be the central feature carried out and the central objective carried out by the Fed. We think it is proof positive that this has worked, and we look forward to hopefully many, many more years of economic growth brought about by this policy.

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

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I come before us this afternoon as the ranking Democratic member on the Joint Economic Committee, fulfilling a requirement outlined in the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1978 attributed to several of our great colleagues, Mr. Gus Hawkins and Senator Hubert Humphrey, who put the long-term goal of raising U.S. living standards far ahead of any of their short-term political aims. And I rise in strong opposition to the budget resolution before us.

Before I go into details as to how harmful that is, I would like to put this debate in some context, as my senior Republican from the Joint Economic Committee on the House side did just a moment ago.

We have had growth in 1998 close to 4 percent, and the economists are raising their projections for this year every day. Our economy is the envy of the world. The United States is growing two to three times faster than Japan or Germany. The unemployment rate is 4½ percent, the lowest unemployment since 1969. And the unemployment rate has been below 5 percent for almost 2 years.

This is all building up and it is continuing good news. Who would have believed we would have seen us move ahead of Japan in these measurements in our lifetime? Inflation was 1.6 percent in 1998. We would have to go back to the early 1960s to find inflation that low. Furthermore, it has remained low despite falling unemployment, which confounds many of the economists.

The once famous and now forgotten misery index, the combination of unemployment and inflation, the lowest point in 40 years. That is before the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) and I even got to this place. The economy has generated 15 million new jobs net since 1992 and 2.8 million jobs were added in 1998 alone. The average weekly take-home pay after inflation has increased by 2 percent in 1997 and 1998 after almost 20 years of stagnation. The current expansion is not just a statistical phenomena. It has improved the standard of living for many Americans.

Let us not celebrate, because this economic expansion is not yet shared by all Americans and that is not acceptable to the Democratic Party. One in seven counties in this country have twice the unemployment rate of the rest of the Nation. Some research shows that although there are fewer numbers of people receiving welfare, there is no definition as to what has happened to them. Are they working, or have they merely dropped off our statistical radar screen? And what has happened to their children?

There is still more that we need to know in order to ensure that all Americans can enjoy the quality of life they deserve. When things go well, everybody is taking credit. Somebody said, ''success has a thousand parents and failure is an orphan.'' But it is easy to be entangled in the cause and effect. And one thing is clear: Eliminating the budget deficit has enabled interest

rates to fall, which, in turn, is considered one of the major stimulants for our economy.

Our first goal in fiscal 2000 should be to ensure that Social Security and Medicare are financially secure in order to provide health care to those who need it. The Republicans agree to wall off the Social Security Trust Fund, but their budget proposal does not do anything to address the solvency of either Social Security or Medicare. Their proposal calls for a freeze in Medicare's administrative budget over the next 10 years.

We have hearing after hearing about how we have satisfied the Medicare operators so that they can go after fraud and abuse and put these egregious profit-hungry private HMOs and hospital chains that are stealing from the Government out of business. We have the lowest administrative overhead in Medicare of any program in the country, about 2 percent, compared to 10 to 30 percent for private insurers and managed care plans. The latter figure includes overhead and profit. But we cannot continue this good work if we are unwilling in a budget to support the administrators who make it work so well.

Former Speaker Gingrich once said that Medicare's administrative agencies should ''wither on the vine,'' as should the program. Although no longer here, Mr. Gingrich's wishes seem to be with us, as the Republicans attempt to destroy Medicare and its ability to serve the need of America's seniors and disabled.

Let us talk about budget surplus. There is a lot of talk about it, but I did not see one. Once we take Social Security off of the table, as the Republicans suggest, we are left with about $125 billion over the next 5 years. And without touching the Social Security Trust Fund, I do not think we find a surplus until 2002.

So if we are going to make policy based on the surplus, why do we not wait until we know there is one around and then debate it?

During 1999, defense expenditures were 13 percent greater than all nondefense discretionary spending. I wonder if this really reflects our country's priorities. Republicans go further and add billions to defense, and it calls for a cut in discretionary spending.

Now, I do not happen to think the Pentagon is optional. It certainly is not. But if the Pentagon is not optional, neither is Head Start, public health programs, education, job training, housing, veterans' hospitals, law enforcement, environmental programs, the national parks, community and economic development, rural programs, highways, energy, among a few which are being eliminated or cut severely, if the Republicans do not intend to shove us into the greatest deficit we have had since Ronald Reagan forced us into a deficit by reckless tax cuts and even more reckless military spending on things like Star Wars and other things, which produced nothing but welfare for otherwise unemployable scientists and would-be soldiers of fortune.

I predicted that we would strike a deal to kick people off welfare, and we have. But what we have done is harm the children and the helpless in this country in the Republican effort to grab more tax cuts for 1 or 2 percent of the very rich, and that is not again what the Democratic Party is about.

My Republican colleagues did not vote for the 1993 act. Not one of them voted. They are taking credit for it. But it has not stopped them from bragging about it. Eliminating the deficit was the single largest explanation for the current health of this economy, and we must not jeopardize it again.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this budget resolution, send them back to the table to bring one that will help the economy for the long run and help all Americans.

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

CRISIS FACING HCFA & MILLIONS OF AMERICANS

The signatories to this statement believe that many of the difficulties that threaten to cripple the Health care Financing Administration (HCFA) stem from an unwillingness of both Congress and the Clinton administration to provide the agency the resources and administrative flexibility necessary to carry out its mammoth assignment. This is not a partisan issue, because both Democrats and Republicans are culpable for the failure to equip HCFA with the human and financial resources it needs to address what threatens to become a management crisis for the agency and thus for millions of Americans who rely on it. This is also not an endorsement of the present or past administrative activities of the agency. Congress and the administration should insist on an agency that operates efficiently and in the public interest.

Over the past decade Congress has directed the agency to implement, administer, and regulate an increasing number of programs that derive from highly complex legislation. While vast new responsibilities have been added to its heavy workload, some of its most capable administrative talent has departed or retired: other employees have been reassigned as a consequence of reductions in force. At the same time, neither Democratic nor Republican administrations have requested administrative budgets of a size that were in any way commensurate with HCFA's growing challenge.

The latest report of the Medicare trustees points out that HCFA's administrative expenses represented only 1 percent of the outlays of the Hospital Insurance trust fund and less than 2 percent of the Supplementary Medical Insurance trust fund. In part, these low percentages reflect the rapid growth of the denominator—Medicare expenditures. But, even accounting for Medicare's growth, no private health insurer, after subtracting its marketing costs and profit, would ever attempt to manage such large and complex insurance programs with so small an administrative budget. Without prompt attention to these issues, HCFA will fall further behind in its implementation of the many significant reforms mandated by the Balanced Budget Act (BBA) of 1997. In the future the agency also has to cope with a demographic revolution that it is ill equipped to accommodate and with changes in medical technology that will increase fiscal pressures on the programs it administers.

As the Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare grapples with the problem of reshaping the Medicare program for the next millennium, it would do well to consider two important reforms concerning HCFA's administration. First, the commission should recommend that Congress and the Clinton administration endow the agency with an administrative capacity that is similar to that found in the private sector. Second, the commission should consider ways in which the micromanagement of the agency by Congress and the Office of Management and Budget could be reduced. Congress and the public would be better served by measuring the agency's efficiency in terms of its administrative outcomes (such as accuracy and speed of reimbursement of various providers), rather than by tightly controlling its administrative processes. Only if HCFA has more administrative resources and greater management flexibility will it be able to cope with the challenges that lie ahead.

The mismatch between the agency's administrative capacity and its political mandate has grown enormously over the 1990s. As the number of beneficiaries, claims, and participating provider organizations; quality and utilization review; and oversight responsibilities have increased geometrically. HCFA has been downsized. When HCFA was created in 1977, Medicare spending totaled $21.5 billion, the number of beneficiaries served was twenty-six million, and the agency had a staff of about 4,000 full-time-equivalent workers. By 1997 Medicare spending had increased almost tenfold to $207 billion, the number of beneficiaries served had grown to thirty-nine million, but the agency's workforce was actually smaller than it had been two decades earlier. The sheer technical complexity of its new policy directives is mind-boggling and requires a new generation of employees with the requisite skills.

HCFA's ability to provide assistance to beneficiaries, monitor the quality of provider services, and protect against fraud and abuse has been increasingly compromised by the failure to provide the agency with adequate administrative resources. Even with the addition of $154 million to its administrative budget that Congress included in its latest budget bill, the likelihood that HCFA can effectively implement all of its varied assignments is remote. The Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 assigns many new regulatory responsibilities to HCFA, but a far larger task is implementing the BBA of 1997. The BBA has more than 300 provisions affecting HCFA programs, including the Medicare+Choice option, which will require complex institutional changes and ambitious efforts to educate beneficiaries.

Medicare spending accounts for more than 11 percent of the U.S. budget. Workable, effective administration has to be a primary consideration in any restructuring proposal. Whether Medicare reform centers on improving the current system, designing a system that relies on market forces to promote efficiency through competition, or moving toward an even more individualized approach to paying for health insurance, Congress and the administration must reexamine the organization, funding, management, and oversight of the Medicare program. During anything less is short-changing the public and leaving HCFA in a state of disrepair.

Stuart M. Butler, Heritage Foundation; Patricia M. Danzon, University of Pennsylvania; Bill Gradison, Health Insurance Association of America; Robert Helms, American Enterprise Institute; Marilyn Moon, Urban Institute; Joseph P. Newhouse, Harvard University; Mark V. Pauly, University of

Pennsylvania; Martha Phillips, Concord Coalition; Uwe E. Reinhardt, Princeton University; Robert D. Reischauer, Brookings Institution; William L. Roper, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; John Rother, AARP; Leonard D. Schaeffer, WellPoint Health Networks, Inc.; Gail R. Wilensky, Project HOPE.

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

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), a new member of the Joint Economic Committee.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to talk about the economic security of our country, the issue that we are now talking as we debate the Humphrey-Hawkins portion of this.

□ 1430

But as we talk about the economic security of our Nation, we do realize that an economic security for this Nation must put as its foremost goal retirement security, retirement economic security for our seniors. So that is why we have this raging debate down here in the well of the floor of the House of Representatives on how we preserve and protect Social Security.

I would like to draw our attention to the efforts under way to protect and preserve Social Security. We have been talking about these different plans. We have three plans on this side of the aisle, the President's plan and a couple of different Democrat plans, and the Republican plan on Social Security. Let us assume for a second that this podium I am standing at here is the Social Security trust fund. I have the Social Security kitty right here. For the last 30 years, our FICA taxes have been coming in from our paychecks, real money coming in from our paychecks. We then deposit it in the Social Security trust fund. But what they have been doing over the last 30 years has been raiding that money. They have been taking this money out of the Social Security trust fund and spending it out on other government programs and putting in place of it IOUs, putting IOU after IOU coming off of our FICA taxes into the Social Security trust fund.

Now, we have asked the Comptroller of the United States Government to analyze the President's plan, which virtually resembles the Democrat plan being considered here as a substitute. David Walker, who is the Comptroller General of the United States, took a look at the President's plan and said, ''Although the trust funds will appear to have more resources as a result of the President's proposal, in reality nothing about the program has changed. The proposal does not represent Social Security reform.''

What does that mean? What does it mean when he says, ''Although the trust funds will appear to have more resources as a result of the President's proposal, in reality it does nothing''?

What that means is the President's plan and the Democratic substitute we are talking about here today simply does this: They print up more IOUs and stick it in the Social Security trust fund, more IOUs in the Social Security trust fund. It does nothing to extend the solvency of Social Security. If we take a look at this chart here, here is what we are talking about. The Democratic substitute and the President's plan are double-counting the surpluses. Same old smoke and mirrors, same old gimmicky accounting. We are dedicating all of FICA taxes plus interest to Social Security to pay down publicly held debt.

But the Democratic bills say that they are putting $4.3 trillion to Social Security to extend the solvency. This $4.3 trillion is a sham. They are simply saying $4.3 trillion of IOUs to go into the Social Security trust fund, money that a future Congress and a future President one day will have to come up with to pay for Social Security. But it is not real reform. It is not real reform. And it does not do one thing to save Social Security. What we are doing in our budget is saying, let us stop raiding the Social Security trust fund. We have got to act as a Congress to stop the raid on Social Security.

What we do with our plan on Social Security is this: 100 percent of all payroll taxes plus interest is dedicated solely to Social Security and Medicare. We save that money to strengthen the program until we have a solution by the President and the Congress to fix Social Security on its long-term. But here is what we do that the Democrats are not doing. We are being honest with the number and we are saying it is going to require a supermajority vote in Congress to pass any future budget resolution that attempts to raid Social Security. Because the President will not sign legislation into law preventing the further raid on Social Security, we have got to do it ourselves. We have got to change the rules of Congress to do that.

Mr. Chairman, the ranking member on the Committee on the Budget says that a point of order is meaningless in the House of Representatives. In the U.S. Senate, it is not meaningless. Under our rule and under our budget, the way we change the rules, one United States Senator can go to the floor of the Senate and say, ''I raise a point of order against this budget because it raids Social Security.'' That one United States Senator can therefore require a supermajority vote on any budget plan into the future that attempts to raid Social Security. We are trying to make it as difficult as possible for Congress to continue to raid Social Security. And we are not playing fun and games with the numbers. We are not trying to give retirees the false sense of security that we are extending the solvency of Social Security into the year 2055 as the President is doing. We are not going to print up more phony IOUs and stick them in the Social Security trust fund. What we want to do is put real money toward the Social Security solution, put that into Social Security, that is what we want to do, by buying down our debt, by making sure we are in a better cash position to fix Social Security.

Mr. Chairman, it is important as we go through this debate on how to improve the economic security of our country that we improve the economic security for our Nation's retirees. That is why the Republican budget here today is the only budget that puts away $1.8 trillion toward Social Security and Medicare, more than the President does, but makes sure that Congress will not renege on this deal. It really stops the raid on the trust fund, short of passing a bill by the President, because the President does not want to pass a bill stopping the raid of the Social Security trust fund because the President's budget raids the Social Security trust fund by $341 billion over the next 10 years. We are simply saying, stop the raid on the trust fund, stop dipping into Social Security from now on. We are putting the measures in place to prevent Congress from doing so in the future. On top of it, we are going to pay down the debt so we can make sure we are in a better position to save Social Security.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) one of the leading members of the Joint Economic Committee, pending which I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Carolina, ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, in response to the last comments, the difference between now and implementation of the President's proposal and the proposal that we have put in the Democratic budget resolution is simply this: We are going to add an additional $1.8 trillion of bonds to the Social Security trust fund over the next 15 years. That means in 2032, when the administrator of the Social Security trust funds would run out of bonds, instead, under our plan, he will still have enough bonds to cash in at the treasury that will take him to 2050.

I have here a letter from Harry C. Ballantyne, Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration, which says that this will extend the life of the trust fund, the solvency of the trust fund until 2050.

The text of the letter is as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY,
March 12, 1999.

Hon. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC

DEAR MR. GEPHARDT: This letter addresses the potential long-range financial effects on the OASDI program of ''locking away'' the annual increases in the Social Security Trust Funds, as proposed by Republican leaders in the Senate and the House on March 10, 1999. The proposal would require that annual increases in the OASI and DI Trust Funds would be used solely to purchase long-term special issue U.S. government bonds. In addition, the proposal would

require that the revenue used for the purchase of these bonds would in turn be used solely for the purpose of reducing Federal debt held by the public. Of course, the net change in the Federal debt held by the public in any year would also be affected by the size of any on-budget deficit or surplus for that year.

The proposal would not have any significant effect on the long-range solvency of the OASDI program under the intermediate assumptions of the 1998 Trustees Report. Thus, the estimated long-range actuarial deficit of 2.19 percent of taxable payroll and the year of the combined trust funds' exhaustion (2032) would not change. The first year in which estimated outgo will exceed estimated tax income would not be affected and would therefore remain at 2013.

Any plan that reduces the amount of Federal debt held by the public may make later redemption by the Trust Funds of special issue U.S. government bonds easier.

Sincerely,

HARRY C. BALLANTYNE,
Chief Actuary.

SOCIAL SECURITY,
March 15, 1999.

MEMORANDUM

To: Harry C. Ballantyne, Chief Actuary.
From: Stephen C. Goss, Deputy Chief Actuary.
Subject: Long-Range OASDI Financial Effects of Specified Dollar Transfers to the OASDI Program—Information

This memorandum provides the estimated effect on the OASDI program of transferring specified additional dollar amounts from the General Fund of the Treasury to the OASDI trust funds according to the following schedule. These transfers would be in addition to all revenue that will be received by the OASDI program under present law.

Specified amounts to be transferred to the OASDI trust funds

[Billions of current dollars]

Year:	*Amount*
2000	$108.5
2001	116.7
2002	123.5
2003	130.1
2004	137.7
2005	156.2
2006	182.8
2007	197.7
2008	207.4
2009	219.6
2010	224.3
2011	226.8
2012	226.9
2013	213.2
2014	203.7

The specified dollar transfer amounts were developed by the Democratic Policy Committee based on estimated budget surplus estimates from the Congressional Budget Office. These amounts represent transfers for fiscal years.

Enactment of a provision to specify the above transfers in dollar amounts would improve the 75-year OASDI actuarial balance by an estimated 1.01 percent of effective taxable payroll, from a deficit of 2.19 percent of payroll under present law to a deficit of 1.18 percent of payroll. The estimated date of exhaustion of the combined OASDI trust funds would become 2050. This is 18 years later than the date of combined trust fund exhaustion projected under present law, which is 2032. These estimated financial effects on the OASDI program are based on the intermediate assumptions of the 1998 Trustees Report.

STEPHEN C. GOSS.

It is the difference between being a secured creditor with your credit collateralized by government bonds, backed by the full faith of the government and being a political supplicant in 2032 when you run out of bonds to draw down and go to the Treasury window to ask for the money to meet benefits. That is a big difference.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I would first like to turn my attention to the presentation which was made just a few moments ago by the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey, in which he showed the decline in inflation and job loss since 1992 and 1993. That was an interesting presentation, but what it lacked was the other side of the picture. It focused only on monetary policy. As we know, fiscal policy is intertwined with monetary policy and in this particular case led the monetary policy.

When the President gave his presentation here, the budget resolution in 1993, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve sat up in that chair right in the middle there and gave his imprimatur to what the President was trying to do that year. That budget resolution was in fact responsible for driving down inflation and driving down employment and giving us the extraordinarily successful economy that we currently enjoy. The budget resolution currently before us, however, threatens to end all of that. It threatens to end it by returning to the fiscal irresponsibility which preceded public policy, fiscal policy particularly in our country prior to the passage of that budget resolution in 1993. It does so by pretending to do certain things it does not do, by pretending to protect Social Security, by pretending to protect Medicare and in fact Medicare is going to be in serious jeopardy if this budget resolution passes. It does so, also, by advancing a series of very irresponsible tax cuts which grow out exponentially in future years. Those tax cuts will threaten other essential parts of our budget process which are very important to the American people, things like Head Start, like public health programs, job training, housing, law enforcement, environmental programs, national parks will be put in jeopardy, community and economic development programs will have to be sharply reduced, rural programs, energy, agriculture, biomedical research and others will suffer if this budget resolution passes.

That is why we should defeat this resolution and pass the Democratic alternative.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to address the issue that we have been talking about here on saving Social Security that the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget was talking about. What their proposal does, and let us be very clear about what this does. It just puts more IOUs in the trust fund. It simply says that from now until the year 2055, we have got IOUs in there, that one day a future Congress and a future President when they get around to it will honor these IOUs to save Social Security. The letter from the Social Security Administration essentially admits just that.

So the plan that the President has offered and that the Democrat substitutes offer does not give us real reform of Social Security. It simply says more IOUs in the Social Security trust fund. What we need is real money, from our FICA taxes, going to pay down debt so we are in a better position of fixing Social Security and improving its solvency.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I indicated in my opening statement here that there were some factors that were important in terms of how our economy has performed. One of the factors is certainly the way we have been able to control spending. The spending controller who is standing to my left, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, is as responsible for that as anyone.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH).

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I just would like to make a comment. The gentleman from New Jersey has been very accurate in his ability to be able to explain why this economy does so well. With the export mentality of the United States, allowing our economy to be globalized, to be in a mentality that every market has a potential for us, to be able to develop and to bring about the production of more goods in this country has certainly been one of the key components to our economic growth.

In addition to that, of course, has been the development of technology that has allowed our workers to be far more productive. I think the gentleman would agree that within the period of the last couple of weeks, the most welcome news has been not just the news about the economic growth but clearly the fact that it is reflected by very low inflation that comes from rising productivity.

One of the things we have tried to achieve in this country is the ability to have noninflationary growth. So now we have the best of all worlds, which is a strong economy, strong economic growth with low inflation that is accompanied by probably the single best ingredient of predictor to the future in terms of this economy, and that is high productivity. One of the things we also know, however, is that we certainly do not want to do anything to retard the ability of this economy to grow by letting government become too big and, in fact, this budget which allows us to preserve the Social Security and Medicare surpluses to be used to transform Social Security and Medicare for many of the baby boomers who are in this Chamber today.

We know that if we can be, in fact, progressive in the use of Social Security and Medicare, it will not only guarantee a strong program for the baby boomers and their children while preserving the program for our current seniors but at the same time by developing the proper Social Security program, it will not only serve to strengthen the Social Security program but we believe at the end of the day will increase the national savings rate. That will again lead to the continuation of low interest rates which can lead to even better technological development.

One of the major reasons why this party wants to get the on-budget surplus out of town and into the pocket of everyday Americans is not just because we want to run the country from the bottom up, so that our doorkeeper can have more control over his future, so that the future can be his so that he has more control in terms of determining his own destiny, but there is another issue about this and, that is, the last thing this party wants to do is to take the proceeds of a strengthened economy and a budget surplus to create a bigger government.

□ 1445

We came here not just to balance a budget, but to take power, money and influence from this town, sharpen the actions of the Federal Government, but get the power from here into the hands of Americans. If we were to then take the surplus and use it to grow government, it would be a boomerang effect that we would live to regret. We believe that a government that is smaller, the people that are empowered, is a key to a successful economy.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), a member of the Joint Economic Committee.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time for me and for his leadership.

For the first time in decades we are working in the black. I believe the President put it best in his State of the Union speech when he said:

Our fiscal discipline gives us an unprecedented opportunity to address a remarkable and needy new challenge, the aging of America.

In other words, protecting Social Security and Medicare, providing income and health care to the elderly who need it must be a high priority.

The majority's budget resolution, however, completely ignores Medicare, and it provides only false promises of protecting Social Security. The majority's budget fails to protect the elderly. It puts into jeopardy the surpluses and the economic benefits we have worked so hard to gain by balancing the budget.

I was elected in 1992 and came to Congress when we faced a $290 billion deficit. I never believed that the major debate before Congress today would be over what to do with the surplus. When I ran for Congress in 1992, Federal aid to New York City under Reagan and Bush for 12 years, it had been cut by 62 percent. Under President Clinton, aid to New York City has continually risen. In 1992, the unemployment rate was 7.5 percent. Today it is 4.4. In 1992, inflation rate was at 2.9 percent. Today it is at a phenomenal 1.6 percent. The so-called misery index, the combination of unemployment and inflation, was 10 percent in 1992 when President Clinton and I were elected. Today it is at a 30-year low of 6.1 percent. Since 1992, this economy has generated 18 million new jobs, and workers' average weekly take-home pay after inflation has increased by more than 2 percent in 1997 and 1998. And, added to that, we balanced the budget.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to put the rest of my comments into the RECORD and say we should not reverse course and go back to the 1980's that grew the deficits. Let us follow the program we are on. Vote against the Republican resolution and for the Democratic one.

The current economic expansion is not just a statistical phenomenon, it has improved living standards for most Americans.

These are all economic events which occurred since I arrived here.

And I believe that the 1993 budget which introduced fiscal discipline—a budget which cut the deficit by $52 billion that first fiscal year—put us on the path of what is now a $70 billion surplus—and it is growing.

And I just want to remind us all that the first budget which put us on this path was passed without a single Republican vote.

We balanced the budget, but the Majority's Budget Resolution before us today reverses course.

We all like tax cuts, but this budget resolutions cuts taxes. This is the same formula used in the 1980s. The result was astronomical deficits from which we have just begun to recover.

Are we willing to return to the days of deficits as far as the eye can see in order to finance the tax cuts?

The costs and consequences of the Republican tax cuts increase as the years go by.

It postpones the question of how to finance them into some point in the future.

But we must take responsibility for our actions today and not postpone the hard decisions to another time, far in the future when it may be too late.

Instead we must continue to pay down the debt and reap the benefits of having a budget in surplus.

This is the path which will pay off for us in the future.

A report by the Congressional Research Service, examines the surplus options.

It concludes that maintaining the surpluses and reducing the debt ''are likely to contribute more than tax reduction to capital formation as well as to the government's fiscal position. Debt reduction [begins] when surpluses occur and would end when they end.''

(And we must rely on real surpluses—not offsets—like the one some of my colleagues are trying to create by the supposed selling of Governor's Island—for an inflated price to people who would misuse it.)

Mr. Chairman, let us take the wise path and continue the surpluses, reduce the debt, protect Social Security and save Medicare.

Let us take that path and not the path towards a new era of deficits that will be the result of this Budget Resolution.

We learned that their method was wrong and the sound economic policy of the past six years is what will keep the economy on track.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I just want to rise in support of this budget resolution because I think it makes a lot of sense for a couple of different reasons.

One of the reasons I think would simply be that it recognizes debt is debt, and it was interesting my colleague from South Carolina got into a discussion with my colleague from Wisconsin on, well, as my colleagues know, does the President's proposal save Social Security by moving actuarial insolvency out to 2055 versus not, and I think to a degree those are academic conversations because I think what we have to stay focused on is the promise of Social Security. And the fact is we have got 70 million baby boomers who begin to march off toward retirement around 2012, and whether we have marketable security, nonmarketable security on the budget debt versus off the budget debt is irrelevant in that it is a drain on the resources of the Federal Government and has to be addressed at that time.

So, one, this recognizes that debt is debt.

Two, I think it has honest accounting in place. If we were to walk down the street; I mean it really does wall off Social Security in a way that has to be done. Do we want to set aside a hundred percent of Social Security for Social Security, which is incidentally what the President said two State of the Unions ago, or do we want to wall off 62 percent of Social Security for Social Security? Most of the folks I talk to back home say let us save a hundred percent of Social Security for Social Security because if I am taxed on something, I want that tax to go toward that thing that I am being taxed on, and in this case it is Social Security.

I say honest accounting because if we were to go down the street and see a family that had to borrow, as my colleagues know, to put gas in the car or food on the table, we would say that family was not running a surplus. In the business world if we borrowed against our pension fund assets to pay for the current operations of the company, we would go to jail based on federal law, and yet that is what we have been doing in Washington.

Mr. Chairman, that is why I think it is so important to set aside a hundred percent of the Social Security for Social Security.

I think that this budget is also important in the way that it recognizes spending caps. I mean can one have a

Power Ranger toy and a Obe Wan Kinobe toy at the same time? My 6-year-old would say yes. We go in the toy store, and he wants both. And in Washington we seem to always want both, and I think what is so important about the spending caps that this budget keeps in place is that it recognizes that we cannot have the Obe Wan Kinobe toy and the Power Ranger toy at the same time. At times we do have to make hard and difficult choices, but nonetheless choices.

Finally, I think what this budget recognizes that is so important is that right now we are at a post World War II high in terms of the amount of money that has been coming into Washington, D.C. This budget does something about that.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE), but pending that I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, to my friend from South Carolina: What the President has proposed and what we are proposing even more emphatically is that the Social Security surpluses, in our case a hundred percent of those surpluses, first be taken and used solely to buy down public debt. In return for the receipt of those excess payroll taxes the Treasury will issue, as is customary, a bond backed by the full faith and credit of the United States Government to the Social Security trustees. Then, dollar for dollar of debt reduction, the Treasury will issue another bond partly to Social Security, partly to Medicare. Over a period of 15 years, Mr. Chairman, it will double the amount of the trust fund.

So, the key factor is that, as we build up the assets of the Social Security Retirement Trust Fund and the Medicare Trust Fund in this manner, we are also paying down the debt of the United States so that when those trust funds come due in 2032, the Social Security Administration will be able to go to the Treasury window, the Treasury will be in better shape than ever financially to pay those funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE) for 2 minutes.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for having yielded this time to me.

This day is probably a day of budget overload. There is more debate on what is the budget, what should the budget be, what are the implications of different budgets, whose is best, whose is worse, whether they are accurately characterized or caricatured, and it is with some reluctance that I raise the spectre of yet another budget.

I have been working with a group of moderate to conservative Democrats called the Blue Dog Coalition, and we, too, have developed a budget proposal. We feel that our humble budget proposal is one that is not as partisan, as spirited, as some of the others that are being discussed today, and we are not here to say that our colleagues have irresponsible budget proposals. Like the Republican budget proposal and the Democratic budget proposal, we are committed to saving a hundred percent of the Social Security surplus for savings for the Social Security Trust Fund to reduce the debt. I think that is a common theme in the discussions today. We ought to rejoice in that.

The next issue that has become quite contentious, where there certainly is far from any agreement, is what do we do with the operating surplus in the budget?

We have fortunately achieved the time, maybe we can say it is the millennium, when the Federal budget is anticipated to show a surplus even without the Social Security Trust Fund. It is a remarkable achievement. Our group is suggesting that rather than devoting this surplus to tax reduction, devoting the surplus to new program initiatives or to other ways of spending or investing it, that we split the surplus into three parts, that we devote 50 percent of it to reducing the national debt, and I submit in the first 5 years this is very similar to the Democratic proposal.

In this respect the Blue Dog proposal and the Democratic proposal are very similar, and the Republican proposal would suggest that this 50 percent ought to be used for tax reduction.

Going on, the next 25 percent, we urge that we set that money aside and invest it in priority programs: health care, education, veterans, defense, agriculture, the priority programs that Congress would agree on; and third, to take the last 25 percent and devote that to tax reduction, be the continuation of tax credits that are expiring, targeted tax credits, whatever type of initiatives we agree upon here.

I would like to emphasize that this is our proposal, and later on this afternoon we will deal with it in greater detail. But this represents a moderate way of trying to bring some consensus here in Congress as to what we should do on behalf of the American people.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, in his opening remarks the chairman of the Committee on the Budget got up and said that this was about risk taking, this was about a budget that would allow people to take risks to keep more of their money and to take risk. Unfortunately, the people that are at risk in this budget are the people who seek a better education for their children, veterans who seek better health care, communities that seek to lower class sizes, the elderly that want to make sure that Medicare is secure. Those are the people who are taking the risk in the Republican budget. They want to pretend as though, if they give back a tax cut, that everything will happen and everything will turn out all right, and that is the risk, is giving back the tax cut.

No, the risk for America is in paying for that tax cut because, as we see in this budget, student loans for higher education, Pell grants for higher education all need to be cut to make room for that. The hundred thousand teachers to try to lower class sizes needs to be cut to make room for that. In fact, what we see is an across-the-board cut in education at a time when the people in this country are telling us that they recognize the kind of reinvestment that this Nation, our States, our local communities need to make in education so that our young people can compete in a worldwide economy. Those are the people at risk.

Once again what the Republicans have done is shifted the risk of their budget priorities to those who can least afford it, those who have the least ability to make up for their mistakes, those who are trying to the best of their ability to move forward in American society, in American economy.

That is where the risk is in their budget, those are the programs that are targeted, those are the programs that are cut, those are the programs that are reduced, all to make way for a tax cut that they hope for people who have simply none of the worries, none of these everyday worries, that American families have on a daily basis about themselves, their jobs and their children's education.

□ 1500

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

Mr. Chairman, I am going to conclude the contribution to the discussion of the Joint Economic Committee today by saying this: I laid out very carefully, I think, a case in which I believe very deeply, and that is that Fed has been responsible and successfully so in giving us an economy in which there is an inflation rate of darn near zero.

I think that that is primarily responsible for the growth that we have seen, along with other items that I also pointed out.

However, one of the speakers from the other side, following my presentation, suggested that the tax increase that occurred in 1993 was somehow responsible for lowering inflation and lowering interest rates. In fact, the facts do not bear that out in any way, shape or form.

I would just like to say to my friends on the other side of the aisle that when the tax increase occurred, which is now, of course, referred to as the budget arrangement that created this expansion, which I think is false, but when that tax increase occurred in 1993, it went into effect, the vertical line here indicates the time period during which that tax increase went into

effect, interest rates actually spiked upward, not downward, as one of the previous speakers indicated.

The spike upward is indicated here on the chart by the red line. As well as the Federal funds rate also went up, as indicated by the yellow line, and the discount rate went up, as indicated by the black line. So when individuals try to make the case that somehow the tax increase that took place in 1993 had the effect of lowering interest rates, quite the opposite is true. For the following 12 or 13 months after the tax increase went into effect, interest rates went up, not down.

So I think it is somewhat, I must say, misleading, to be kind, to make the claim that somehow the President's tax increase had a positive effect on economic growth.

I do not want to shift the entire credit to the Federal Reserve. I think they did a good job. I think they have squeezed and squeezed and squeezed on targeting inflation and have successfully gotten it out of our system.

It is true that restraint in government spending has played a part. As a matter of fact, in 1992, our government consumed 22 percent of GDP. Today our government consumes 19½ percent of GDP. I think that is good and good for growth.

I believe that lower marginal tax rates that remain in place today, in spite of the increases in 1990 and 1993, are good and provide a positive effect on growth. The marginal rates are lower today than they were in the fifties or the sixties or the seventies.

Investment has also worked to expand capacity. Business has been encouraged to invest and, of course, global competition and freer trade have also played a role in fostering growth.

This is the economic report of the President, and incidentally, I think it is very appropriate that the cover is red, which claimed that the tax increase in 1993 produced lower interest rates. This book does not even mention, does not even mention, the role of the Fed, when the facts claim quite conversely that the tax increase also created an increase in interest rates across the board.

I am very pleased to have been able to manage this time on behalf of the Joint Economic Committee. I hope it has been a contribution to the understanding that we all have as to what happened to the economy.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) to control.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 2½ minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time and its control to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I inquire as to the balance of the time remaining on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL).

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

Mr. Chairman, it is time for Congress to recognize that uncontrolled sprawling development is an economic disaster that wastes human resources and uses human and financial capital in inefficient and wasteful ways.

Our Democratic proposal contains a livability agenda that does not promote Federal planning or zoning but embraces local control, providing Federal vision with tools to municipalities and counties and States to better prepare themselves for the 21st Century.

The Democratic budget puts greater power, more money and enhanced decision-making authority in local hands, to fight sprawl, clean up the environment and protect the legacy of our land.

Some of the tools in this livability agenda include the proposed Better America Bonds, which would allow State and local governments to borrow up to $10 billion to preserve green space, protect water quality and reclaim brown fields.

The regional connections initiative will promote regional smart growth strategies across local jurisdictional lines. The community Federal information partnership will provide communities with grants for easy-to-use information to develop strategies for local growth; and the lands legacy initiative will provide $1 billion to significantly expand Federal efforts to save America's natural treasures and provide new resources for State and communities to protect local green spaces.

Mr. Chairman, it is wasteful and inefficient and harmful to our economy to permit sprawling, unmanaged growth, to sit in traffic jams, to pave over good farmland instead of reclaiming and reusing brown fields.

We must save the American landscape. We must provide future generations with livable communities. We owe it to America to support the democratic proposal.

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

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Republican budget resolution and in strong support of the Democratic alternative.

Mr. Chairman, under the very able leadership of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking member of the committee, the Democrats want to keep prosperity on track and protect the American family.

The proposal of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) would build upon past Democratic efforts and ensure continued fiscal responsibility while protecting many valuable Federal programs.

The Democratic plan would save 100 percent of the Social Security surplus and 62 percent of the total estimated unified budget surplus for Social Security, ensuring the Social Security trust fund remains solvent for many years to come.

Our plan also transfers 15 percent of these surpluses to shoring up Medicare, extending its solvency for at least a decade to grant us the time we need to fix and to develop and implement a bipartisan fix for this valuable social program.

Mr. Chairman, education, one of the most crucial underpinnings of our great country, is barely given lip service under the Republican proposal.

Many of my colleagues may ask why the Federal Government needs to become involved in school innovation and construction issues which are historically local concerns? The simple answer is that the problem has grown so large that localities and States alone do not have the resources or the programs to address the overwhelming needs.

For instance, a recent survey by the Division of School Facilities in New York City concluded that in my district alone 19 new schools were needed to alleviate overcrowding. Additionally, to bring schools in the 7th Congressional District of New York up to standards deemed fair by school facility engineers, New York City would have to fund $218.65 million in exterior modernization projects and $53.8 million in interior modernization projects.

Mr. Chairman, if we support the working men and women of this country and if we support our Nation's children, we must oppose this budget resolution and support the Democratic alternative.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking member on the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. Chairman, let me thank the chairman of the Committee on the Budget for giving us this opportunity to face Americans and define for them what kind of country we would like to be.

I had the pleasure of organizing the Congressional Children's Caucus, a group of about 60 Members who have committed to promoting children first in the national agenda. We look forward to hearing from Mrs. Tipper Gore, the wife of the vice president, on the

issues of mental health services for children.

Keeping that in mind, I am very concerned with the budget as proposed by the majority leadership, because our children must face the challenges of competing in a global environment and the new millennium. We have got to invest in children. This budget does not.

Children cannot learn if they are hungry, tired and improperly prepared. The majority's budget proposal reduces domestic spending in programs aimed at protecting the interests of children.

Allow me to call the roll. A program of which many Members of this House have testified that they graduated from, Head Start, is being cut $501 million, a 10 percent cut; the WIC program that provides for women, infants and children, being cut $425 million; Job Corps, which has allowed many inner city and rural community youth to find an opportunity out of the seat of degradation, cut $141 million; child care, there is not a time that I go home to my district when women and men, parents who say give me the ability to work, provide child care and help me provide child care for my children, sometimes one-third of their income, $119 million; the summer youth program, where a mother gave me the good news of her young person who had graduated through the summer youth program, now gainfully employed, cut some $109 million; community services block, cut $54 million; runaway and homeless youth, which I confront all the time in our community, cut $4.7 million; Native American Head Start, cut $3.8 million; child abuse, $2.2 million; abandoned infants assistance, $1.3 million.

Mr. Chairman, I can only say oppose this majority leadership budget. Realize that our children are our best investment. Let us support the Democratic alternative and invest in our children.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to FY 2000 Budget Resolution offered by the Majority's Leadership. I come in the spirit of Hershey and bipartisanism. I come to request a budget that protects the Social Security Trust Fund for America's citizens. I rise to request a budget that will protect the Medicare Trust Fund.

We must authorize a budget that will protect the Social Security Trust Fund. While women tend to collect benefits over a longer period than men because of a greater life expectancy; women on average receive lower monthly social security benefits since they have lower earnings and are more likely to be widowed or unmarried in retirement. The Majority's budget proposal does not protect women or children or the Social Security Trust Fund. Under this budget proposal—programs directed toward improving the quality of life for women and children, are the first programs to be reduced and cut—in order to give a tax break to the wealthy.

The majority is suggesting that their budget proposal will save 100% of the social security surplus but 0% of that money goes to the Social Security Trust Fund and 0% goes towards strengthening Medicare. This simply is not true! Domestic programs are not a priority in this budget resolution offered by the Majority.

We must authorize a budget that will appropriate financial resources to reduce the average classroom size to promote a learning environment and to modernize public schools. Educating America's children should be our number one priority. Our children must be prepared to face the challenges of competing in a global environment and the new millenium. Children can not learn if they are hungry, tired and improperly prepared. The Majority's budget proposal reduces domestic spending and programs aimed at protecting the interest of our children. $425.1 million would be slashed from the WIC budget, Head Start would be cut by approximately $501.4 million and LIHEAP funding would be reduced by $109 million. Nevertheless, the Majority's budget resolution reserves $800 billion for tax cuts.

We must authorize a budget that will protect and extend the Medicare Trust Fund. This budget must ensure that patients will have access to high quality healthcare by guaranteeing important protections such as access to the specialists, coverage for emergency medical services and affording prescriptions for seniors. The Majority's budget proposal leaves the Medicare Trust Fund in a precarious position and its future in question. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that there will be a federal surplus of about $2.6 trillion over the next 10 years. We must authorize a budget that will ensure the economic viability of Social Security, Medicare and our national defense.

We must authorize a budget that will protect America's families. Families first—America first—Children first—we must authorize financial resources to assist in expanding after-school programs. Furthermore, we must enact legislation that will increase the minimum wage and improve the quality of life for all Americans. The Majority's budget proposal does not safeguard the interest of our Children. The Summer Youth Employment program's funding will be cut by over $94.9 million, the Community Services Block Grant Program slashed by over $54.5 million—we must prioritize families, women and children in the FY 2000 budget.

We must authorize a budget that will provide law enforcement officers and agencies with modern technology directed at reducing crime. We must allocate financial resources to help communities put additional law enforcement officers on the street. We must authorize a budget that will protect our most valued and venerable citizens, children and seniors.

We must authorize a budget that will redirect additional income to America's families. Congress must empower families to save for their retirement and provide for quality care for older family members. We must enact legislation that will protect women, children and America's families. Congress must put families first!

We must authorize a budget that will safeguard the financial viability of American's veterans. The Spratt Amendment will add an additional $9 Billion for veterans. We must pass a budget that will appropriate an additional $3 Billion for agriculture over the next five years. We must pass a budget that will allocate $10 Billion for education and $18 Billion more for healthcare.

We must support a budget that protects America's families, seniors and children. I urge you to vote "no" on the bill and "yes" on the Democratic substitute.

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

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

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, the Spratt Democratic budget extends the life of Social Security and Medicare. The Republican budget does not. Do not be fooled. This same Democratic Party that created Social Security and Medicare is the same party to trust when it comes to strengthening Social Security and Medicare.

Under the Democratic plan, the Social Security trust fund would have 50 percent more dollars in it than under the Republican plan. There is a $1.3 trillion set-aside in the Democratic plan, more for Social Security than in the Republican plan; $1.3 trillion.

For Medicare, the Republican plan does not do anything at all. The Republican plan does not add one penny of money to extend the life of Medicare or to strengthen it. The Democratic plan for Medicare will triple the amount of money put into Medicare, a move that will extend the life of Medicare until 2020. For all those who care about Social Security and Medicare and who want Social Security and Medicare to be there for our generation and our children's generation, there is only one responsible choice: The Democratic budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise against the Republican budget and in support of the Democratic alternative. The Republican Party, unfortunately, has always been hostile to Medicare. My senior citizens need Medicare, and that is why the Democratic plan strengthens Medicare.

When I talk to senior citizens in my district, they tell me that Medicare is just as important to them as Social Security. When I speak with my mother, who is my best advisor, she tells me that Medicare needs to be enhanced.

The President has proposed a prescription drug component. I believe that that is what we should have. The Republican resolution, it does not provide a long-term care benefit, nor prescription drug benefit under Medicare.

□ 1515

We need to make sure that our seniors do not choose between food and drugs. The Republican budget has no problem in proposing a $775 billion tax break for the rich, for the wealthiest of Americans.

We cannot continue to play politics with our seniors' health. The Democratic plan strengthens social security and strengthens Medicare. The Republican plan leaves out Medicare. Medicare ought to be on the table. The prescription drug component ought to be

part and parcel of the mix. Long-term care is very, very important. Senior citizens in this country need help. The Democratic plan provides that help, the Republican plan does not.

Let us work on a budget resolution that enhances Medicare, not hurts it. We cannot ignore the problem.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the Republican budget. The majority attack on education, seniors, and this Nation's most vulnerable is becoming an annual rite of passage for the Republican Party. Just recently the stock market broke 10,000, the highest it has ever been. Despite this wealth, however, we are here inflicting pain.

What kind of message are we sending to our children when we cut funding for education by $1.2 billion, essentially crippling Head Start and undercutting Pell Grants? What are we saying to public housing residents when this budget would put 1 million of them out on the street? Where are the compassionate conservatives now?

What is worse about this budget is that it does nothing to ensure the solvency of social security and Medicare, all in the name of cutting taxes for the wealthiest families in this country.

This budget asks too high a price of poor Americans, and breaks the promise of a better tomorrow for our children, elderly, and working poor. I urge my colleagues to oppose this budget and support the Democratic alternative.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman who just spoke mentioned how in our budget plan there are tax cuts for the rich. I have read it. It does not say that in here one place.

I had a speaker come up here today and said how we cut funds for the Ryan White AIDS research. I will jump off the Capitol dome if Members can find the words ''Ryan White'' in here. Look for it, it is not in here. How do they say that? How do they get away with that? Do they feel no shame, getting to the floor of the House and saying Ryan White AIDS research is cut in here? Find it for me. I will wager with them. I will be glad to do that. They cannot find it.

The other interesting thing about this is that they come to the floor and they say how they want to put money into veterans, they want to save social security, they do not want Medicare cuts.

Why did Members not make those arguments to the President? The President's plan does all of those things. Instead of making those arguments down at the Rose Garden, down with the President, at the last minute they rush in here with two, not one but two, alternatives to the President's plan.

Why are Members running away from the President? Why are they running away from the person who stood here before the Nation at the State of the Union and said how he is going to keep education as a priority, how he is going to keep making sure that Medicare and social security are a priority? Why are Members running from that plan?

I have a feeling here in the next portion of this debate we are going to get a little bit of insight into why the Democrats, instead of supporting the President, instead of even adopting a portion of his plan, have written their own in a hurry to rush in here and try and save themselves from the polls that are going south on them.

I think we are going to find out here in just a little bit, as the gentleman from Oklahoma, the gentleman from Minnesota, the gentleman from Arizona, are going to point out to us, why the President's plan has so many people running from it, and particularly people from his own party; people who we would think would at least find a few things in the budget that they could agree with.

But instead, they are saying, no, we do not want to do what the President does for social security, we are running from that; we don't want to have Medicare cuts like the President, we are running from that; we don't want to increase taxes like the President does, we are running from that; we don't want to keep the priority low on education, we are running from that; we don't want veterans' hospitals to close, we are running from that.

They are running and running and running. Mr. Chairman, they can run but they cannot hide. We are about to show them why.

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

Mr. Chairman, 6 years ago the President sent us a budget on February 17 which passed this House by 2 votes. Opponents on the other side of the aisle said it would cut the economy off at the knees and mushroom the deficit. Six years later, the economy is running strong and the deficit has dropped from $290 billion to a $70 billion surplus. That is the finest tribute we can pay to the Humphrey-Hawkins debate.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to both the GOP budget proposal as well as the Democratic alternative. Both budgets call for enormous increases in defense spending over the next six to ten years. I cannot vote for these exorbitant increases in defense spending—anywhere between $112–134 billion—when the fate of Social Security and Medicare remains questionable.

The Democratic Budget Resolution, by using the President's plan for defense spending, endangers already vulnerable programs by needlessly puffing up the military. The Democratic resolution calls for over $9 billion in undistributed cuts by the year 2000. The question is—where do we find it? Shall we do away with the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Energy? Which severely underfunded federal program will we raid first? Come the year 2000, programs that are already suffering—like federal childcare and job training programs—will be sitting ducks.

Proponents of increasing military spending claim that this money is needed to replace aging weapons systems, improve the military's readiness and training, and to attract and retain more people in the armed services through better pay benefits. Since 1996, the Congressional majority has added nearly $30 billion beyond the Pentagon's request to help with military readiness. Three-quarters of this went to pork projects in key members' districts. The proposals before us today would commit more than $1.8 trillion to the military over the next six years. There is no justification for increasing military spending by this amount.

These budgets propose to squander scarce resources in order to appease the defense industry and procure weapons systems not seen since the Reagan era. The U.S. alone spends more than twice that of all of its potential aggressors combined. That means Russia, China, Iraq, North Korea, Syria, Libya and Cuba combined don't even spend half of what the U.S. spends for defense.

The U.S. spends up to $35 billion per year maintaining 6,000 nuclear weapons on hair trigger alert. The Soviet Union is no longer a threat to the U.S. The U.S. is more threatened by the technicians and technology in Russia falling into the hands of rogue states. However, yesterday, in the Supplemental Appropriations bill, my colleagues chose to reduce the funding to purchase and store the enriched plutonium and uranium used to make nuclear weapons in Russia.

The budgets before us include spending for a National Missile Defense (NMD) system on top of the billions already wasted on a futile deployment. Spending just a fraction of what the U.S. has spent, and plans to spend, on NMD could do far more to reduce the danger of missile attacks and weapons proliferation if used on verifiable arms control and disarmament.

We are marching down the wrong path. Instead of making this a more livable and peaceful world for our children, we are proposing cuts in necessary programs for life while increasing spending on weapons of destruction. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing these egregious budget proposals.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the fiscally responsible Republican budget plan that protects Social Security and Medicare while providing needed tax relief.

President Clinton has called on Congress to use part of the so-called budget ''surplus'' to protect Social Security, strengthen Medicare and finance a number of new spending projects. But when we hear President Clinton and other Washington politicians talk about this great ''surplus'' we have to remember where it comes from—the Social Security Trust Fund. The federal government borrows money from this Trust Fund—about $99 billion last year—to finance other government spending and to mask what is, in reality, a budget deficit. In fact, if we had taken the Social Trust Fund surplus out of the federal last year, we would have been $30 billion short of a balanced budget.

For the next couple of years it is expected that most of the so-called surplus will be due to the Social Trust Fund, which all of us pay into in the form of payroll taxes. Then, based on current economic projects, real surpluses

from the non-Social Security portion of the budget will begin to grow as taxpayers pay more than the government needs to finance its operations.

I commend my friend and colleague from Ohio, JOHN KASICH, the members of the Budget Committee and the Republican Leadership for proposing a sensible, long-overdue change to the way the Trust Fund is treated. The Republican budget stops using the Trust Fund to mask the real size of the deficit and, instead, preserves it for Social Security. This new approach to the surplus is more honest and more fiscally responsible. It also results in more surplus being preserved for Social Security than the President has proposed.

Our plan builds a wall around the Social Trust Fund—creating a ''lock box'' that preserves 100% of the ''surplus'' for Social Security's needs. By stopping Congress and the White House from spending the Social Trust Fund, we protect current and future retirees. That's why the American Association of Retired Persons (AARP) has given the Republican plan its endorsement.

President Clinton's budget also calls for using 15% of the so-called ''surplus'' for Medicare. But in short term, he actually proposes to borrow money from the Social Trust Fund to shore up Medicare, while at the same time cutting almost $9 billion from Medicare to pay for new government spending. This scheme is a classic example of robbing Peter to pay Paul. It also means, when the Medicare Trust Fund runs out of money in 2009, taxpayers will foot the bill.

The Republican plan also takes steps to pay down the national debt and uses honest numbers—not shady Washington accounting—to address Medicare's financial challenges. Finally, while President Clinton's budget proposal calls for $100 in new taxes at a time when tax revenues are at an historic high, our plan provides tax relief beginning in 2000 that grows substantially over the next ten years to reduce the tax burden on America's families.

With this new plan, we can finally stop raiding the Social Trust Fund to pay for more government spending. Let's hope Congress rejects the old ways as represented in the President's budget, and passes an honest plan to protect Social Security, preserve Medicare and let Americans keep more of what they earn.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, one of my priorities when I came to Congress two years ago was to bring good East Texas fiscal responsibility to Washington. We made great strides in balancing the budget over the past two years, and we must not stray from this path. That is why I rise tonight, in the name of fiscal responsibility and on behalf of hard-working East Texas families, in strong support of both the Democratic and Blue Dog budget resolutions.

I support tax relief. In fact, I was one of only 19 Democrats to vote for last year's tax relief bill. Both of these budget alternatives provide for tax relief for working Americans. I would prefer to see even more tax relief, but it is important to remember that our nation still has a $5 trillion debt. The best thing we can do with projected surpluses would be to pay down the federal debt, which would reduce interest rates for families and small businesses, prepare for the retirement of the baby boom generation, and slash the interest payments of the federal government.

We can't fund a larger tax cut until projected surpluses have actually materialized and until we fulfill our commitment to preserve Social Security and Medicare. Instead, we must pay down the debt, honor our promise to our nation's seniors, and provide for targeted tax cuts, and both the Blue Dog and Democratic alternative budget resolutions do just that.

Furthermore, both these budget alternatives spend money wisely on priority areas. We can fulfill our commitment to reduce class size and hire 1000,000 new teachers. We can spend more on education to repair our crumbling schools and expand after-school learning programs in rural areas. We can provide for the health care needs of the men and women who have fought on the battlefield and risked their lives for all Americans. We can help East Texas agricultural producers and fund crop insurance reform that will provide some meaningful protections for farmers against those things that are out of their control. Finally, we can spend more for our nation's defense, improving our nation's military readiness and increasing military pay.

These are good budget alternatives that preserve Social Security and Medicare, pay down the federal debt, and spend money where it needs to be spent. These budget alternatives have been drafted with the fiscal responsibility I've spent the last two years fighting for. I urge my colleagues to support them and pass a budget that is good for American families.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my grave concern regarding the proposed veterans' budget for Fiscal Year 2000. Currently veterans are facing a medical emergency. Unless the veteran health care system receives significant increases in funding, critical services will be cut, health care will be denied, facilities closed, and dedicated employees will be out of work.

The Republican budget provides a modest $900 million increase in funding. However, this increase is a one-time addition that is not carried over to the next fiscal year. The Republican budget actually proposes to decrease funding for veterans. In fact, over five years, the budget resolution cuts funding for veterans by $300 million. And over ten years, their resolution cuts veterans' funding by $3 billion below the 1999 level.

During consideration of this budget, while in committee and on the House floor, the majority refused an attempt to increase veterans' funding. This important issue, which affects millions, deserves the change to be considered. Representative CLEMENT'S proposed amendment to the budget would increase veterans' benefits by $1.9 billion over last year's request, and by $1 billion above the Republican proposal. Specifically, this increase would provide: $100 million more for mental health care to reverse the trend of eliminating psychiatric, substance abuse and other effective mental health programs; $271 million more for long-term care initiatives to increase options for elderly and disabled veterans; and $681 million more for the Montgomery GI Bill to increase coverage for tuition, fees and stipends to service members who are enlisted for at least three years. Over 10 years, the budget proposal offered by Democrats would provide over $40 billion more for veterans' programs. I support this amendment and am very upset that we were prevented from providing an increase to such an underfunded and important program.

It is our duty to provide the care and service promised to our heroes, and the proposed Republican budget fails to give veterans the benefits they need and deserve. For the fourth consecutive year, the Veterans Administration budget has been essentially stagnant. This pattern has to end. To refuse consideration of an increase in funding for veterans who have given so much to their country is an outrage.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this budget resolution.

This budget, contrary to the President's proposal, is a responsible approach to funding the Federal government without turning our backs on our 1997 Balanced Budget Agreement, an agreement that means so much to the American public and to our nation's economic future.

And perhaps more than ever, this budget is about providing security for America's future. We can continue to set the course for a sound Federal fiscal policy and a strong economy, or we can set up our children for a future of paying our debts—the President's budget saddles our children with more national debt, more taxes, fewer educational opportunities, a bigger government and shaky retirement prospects.

As we vote to pass this budget, I say to my colleagues who have joined the President in criticism of our efforts, for a moment, take a step back from the podium, and imagine you are not immersed here in the politics of our nation's capital.

For a moment, think of yourself not standing before your colleagues in debate, but rather, being with your constituents at a town meeting.

Would you still argue to enact the President's budget, the largest in our nation's history, a budget which grows the size of our government and breathes more life into a bureaucracy we've been struggling to contain? Or do you think your constituents would rather know that you have voted for a Federal budget that keeps our government in check and may possibly even shrink that once sprawling bureaucracy?

Could you speak passionately to them about the need to pass the President's budget which only devotes 62 percent of our projected budget surpluses to preserving and protecting Social Security and allows him to spend $146 billion of the Social Security surplus over five years.

Or might you inspire more confidence from your constituents if you told them the budget you want locks away $100 billion more than the President to strengthen Social Security and Medicare, a total of $1.8 trillion over a decade, with the guarantee that Washington can't touch the Social Security surplus—your constituents' payroll taxes—ever?

Again, the families you represent may want to know whether you support the President's budget, or our Congressional budget plan that will pay down the national debt by $450 billion more than the President over the next ten years.

The hard-working Americans you represent might be interested to know whether you voted for tax increases or tax cuts. The President's budget raises taxes by $172 billion in the next decade, but our budget provides $800 billion in tax relief for the same period.

Would the veterans of your District salute you for passing the President's flat-lined VA budget which raises serious questions about the quality of care our veterans receive in VA medical facilities, or do America's heroes of

the past deserve the $1.1 billion increase we gave them in our budget proposal?

To the young men and women in uniform who now serve our nation—what would you tell them? Could you look a young enlisted man or woman in the eye, one of our brave Americans who has joined NATO forces in Kosovo, and tell them to do their job even though you voted for the President's budget which falls $8 billion short of the budget we propose for our nation's defense?

Improving the education of our young people is not only important to all of us, it is a critical element of our nation's ability to remain competitive in the 21st Century. For America's children, do you vote party or conscience? On your next school visit, do you tell the students you voted for the President's budget which cuts special education funding, or do you teach them that principle is above politics, and you voted for our budget which increases education funding $1.2 billion more than President Clinton proposes. It includes more funding for Pell grants, and more flexibility for states to decide how best to spend this funding. Our budget, $22 billion total for education, will improve the quality of elementary, secondary, and special education. Parents and children with special needs may question your vote for the President's budget because it amounts to a cut in Federal special education funding. Our budget contains a $1 billion increase for Federal funding of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. While this is not the full funding I and 75 of my House colleagues from both sides of the aisle requested, it is a step in the right direction. In my state of New Jersey alone, if the Federal government would keep its promise to pay 40 percent of the costs associated with providing special education, $300 million at the state level would become available each year—real money that could be used to hire more teachers, build more classrooms or reduce local property tax rates.

Our budget proposal provides security for American people and their future—retirement security, fiscal security, education security, national security and economic security. But it won't be easy to achieve these important goals, and is closing. I offer a word of caution.

Keeping within the confines of our balanced budget is our ultimate goal, and the Appropriations Committee works hard to balance the needs of our nation and our government while doing so. As a Member of this Committee, I can tell my colleagues that there will be sacrifices. We must understand this at the outset and prepare ourselves for the tough choices with which we all will be confronted. When the time comes, we will need to ask ourselves, ''is a future of peace, prosperity, achievement and financial security for our children worth the sacrifice and effort today?'' The answer is always ''yes.'' We will need to remember this in the months ahead.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican budget resolution. This budget is a blueprint for another budgetary train wreck.

The Majority's budget is irresponsible. It is simply wrong to move ahead with a $778 billion tax cut before taking action to assure the long-term financial health of Social Security and Medicare. The budget surplus gives us a unique opportunity to address these programs and we must not squander it. We should save the entire surplus until we've taken care of Social Security and Medicare.

No one believes the House can approve the appropriation bills that would be drawn from this budget template. Do we want a repeat of last year's budgetary derailment when Congress was unable to complete action on eight of the thirteen regular appropriation bills? But that's exactly where we're headed with the Majority's budget resolution.

Under the resolution, non-defense discretionary appropriations would be cut by $46.4 billion next year, a full 16 percent below this year's funding level. Which programs does the Majority propose to cut? Energy assistance for the elderly? Maternal and child health care? Head Start? Law enforcement? The GOP budget resolution doesn't give any specifics.

The Republican budget also does nothing to shore up Medicare. All of us know that Medicare is projected to run short of funds in just eight more years. If Medicare's solvency is the price for the GOP's tax cuts, that price is too high.

I will support the Democratic substitute that will be offered by Representative SPRATT. The Spratt substitute is a responsible alternative to the budgetary gridlock that will surely follow adoption of the Majority's budget resolution. The Spratt substitute fulfills our obligations to Social Security and Medicare. It reserves 100 percent of the Social Security surplus for Social Security and extends Medicare's solvency until 2020.

I want to speak to the issue of legal immigrants. The Spratt substitute also restores vital benefits for legal immigrant that were wrongly taken away under the 1996 welfare law. I led the fight last year to restore food stamp eligibility to the children of legal immigrant as well as elderly legal immigrants who entered the country before enactment of the 1996 welfare bill. The Spratt substitute would permit states to cover legal immigrant pregnant women and children with Medicaid, restore SSI eligibility for legal immigrants who entered the country after August 22, 1996 and were subsequently disabled, and would assure food stamps to legal immigrants who were residents as of August 22, 1996 and are over the age of 65. This is a step in the right direction.

I urge my colleagues to reject this irresponsible budget resolution and support the Spratt substitute.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman. I rise to oppose the priorities as expressed in this Budget.

I strongly oppose this Republican budget because its priorities are wrong. A substantial number of us, five and a half million, are ill-housed. 42 million of us are without health care coverage. Our schools need more teaches and better-trained teachers; our school buildings need to be rehabilitated.

If we maintain the caps on discretionary spending, as proposed in this Republican budget, as well as increase the military budget, and give about $780 billion in tax cuts, the result will be to squeeze out essential programs that effect the daily well-being of a significant sector of our society.

The Republican Budget does not adequately protect our elderly. One of our most important programs Social Security, has kept one of every two elderly Americans from falling into poverty. Social Security must be extended and protected. Likewise, Medicare is widely recognized and appreciated as an essential program by all of us because of its benefit to the elderly and the families of the elderly. Medicare must be extended and protected.

The Republican budget allocates, over a ten-year period, just $1.77 trillion to extend Social Security, half of the Democrats' proposal, which calls for $3.4 trillion. The Democrats' much greater investment in Social Security is essential to ensure its security.

The difference in budgetary priorities is even greater with Medicare. The Republican budget, over a ten-year period, sets $14 billion for Part A, compared with the Democrats' proposal to invest $397 billion in Medicare, an investment 28 times, greater than the Republicans' inadequate propositions.

This Republican budget does not protect and invest in our children. It ignores the needs of our children.

The retention of the budget cap, coupled with the $18.1 billion increase in defense spending, means that Republicans cut Head Start by $501 million; Republicans cut by $425 million, they cut Job Corps by $142 million; they cut child care funding by $120 million; they cut low-income heating assistance by $109 million; they cut summer youth employment by $95 million; they cut homeless youth programs by $4.7 million; they cut abandoned infants assistance by $1.3 million.

These are the programs that will suffer deep cuts if this Republican budget is approved. Of course, there is no money in this Republican bill for more and better-trained teachers in America's classroom.

This budget is not a responsible, adult budget because it fails to take care of the basic needs of the nation's families. I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise with many concerns about the majority's budget resolution before us today. Because of the strong economy and prudent fiscal policies of the past few years, we are on track towards achieving our first non-social security budget surplus in a generation. When I first came to Congress in 1995, even the thought of achieving an on-budget surplus by the year 2000 or 2001 seemed completely unrealistic.

That is why I believe we must not waste this historic opportunity to ensure the long-term solvency of the social security system which will be threatened due to the large number of baby-boomers who will begin retiring in the next 10–15 years. While the majority's plan ensures that money dedicated to the social security program should go to the program, this so-called ''lock box'' approach does nothing more than ensure that the system will go broke on schedule. A more responsible approach would be to dedicate surplus funds to the social security system in preparation for the increased number of retirees early in the next century.

I am also disappointed that the majority's plan does nothing to reduce the federal debt. The proposal uses nearly all of the projected surplus for a yet to be specified $778 billion tax cut that relies on future revenue projections. Economists have repeatedly stated that reductions in the public debt would result in lower interest rates which leads to increased economic growth and opportunities for all American families.

This proposal represents the type of budget gimmickry that has made the American people cynical about the entire federal budget process. I believe the American people understand they aren't being told the full truth when they hear proposals such as this which claim to cut taxes, dramatically increase defense spending,

protect social security and stay within the 1997 budget caps. Believe me, they are smart enough to realize that schemes like this just don't add up. We were elected to make the tough choices necessary to keep our fiscal house in order. I believe the American people deserve better than this type of smoke-and-mirrors budgeting that relies solely on future unreliable projections.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to reject this proposal and seize this rare opportunity to dedicate the surplus to protecting the long term solvency of social security and to paying down the federal debt.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to explain my priorities as we debate the budget resolution for FY 2000.

I am a cosponsor of a Constitutional Amendment to Balance the Budget and have introduced budget enforcement legislation in the past. As such, I am pleased that we balanced the nation's budget in FY 1998. However, we should not be complacent.

Before we talk of new spending or new tax cuts, we should keep our eye on one goal, and that is maintaining a balanced budget: a balanced budget for our current fiscal year and for FY 2000. Moreover, we should recognize that trust fund surpluses from Social Security, Medicare, the Highway Trust Fund and other federal trust funds totaled $150 billion last year and masked our true situation by making our budgetary position appear more favorable than it really was. Hence, I feel our second priority should be to really balance the budget without the use of any trust fund surpluses.

Thereafter, I believe that we should begin to pay down the national debt, which, according to the Congressional Budget Office, has reached an all-time high of $5.5 trillion. By using all the surplus to pay down the debt, we as taxpayers would save a significant amount of money in future interest payments. Today those payments total $231 billion. For every $1 billion in debt that we can retire, we save an average of $70 million in annual interest payments. This savings would benefit every American regardless of their economic status and I believe it represents the best tax cut we can give to the American people. Furthermore, this debt retirement would provide us with more flexibility in addressing how best to secure Medicare and Social Security for future generations while maintaining our ability to also invest in solid programs that can make our economy more productive.

Several budget resolutions have been introduced which take different approaches to maintaining a surplus and allocating our financial resources. I favor the resolution proposed by a coalition of conservative Democrats, since it provides the most fiscally sound approach. It would reserve 100% of the Social Security surplus for the Social Security Trust Fund. It also pays down more debt than any other proposal before the House, thereby providing for lower interest payments in the future and more flexibility to address unforeseen problems. Conservative projections indicate that this budget would save us $113 billion in interest payments on our debt over the next five years.

Although I am primarily concerned about maintaining fiscal discipline and believe a tax cut could be detrimental to sustaining a balanced budget, the tax cut provided for in this proposal is minimal and can be targeted towards the hard-working middle class families who need it most.

Mr. Chairman, I close by adding that maintaining the public trust is the single most important issue we face today. I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to weigh the impact that the budget resolution will have on future generations.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to give my enthusiastic endorsement for the Democratic Substitute to the Budget Resolution offered by the Ranking Member on the Budget Committee, JOHN SPRATT.

This substitute takes a responsible approach to government. It takes the surplus from this year, and reinvests it back into Social Security and Medicare. However, what is important is the manner in which this is accomplished. Unlike the Republican Budget Resolution, this amendment takes those surplus funds and directly deposits the money into the Social Security Trust Fund and the Medicare Trust Fund. The Republicans cannot tell you they are doing that—because they are not. They swear to put 100% of the surplus aside, but they do not guarantee the American people what they will do with that surplus once the smoke clears. On the other hand, this substitute puts its money where its mouth is—back into the accounts that will extend the life of Social Security for another 18 years, and Medicare another 12.

And the Democratic budget extends these programs without a loss of benefits for the people who rely upon them. Earlier this week, I met with several groups of seniors in my district in Houston. Without exception, the most pressing concern of theirs as it related to the budget was the loss of benefits. Under the Democratic Resolution, their concerns are answered—but we cannot say the same under the Republican plan, because it set forth how Medicare and Social Security funds will be spent. We can close the door on the Republican plan of Social Security privatization today if we pass this substitute—and I urge all of you to support it.

The Democratic proposal also does more to reduce the debt than the Republican plan. This budget contains out-year debt reduction that totals over 474 billion dollars over fifteen years. The Republicans cannot tell you the same. In fact, if they can pass their budget, you will much more likely see tax cuts than debt reduction.

However, that does not mean that the Democratic budget does not contain tax cuts, because it does. Indeed, the Democratic substitute contains targeted tax cuts of the sort that bring the most relief to the American family. Those tax cuts adjust the marriage penalty, help pay for child and healthcare, and extend work opportunity credits. Do we need anything more than this? I believe that these are the tax cuts that the American people have been waiting for, and I am happy to support this budget so we can bring it to them.

This substitute simply does more for children and families than the budget offered by the Republicans. It contains funding for important programs like Women, Infants and Children (WIC), Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), Job Corps, and Head Start that are ignored in the Republican plan. At the same time, it provides a bedrock foundation so we can rebuild our schools and reduce class sizes across the country. In addition, the Democratic plan includes the funds necessary to hire 100,000 skilled new teachers so our children will be prepared for the 21st Century.

The Democratic substitute also follows the lead of the President by increasing the funding for the Department of Defense and the Veterans' Administration. These increases go above and beyond what the Republican budget offers—by including higher-than-baseline pay raises for our service members and a repeal of the Retired Pay Repeal Act (REDUX).

I urge each of my colleagues to do what is right and vote for a balanced budget, for our seniors, for our future, and for the Democratic substitute.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise today in proud support of the Republican Fiscal Year 2000 Budget. Once again my colleagues and I will continue to give American citizens tax relief while paying down the national debt and protecting Social Security.

The simply fact is that the American people are over-taxed. President Clinton's budget calls for $100 billion in tax increases, while our budget offers $800 billion in tax relief over ten years. The truth is a surplus is nothing more than an overpayment by America's taxpayers. It does not belong to Washington and we should return it in the form of tax relief. In addition, our budget will continue to re-pay the debt by placing over $1.8 trillion towards the debt over the next decade. That's $450 billion more than the President's budget.

While the President talks about saving Social Security for the next generation, his budget actually spends 42% of the Social Security Surplus. The Republican budget will lock up every penny of the Social Security Surplus over the next ten years. The American public has made it clear that Washington has no right to spend away a surplus, which does not belong to them.

Mr. Chairman, I'm tired of Washington having their hands in the pockets of the American taxpayer. Let's pass this historic budget for the new millennium and provide a better and more prosperous future for all Americans.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the Republican budget resolution because I believe it emphasizes exactly the wrong priorities for America's future and does little to make our communities more livable. By approving this document, we are ignoring the negative effects this budget would inflict on the health of our communities, our infrastructure, and our economy for the next decade.

If I had my way, I would place more priority on paying down the debt, saving Social Security and Medicare, avoid costly new tax cuts and unnecessary. Unfocused defense spending, and develop a capital budget to account for infrastructure investments for a more livable future. However, this budget resolution doesn't extend the solvency of those trust funds by a single day, and instead of paying down the debt, offers tax cuts that primarily benefit those who need help the least. It also calls for unfocused increases in some aspects of our military spending without assurances that any of this spending will increase our overall security. An example of this is the call for new ''Star Wars'' spending, an unproven system on which we've already spent over $60 billion in research with nothing to show for it.

It fails to give America's communities the tools they need to improve their quality of life. The ''Building Livable Communities'' initiatives

embodied in the Administration's budget offered increased choices for citizens in the areas of transportation, housing, regional planning, open space preservation, education, and crime control. The Democratic alternative recognizes the importance of these initiatives through a Sense of the House resolution. I believe we have a responsibility to do all we can to have the federal government be a better partner with communities and citizens in their efforts to improve very basic components of everyday life—getting to work and school safely, ensuring the quality of the water we drink and the air we breathe, and having economic opportunities for the future.

It should also be noted that long-term budget projections are nearly always miscalculated, and have been overly optimistic by over $200 billion on average over the last 15 years. Even small errors and changes in the economic picture can drastically alter what the government collects and spends. A forecasting error of as little as 2% can alter the budget balance by as much as $70 billion annually. Future military conflicts, slower economic growth, stock market fluctuations, decisions by the Federal Reserve, currency values, natural disasters, and any number of other variables can also radically alter what the government spends and takes in.

Therefore it is unwise to push massive tax cuts years down the line, when it is impossible to know what our economic situation will be. Only by remaining fiscally cautious now and investing in America's infrastructure can we make this a budget that helps make our communities more livable.

This proposed budget would be a disaster if it were implemented. It siphons nearly a trillion dollars into tax cuts paid for with painful and unnecessary budget cuts, while ignoring key investments that need to be made in education, Social Security, and health care. The good news is that it won't be adopted in this form because even the Republicans have no intention of implementing it. The bad news is that it is a license to avoid responsible budgeting. I urge my colleagues to vote no and instead strive to produce a budget that promotes livable communities and fiscal stability.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the GOP's Budget Resolution. Again, the Republicans have sent to the House floor a resolution which abandons older Americans needs by ignoring the Medicare challenge, fails to protect satisfactorily and extend the solvency of the Social Security Trust Funds, shortchanges important health care benefits and services earned by our Nation's veterans, creates an illusionary increase in education spending, drastically cuts important funding and investment in our Earth's natural resources and before the budget surplus is realized, proposes to expend it with a $779 billion 10-year tax expenditure that will grow even larger and larger with time and could eventually eliminate the projected on-budget surplus by dipping into the Social Security Insurance revenues.

Republicans are quick to defend this budget by declaring credit for spending increases for such programs as defense and education without ever specifying the severe cuts necessary to meet their overall spending totals. In this resolution, the GOP would underfund much-needed people programs by $27 billion for fiscal year 2000. This is completely unrealistic as it all but ensures a confrontation and guarantees yet another disastrous appropriations fight this fall. Modest increases in elementary and secondary education are proposed while a significant reduction is exacted from post-secondary education.

This resolution fails to save the surplus for Social Security Insurance. The GOP proposed ''lock-box'' initiative claims to save all of the Social Security Insurance surplus to pay down government debt. The facts are clear: this proposal stipulates that the surplus could be used to set up private individual retirement accounts as a substitute for Social Security Insurance. This represents a serious threat to the future solvency of the most successful domestic program ever established. What kind of message are we sending to the baby boomers soon to retire and our older Americans who are guaranteed a defined Social Security Insurance benefit? If the resources already committed to Social Security beneficiaries under current law are diverted to private accounts, benefits will eventually have to be cut. Or, workers will be taxed double to pay for current beneficiaries insurance and again to divert to such individual accounts. In addition, the GOP's ''lock-box'' proposal would not ensure that the debt held by the public is reduced. Overall, all this proposal does is ensure that Social Security goes broke on schedule and not extend its solvency by one day. Advocates may well speculate that the intent is to create a crisis with Social Security benefits to justify radical privatization schemes.

While Social Security Insurance benefits are projected to be in problems by 2032, Medicare is projected to run short of funds by 2008. Given this Medicare pressing and more urgent problem, our efforts should be more focused on the stability and solvency of this much-needed Medicare program. The GOP's insistence of $779 billion in tax cuts over 10 years would surely come at the expense of Medicare. The Administration initiated a proposal to reserve 15 percent of projected budget surpluses to address and close the long-term funding gap of the Medicare program. By ignoring Medicare, the Republicans have decided to provide a huge tax expenditure and a significant defense spending increase. Frankly, the GOP budget lyrics do not match the music and is unable to face up to the facts. The GOP budget sets in place a political document which is unworkable and unfair.

The Administration has indicated a willingness not to ''recoup'' the Federal share of the recent tobacco settlements if there are safeguards which ensure that Federal contributions are used for public health and awareness programs. The Republican resolution assumes the Federal Government relinquishes both the right to recoup funds from the multi-State tobacco settlement as well as the authority to direct the States how to use those funds. Frankly, I believe that the national dollars recovered ought to be directed to health care concerns, not a rebate. These are Federal funds and we have a responsibility to exact accountability.

Under the Republican resolution, discretionary veterans programs are funded at $20.2 billion. While this represents less than a $1 billion increase over last year's funding levels and a one-time addition. Over five years, the GOP resolution would cut veterans' funding by $300 billion below the 1999 freeze level. This is completely unacceptable. After years of inadequate funding levels, many VA employees and veteran service organizations in my State of Minnesota have joined a national consensus to push for a substantial funding increase for the VA, especially for the health care function. This budget does far too little in 2000 and beyond to address the understaffed VA medical centers across the nation and the hard working, underpaid VA employee's that provide veterans the health care and other benefits and services they have earned. We can not overlook this today. According to the Independent Budget group, comprised of most of the major veterans service groups recommended an additional $3 billion more than the Administration's VA proposal. In this budget resolution, the GOP has ignored such concerns and requests. A substantial increase is critically needed to avoid deep cuts in VA's medical care budget. We owe our veterans adequate health care and services that we promised to them.

The Republicans boast that their budget blueprint has a strong commitment to education, which time and again has been promoted by the American people as a top priority for federal tax dollars. And we can all see that this resolution does increase funding for elementary and secondary education. However, in taking a closer look it is apparent that this is a true case of robbing college student Peter to pay grade schooler Paul; in order to showcase the $1.2 billion increase over the President's request for primary and secordary education funding, this budget severely shorchanges all other education programs. Deep cuts in higher education initiatives, such as Pell Grants and Work Study, and reductions in funding for programs which help preschoolers, such as Head Start, is extremely shortsighted. Education is a continuous journey, therefore, the idea of focusing entirely on K–12 and ignoring the needs of students who are preparing to enter school or those who wish to continue on to higher education opportunities is shallow and illusionary. A pea and shell game without the pea. Additionally, even with the increase in funding for elementary and secondary programs, this resolution leaves no room for full funding of special education programs, unless other programs for these grade levels are cut. In addition, the Republicans have decided to do nothing on the President's and a majority of Congress's initiative of hiring 100,000 more teachers and reducing class size that will provide our young people the much needed attention and focus they deserve to succeed in school and in life.

Many of the environmental programs that our state and local governments rely on, such as grants to wastewater and drinking water plants, will receive unacceptable cuts in funding as a result of the Republican budget. America's greatest natural treasures, our National Parks, Forests, and the like, will continue their severe backslide in maintenance and upkeep. And despite Interior's efforts to cure these ills with what little money they have secured, employees will still be fired and furloughed in an effort to stay within the spending caps as proposed by the Republican majority. Many in Congress have seen a grand vision for the future in preserving greenspace, and making life for everyone in the Union more in tune with the land in which they reside as seen in the President's proposed Lands Legacy Initiative. Despite overwhelming support for this exciting program, the majority has failed to fund any initiative with this objective.

We've heard the arguments against this program, that there is too much of a maintenance backlog in our parks to further expand them, but the GOP budget blueprint has come full circle—the GOP budget has nothing for maintenance conservation and restoration of our national treasures and nothing new for the preservation of America's remaining greenspace. Such a greenspace that we are losing each passing day. Apparently only useful as rhetoric to shoot down the President's land legacy initiative.

According to HUD's estimations, the Republican budget has a negative impact on several important housing programs. The reduction of 6.8% in outlays in FY 2000 for the section 8 voucher and project-based programs means 195,000 fewer households, or 478,000 fewer individuals, will be served. In addition, the reduction in outlays for public housing will result in under-funding 86,700 units, or 201,000 needy individuals.

If these reduction initiatives are enacted, HUD projects that $1,335 billion (83%) of HOME program's FY 1999 budget authority would have to be rescinded and the Congress would be unable to appropriate any budget authority to the program in FY 2000. HUD assumes that in FY 1999, 78,000 families, or 177,000 individuals, will be assisted by HOME funds. If we were to rescind this budget authority for HOME, however, not one of the families or individuals would be served.

Again, the Republican budget fails to provide for the growing number of homeless or near-homeless individuals. If funds are reduced as under this GOP resolution, HUD projects that $975 million (96%) of last years funding levels would have to be rescinded. Such a reduction would freeze dollars for future investment and spending for our homeless populations. This would result in a loss of 10,000 beds in transitional housing and 7,125 permanent beds for the disabled who are homeless.

Because of the extremely slow spend-out rates in these programs, Congress would have to halt current funding and all carry-over budget authority from previous years to meet the Republicans outlay reduction target. In FY 1999, HUD expects to develop 11,300 housing units (8,000 elderly and 3,300 disabled). All of those units would be lost. Furthermore, if outlays are reduced 6.8% in FY 2000 as required under this budget, HUD projects that $125 million of the programs' current funding levels would have to be rescinded. Again, this leaves Congress without the resources to address and meet future spending needs. This would result in eliminating aid to 42,000 persons in FY 1999 and 79,000 persons in FY 2000. As a result of this totally inadequate GOP resolution, the number of persons who would lose housing assistance is estimated to be almost 1 million Americans.

The inaction on restoring and protecting the solvency of Medicare and the Social Security Insurance systems, ignoring special and higher-education programs and reduction in class room size initiatives, shortchanging our veterans health care, all but eliminating public housing funding to needy persons, abandoning our existing commitment to much needed environmental cleanup and protection efforts of our natural resources all result from one overriding GOP priority: passing a huge package of tax expenditures. Once again, the GOP has insisted to increase an all ready over budgeted defense department and provide an un-timely $779 billion tax expenditure that will in reality raid the Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds. This budget does not provide adequate investment in people programs and truly undermines our existing federal commitments by underfunding much needed resources and programs by $27 billion in fiscal year 2000.

I urge all Members to vote no on this GOP budget resolution that comes up way short of meeting the needs and investments in people programs.

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Republican budget resolution that is before us today.

This budget sets the wrong priorities for Congress. It proposes a massive tax cut, substantial cuts in domestic spending programs, and no significant action on Social Security and Medicare—whereas I believe that Congress should be taking action now to preserve Social Security and Medicare, to address the difficult problems our nation still faces, and to invest in education and other programs that will improve all Americans' quality of life in the future.

Mr. Chairman, Americans have much for which to be grateful. The economy is growing, unemployment is down, and real incomes for working families are increasing—ableit at too slow a rate. We all know, though, that these good times cannot last indefinitely. At some point, the economy will stall. At some point there will be a recession. And in a few years, the Baby Boom generation will start to retire—and place a heavy new burden on programs like Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.

Many of the Republicans in Congress are saying that now is the time for the American people to relax and enjoy the fruits of our labors. Well, no one denies that the American people work hard and deserve a break. And no one wants to turn down a tax cut. But our debate today should not focus on what we deserve, or even on what we would like to do; that would be irresponsible. Rather, today's debate should focus on what we ought to do.

Today, twenty years of deficit spending are over, and budget surpluses are projected for at least the next ten years. But our fiscal troubles are not at an end. At best, we have only a dozen or so years of projected surpluses before dramatic increases in outlays for Social Security and Medicare—to pay for the Baby Boomers' retirement—submerge the federal budget again in a sea of red ink. A good economist will tell you that we cannot even be certain that the projected surpluses will materialize at all. So I say, let's prepare for the hard times ahead—not celebrate prematurely.

What steps should we take to prepare for the future challenges that we can already anticipate? What can we do to ensure that future Americans can face the prospect of retirement with pleasant anticipation and without fear? What can we do to ensure that all Americans have access to safe, affordable health care? And what can we do to promote our country's future economic growth and provide a better standard of living for all Americans?

I believe that Congress should be taking this opportunity to restore the solvency of Social Security and Medicare, and to invest in education, infrastructure and research that will increase our productivity and improve our standards of living. Consequently, I oppose the resolution before us today.

I oppose this budget resolution because I believe that it would devastate dozens of important federal programs, programs like educational assistance, veterans' programs, crime-fighting programs, scientific and biomedical research programs, public works projects, and anti-poverty programs.

I oppose this budget because it does nothing to help the Americans who, even in these boom times, are struggling just to keep their heads above water.

I oppose this budget because it fails to invest in the programs and projects that would make America more productive and more competitive in the global economy.

I oppose this budget because it would provide unwise and irresponsible tax cuts which would be paid for with a surplus that has not yet materialized—and which in fact, may never materialize.

I oppose this budget because it does nothing to save Medicare from insolvency.

And finally, I oppose this budget resolution because it does nothing to save Social Security.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject this short-sighted, self-indulgent budget—and to work together to draft a prudent, fiscally conservative budget that addresses the American people's future needs, not just someone's misguided desires.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise against the cuts in higher education in the Republican budget resolution. While some of us are working to extend the opportunity for higher education through vital programs like Pell Grants, the Republicans have introduced a budget which cuts all non-elementary and secondary education, training and social service programs by $16.6 billion over the next 5 years. Over the next ten years, the Republicans call for a 12.2% across the board cut for these same programs. This at a time when increasing tuition costs are burdening families nationwide.

At a time of anticipated future surpluses and significant increases in military spending already underway, it is critical that federal funding for education take its place as a national priority. Making college more affordable is one of the most important investments we can make in our country's future prosperity. This year, the maximum Pell Grant award will provide funding that only covers 35% of the average costs of attendance at a four-year state college. For a four-year private college, the Pell Grant barely covers 13% of average annual costs. Yet the Republicans want to further deny access to higher education by cutting this important program. Support access to higher education.

Vote no on the GOP budget resolution.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition of the rule to H. Con. Res. 68 which blocks a vote on Representative CLEMENT's amendment to increase funding for veterans health care.

The Republican Leadership's FY 2000 Budget fails miserably to protect our Nation's veterans. While their budget resolution provides a $900 million increase in budget authority for veterans, this is a ONE time addition. Over the next 5 years, the Majority's budget resolution cuts discretionary spending for veterans by $300 million. Over 10 years, veterans funding will be cut by $3 billion below this year's funding levels. The Republican leadership should be ashamed to submit a

budget which slashes funding for the men and women who fought for our freedom.

This Republican-led Congress has flat-lined the veterans budget for the last 4 years. As our veterans continue aging, they face more medical emergencies. Unless funding for veterans' health care is significantly increased services will be cut and health care will be denied.

Mr. Chairman, how can you propose several new health care initiatives without providing the necessary funds to support them? The message you send to our veterans when the promises made to them are broken is that the sacrifices they made for our country are meaningless. Representative CLEMENT's amendment would have increased the Veterans Affairs budget by $1 billion over the Republican increase of $900 million. This amendment was supported by the Veterans of Foreign War, Disabled American Veterans, Paralyzed Veterans of America and the American Legion.

Give our nation's veterans what they deserve. I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule and the Republican budget.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support H. Con. Res. 68, the Budget Resolution. This resolution continues the hard work of balancing the budget and putting our fiscal house in order that we began in 1997.

PRIORITIES

The priorities that we should establish in this new ''age of surplus.'' Those are providing retirement security by saving Social Security and Medicare, paying down the debt, and reforming the tax code. These reforms are essential for our future. At the same time, we must be realistic and fair about maintaining adequate support for all domestic programs, most specifically education and health care.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Of primary concern is Social Security. As we all know Social Security is the most popular and important program in the nation's history. It touches almost every family in America. This budget saves ALL of the Social Security Trust Fund surplus for Social Security. That is close to $1.8 TRILLION over the next ten years. But this money must be made SAFE! Upon passage of a Conference Report on a joint budget resolution passed by both the House and Senate, we should act immediately to create a real lock box that through law saves the Social Security Trust Fund surplus. This money will be used to strengthen and secure Social Security and Medicare when bipartisan reform legislation beginning signed into law. We must protect Social Security through law not legislative shadow boxing. When it comes to Social Security, this program must be sacrificed to tax cuts or extra spending. I look forward to the day when we engage in the debate on reform with the knowledge that every cent in the Social Security Trust Fund is safe.

PAYING DOWN THE DEBT

Priority must be given to paying down the debt. The National debt is currently over $5.6 TRILLION. The debt has increased by $95 BILLION in FY 1999 alone. In 1998 we have spent about 15% of all federal revenues just on interest on the debt. That is money NOT spent on our children, on education, or health care. It is money that goes into the fiscal black hole created by our continued indebtedness. We must reduce the debt in order to spend less money on interest payments and more on our future. We must make the commitment to debt reduction. It is immoral for us to continue to write checks that our children will have to cash.

TAX REFORM

Tax reform not necessarily tax cuts must be a priority over the next ten years but as I said before not at the sacrifice of Social Security. Tax reform creates a fairer, flatter, and simpler tax code that results in a lower tax burden for all Americans. Tax reform includes eliminating the marriage penalty, rewarding savings and investment so families can send their kids to school, buy a home, or start a business, and does not punish their success. A significant portion of the non-Social Security surplus must be returned to American families because they know how to spend money better than most in Washington.

BLUEPRINT FOR THE FUTURE

It is important to remember that this Resolution is a blueprint. It is not the endstate but the beginning of a process of what I hope is thoughtful debate on America's future. It is our responsibility, in this Congress, to ensure the visibility of worthy federal programs and to create a strong and vibrant economy in which our children and grandchildren can thrive, succeed, and enjoy the promise of what America has to offer.

There are going to be difficult decisions ahead. To stay within the budget caps will not be easy. In some cases, I believe that we should revisit those caps through the appropriations process to address priority spending investments in education, health care, and veterans. While we should not turn the surplus into a spending spree, we must be sensitive to fair treatment for all domestic programs affecting families—our children as well as our families.

The next decade will be the best opportunity for us to give our children the future we hope for them. We must be wise, judicious, and fair when it comes to spending the surplus. We must not count our surplus eggs before they hatch and we can not squander this opportunity. We must set priorities. We owe that to our children.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to strongly oppose this amendment. This budget contains a net tax increase over the next five years, a time in which we are realizing surpluses.

This tax increase comes largely from one source: regressive, excise taxes leveled on those least able to afford them. Americans are overtaxed. The government does not need more of our money to carry out its spending plans, lengthening the era of big government. Contrary to what we have been told, this era is far from over.

Nearly have of these new taxes, $35 billion worth, come from a 200-percent tax increase on tobacco products, 55 cents on a pack of cigarettes. This tax increase hurts hard-working family tobacco farmers in my district and all of Kentucky. These taxes will take away the livelihood of these working families, who depend on their tobacco crops to pay for their farms, their homes and their children's education.

But this excise tax increase issue is not confined to states with tobacco farmers. It has a negative impact no matter what your opinion is on the use of tobacco products. This huge tax increase in all states falls most heavily on those least able to afford it.

Who will pay these new regressive excise taxes? Working families who earn $30,000 or less will pick up nearly half the tab, even though they account for just 16 percent of total national family income. According to the Federal Trade Commission, legal adults purchase 98 percent of all cigarettes. New regressive taxes on these adult products are not acceptable in this budget.

This administration has stated it wants to help bring prosperity back to the family farm. So do I. But I do not understand how taxing our family farmers out of business will achieve this goal. I urge all of my colleagues to join with me and oppose all attempts by this administration to finance its big-government budget on the backs of tobacco farmers and other working families.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican's budget resolution. I am truly disappointed that the Majority has not put forth a more reasonable, workable proposal that could garner true bipartisan support.

Mr. Chairman, at a time when this Congress has a unique opportunity to build upon the economic success of recent years under the leadership of President Clinton, we are presented with a document that is political in its origin and regressive in its policies. At this crucial juncture in our Nation's history, we are being asked to look backwards, not forward. Rather than working together to develop and implement an economic policy for the new millennium, we are presented with a back room, cut-and-paste deal that simply can not deliver on its promises and would set us on a course which can only result in further escalating the astronomical national debt run-up during the 1980s.

Mr. Chairman, we have been down this road before and it is a dead-end. We cannot afford to take this route again.

Mr. Chairman, we should be working together to set our Nation's economic policy on a path that will ensure continued surpluses while saving Social Security, strengthening Medicare, and paying-down our debt. We have the ability to achieve a balanced budget for years to come, while still providing for the needs of our country—education, health care, and Social Security. We should not, indeed, must not, pass-up this once in a lifetime opportunity to establish a sound and lasting budgetary policy.

Unfortunately, the document before us today falls far short of these worthwhile and obtainable goals. The proposal borders on being reckless in its approach to our budgetary needs and disingenuous in its promises. Indeed, some have even referred to this measure as the ''meat ax'' approach to budgeting.

Mr. Chairman, we are presented with unrealistic spending levels, under-funding almost every major program in order to once again provide tax relief for the most well-off in our society. I seriously doubt that many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle realistically believe that the requirements of this proposal can be met.

Under the Republican plan, Medicare and Social Security are left unprotected. We all know that Medicare will become insolvent in 2008 and Social Security will become insolvent in 2032, if this Congress does not enact meaningful, sensible reform in the near future. This budget proposal fails to address this looming problem and seriously weakens our

ability to face the economic challenges of the next century.

At a time when we should be moving forward, looking to the future, this proposal hearkens back to the days of isolationism and poor houses. I ask my friends in the Majority, where is their oft-touted commitment to the war on drugs, to fighting crime and making our streets safe, to education, to health care, to the environment and our natural resources, to science and technology, to our men and women in the armed services, and to the so many other vital programs which seek to take care of the less fortunate and ensure a better life for the American middle class? Where is their commitment to a balanced budget and paying-down the debt?

Mr. Chairman, under the very able leadership of Ranking Member SPRATT, the Democrats want to keep prosperity on track and protect the American family. Our plan would preserve 62 percent of the total estimated budget surplus for Social Security, ensuring the Social Security Trust Fund remains solvent for many decades to come. Our plan also transfer 15 percent of these surpluses to shoring-up Medicare, extending its solvency for at least a decade to grant us the time we will need to develop and implement a bipartisan fix for this valuable social program.

Education, one of the most crucial underpinnings of our great country is barely paid lip-service under this proposal. Many of my colleagues may ask why the Federal Government needs to become involved in school renovation and construction issues, which are historically local concerns. The simple answer is that the problem has grown so large that localities and States alone do not have the resources or the programs to address their overwhelming needs. For instance, a recent survey by the Division of School Facilities in New York City concluded that, in my district alone, 19 new schools were needed to alleviate overcrowding. Additionally, to bring schools in the Seventh Congressional District of New York up to standards deemed ''fair'' by school facilities' engineers, New York City would have to fund $218.65 million in exterior modernization projects and $53.18 million in interior modernization projects.

Mr. Chairman, this budget does not ring true. It has a harsh sound that is indicative of it being out of tune with our current economic conditions and good government. I urge my colleagues to vote against this proposal. If you support the working men and women of this country, if you support our Nation's children, you must oppose this budget resolution and support the Democratic alternative.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, our Federal budget should be a statement of our national values. How we spend our money should reflect what is important to us. The budget should address our current needs and capitalize on opportunities in the future.

The budget should recognize the strength of our country, not only in terms of our military might, but also measure our strength in terms of the health, education, and well-being of American families.

I cannot think of two better measures of a budget than its attention to educating our children and improving the health status of all Americans. This budget turns away from both these urgent priorities, putting tax cuts ahead of all else.

The preschool education program Head Start is one example. Head Start is one of our success stories. It offers early education and nutrition services to lower income children and it has been proven effective. Within 10 years, this budget would decimate Head Start, cutting funding by nearly one-third. One hundred thousand low-income children would lose Head Start services.

The Republican budget chooses a tax cut over Head Start funding.

In the area of health, the Republican budget is just as short-sighted. This country faces many challenges in health care. Forty-four million Americans are living without health insurance. And at the same time, we face tremendous opportunities to improve and extend lives with health research. It is our obligation to act on these challenges and opportunities. This Republican budget turns away from them.

The budget proposal cuts discretionary health spending by 31 percent over 10 years without spelling out what will be cut. Will it be health promotion at the Centers for Disease Control? Health care for the uninsured at the Health Resources and Services Administration? Health research at the National Institutes of Health? The answer is that all these vital areas would suffer under the Republican budget, and that would have a direct impact on the health status of people across the country.

This budget also ignores Medicare, calling for unspecified Medicare ''reforms,'' and proposing no tangible resources to shore up the health care program on which tens of millions of seniors depend.

The Republican budget chooses a tax cut over health care and health research. This Republican budget is dangerously out of step with our values. It is short-sighted and it makes its biggest cuts where the poor will feel them most directly. I urge my colleagues to oppose the Republican budget resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment printed in part 1 of House Report 106–77 is adopted and the concurrent resolution, as amended, is considered as having been read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of House Concurrent Resolution 68, as amended by the amendment printed in part 1 of House Report 106–77, is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 68

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000.

The Congress declares that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000 and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2001 through 2009 are hereby set forth.

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2009:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,408,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,435,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,456,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,532,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,584,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,651,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,684,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,733,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,802,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $1,867,500,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $0.
Fiscal year 2001: −$9,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: −$52,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: −$30,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: −$50,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: −$59,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: −$106,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: −$138,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: −$153,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: −$178,200,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,426,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,456,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,487,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,558,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,611,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,665,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,697,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,752,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,813,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $1,874,400,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,408,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,435,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,455,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,532,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,583,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,638,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,666,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,715,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,781,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $1,841,300,000,000.

(4) SURPLUSES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the surpluses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $0.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $12,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $18,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $17,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $21,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $26,200,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $5,627,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $5,707,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $5,791,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $5,875,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $5,954,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $6,019,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $6,075,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $6,128,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $6,168,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $6,198,100,000,000.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and budget outlays for fiscal years 2000 through 2009 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $288,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $276,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $303,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $285,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $308,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $291,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $318,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $303,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $327,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $313,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $328,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $316,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $329,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $315,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $330,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $313,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $332,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $317,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $333,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $318,000,000,000.
(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $11,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $10,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $9,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $11,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $13,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $13,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $13,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $13,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $14,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $14,000,000,000
(B) Outlays, $12,100,000,000.
(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $18,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $17,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $17,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $17,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $17,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $17,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $17,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $17,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $17,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $17,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,800,000,000.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, −$700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$1,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$3,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, −$400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, −$500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, −$500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, −$200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, −$100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,100,000,000.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $22,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $22,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $22,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $22,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $23,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $23,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $23,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $23,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $23,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $24,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,700,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $14,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $11,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $12,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $12,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $10,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $10,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $10,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $10,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $10,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,200,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $9,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $10,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $14,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $14,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $13,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $12,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $12,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $12,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $12,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $13,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,800,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $51,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $51,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $50,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $52,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $52,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $52,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $52,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $52,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $52,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $52,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,100,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $7,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $5,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $5,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $5,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $5,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $5,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $5,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $5,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, $5,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $5,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,300,000,000.
(10) Elementary and Secondary Education, and Vocational Education (501):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $22,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $24,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $24,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $25,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $26,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $26,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $26,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $26,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $26,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $26,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,900,000,000.
(11) Higher Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500, except for 501):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $43,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $41,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $41,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $42,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $43,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $43,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $44,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $45,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $46,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $46,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,500,000,000.
(12) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $156,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $153,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $164,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $162,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $173,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $173,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $184,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $185,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $197,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $198,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $212,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $212,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $228,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $228,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $246,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $245,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $265,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $264,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $285,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $284,900,000,000.
(13) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $208,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $208,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $222,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $222,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $230,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $230,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $250,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $250,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $268,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $268,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $295,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $295,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $306,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $306,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $337,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $337,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $365,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $365,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $394,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $394,200,000,000.
(14) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $244,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $248,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $250,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $257,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $262,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $267,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $277,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $276,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $286,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $286,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $298,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $298,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $304,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $305,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $310,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $311,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $323,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $325,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $334,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $335,700,000,000.
(15) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $14,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $15,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $16,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $17,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $18,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $18,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $19,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $21,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $22,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,200,000,000.
(16) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $44,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $44,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $44,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $45,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $46,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $48,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $47,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $47,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $48,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $49,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,700,000,000.
(17) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $23,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $24,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $24,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $24,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $26,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $26,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $26,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $26,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $26,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $26,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,400,000,000.
(18) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $11,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $12,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $12,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $12,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $12,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $12,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $12,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $12,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $12,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,900,000,000.
(19) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $275,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $275,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $271,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $271,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $267,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $267,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $265,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $263,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $263,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $261,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $261,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $258,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $258,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $257,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $257,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $254,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $254,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $252,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $252,700,000,000.
(20) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$8,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$10,100,000,000
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$8,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$12,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$6,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$20,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$4,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$4,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$4,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, −$4,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, −$4,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, −$5,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, −$5,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, −$5,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,900,000,000.
(21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$34,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$34,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$36,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$36,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$43,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$43,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$37,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$37,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$37,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$37,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, −$38,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$38,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, −$38,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$38,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, −$40,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$40,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, −$40,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$40,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, −$41,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$41,800,000,000.

SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

Not later than September 30, 1999, the House Committee on Ways and Means shall report to the House a reconciliation bill that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of revenues is not less than: $1,408,500,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 2000, $7,416,800,000,000 in revenues for fiscal years 2000 through 2004, and $16,155,700,000,000 in revenues for fiscal years 2000 through 2009.

SEC. 5. SAFE DEPOSIT BOX FOR SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) under the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the social security trust funds are off-budget for purposes of the President's budget submission and the concurrent resolution on the budget;

(2) the social security trust funds have been running surpluses for 17 years;

(3) these surpluses have been used to implicitly finance the general operations of the Federal government;

(4) in fiscal year 2000, the social security surplus will exceed $137 billion;

(5) for the first time, a concurrent resolution on the budget balances the Federal budget without counting social security surpluses; and

(6) the only way to ensure that social security surpluses are not diverted for other purposes is to balance the budget exclusive of such surpluses.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—(1) It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any concurrent resolution on the budget, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that sets forth a deficit for any fiscal year. For purposes of this subsection, a deficit shall be the level (if any) set forth in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for that fiscal year pursuant to section 301(a)(3) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. In setting forth the deficit level pursuant to such section, that level shall not include any adjustments in aggregates that would be made pursuant to any reserve fund that provides for adjustments in allocations and aggregates for legislation that enhances retirement security or extends the solvency of the medicare trust funds or makes such changes in the medicare payment or benefit structure as are necessary.

(2) Paragraph (1) may be waived in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members voting.

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) beginning with fiscal year 2000, legislation should be enacted to require any official statement issued by the Office of Management and Budget, the Congressional Budget Office, or any other agency or instrumentality of the Government of surplus or deficit totals of the budget of the Government as submitted by the President or of the surplus or deficit totals of the congressional budget, and any description of, or reference to, such totals in any official publication or material issued by either of such offices or any other such agency or instrumentality, should exclude the outlays and receipts of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program under title II of the Social Security Act (including the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund) and the related provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(2) legislation should be considered to augment subsection (b) by—

(A) taking such steps as may be required to safeguard the social security surpluses, such as statutory changes equivalent to the reserve fund for retirement security and medicare set forth in section 6; or

(B) otherwise establishing a statutory limit on debt held by the public and reducing such limit by the amount of the social security surpluses.

SEC. 6. RESERVE FUND FOR RETIREMENT SECURITY AND, AS NEEDED, MEDICARE.

(a) RETIREMENT SECURITY.—Whenever the Committee on Ways and Means of the House reports a bill, or an amendment thereto is offered, or a conference report thereon is submitted that enhances retirement security, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may—

(1) increase the appropriate allocations for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2004 and aggregates for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2009 of new budget authority and outlays by the amount of new budget authority provided by such measure (and outlays flowing therefrom) for such fiscal year for that purpose; and

(2) reduce the revenue aggregates for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2009 by the amount of the revenue loss resulting from that measure for such fiscal year for that purpose.

(b) MEDICARE PROGRAM.—Whenever the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Commerce of the House reports a bill, or an amendment thereto is offered, or a conference report thereon is submitted that extends the solvency or reforms the benefit or payment structure of the medicare program including any measure in response to the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the appropriate allocations and aggregates of new budget authority and outlays by the amounts provided in that bill for that purpose.

(c) LIMITATION.—(1) The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may only make adjustments under subsection (a) or (b) if the net outlay increase plus revenue reduction resulting from any measure referred to in those subsections (including any prior adjustments made for any other such measure) for fiscal year 2000, the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004, or the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2009 is not greater than an amount equal to the projected social security surplus for such period, as set forth in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this concurrent resolution or, if published, the midsession review for fiscal year 2000 of the Director of the Congressional Budget Office. For purposes of the preceding sentence, revenue reductions shall be treated as a positive number.

(2) In the midsession review for fiscal year 2000, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office in consultation with the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund shall make an up-to-date estimate of the projected surpluses in the social security trust funds for fiscal year 2000, for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004, and for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2009.

(3) As used in this subsection, the term ''social security trust funds'' means the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund.

SEC. 7. RESERVE FUND FOR PROGRAMS AUTHORIZED UNDER THE INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, when the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto is offered, or a conference report thereon is submitted that provides new budget authority for fiscal year 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, or 2004 for programs authorized under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the appropriate allocations and aggregates of new budget authority and outlays by an amount not to exceed the amount of new budget authority provided by that measure (and outlays flowing therefrom) for that purpose up to the maximum amount consistent with section 611(a) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1411(a)(2)).

(b) ADJUSTMENTS.—The adjustments in outlays (and the corresponding amount of new budget authority) made under subsection (a) for any fiscal year may not exceed the amount by which an up-to-date projection of the on-budget surplus made by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office for that fiscal year exceeds the on-budget surplus for that fiscal year set forth in section 2(4) of this resolution.

(c) CBO PROJECTIONS.—Upon the request of the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall make an up-to-date estimate of the projected on-budget surplus for the applicable fiscal year.

SEC. 8. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution for any measure shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

SEC. 9. UPDATED CBO PROJECTIONS.

Each calendar quarter the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall make an up-to-date estimate of receipts, outlays and surplus (on-budget and off-budget) for the current fiscal year.

SEC. 10. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) persecution of individuals on the sole ground of their religious beliefs and practices occurs in countries around the world and affects millions of lives;

(2) such persecution violates international norms of human rights, including those established in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Helsinki Accords, and the Declaration on the Elimination of all Forms of Intolerance and Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief;

(3) such persecution is abhorrent to all Americans, and our very Nation was founded on the principle of the freedom to worship according to the dictates of our conscience; and

(4) in 1998 Congress unanimously passed, and President Clinton signed into law, the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998, which established the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom to monitor facts and circumstances of violations of religious freedom and authorized $3,000,000 to carry out the functions of the Commission for each of fiscal years 1999 and 2000.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) this resolution assumes that $3,000,000 will be appropriated within function 150 for fiscal year 2000 for the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom to carry out its duties; and

(2) the House Committee on Appropriations is strongly urged to appropriate such amount for the Commission.

SEC. 11. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON PROVIDING ADDITIONAL DOLLARS TO THE CLASSROOM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) strengthening America's public schools while respecting State and local control is critically important to the future of our children and our Nation;

(2) education is a local responsibility, a State priority, and a national concern;

(3) working with the Nation's governors, parents, teachers, and principals must take place in order to strengthen public schools and foster educational excellence;

(4) the consolidation of various Federal education programs will benefit our Nation's children, parents, and teachers by sending more dollars directly to the classroom; and

(5) our Nation's children deserve an educational system that will provide opportunities to excel.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that—

(1) the House should enact legislation that would consolidate thirty-one Federal K–12 education programs; and

(2) the Department of Education, the States, and local educational agencies should work together to ensure that not less than 95 percent of all funds appropriated for the purpose of carrying out elementary and secondary education programs administered by the Department of Education is spent for our children in their classrooms.

SEC. 12. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ASSET-BUILDING FOR THE WORKING POOR.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) 33 percent of all American households have no or negative financial assets and 60 percent of African-American households have no or negative financial assets;

(2) 46.9 percent of all children in America live in households with no financial assets, including 40 percent of caucasian children and 75 percent of African-American children;

(3) in order to provide low-income families with more tools for empowerment, incentives which encourage asset-building should be established;

(4) across the Nation numerous small public, private, and public-private asset-building initiatives (including individual development account programs) are demonstrating success at empowering low-income workers;

(5) the Government currently provides middle and upper income Americans with hundreds of billions of dollars in tax incentives for building assets; and

(6) the Government should utilize tax laws or other measures to provide low-income Americans with incentives to work and build assets in order to escape poverty permanently.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that any changes in tax law should include provisions which encourage low-income workers and their families to save for buying their first home, starting a business, obtaining an education, or taking other measures to prepare for the future.

SEC. 13. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ACCESS TO HEALTH INSURANCE AND PRESERVING HOME HEALTH SERVICES FOR ALL MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES.

(a) ACCESS TO HEALTH INSURANCE.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) 43.4 million Americans are currently without health insurance, and that this number is expected to rise to nearly 60 million people in the next 10 years;

(B) the cost of health insurance continues to rise, a key factor in increasing the number of uninsured; and

(C) there is a consensus that working Americans and their families and children will suffer from reduced access to health insurance.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON IMPROVING ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE INSURANCE.—It is the sense of Congress that access to affordable health care coverage for all Americans is a priority of the 106th Congress.

(b) PRESERVING HOME HEALTH SERVICE FOR ALL MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 reformed medicare home health care spending by instructing the Health Care Financing Administration to implement a prospective payment system and instituted an interim payment system to achieve savings;

(B) the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999, reformed the interim payment system to increase reimbursements to low-cost providers, added $900 million in funding, and delayed the automatic 15 percent payment reduction for one year, to October 1, 2000; and

(C) patients whose care is more extensive and expensive than the typical medicare patient do not receive supplemental payments in the interim payment system but will receive special protection in the home health care prospective payment system.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ACCESS TO HOME HEALTH CARE.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(A) Congress recognizes the importance of home health care for seniors and disabled citizens;

(B) Congress and the Administration should work together to maintain quality care for patients whose care is more extensive and expensive than the typical medicare patient, including the sickest and frailest medicare beneficiaries, while home health care agencies operate in the interim payment system; and

(C) Congress and the Administration should work together to avoid the implementation of the 15 percent reduction in the interim payment system and ensure timely implementation of the prospective payment system.

SEC. 14. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON MEDICARE PAYMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) a goal of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 was to expand options for medicare beneficiaries under the new Medicare+Choice program;

(2) Medicare+Choice was intended to make these choices available to all medicare beneficiaries; and unfortunately, during the first

two years of the Medicare+Choice program the blended payment was not implemented, stifling health care options and continuing regional disparity among many counties across the United States; and

(3) the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 also established the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare to develop legislative recommendations to address the long-term funding challenges facing medicare.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that this resolution assumes that funding of the Medicare+Choice program is a priority for the House Committee on the Budget before financing new programs and benefits that may potentially add to the imbalance of payments and benefits in Fee-for-Service Medicare and Medicare+Choice.

SEC. 15. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON ASSESSMENT OF WELFARE-TO-WORK PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It is the sense of the House that, recognizing the need to maximize the benefit of the Welfare-to-Work Program, the Secretary of Labor should prepare a report on Welfare-to-Work Programs pursuant to section 403(a)(5) of the Social Security Act. This report should include information on the following—

(1) the extent to which the funds available under such section have been used (including the number of States that have not used any of such funds), the types of programs that have received such funds, the number of and characteristics of the recipients of assistance under such programs, the goals of such programs, the duration of such programs, the costs of such programs, any evidence of the effects of such programs on such recipients, and accounting of the total amount expended by the States from such funds, and the rate at which the Secretary expects such funds to be expended for each of the fiscal years 2000, 2001, and 2002;

(2) with regard to the unused funds allocated for Welfare-to-Work for each of fiscal years 1998 and 1999, identify areas of the Nation that have unmet needs for Welfare-to-Work initiatives; and

(3) identify possible Congressional action that may be taken to reprogram Welfare-to-Work funds from States that have not utilized previously allocated funds to places of unmet need, including those States that have rejected or otherwise not utilized prior funding.

(b) REPORT.—It is the sense of the House that, not later than January 1, 2000, the Secretary of Labor should submit to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, in writing, the report described in subsection (a).

SEC. 16. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PROVIDING HONOR GUARD SERVICES FOR VETERANS' FUNERALS.

It is the sense of Congress that all relevant congressional committees should make every effort to provide sufficient resources so that an Honor Guard, if requested, is available for veterans' funerals.

SEC. 17. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CHILD NUTRITION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) both Republicans and Democrats understand that an adequate diet and proper nutrition are essential to a child's general well-being;

(2) the lack of an adequate diet and proper nutrition may adversely affect a child's ability to perform up to his or her ability in school;

(3) the Government currently plays a role in funding school nutrition programs; and

(4) there is a bipartisan commitment to helping children learn.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Committee on Education and the Workforce and the Committee on Agriculture should examine our Nation's nutrition programs to determine if they can be improved, particularly with respect to services to low-income children.

The CHAIRMAN. No further amendment is in order except the amendments printed in part 2 of that report. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by the Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for 40 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment.

After conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, there shall be 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.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part 2 of House Report 106–77.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 in the nature of a substitute printed in part 2 of House Report 106–77 offered by Mr. Coburn:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000.

The Congress declares that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000 and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2001 through 2004 are hereby set forth.

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2004:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,406,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,445,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,507,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,562,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,631,800,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $11,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $10,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $10,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $10,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $9,500,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,549,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,588,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,648,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,717,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,798,500,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,535,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,564,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,634,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,702,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,780,600,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $129,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $119,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $126,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $139,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $148,800,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $5,778,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $5,999,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $6,242,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $6,497,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $6,764,500,000,000.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and budget outlays for fiscal years 2000 through 2004 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $280,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $283,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $300,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $285,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $302,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $293,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $312,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $303,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $321,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $313,800,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $16,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $16,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $15,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $17,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $18,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,600,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $19,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $19,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $19,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $19,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $19,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,200,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $1,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $1,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $1,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $1,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−200,000,000.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $24,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $24,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $23,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $24,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $24,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,000,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $15,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $11,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $11,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $11,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,000,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $11,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $11,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $15,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $15,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $15,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,500,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $54,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $545,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $55,600,000,000
(B) Outlays, $50,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $57,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $59,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,800,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $11,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $9,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $9,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $9,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $9,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,700,000,000.
(10) Elementary and Secondary Education, and Vocational Education (501):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $20,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $22,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $22,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $22,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $22,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,800,000,000.
(11) Higher Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500, except for 501):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $46,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $46,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $46,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $47,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $48,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,700,000,000.
(12) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $157,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $153,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $166,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $165,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $176,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $177,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $188,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $189,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $202,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $202,800,000,000.
(13) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $207,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $207,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $220,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $220,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $228,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $228,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $248,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $249,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $266,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $266,900,000,000.
(14) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $256,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $259,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $268,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $271,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $282,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $285,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $291,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $295,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $301,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $304,000,000,000.
(15) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $99,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $99,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $84,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $84,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $107,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $107,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $106,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $106,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $126,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $126,000,000,000.
(16) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $43,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $44,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $45,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $45,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $45,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,300,000,000.
(17) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $26,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $27,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $27,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $26,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $26,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,000,000,000.
(18) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $13,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $14,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $14,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $14,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $14,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,400,000,000.
(19) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $278,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $278,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $279,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $279,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $282,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $282,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $286,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $286,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $291,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $291,900,000,000.
(20) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $1,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $3,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $6,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $9,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $12,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $9,900,000,000.
(21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $−35,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−35,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $−39,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−39,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $−43,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−43,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $−38,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−38,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $−38,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−38,500,000,000.

SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

Not later than September 30, 1999, the House Committee on Ways and Means shall report to the House a reconciliation bill that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of revenues for that committee is not less than: $1,406,000,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 2000 and $7,553,900,000,000 in revenues for fiscal years 2000 through 2004.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to raise a parliamentary point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, do the rules of the House require that an offeror of the amendment be a supporter and proponent of the amendment that he offers and proposes to the House?

The CHAIRMAN. House Resolution 131 explicitly makes it in order for the gentleman from Oklahoma to offer this amendment. The Chair does not assess the attitude of the gentleman from Oklahoma toward the proposition.

Mr. SPRATT. Would it be in order to ask if the gentleman does indeed support this, or if he is offering it for dilatory purposes?

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Oklahoma rise?

Mr. COBURN. To speak in favor of my amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and a Member opposed each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

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

Mr. Chairman, the reason I am offering this amendment is because millions of dollars and nearly 1,000 people in the executive branch spent time preparing this budget. The President spoke in his State of the Union speech. He outlined the plans that he would submit.

The reason I am offering this budget is because it is fair to the President to debate his issues. It is ironic that nobody from his party would submit his budget.

There is no question I have great disagreements with many aspects of the budget, but the American people deserve to hear his budget outlined as scored by the CBO, as every other budget that will be presented on this floor, and what it actually says, because it is my contention that the budget that is presented does not go along with what the President said in his State of the Union speech. I hope through this discussion and with the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, that we will find out where that is.

There is no intention to deceive anybody. It is an honest and sincere desire to make sure that this budget is considered. But I think it is also implicit on us to use the same scoring mechanisms, assuming all the assumptions in his budget, that we would do that.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) is recognized for 20 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Would the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) state his parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. NUSSLE. Yes. Is the gentleman who has claimed the time in opposition to this amendment opposed to the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already established that he is in opposition to the amendment. He is entitled to 20 minutes of debate.

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) is recognized.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would first like to say that we have a letter from Jacob J. Lew, director of the Office of Management and Budget, saying that he is informed that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) will be offering a substitute to the budget resolution today.

This amendment is being characterized as the President's budget. The Administration has not been consulted in the development of this amendment. It is our understanding that it is based on a set of assumptions that is quite different from those presented in the President's budget. Therefore, we do not support the amendment.

While we are talking about the President's budget, though, and drawing comparisons and contrasts, let me take just a minute to point out a very significant difference between the Republican budget and the President's budget.

The President sent up early this year a request to increase defense by $84 billion over the next 6 years, $68 billion of which would fall in the next 5 years. As Members can see, the President has proposed a pretty robust defense budget starting this year and continuing through the 10-year time frame of the budget to the point where it reaches nearly $385 billion.

Let me point out two factors in the Republican budget which really work against the claim, undercut the claim, that their budget is supportive of national defense.

First of all, in the first 5 years of their budget they offer $29 billion more than the President, $29.6 billion in budget authority. Members can only use budget authority, as the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) earlier said, if it has outlays to back it up. Outlays are money we can spend.

In giving spending authority to the Pentagon, their budget in the first 5 years matches the $30 billion increase in defense spending budget authority. With only $5.2 billion, only one-sixth of the money they are putting up can actually be used in this period of time. So in the first 5 years, while they sort of beat their breast and say, look what we are doing for defense over and above the President, in truth, they pull this punch by not providing the outlays to back it up.

In the second period of time this chart very graphically shows what happens to their defense budget and where they put their preferences. Because in the year 2004 their defense budget peaks, and thereafter it is the black line on this chart, it is flat as a pancake. It never increases in the next 5 years more than $1 billion.

What is wrong with that? That is the period when the procurement holiday is over. That is the period when the F–22 and the V–22 and the joint strike fighter and missile defense and everything else is going to be procured. That is when we need the money more than ever.

What happens in the Republican budget? It bottoms out. Why does it bottom out? Because when they were forced to choose between national defense and tax cuts, they opted clearly for tax cuts, so much so that they plotted an out year budget that is totally unrealistic.

I asked the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) on the floor the other day, when he came to speak in support of missile defense, how in the world was he going to pay for it? Because that is the time frame when he would be deploying missile defense, putting the satellites in space, the ground interceptors in place.

He said, I can say that our numbers are real. That is the thing that worries me, this is a real number. Their tax cut will make impossible any increase in defense in those years to do the things they say and purport they want to do for national defense. Their budget is a disaster for national defense compared to the President's budget.

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

Mr. Chairman, our staff was in contact with one Elizabeth Gore and outlined our plans. She had no objections to the assumptions that we made on that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

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

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important that we have this debate. As the gentleman from Oklahoma mentioned, the

President and his team spent literally $1 million putting their budget together. I think it deserves careful consideration by the Members of this body.

□ 1530

First of all, I want to point out a chart we have used all day, and I think it is important because there are clear distinctions and differences between our plan and the President's plan.

We believe that every penny of Social Security taxes should go only for Social Security. There is a difference there between us and the President. If my colleagues look at the difference in the plan, and again these are not our numbers, these are from the Congressional Budget Office, we secure $1.8 trillion for Medicare and Social Security over the next 10 years. The President is somewhere in the neighborhood of $1.65 trillion.

I want to give some credit to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the Democrats and the Blue Dog budget. In fact, in some respects, we should feel honored because, in many respects, their budget looks a lot more like our budget than it does the President's budget.

But one of the biggest differences between the various budget plans that are being offered here today is we believe that, once we have saved Social Security, once we have said that every penny of Social Security taxes will only go for Social Security, and then, secondly, we say we are going to live by the spending caps that we and the White House agreed to. I was there for the bill signing, and I think the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) was there as well. It was a glorious day out on the White House lawn. We said we are going to live by these spending caps, and we are going to keep our word even if the President does not.

The President has in his budget exceeded the spending caps by about $30 billion. Again, to the credit of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and the Blue Dogs, I think they do a better job of living by those spending caps.

But I think the biggest difference between our budget, the Blue Dog budget, and more importantly the President's budget is the President imposes about $45.8 billion, depending on whose scoring we use, but over the next 5 years, we are looking somewhere in the neighborhood of $46 billion in new taxes.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking member of the Committee on Budget, for doing a yeoman's job today.

Mr. Chairman, the Coburn alternative is a sham, and the Republican budget is a failure. It fails our future retirees, it fails our veterans, it fails our families, and it fails our children and their education.

The Republican budget increases military spending, yet fails to itemize veterans' pay and retirement benefits and at the same time cuts funding for Head Start and after-school programs.

What is worse, now the Republicans are failing to use the projected $2.8 trillion surplus to extend the solvency of Social Security by even one day. Instead, the Republicans' plan gambles with the guarantee we have made to our seniors, our women, and our families by proposing tax cuts for the wealthiest in the Nation.

Do not forget, the Republican budget fails to use one red cent for Medicare, which benefits mainly the middle income folks and retirees in this Nation.

A responsible budget will save Social Security and Medicare, invest in our children and their education, support our veterans and our farmers, and give targeted tax relief to working Americans. The Republican budget fails in all of these areas and must be defeated.

Vote against the Coburn amendment. Vote against the Republican budget. Vote for the Democratic alternative.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would just make mention of the fact that, in this budget, there are no specific targeted tax cuts for anyone. To continue to speak on this House floor about tax cuts for rich people, which is not our intention in the first place, but to say that is erroneous.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER).

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

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, the Constitution was established to provide for the common defense. However, at a time when the threat of rogue nations with nuclear weapons remain strong and the administration has ordered an unprecedented number of deployments, our troops and military are not as well equipped or as well provided for as yesterday.

Consider: For the first time in decades, we are failing to meet recruitment goals. For example, in 1998, the Navy missed its recruiting goals by 12 percent. Additionally, there is a 13½ percent wage gap between civilian and military pay. In fact, many military families need the assistance of food stamps just to survive.

My colleagues may be pondering this weakened state of U.S. military forces and feel alarmed about our current level of national security, but there is hope. The same President who has overseen this tremendous decline in our military has proposed a solution to undo the devastation.

First, the President proposes defense spending over the next 6 years, which is as much as $70 billion below the Defense Chiefs' requirements to maintain our current level of national security.

Second, the President realizes that the U.S. House, which declared that the U.S. should deploy a national missile defense system to protect our Nation and troops, is mistaken. That must be why he would rescind $230 million in funding for the development of a national missile defense.

To improve the financial condition of our military families, the President has slashed military construction funding, including money for military family housing, by $3.1 billion.

For those of my colleagues who desire to improve national security by inadequately funding our armed services, by stealing pledged funds from our national missile defense program, and by severely reducing construction for our military and its families, I urge their support for the Clinton-Gore budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding me this time.

There has been a lot of complaints about the President's budget and how it treats the National Institutes of Health. As members of the committee know, I have been the author in the past of an amendment to double the size of our commitment to medical research through the National Institutes of Health. In fact, the committee defeated the amendment last year. They defeated it this year. In fact, the Republican controlled committee at one point, and the Republican House, wanted to cut the NIH by 5 percent.

Let us talk about the Republican budget that is before us today. If my colleagues look at what they have in the health function, they tell us in the very little detail they give us about their budget that they are going to double the size of the National Institutes of Health, but they actually cut the level below the baseline in the health function, which means that we are going to have to choose between community health centers, between WIC, Women and Infant Children programs. We are going to have to decide between nutrition programs and the NIH.

That is the problem with the Republican budget. They do not tell us where the cuts come from. They lock in $1 trillion tax cut on surpluses that we do not know whether they are going to come true or not. They bust the caps because they know that $28 billion in nondefense discretionary cuts they want to make just are not there. That is the problem with the budget.

So we can engage in theatrics today of writing up a budget that is not going to be given any real consideration because we do not want to look at the truth behind the majority's budget.

At the end of the day, we all know sometime in August or September or October we will get down to business and write a real budget. But a two-page budget like that that was put before

the Committee on Budget with no detail, and the chairman, a good friend of mine, saying my Members do not want to talk about where we are going to make the cuts right now, is not a real budget.

The Republicans' budget is not a real budget. It does not increase NIH. If we were to follow this budget, we would be cutting community health centers, we would be cutting WIC, nutrition, all those programs that a bipartisan majority of Members of this body have supported in the past.

We can engage in theatrics, but at the end of the day, we are going to have to write a real budget like the Democratic budget.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the time remaining on both sides?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) has 14 minutes remaining. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 12 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a note that, last year, NIH was increased 14.5 percent in our budget. I would also like to make a note that WIC is not in the category that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) just referred to and is not at risk at all under this budget.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I find there is much to disagree with in the Clinton budget, but I want to focus on two areas just in the 60 seconds that I have.

First of all, when the President's budget came before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of which I serve and I am chairman of the Subcommittee on Health, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), the ranking member, said it was a pack of cards, house of cards. He recognized as well as all of the Republicans and Democrats that basically it was underfunded.

The second point is that, not only was it underfunded, but the whole budget process in terms of where they thought they would get the money to pay for the items they were talking about was not really there. Smoke and mirrors.

So the Republicans on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs supported increasing the amount of money for veterans, and we proposed an almost $2 billion increase. The Democrats on this side said they want to do $3 billion. We thought it out, and we decided that the compromise was $2 billion. We put forth that, and we passed it out of our committee. It passed with bipartisan support. There were about four Democrats who voted for the Republican position.

So I think the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman STUMP) and others were courageous in their attempt to increase the veterans budget, and I am glad we did.

Mr. Chairman. I want to compliment my colleague from Ohio, Chairman KASICH, for bringing his FY 2000 budget resolution to the floor today.

Thomas Jefferson stated:

> The same prudence which in private life would forbid our paying our own money for unexplained projects, forbids it in the dispensation of the public money.

These words still hold today.

I support the Kasich budget because it does what I believe needs to be done. It establishes a "safe deposit box" so that Social Security funds cannot be raided, it provides for debt reduction, controls spending while increasing defense spending, and provides much-needed tax relief. Furthermore, it increases funding for education and provides an increase of more than 1 billion for veterans health care over the President's budget.

I am troubled by the President's FY 2000 budget because it would increase domestic spending by $200 billion, increase taxes by over $100 billion, it would create 120 new government programs, and it would break the spending caps put in place in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. Ironically, the President, who talks a good game when it comes to education, has proposed cutting special education (title VI block grants) by $375 million.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that passage of the President's budget would erode all the hard work and effort it has taken to cut wasteful spending and reduce the size of government.

While I find there is much to disagree with in the President's budget, I want to focus on two areas in his proposal that I find particularly intolerable.

As a veteran I find the administration's budget to be short of support for our Nation's men and women who served their country in time of need.

The President's budget is a mockery and I believe that he must be held accountable for sending us such a woefully inadequate VA budget, especially as it relates to VA medical care.

As chairman of the Veterans Subcommittee on Health, I know all too well how difficult it is to meet the health care needs of our Nation's veterans. In fact, when VA Secretary Togo West presented the administration's budget, I suggested that he might want to resubmit a new one because the one he was submitting seeks no funding increase for VA medical care above the 1999 baseline level. That makes our job even more difficult.

The President's budget doesn't address how the VA will find the money to pay for fixed cost increases of $870 million for inflation and salaries, at least $135 million in new costs for hepatitis, and estimated $250 million to meet emergency care obligations, increased medication and prosthetics of $150 million, and a shortfall of $100 million in medical collections. I have long believed that these third party payer collections should be a supplement to and not instead of guaranteed health care dollars.

The other area of concern I have is with how the President deals with Social Security. During the last election we heard a lot about saving Social Security. The President criticized Congress for not doing enough to save the Social Security program. He pledged to and I quote, "save Social Security first" and to dedicate 100 percent of the surplus for that purpose.

However, as is so often the case, what he says and what he does are sometimes at odds. The budget he presented to Congress uses not 100 percent of the surplus for Social Security. Not 90 percent, not 80 percent, not 70, but 60 percent of future surpluses would go to the trust fund. Now, Mr. President, which is it all of the surplus, 60 percent of the surplus, or will you change your mind again at some future date.

I don't think we should play politics with the budget, especially when it comes to our Nation's veterans and seniors. They made our country what it is today and I, for one believe we owe them a debt of gratitude. Smoke and mirrors to pay for your new programs is one thing, but breaking a pledge we made with these individuals is another.

I'm committed to making sure that our Nation's veterans and our seniors are treated with the dignity they deserve.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN).

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Chairman, I think we have to start off with a simple question; and that is, how do WE get $778 billion worth of tax cuts if we do not have someplace to look at in the budget?

So I am reminded, probably back in 1995, that we are back at the same issue. We are hitting the very same people that lose every time; that is the veterans, that is the elderly, the children, and the disabled. The facts are there.

I just heard the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS). We are putting $3 billion in. They are adding $1 billion. But the fact of the matter is ours keeps the money in there, and theirs would actually cut veterans over the next 5 years.

I want to know what happened to the promise to our veterans. I simply cannot believe, also, that we are looking at low income women and children and the disabled. We are going to cut, and 1 million low-income women, infants and children would lose nutrition assistance. In Florida, we found that to be the most successful program to have healthy children.

We do welfare reform. These people have to have places to take their children. What happens? We are looking at the fact of cutting, and 50,000 low-income children will lose their child care assistance under the Child Care and Development Block Grant.

But here is one that absolutely I do not get. I spend half of my time in the district with people that come in to talk to me that are trying to apply for SSI. They want to cut administrative expenses. Let me tell my colleagues, it is taking 2, 3, 4 years for these folks already to get their claims done. These people are losing their homes. Their children cannot go to college. We ought not to be slashing administrative expenses in this area. We ought to be bolstering this area. Then on top of that, we are going to cut and reduce Meals On Wheels, congregate dining sites.

Then I just hope that my colleagues can go home and talk to their constituents about this budget.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE).

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak about a feature of the budget being offered by the Blue Dog Coalition and the budget that is being offered at this point by the majority.

The budget being offered by the majority, which is the President's budget, is using the Social Security surplus twice and claiming that this extends the life of the Social Security system to the year 2050. I am surprised that the majority would offer that type of a budget. I understand this is the President's budget. I must say that this is a point at which the Blue Dog Coalition disagrees with the President.

We feel that, if we are going to reform the Social Security system, it is incumbent upon us to do so on a forthright fashion, recognizing we have some very difficult decisions to make, and not assuming that we can extend the life of that system by simply giving it a pipeline into the general funds.

For this reason, we would like to urge that there be bipartisan support of the Blue Dog budget as opposed to the budget that is currently being advocated.

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

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding me this time, and I thank him for his outstanding leadership as we debate the budget.

This has been a very good debate because I think it highlights the differences between the two parties, and it gives the American people an opportunity to make some very fundamental choices.

On the one hand, the Democrats are saying that there are some very real and large problems in this country that need attention, problems like Social Security and extending the solvency of the Social Security program, problems like Medicare, extending solvency there, and problems like education, which needs our serious national attention.

On the other hand, the Republicans offer us the panacea of tax cuts, tax cuts that largely go to the wealthy. What happens in the Republican budget is this, the poor and the middle class count their tax breaks in terms of tens and hundreds. The wealthy count their tax breaks in terms of 10,000s.

These tax breaks that they talk about do not add to the solvency of Social Security by one day. They do not add to the solvency of Medicare by one day, nor do they address any of the education problems we have in this country. These tax cuts do not give us a single teacher. They do not give us a single additional classroom.

□ 1545

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Point of Order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I believe the speaker is off the subject at this time, and I do not believe that is proper.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Will the gentleman repeat the point of order?

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Sure. The gentleman is talking off subject.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN) will speak to the amendment pending.

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure I understand the objection. I think it is more the gentleman does not like what I am saying as opposed to the relevancy of what I am saying.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair will remind all Members that they will speak to the amendment pending.

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, could the Chair specify what is the objection of the gentleman to the statement I am making?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman must maintain a nexus to the budget amendment pending and the President's budget overall.

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, the point I was making is that in the context of debate on national policy, there must be areas of comparison and contrast. I was attempting to establish a contrast between the Democratic approach and the Republican approach.

They have now brought up a straw man and claimed this is what they are advocating, when actually they wanted to use the President's budget as a vehicle upon which to punch, a vehicle that we Democrats are not talking about. We Democrats are talking about a specific vehicle which I am in fact addressing, a vehicle that addresses Medicare, Social Security and education.

Now, I do not see how that is not relevant, but I can see how it might be disturbing to my Republican colleagues. The point is we have an important opportunity today to make a choice: a Republican approach that wants to hit a straw man and produce tax benefits for the very wealthy; or a Democratic approach that is fundamentally sound and addresses the key problems of America today.

I think we ought to opt for the Democratic approach.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

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

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the gentleman who just spoke said we are not talking about the Clinton-Gore, the President's, budget. Quite frankly, he candidly said we do not want to talk about the Clinton-Gore budget. In reality, this is the Clinton-Gore budget and it is, in fact, what we are offering at this time on the floor.

Our position is this deserves to be discussed and to be debated. Millions of dollars were spent to develop this budget. If the Democrats do not want to offer it, we want to offer it and at least have some discussion of what is in it. So I understand the gentleman's embarrassment about not wanting to talk about the President's budget, but the facts are the facts.

So let us talk about that budget. My colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE), on the other side, pointed out that the President's budget double counts the Social Security surplus and actually spends that amount of money twice. Let us talk about what the Republican budget versus the Clinton-Gore budget does with Social Security.

We save, as my colleagues understand, I hope, by now, 100 percent of that surplus. Beyond that, the President, by contrast, as scored by CBO, spends $158 billion of that surplus. I do not know how anyone can tell the American people they are saving it when they are spending $158 billion of it.

The second point I want to make is that one of my colleagues who just spoke on the other side said, well, I think the Republicans are ultimately going to bury the budget caps, after all, I do not think they are really going to live within the budget that they proposed.

I simply want to make the point that he can speculate all he wants about the Republican budget. In point of fact, this chart right here shows quite clearly the Republican budget on the floor today does not break the budget cap. We entered into negotiations in 1997, and we set statutory spending caps. Our budget on the floor today does not break those caps.

So my colleagues can speculate, but the fact is the President's budget does break the caps by $31 billion.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, there is a good bit of rhetoric being spoken here today. I think our Republican friends would understandably like to do anything other than compare straightforwardly the Democratic alternative and the Republican alternative that are before us today.

The facts are that in at least five critical aspects the Democratic product is vastly superior, and I do not think really anyone has challenged that effectively today.

First, the Democratic alternative extends Social Security solvency until 2050 and Medicare solvency to 2020. The Republican budget does not extend that one day.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. COBURN. Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. COBURN. I believe the discussion is to be focused on the amendment at hand. The amendment at hand is the President's budget.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members that the President's budget is pending, however the President's budget extends to everything affecting the United States budget.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Absolutely. Every item that I am addressing is touched on by all these budget promotions, again, parliamentary maneuvers, anything to avoid a direct comparison of the Democratic and Republican alternatives that are before us.

The second point of comparison: Over 10 years the Democratic budget pays down $146 billion more in public debt than the Republican budget.

Third point of comparison, education. Over 5 years, $10 billion more in the Democratic alternative for education, making it possible to reduce class size, to bring on 100,000 new teachers; making it possible to get our children out of trailers. And I speak as someone from a district where thousands of children are going to school in hundreds of trailers. In low-income areas, in high-growth areas, we simply must give our children the modernized facilities, the good equipment they deserve.

The fourth area of difference, tax cuts. The Democratic budget provides for targeted tax cuts; long-term care tax credits, child care tax credits, research and experimentation tax credits, and tax credits to let local school authorities get ahead of the curve in issuing school bonds.

Fifth, Veterans and veterans' health care. We discussed that earlier today. The Republican budget makes a show of boosting veterans' health care, does it in the first year only, and then actually cuts, cuts, veterans' health care $400 million below the freeze level over the next 5 years.

We could go on and on. There is no question the Democratic budget is fiscally responsible. There is no question it is targeted at areas of urgent national needs. It is far superior to the majority proposal, and I urge its adoption.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair will acknowledge that the amendment pending is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), and in the future will refrain from characterizing it as the President's amendment.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY).

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

Mr. Chairman, it is clear the Democrat Members of this body do not want to talk about the President's budget proposal, because the President's budget proposal is the proposal to increase taxes on the American people.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SPRATT. Point of Order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. SPRATT. The Chair just stated it should be referred to as the Coburn resolution rather than as the President's budget.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Members may debate the content of the amendment.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, it is no wonder that the proposal that is presented by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) that was presented to Congress on behalf of the White House——

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) will suspend for one moment, please.

The Chair will clarify his statement. The Chair will refrain from referring to the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) as the President's budget, however, the Members have every right to do so.

Mr. ARMEY. The President of the United States is proud to say that he is trying to set money aside for Social Security and Medicare and, yes, he does try, but he tries with some reservation because of his commitment to increase taxes and spending.

The fact is the Republicans set more money aside for Social Security and Medicare than the President does in his budget. After these funds are set aside, we discover that the American people will still, over the next decade, on average, pay over $5,000 in increased taxes beyond that which is necessary. We in the Republican Party believe we ought to give that money back to the people who earned it in the first place, but the President and the Democrats do not want to do that.

In fact, in a recent speech in Buffalo, President Clinton told us that we could, he says, ''We could give it all back to you and hope you might spend it right, but,'' but he does not believe the American people can do that. We, however, believe the President should understand that we can spend our own money that we earn wisely and that he should not take more than what is necessary. So, after we set aside more money for Social Security and for Medicare than the President does, we think we ought to have a tax reduction.

The President says let us raise taxes, 80 different taxes, for a net of $52 billion over 5 years. And then, on top of everything else, the President raises taxes on whom? As this chart shows, precisely on the least income-earning Americans in the country. That is to say, the President wants to build government so badly that he is willing to hold back part of the payroll taxes of our young working Americans, who pay for the retirement security of America's seniors, so the President can instead use it for new government programs. And, in addition to that, levy $52 billion worth of increased taxes on the poorest of these working Americans.

I must say, I must say, given this inability to in fact save Social Security taxes for Social Security, to in fact restrain the growth of government, in the face of all the liberal demands of his constituency, and to in fact cut taxes instead of raising them as he does, and indeed raising them on the poorest of Americans, given the President's inability to do something other than these compulsive things, it is no wonder my colleagues on the Democrat side of the aisle do not want to talk about the President's budget. I would not want to either.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

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

I think my friend the majority leader is a little bit confused. The President has identified some revenue adjustments. The difference is the Republicans, through their Committee on the Budget Chair, admit that the Republicans are going to have them but they are not laying out what they are in terms of the offsets and the pre-increases.

I think, however, the more fundamental point is that they have it precisely wrong in terms of, unlike the President's proposal, they do not give tools to our communities to help them build more livable communities. Their budget fails to give the tools that communities need to help improve the quality of life, like the administration's budget does when it offers increased choices for citizens in areas of transportation, housing, regional planning, open space preservation, education and crime control. The Democratic alternative recognizes the importance of these initiatives.

The proposal from the Republicans would be a disaster, if there was any chance that it would ever be implemented. It siphons off nearly $1 trillion in tax cuts and pays for them with unnecessary and painful budget cuts, while ignoring key investments that are needed to make communities more liveable.

The good news is that it will not be adopted in this form, because even the Republicans have no intention of implementing it. The bad news is it is simply a license to avoid responsible budgeting.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and, instead, strive to produce a budget that promotes livable communities and fiscal stability.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the time on each side?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr.

COBURN) has 8¼ minutes, and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, listening to my colleague talk about tools to build livable communities, I would point out in the Clinton-Gore budget some things they do for tools for livable communities.

The Clinton-Gore budget cuts State and local law enforcement assistance by $758 million. It reduces funding for State prison grants from $729 million to only $75 million.

□ 1600

It eliminates local law enforcement block grants. And here is a great one. On January 28, 1999, Vice President AL GORE announced the Department of Justice would provide $28 million to help law enforcement agencies hire more police officers, the Community Oriented Police Services, COPS. Three days later, on February 3, President Clinton's budget, the budget we are debating right now, cut funding for COPS by $155 million. It does not seem to me that that is going to create more livable communities.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER).

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I rise against the Coburn amendment.

It is very often in these debates we have a great number of charts and a great deal of interpretation on what we are going to call the budget and how we are going to contour its label. But, in fact, there are certain fundamental differences that I think all Americans are starting to see in this debate.

One is that the President and those of us on the Democratic side of the aisle believe that Medicare is an important Federal program that aids many seniors and it should be shored up, it should be expanded, and we should cover prescription drugs. That is what we believe. That is not what the opponents believe.

We believe that schools are important, education is important, teachers are important, new construction for overcrowded schools. That is what we believe. This is what is in our value systems. That is what we believe the other side will not speak about because it is not what they believe.

We believe that it is important to pay down, to retire some of our Federal debt because every dollar that we pay into interest are dollars we cannot spend for all of the things that all of us here support, whether it be tax cuts, whether it be defense, whether it be education or anything else. These are fundamental dividing lines between us.

And they can hold up charts all they like, but we will never see the sponsors of this amendment talk about those three fundamental issues. It makes us wonder, do they not realize that these are the issues that motivate Americans?

Right now seniors pay more out of their own pocket than when the Medicare program was created in the 1960s, more today than at that time we declared a health care emergency. That is a shame and we should reverse that.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think it is very important that the gentleman raised the Medicare issue. Because, in fact, the statements of the President in his State of the Union do not match the budget, and that is one of the reasons his budget needs to be compared to.

As a physician who cares for Medicare patients, let me tell my colleagues what the President's budget does for Medicare. It freezes inpatient hospital payments. That is the first thing it does. So what that is going to do is shift the cost for everybody that is not Medicare, raise their cost for health care. So it is an indirect tax on everybody else in the country.

The second thing it does is it reduces laboratory services payments. They are all making a ton of money. It reduces prices paid for durable medical equipment, which has already been reduced by about 50 percent over the last 5 years. It imposes $194 million next year, $970 million over 5 years, and $1.94 billion over 10 years in new user fees on Medicare.

We cannot get doctors to care for a lot of our Medicare patients. Now we are going to charge them something every year if they are going to be a Medicare provider. We now are having trouble getting HMO firms to give care under the Medicare Plus Choice Plan. He has a charge, a tax on everybody that is a provider in a Medicare Plus Choice Plan.

So as we go through the things that the President said he wants to help save Medicare, in fact it is very, very different from that.

There is a total cut of $3.3 billion in Medicare, according to the CBO, over the next 10 years. This next year $1 billion is cut from Medicare by President Clinton through these and other things. That is not to mention the reduction in drug payments. The whole Medicare Commission failed over the fight over prescription drug benefits. And yet in his budget that he submits, which I am submitting so we can debate it, he cuts the Medicare prescription benefit that is out there. He cuts the drug payment for cancer drugs to keep people alive that are on Medicare.

So it is important that we talk about what is really in the President's budget. I understand why it was not offered, but it is still very important that we discuss what is in the budget.

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

Let me simply make clear that that is not in our budget, not in the Spratt substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I wonder why there is such a desire to discuss the President's budget when it is not before us. I know there is no merit. I gather there is great delight in discussing irrelevant things. I cannot imagine why we would do that.

Let me tell my colleagues why I support the Democrat alternative. The Democrat alternative stands up for families, stands up for children, stands up for seniors, stands up for rural communities. It indeed cuts taxes. But it does not do what the Republican budget does. Now that is before us. The Republican budget is before us, and it cuts taxes using the greatest amount of resources to give the least amount of benefit to taxes.

We target our tax cut to make sure that we respect child care needs, we respect long-term care in terms of needing health care for our seniors. All of those are part of our targeted tax reduction. What we do in our spending and what we do in our tax laws says a lot about who we are. Our priorities for spending, our tax policy says to the world what things are important.

I submit to my colleagues that the Republican budget says it does not care for children, it does not care for schoolchildren in the way that it should, it does not care for seniors in the way it proposes to do, it does not care for rural families in the way that they claim they do.

Indeed, my colleagues should support the Democrat alternative, which does what it says, and not discuss the President's budget, which is not relevant in this discussion.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, what is amazing to me is that despite the record high taxes on the American people and unprecedented surpluses, what does the President's budget propose? More taxes, over $100 billion in new taxes and fees. And what does he propose to do with these new taxes? More big government programs and more spending.

Now, usually I try to illustrate my points with legible charts. But I am afraid that the only way I could fit all of the President's new taxes and fees and all of his new spending programs was to do it on these charts. I ask my colleagues to do the best they can to read them.

But the point is, how does the President pay for all of this new spending? He spends over $100 billion of the Social Security surplus during the next 5 years, eliminates or underfunds programs like special education and NIH research, reduces Medicare payments, and again proposes over $100 billion in new taxes and fees.

In conclusion, I just want to urge my colleagues to vote against the President's budget, vote against the new spending and new programs made possible by raiding Social Security and raising taxes.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) who

wishes to rise and speak in support of the President's budget, who was the chairman of the Committee on the Budget when the Deficit Reduction Act of 1993 was passed which has brought us to this point.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding me the time.

First let me say that I think the most irresponsible budget that I have ever seen on this House floor by a majority is what we have before us today.

Secondly, I am going to vote for this misinterpretation of the President's budget for one fundamental reason. I have differences with it and many things. He is over-optimistic about what we can do in the year 2000. The budgets that we have are unrealistic for dealing with any legitimate need. But the President did put forward before us a realistic proposal to deal with the funding of Social Security and Medicare.

His program adds significantly to the reserves of the Social Security trust fund. Yes, he does. He adds significantly to the reserves for Medicare. It does not solve the problems in total, but it is an important beginning step to deal with them.

The Republican proposal adds penny zero to the Social Security trust fund, adds penny zero to the Medicare trust fund.

The President is on the right track. And as a symbolic vote for the real leadership that he has provided, I will vote for this misinterpretation of his budget.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would just add that the GAO reports the President's proposal to strengthen the hospital insurance program is more perceived than real. In realty, nothing about the program has changed.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT).

Mr. DeMINT. Mr. Chairman, as a new Member of Congress, it is refreshing today to hear some honesty. I have heard the Members of the President's own party call his budget a straw dog that we are embarrassed to even talk about.

It is embarrassing when the President talks about saving Social Security yet continues to spend the Social Security Trust Fund. It is embarrassing when he talks about saving Medicare when he cuts the Medicare budget. It is embarrassing when he raises taxes and makes promises he cannot keep.

Now, I know this does not represent the values of my colleagues. It does not represent our values. We need to call this budget what it is. Vote it down and move on to some honest debate with their budget and ours on the table.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) has 3¼ minutes remaining. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has expired.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON).

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, it is easy to understand why most of my colleagues do not want to vote for this President's budget. As a veteran, I have looked at it. And the President flat-lines benefits for veterans. The Republican budget actually increases it by $1 billion.

Let me just tell my colleagues a few things. The President's budget busts the spending caps by $30 billion. We hold them. The President's budget raids Social Security money for more and more spending. Our budget protects Social Security and Medicare. The President's budget cuts $11 billion in Medicare, cuts the Republican budget. The Republican budget protects Medicare. The President's budget raises taxes by $172 billion.

To quote President Reagan, ''There they go again, spending more money.'' In fact, the President has said Congress should not even consider providing tax relief for 15 years. Let us not let that happen. Vote this budget down.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding me this time.

We have a very hard time in agriculture today, and the fix that we need is some type of revenue insurance, some way of farmers insuring their risk. The Secretary of Agriculture came before our Subcommittee on Appropriations and said, ''We cannot do it on the cheap to fix this problem.''

Well, let us look at the President's budget. What does he have for crop insurance to fix the problem? A big fat goose egg. What does the Republican budget have in it? $6 billion to help our farmers. And also, in the President's budget, the livestock producers are going to have their taxes increased by $504 million right out of their hides.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) has 1¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, it is important that the President's proposals be put forward. It is important to contrast what was stated in the State of the Union with the actual numbers coming through in his budget. It is important for us to give his budget a comparison to the other budgets on this floor. It is important for us all to remember that, while he is saying he is saving Medicare, he cuts it $1 billion this year, $11 billion over the next 5 years. While it is important that he says he is saving Social Security, he spends all but 58 percent of it this next year and all but 62 percent of it the next 4 years.

Vice President GORE, in the Clinton-Gore budget, one of the things that he said in his book, and I quote from Earth and Balance, ''Look at the budget where we are borrowing a billion dollars every 24 hours and in the process endangering the future of our children. Yet nobody is doing anything about it.''

Well, I would propose to my colleagues that the Clinton-Gore budget does nothing about that, that in fact it increases the debt on our children $1.5 trillion between now and the year 2005.

□ 1615

It runs a budget deficit of $663 billion over the next 5 years. The budget of the majority runs a surplus.

If this vision for America is appealing to my colleagues, higher taxes, more debt for our grandchildren, stealing money from Social Security, cuts in Medicare, then I would encourage them to support my resolution which is the Clinton-Gore budget and vote for it. But if they want to begin easing the debt burden on our grandchildren, save 100 percent of the Social Security trust fund surplus and actually increase spending for Medicare, then I encourage them to oppose my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 2, noes 426, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 74]

AYES—2

Rush
Sabo

NOES—426

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth

Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
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
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Filner

NOT VOTING—4

Burton
Owens
Pelosi
Stupak

□ 1635

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, and Messrs. METCALF, CLYBURN, COOKSEY and Mrs. NORTHUP changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall No. 74. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no''.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part 2 of House Report 106–77.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. MINGE

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 in the nature of a substitute printed in part 2 of House Report 106–77 offered by Mr. MINGE:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000.

The Congress declares that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000 and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2001 through 2004 are hereby set forth.

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2004:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,405,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,441,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,496,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,551,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,613,600,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: −$0.
Fiscal year 2001: −$3,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: −$11,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: −$11,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: −$14,300,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,418,785,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,316,307,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,493,021,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,546,516,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,608,848,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,405,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,436,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,468,250,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,527,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,583,300,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: −$900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: −$5,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: −$28,250,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: −$23,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: −$30,300,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $5,620,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $5,704,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $5,763,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $5,802,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $5,828,600,000,000.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and budget outlays for fiscal years 2000 through 2004 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $281,773,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $274,595,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $305,158,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $285,949,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $308,046,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $297,646,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $314,507,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $306,937,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $316,033,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $316,593,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $10,746,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,052,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $10,651,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,111,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $9,765,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $11,550,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,623,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $13,483,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,323,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $17,977,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,257,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $17,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,865,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $17,934,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,865,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $17,934,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,743,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $18,208,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,682,000,000.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $33,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$618,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$141,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,937,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$152,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,178,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$76,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,282,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$315,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,419,000,000.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $22,809,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,669,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $22,529,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,057,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $22,463,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,391,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $22,484,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,555,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $23,470,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,483,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $16,340,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,251,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $14,294,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,884,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $12,764,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,893,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $13,233,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,304,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $13,501,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,851,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $9,848,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,103,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $10,573,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,711,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $14,410,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,166,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $14,540,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,872,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $13,874,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,438,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $51,744,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,846,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $50,992,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,718,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $50,807,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,278,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $52,248,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,806,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $52,278,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,298,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $7,407,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,642,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $5,355,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,111,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $4,288,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,081,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $5,650,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,067,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $5,620,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,475,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $65,302,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,557,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $67,338,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,496,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $68,386,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,107,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $71,053,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,375,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $73,543,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,833,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $156,176,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $152,988,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $165,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $163,179,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $174,521,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $174,884,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $186,343,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $186,830,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $201,010,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $201,317,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $208,663,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $208,707,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $222,115,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $222,269,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $230,604,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $230,239,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $250,754,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $250,888,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $268,569,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $268,755,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $246,479,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $248,070,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $248,192,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $257,020,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $264,339,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $266,555,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $276,831,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $276,147,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $285,569,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $285,429,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $14,455,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,556,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $14,134,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,034,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $16,249,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,149,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $16,335,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,235,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $17,123,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,023,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $45,536,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,693,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $46,289,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,632,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $47,236,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,517,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $47,987,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,447,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $48,363,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,939,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $23,385,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,335,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $24,622,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,114,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $25,128,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,292,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $25,548,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,301,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $27,709,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,463,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $11,940,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,148,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $11,946,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,639,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $12,079,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,328,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $12,093,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,159,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $12,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,147,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $270,815,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $270,815,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $266,827,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $266,827,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $262,680,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $262,680,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $258,806,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $258,806,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $262,799,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $262,799,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$8,350,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$8,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$10,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$14,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$4,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$15,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$14,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$12,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$7,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$9,600,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, −$34,260,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$34,260,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$36,876,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$36,876,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$43,626,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$43,626,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$37,004,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$37,004,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$37,089,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$37,089,000,000.

SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

(a) RECONCILIATION.—Not later than September 30, 1999, the House Committee on Ways and Means shall report to the House a reconciliation bill that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of revenues for that committee is not less than: $0 in revenues for fiscal year 2000 and $41,600,000,000 in revenues for fiscal years 2000 through 2004.

(b) TAX CUT CONTINGENT ON SAVING SOCIAL SECURITY.—It shall not be in order in the House to consider a reconciliation bill reported pursuant to subsection (a) unless the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget has received a certification from the Board of Trustees of the social security trust funds that the funds are in actuarial balance for the 75-year period used in the most recent annual report of that Board pursuant to section 201(c)(2) of the Social Security Act.

SEC. 5. SAVING THE SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) under the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the social security trust funds are required to be off-budget for the purposes of the President's budget submission and the concurrent resolution on the budget;

(2) the social security trust funds have been running surpluses for 17 years;

(3) these surpluses have been used implicitly to finance the general operations of the Government;

(4) in fiscal year 2000, the social security surplus will exceed $137,000,000,000;

(5) for the first time in 24 years, a concurrent resolution on the budget balances the Federal budget without counting social security surpluses; and

(6) the only way to ensure social security surpluses are not diverted for other purposes is to balance the budget exclusive of such surpluses.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the social security surplus should not be used to fund other operations within the Government;

(2) the budget of the Government should balance without relying on social security trust funds to hide a deficit or inflate a surplus; and

(3) surpluses in the social security trust funds should be reserved, to be used exclusively by the social security system.

(c) POINT OF ORDER.—(1) It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any concurrent resolution on the budget, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that sets forth a deficit for any fiscal year. For purposes of this subsection, a deficit shall be the level (if any) set forth in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for that fiscal year pursuant to section 301(a)(3) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. In setting forth the deficit level pursuant to such section, that level shall not include any adjustments in aggregates that would be made pursuant to any reserve fund that provides for adjustments in allocations and aggregates for legislation that enhances retirement security or extends the solvency of the medicare trust funds or makes such changes in the medicare payment or benefit structure as are necessary.

(2) Paragraph (1) may be waived in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members voting.

SEC. 6. REMOVAL OF SOCIAL SECURITY FROM BUDGET PRONOUNCEMENTS.

It is the sense of Congress that any official statement issued by the Office of Management and Budget, the Congressional Budget Office, or any other agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government of surplus or deficit totals of the budget of the United States Government as submitted by the President or of the surplus or deficit totals of the congressional budget, and any description of, or reference to, such totals in any official publication or material issued by either of such Offices or any other such agency or instrumentality, shall exclude the outlays and receipts of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program under title II of the Social Security Act (including the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund) and the related provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

SEC. 7. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ALLOCATION OF ON-BUDGET SURPLUSES.

As reflected in this resolution, it is the sense of Congress that all on-budget surpluses should be distributed as follows:

(1) 50 PERCENT TO DEBT REDUCTION.—It is the determination of Congress that the national debt is too high. In a time of peace and prosperity, debt reduction is a top national priority. This reduction of debt will better position the Government to finance anticipated depletions of the social security and medicare trust funds. However, the Congress determines that such a reduction in debt shall not be construed as a substitute for needed substantive reforms of those programs to assure their long term financial integrity.

(2) 25 PERCENT TO TAX REDUCTION.—Congress determines that 4 types of tax reduction should be accommodated within this budget:

(A) Extensions of current temporary provision of the tax code.

(B) Targeted tax reduction in settings in which changes are needed for fairness and sound economic planning.

(C) Tax reform and simplification to eliminate complicated features of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(D) Consideration of across-the-board tax cuts.

(3) 25 PERCENT TO INVESTMENT IN PRIORITY AREAS.—Congress recognizes that the budget caps have imposed severe constraints on Government operations for fiscal year 2000, and without relief, programs may be difficult to administer in the ensuing fiscal years. As a result, investments in many priorities will be deferred or not made. The 25 percent of surplus allocated to priority programs is designed to offer opportunity to strengthen these programs in the years ahead. Congress finds that priorities include agriculture, defense, education, and veterans' programs, and others that may be from time-to-time determined.

SEC. 8. SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE.

It is the sense of the Congress that the Social Security and Medicare programs are vital to our nation's health and the retirement security of our citizens. Enactment of reforms to strengthen and preserve these programs must be an urgent priority.

(1) SOCIAL SECURITY.—After the Congress enacts legislation to reform and extend the solvency of the social security program, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may adjust allocations for fiscal years 2000 through 2004 to allow for general revenue transfers to the social security trust fund, subject to the following limitations: Fiscal year 2001, adjustments not greater than $8,500,000,000; fiscal year 2002, $16,500,000,000; fiscal year 2003, $25,500,000,000; and fiscal year 2004, $34,000,000,000.

(2) MEDICARE.—After the Congress enacts legislation to reform and extend the solvency of the medicare program, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may adjust allocations for fiscal years 2000 through 2004 to allow for general revenue transfers to the medicare trust fund, subject to the following limitations: Fiscal year 2001, $2,800,000,000; fiscal year 2002, $5,500,000,000; fiscal year 2003, $8,500,000,000; and fiscal year 2004, $11,000,000,000.

SEC. 9. UPDATING BASELINE PROJECTIONS AND PRIORITIES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000.

(a) UP-TO-DATE ESTIMATES OF ON-BUDGET SURPLUSES.—Upon the request of the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall make an up-to-date estimate of the projected on-budget surplus for the applicable fiscal year.

(b) ADJUSTMENTS.—Upon receipt of an up-to-date estimate of an on-budget surplus made pursuant to subsection (a), the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget shall adjust the aggregates of new budget authority, outlays, revenues, and the public debt as follows:

(1) Reduce the aggregates for public debt for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2001 by an amount equal to ½ of the increase (if any) in on-budget surplus projections above the amounts provided in this resolution.

(2) Increase the aggregates of new budget authority and outlays for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2004 by an amount equal to ¼ of the increase (if any) in on-budget surplus projections above the amounts provided in this resolution.

(3) Reduce the revenue aggregates for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2004 by an amount equal to ¼ of the increase (if any) in on-budget surplus projections above the amounts provided in this resolution.

SEC. 10. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING ENFORCEMENT.

It is the sense of Congress that before October 1, 2000, Congress should enact legislation to modify and extend the pay-as-you-go requirement through 2009, increase the discretionary spending limits set forth under section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 for fiscal years 2001 and 2002, and extend those limits to include fiscal years 2003 and 2004, to reflect the new budget authority and outlays as set forth in this resolution.

SEC. 11. INTENT OF THE COMMITTEE REGARDING CROP INSURANCE.

It is the intent of the Committee on the Budget of the House that function 350 for agriculture allow for the implementation of a new, comprehensive, affordable, and permanent crop and revenue insurance program. The cost of the program is assumed to be $___ billion in this resolution; but the program design has not been developed. When the program is developed such committee will take all steps necessary to work the crop and revenue insurance initiative into the budget resolution and budget process.

SEC. 12. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING THE MEDICARE+CHOICE PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the geographic disparity in payment rates for the medicare managed care program is inherently unfair;

(2) unfairness disproportionately effects rural areas and efficient health care markets;

(3) seniors in areas with higher reimbursement can receive additional benefits that are

unavailable to seniors in other areas of the country.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Medicare+Choice payment rate must be addressed to correct the current inequality, and any expansion of the medicare program can be made only after this disparity is addressed.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognize the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE).

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

Mr. Chairman, we have spent most of today debating what budget is best for the people of the United States of America. We have had conflicting budgets presented. The President's budget, or at least how it has been perceived by the other side, has just been voted upon, the majority budget will be voted on later in the day, I expect, and the democratic substitute will be voted on.

The Blue Dog Coalition, a group of moderate to conservative Democrats, has developed a substitute budget proposal. That substitute budget proposal is summarized on the easel that is in the well, and I would like to ask that my colleagues direct their attention to this substitute summary because it is important to understand both what the differences are and what the similarities are to the other budgets that are receiving consideration today.

Most importantly, Mr. Chairman, the Blue Dog budget recognizes that we have a responsibility to the American people, a responsibility to ensure that the Social Security program is no longer treated like a regular part of the budget and used as a cash cow to finance other activities, whether they be new programs, expanded programs or tax reductions. We put that Social Security program off budget, and the money that is accumulated as a surplus is used to pay down on the debt and position this country to better handle the obligations that we will owe in future years in the Social Security program.

Secondly, we recognize that we are blessed in this country with the prospect of a budget surplus without using Social Security.

We recognize that we must be terribly responsible or we will be making terrible mistakes with respect to this anticipated surplus. We have a time of virtually unparalleled prosperity. We feel our first order of business ought to be to use at least half of this surplus to reduce the Federal debt. When the sun is shining, we ought to repair the roof. We have had leaks in the roof, we have been running deficits, we have built up an enormous debt; it is time to make those repairs.

We also urge that we spend 25 percent on investment priorities and the other 25 percent returned to the American taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman I yield 2¼ minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHN) to discuss our 5-year plan.

Mr. JOHN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me. I also appreciate the Committee on Rules for making the Blue Dog budget in order.

The title of my remarks are: Honest Projections and No Phony Bones, and that may seem a little humorous to my colleagues, but I think it is very important that we go through this exercise.

Mr. Chairman, I support wholeheartedly the Blue Dog budget for a myriad of reasons, and my remarks today are going to focus on what I think is one of the more important reasons to support the Blue Dog budget, and the issue concerns economic projections. I am referring to the fact that the Blue Dog budget is a 5-year budget with projections over 5 years, and the Republican budget is a 15-year budget.

As a new Member of the 105th Congress, I came in during the balanced budget agreement, and the debate was about tackling the deficit before we tackle the debt. We have enjoyed a very strong economy since that point in time, even though back then the projection said that we would not reach the surplus that we have until the year 2002.

While I am optimistic that the economy today will continue, we must prepare now for a downturn in our economy because it is realistically going to happen.

□ 1645

That is why I believe, the Blue Dogs believe, that it is irresponsible to rely on 15-year projections that no one really honestly believes will come to fruition.

To give an example, in 1993, before I was even a Member of this body, the CBO projected that this year, 1999, that we would have a $404 billion deficit. I think that it is very, very important to look at these projections. It is irresponsible to go out and look at the numbers over a 15-year period.

The Blue Dog budget is about real numbers. It is no phony numbers, and I urge support for this budget because it is the fiscally responsible budget that we can deal with today.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER), a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mrs. FOWLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, the President and the Republican leadership both face issues of what to do about the Social Security and Medicare programs, defense, education and the surplus, but the differences between our proposals are stark.

Last year, the Republican proposal to set aside 90 percent of the surplus for Social Security was not good enough for the President. So this year we are locking away 100 percent of the Social Security surplus for retirement security and Medicare.

The President was not able to live up to his own demands. His budget sets aside only 77 percent. We are proud to have locked away more money for Social Security and Medicare than the President does.

The Congress and the President agreed to certain spending caps in 1997. It is a simple concept but difficult to accomplish. Our resolution keeps our promise on caps. The President's budget creates new programs and busts the caps by some $30 billion.

His budget raises taxes by $172 billion over the next decade, while our budget provides nearly $800 billion in tax relief over the next 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, right now our pilots are in Kosovo carrying out a dangerous mission. I support them and pray for their safe return. We must provide adequate resources for them and to all our men and women in uniform.

It is unfortunate that the President is using questionable numbers for his defense budget. His budget boasts an increase of $12.6 billion in budget authority but the real increase is only $4.1 billion. The rest is primarily from funds that were already budgeted for the Department of Defense and just reshuffled around.

The Republican budget provides an honest increase of, when it is passed, it will be $11.3 billion over fiscal year 1999. That is frankly less than what is truly needed and what the Joint Chiefs have testified they need, but it is a start and I am proud that we have taken an honest step towards reducing the undue burden on our military.

Mr. Chairman, the differences in these budgets are clear. I ask my colleagues for their support of our budget resolution.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains for each side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE) has 15¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) has 17¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, the budget we have constructed for fiscal year 2000 will be the first budget of the millennium, and under the leadership of my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), we are building a better budget than the one we received last month from the President. We are locking more than the President, locking it away for Social Security and Medicare.

For the first time ever, we are locking away Social Security money for Social Security and ending Washington's practice of raiding Social Security for other spending.

We are also maintaining the spending discipline that brought us the balanced budget.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, the debate at this point is on the budget resolution, the amendment in the nature of a substitute that is on the floor, and the debate is being addressed to matters which are not currently under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will accord Members latitude to discuss matters related to the budget.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, our budget sticks to the spending caps signed into law by President Clinton in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997; while the President's budget exceeds those caps, as does the budget we are considering on the floor, the proposal, by our Blue Dog friends.

That is the critical difference, Mr. Chairman, is that this distinguishes our budget from the President's and our budget from the one that is under consideration by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE).

The spending caps are the heart of the balanced budget both parties have worked hard to achieve in recent years, but they are also the heart of our pledge to strengthen Social Security and Medicare.

Our budget sticks to those caps and locks away 100 percent of the Social Security surplus for Social Security, off limits for new Washington spending. After locking away funds for Social Security and Medicare, and only after that, we return the rest of the surplus to the American people in the form of tax relief.

Unfortunately, it seems our colleagues on the other side are not prepared to make that kind of a commitment.

Now, do not get me wrong, Mr. Chairman. Our colleagues have every right to seek higher spending, but understand that for every dime that they spend beyond the caps is a dime that they could have locked away for Social Security and Medicare. By saying yes to higher spending, they are saying no to Social Security and Medicare.

When we get right down to it, budgets are about choices. The choice here is not between Social Security and tax cuts. The choice is between Social Security and new Washington spending.

We Republicans, we have already made our choice. We have said no to new Washington spending and we are locking away 100 percent of the Social Security surplus. We are locking away $100 billion more for Social Security and Medicare than the President, who cuts Medicare by $11.9 billion and spends a chunk of the Social Security surplus on new Washington spending.

Mr. Chairman, given a choice between Social Security and new Washington spending, Republicans have chosen to support Social Security and Medicare. Now it is up to our colleagues which one they will decide to choose.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, returning the debate to the Blue Dog budget, I yield 1¾ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER).

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

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Chairman, this country owes, based on past consumption, over $5 trillion and nobody is talking about paying that back. This Blue Dog budget is the budget that if my colleagues believe, as I do, that when one borrows money as we have from our children and grandchildren, that the responsible, honorable thing to do is to try to pay it back, then my colleagues will vote for the Blue Dog budget.

There are $3.8 trillion of debt that we pay interest on every year. Last year we paid almost $250 billion in interest. Now where I come from, if someone owes somebody some money and they come into money, and remember all of this surplus is projected, not here yet, and they come into some money and they go buy an airplane or new car and do not pay the man that they owe, that is considered very poor form.

I think, as the Blue Dogs do, that if we save all of the Social Security surplus and pay down the debt, we save half of the real surplus, if it materializes, and pay it down on the debt, this country will be stronger, not weaker.

There are events over which we have no control. As long as we are paying down debt, whatever happens there, this country, our children and our grandchildren, will be in a better financial position to deal with those unknowns when they occur.

If my colleagues believe, as I do, that we ought to pay back some of this past consumption, then my colleagues will help us pass this Blue Dog budget today.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. FLETCHER).

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the opportunity to address this matter. I want to speak just briefly about the budget in general and then talk some about Medicare and what we face and what the differences are that we have in looking at the budgets that have been presented.

First of all, over the last several years, as I have gone around the district and talked to my constituents, one of the things I consistently heard was that we want to put away 100 percent of the Social Security surplus. We even heard the President say that last year.

This year he came and said, no, I only want to put 62 percent of that surplus for this next coming year into Social Security. We are going to do the 100 percent that he wanted that time, and I think we are going to, for the first time, put away everything; instead of just putting 62 percent we are going to put 100 percent away to save Social Security and Medicare; the first time in 40 years that we have not spent the surplus on wasteful Washington spending or larger and more government. I think this is really a change.

We have another budget here presented. It seems to be a little bit more of a me-too budget, but it still has that same philosophy of growing government. When we talk to the people across this country, they are tired of wasteful Washington spending. They want to see the end of the era of big government. They want to make sure that we provide the kind of support and security that we need, but that we also secure the future of our children; that we return as much as we can to our families so they can invest it in the best way to ensure the future of their children and grandchildren.

It may be saving for college. It may be providing other things that their children need. It may be providing or donating to community activities, but it is very important that we return as much as we can to the American people because that is what they want. It is the right thing to do.

I think the budget that we have is very good, as opposed to the President's budget and the Blue Dog budget, that we are being more conservative in spending, that we are stopping wasteful Washington spending and we are going to return as much as we can to the people back home.

Secondly, I would like to look at some of the President's cuts on Medicare. It is an issue I am very concerned about. We see possibly a quarter of the home health agencies looking at problems of possibly going out of business. In my district there are 10 counties where one home health agency provides the primary care there. That home health agency is having problems. They may go out of business here in the next few months and that will reduce the care that we can give to those individuals in that area.

Rural hospitals are having problems. The President has talked about prescription drugs and increasing there, but let us look at the cuts that he has proposed in Medicare. He has proposed cutting the prescription drug payment by $2.3 billion. Many of these cuts are to the sickest patients. They are to those cancer treatment patients that might mean the difference between life and death.

He talks about prescription drugs but he cuts at the very heart of our sickest patients, and I am glad that we are not going to do that; that we are taking 100 percent of that budget and putting it to shore up Medicare.

Secondly, we see other things. When we look at some of the things that he is decreasing, the total decrease is $11.9 billion. He is talking about extending these cuts in payments beyond the years that were agreed with in the balanced budget amendment.

What will that do to our rural hospitals? I have a hospital in Garrard County, Kentucky, right now. We worked with them to combine two hospitals so they could be more efficient and more effective.

□ 1700

That is not going to occur, though, for the next 6 to 12 months. In the interim, they are having to shut down the emergency room right now because they do not have the margins. We need to make sure that we have the kind of support we need, and we cannot afford to cut it $11.9 billion.

I am glad that we have a budget that is fiscally conservative, that provides tax relief, and provides for our senior citizens.

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

Mr. Chairman, we are pleased with the presentation. We know there is a problem. We want to cut taxes. At the same time we want to promote programs. That is what the Blue Dog budget does, it is a mix.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CRAMER)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, let us return to the budget under debate here, the Blue Dog budget, no more phony debate about this other budget. If Members are serious about balancing the budget, if they are serious about debt reduction, if they are serious about focused tax cuts, if they want to support our veterans, if they want to give a commitment to the defense of this country, then this is the budget for all of us.

We have been calling for a true balanced budget excluding the social security trust fund for years. There is no phony baloney here, this is the real thing. Members should wake up. They can take all day, and we have for years, but this is the budget for us.

Finally, I want to compliment the leadership here. We have had a fair debate here today. We have had an opportunity to present this budget. I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT) for giving us this opportunity.

The Blue Dog's have been calling for a true balanced budget excluding the Social Security trust fund for several years. We are glad to see that we have finally reached a point where everyone is agreeing with us that we should balance the budget without counting the Social Security trust fund.

The Blue Dog budget sets out a responsible budgetary policy that achieves and maintains a true balanced budget without counting the Social Security trust fund.

Because the Republican budget uses virtually all of the non-Social Security surplus for tax cuts, we could have a return of deficits in the non-Social Security budget if future budget conditions are not quite as positive as currently projected.

Even if the current projections are correct, the tax cuts in the Republican budget would cause a deficit after 2010, because the exploding tax cuts would continue to grow, while the non-Social Security surpluses will be smaller.

RESPONSIBLE USE OF THE PROJECTED ON-BUDGET SURPLUS

Republicans want to commit all of the projected surpluses for exploding tax cuts, whether or not the surpluses actually materialize.

The Spratt budget is a little more prudent than the Republican budget by saving some of the on-budget surplus, but is uses most of the projected on-budget surpluses for new spending and some tax cuts.

The Blue Dog budget takes the position that the conservative thing to do with projected on-budget is to be conservative. The Blue Dog budget makes paying off the national debt the first priority for any projected budget surplus, dedicating approximately half of the on-budget surplus for debt reduction.

The Blue Dog budget divides the remaining half of the on-budget surplus between tax reduction and shoring up the nation's commitment to priorities such as agriculture, defense, education, health care and veterans' programs.

If CBO increases surplus projections, there will be additional funds for tax cuts and spending priorities. The Blue Dog budget provides that any increase in surplus projections be divided with the same allocation of one-half for debt reduction, one-quarter for tax cuts and one-quarter for spending priorities.

PAYING OFF THE DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC

By saving the entire Social Security surplus and using half of on-budget surpluses for debt reduction, the Blue Dog budget will pay off nearly one-fourth ($857 billion) of the $3.6 trillion debt held by the public over the next five years.

Saving non-Social Security surpluses for debt reduction will help make up for the years in which Social Security surpluses were borrowed for operating expenses instead of saving them for Social Security.

The Blue Dog budget reduces the debt held by the public by $87 billion more than the Republican budget over the next five years.

STRENGTHENING SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE

The Blue Dog budget calls on Congress to enact reforms of Social Security and Medicare to strengthen these programs and reserves additional funds that could be used to help finance the short term costs of Medicare and Social Security reform.

The Blue Dog budget reserves the savings from the lower interest payments that will occur as a result of reducing the debt to be used for Social Security and Medicare reform.

Congress would have $85 billion over the next five years that could be used as part of Social Security reform and an additional $28 million over the next five years that could be used as part of Medicare reform.

The combination of saving the Social Security surpluses for Social Security and reserving the debt reduction dividend for Social Security and Medicare, the Blue Dog budget saves a total of $937 billion for Social Security and Medicare—more than 90% of total projected unified budget surpluses over the next five years.

The Blue Dog budget does not contain the cuts in Medicare payments to hospitals that were included in the President's budget.

FISCALLY RESPONSIBLE TAX CUTS

The Blue Dog budget allocates approximately 25% of on-budget surplus for tax relief providing room for a net tax cut of $41.7 billion over the next five years.

Limiting tax cuts to 25% of the projected surplus is a prudent step to ensure that the tax cuts do not cause deficits in the non-Social Security budget if actual budget conditions are not as good as current projections.

The tax cuts in the Republican budget will consume nearly 100% of the projected budget non-Social Security surplus over the next five years. If the current projections are too optimistic, the tax cuts in the Republican budget will result in on-budget deficits and a return to the practice of borrowing from the Social Security trust fund to meet operating expenses.

The tax cuts in the Republican budget will continue to grow after 2009, while the projected surpluses will be smaller. By 2013 or 2014, the tax cuts in the Republican budget will cause deficits.

A GENUINE INCREASE IN FUNDING FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Blue Dog budget equips our military commanders with the tools and resources necessary to continue to field the world's preeminent fighting force for years to come. It maintains a general funding mix ensuring our immediate military readiness and long-term defense procurement needs are not neglected.

The Republican budget makes hollow promises for defense, but does not give the Department of Defense the real resources to follow through on these commitments.

The Blue Dog budget includes $13 billion more in defense funding than Republicans. The Republican budget is $21 billion short in outlays (real expenditures) needed to support their budget authority (the amount which may be committed or obligated).

The Blue Dog budget provides for a much-needed pay raise for our troops and addresses the current retention problems by adequately funding vital personnel and quality of life programs. The Republican budget does not accommodate the pay raise, and could force the Department of Defense to shift resources away from personnel and quality of life programs.

MEETING CRITICAL NEEDS IN AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

The Blue Dog budget contains $3 billion more mandatory funding for crop insurance than the Republican budget resolution. The increased funding for crop insurance in the Blue Dog budget is permanent, as opposed to the Republican budget which eliminates the increased funding for crop insurance after 2004.

The Blue Dog budget provides $3.4 billion more budget authority for discretionary agricultural programs than the Republican budget.

The Republican budget contains 10% cut in discretionary agriculture programs in fiscal year 2000, which could force a 1500 person reduction in Farm Service Agency funding, further slowing down the delivery of vital farm programs. The Blue Dog budget does not force cuts in discretionary agriculture programs in fiscal year 2000.

MEETING OUR PROMISES TO VETERANS

The Blue Dog budget provides a total of $10 billion more budget authority and $5.1 billion more outlays than the Republican budget for discretionary veterans programs.

The Blue Dog budget increases funding for veterans health care and GI bill benefits by $1.9 billion 2000, and continues this increased funding level with modest growth after 2000.

The Republican budget provides a one-time $950 million increase in veterans programs in fiscal year 2000, but eliminates this increase after 2000 and cuts veterans programs below 1999 levels.

INCREASED FUNDING FOR PRIORITY EDUCATION AND HEALTH CARE PROGRAMS

The Blue Dog budget provides $10 billion more total funding for education and $8.6 billion more for health care programs than the

Republican budget does over the next five years.

These higher funding levels will allow for increased funding for rural health care programs, health research, elementary and secondary education and other priority education and health care programs without making deep cuts in other programs within these functions.

The Republican budget claims to provide increased funding for the National Institutes of Health and for some education programs, but cuts total discretionary spending for the health care and education functions below a freeze. Any promised increases for specific education or health care programs under the Republican budget would require deeper cuts in all other health care and education programs.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CRAMER) remains the great gentleman that he is.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I appreciate the opportunity to share a few thoughts that I have on the budget proposals that are before us today.

Mr. Chairman, I am thankful that we are not going to have to deal and live with the President's budget, because if we did, and he promised us that he was going to secure Medicare, but with the left hand he cut it. I am pleased that we have an alternative budget where we are saving 100 percent of the social security surplus for social security and for Medicare.

Our seniors have been misled by the President; double-speak at its best, when one talks about securing social security and Medicare when on the other hand one is actually cutting it. Prescription drug payments, hospital payment freezes.

I represent a lot of smaller rural hospitals who are struggling with red ink today. With the proposed cuts that are coming, they are possibly going to go out of business without the President's budget cuts. There is a complete lack of sensitivity to rural health care in America by this President and by this administration, when the facts are in.

It is obviously clear that rural health care in America is already in trouble because of the lower payment they receive from HCFA, from the urban and suburban centers, and we are going to cut them some more if we would follow the President.

I think it is vital, when we pass a budget later today, that it is a budget that really secures social security and Medicare and is not a phony budget, as has been presented by this administration, that says one thing on the right hand but on the left hand is actually cutting to the very heart of real health care in America, and would deprive rural Americans of the quality care they depend on.

I am pleased that we do not have to pass the President's budget.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, the Blue Dog substitute I support today is a triumph of common sense over ideology. It reduces the budget debt more than any other plan, and therefore does more to shore up social security and Medicare. By design, it protects the Nation's priority needs, which common sense dictates that we cannot abandon.

For farmers, we provide $3 billion more for crop insurance without additional reductions in county offices and employees. For the military, we provide $13 billion more to ensure that morale and readiness problems are addressed. For veterans, we provide $1.9 billion more so this Nation will not renege on its promise to those who sacrificed to keep our country great.

For our children, we provide $10 billion more for critical education programs like school construction and repair, Internet access, and smaller class size. For health care in rural areas, we provide more. Finally, the Blue Dog budget cuts taxes by $41.7 billion over the next 10 years, and provides for tax relief to increase as the surplus grows.

Vote for the budget that will do more for America. Vote for the Blue Dog budget.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA).

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

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding time to me. I also want to compliment the Committee on the Budget, and notably the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH).

The way I look at it, it is very simple. The Republican budget resolution has set forth a very simple and straightforward concept. I think what the American people really want from Washington is straight talk. For the first time ever, we have 100 percent of social security going for social security. I know over the years it has been seen as a slush fund, but once and for all the American people are getting straight talk and honesty.

With respect to the budget caps, a couple of years ago everybody sat around here in Washington, and the President, and they smoked their peace pipe and they agreed to the budget caps. Some people think that was a game. The Republicans say it is for real. That is what the American people expect and deserve.

What are the principles we set forth? A strong defense. Taking care of Medicare. We saw what the President's budget did to Medicare. Taking care of our veterans. Needed tax relief.

That is the critical distinction here between the amendment before us and what the Republican budget resolution calls for, because every year since 1995 the President submitted his budget and the Republicans have done the responsible and appropriate thing and said, let us put the brakes on. Let us spend money appropriately and be responsible, but not have a party at taxpayers' expense.

Once and for all, we are going to get that. The American people deserve that. I urge the rejection of this amendment and support for the Republican budget resolution.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LUCAS).

Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, we, the Blue Dogs, are here today to blow the whistle on partisan wrangling and to act as a budget referee.

Neither the Republican nor the Democratic alternatives have achieved a fiscally responsible approach to this budget. The Democratic budget uses most of the projected on-budget surplus for new spending and some tax cuts. On the other hand, the Republican budget will consume nearly 100 percent of the projected budget non-social security surplus over the next 5 years.

In an economic downturn, the Republican budget would result in deficits, a return to the practice of raiding the social security trust fund. That is just not right.

Our backlog budget allocates 25 percent of the on-budget surplus for tax relief, a net cut of $41.7 billion over the next 5 years. It is time to do the right thing.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, let me just compliment my friends in the Blue Dog Coalition. They have, I think, moved this process in a very constructive way, but nevertheless, I am forced to have to reluctantly and softly oppose the Blue Dog budget for three basic reasons.

One is, in the year 2001 they break the discipline of the 1997 budget agreement. We believe it is essential to not break the discipline of the 1997 budget agreement. We just made that agreement. We ought to stay within that agreement. Unfortunately, in the Blue Dog budget, that agreement is not adhered to in 2001.

Secondly, there is $7 billion less in budget authority than the GOP plans in the fiscal year 2000, and $2 billion less in outlays. We do believe, as I know many of the Blue Dogs believe, that we do need to add more in the area of defense. In fact, our budget has a significantly greater amount of money in defense than the Blue Dog budget.

Finally, while I can admire the Blue Dogs' position on the issue of paying down debt, they only have $41 billion in tax cuts over the next 5 years. I want to compliment them for that. However, the Republican budget has approximately $150 billion in tax cuts.

I would very much like to think that we could allow money to sit around in

Washington to be used to pay down a debt. We in fact are going to pay down the largest amount of the publicly-held debt out of the money we are reserving for social security. But when this on-budget surplus comes, as sure as God made little green apples, if there is money sitting around on the table in this town, I believe it will be used to create bigger government and more spending. The single biggest way to resolve that is to put ourselves in a position of being able to cut taxes and get that on-budget surplus out of town.

I want to personally thank the Blue Dogs, and particularly the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE) for his efforts to drive the debate on taking all of the social security and Medicare trust funds off-budget. He was a pioneer in that.

I want to compliment them on their $41 billion in tax cuts, but it falls short in the area of breaking the spending caps, breaking the budget agreement in 1997, spending too little on defense, and not providing the tax relief that Americans really need and deserve to prevent the growth of big government, to empower people, and to run America from the bottom up.

So for that reason, I must reluctantly oppose the Blue Dog substitute.

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

Mr. Chairman, we had high hopes that the chairman of the Committee on the Budget would be supporting our budget until that last statement. We obviously need to talk to them a little more.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I, too, am sorry that my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) cannot support our budget, but I am here today to support a budget that I believe in and I think the American people believe in.

This budget does what needs to be done. It gets the social security trust fund off-budget. It starts paying down the debt. It funds the priorities that we need funded in this country.

I come from a district that has a lot of problems in agriculture. This budget puts extra money into mandatory spending and into discretionary programs that we need if we are going to have any chance of pulling this agriculture economy out.

The thing I want to talk about, I serve on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Some know we have had a real commotion going on down there over the budget. All of the veterans groups came in and asked for $3.3 billion extra to make things work. Some of us tried to get that accomplished. In this budget we have an additional $1.9 billion for veterans, and then we extend that through the whole period.

The Republicans only have $900 million for the next year. Then they go back to the same level as the President. We cannot meet our commitments to veterans. We cannot keep our contract with veterans with that kind of a budget. Support the Blue Dog budget.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. SHOWS).

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Chairman, both the President's budget plan and the Republican budget plan are disastrous for our Nation's veterans. The Blue Dog budget plan is the only budget proposal that meets the needs of our Nation's deserving veterans.

We are in critical need of more health care dollars for our veterans. We need to expand our health care to veterans suffering from Hepatitis C-related illnesses and who are needing emergency care and long-term care. We need to expand care for homeless veterans. We need to provide more outpatient centers.

Although the President acknowledges these needs, he has not provided for any new dollars in his initiatives. In fact, the VA budget freezes funded levels to what they were last year.

Meanwhile, Republicans, on the other hand, are using doubletalk. Republicans claim their budget increases funding for veterans, but anyone who looks at the budget sees that they get a $900 million increase in 2000, but then it decreases back to the original budget of 1999 levels. What is worse, the next 5 years, they cut it $2.4 billion. The Blue Dog budget provides over $10 billion over this period of time in outlays of more than $5.1 billion.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SISISKY), our defense expert.

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

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I support the Blue Dog budget. I want to take time to explain why on defense.

Last Monday, this past Monday, I was in Norfolk, Virginia, at the Norfolk Naval Station. The Admiral of the Atlantic Fleet remarked at how good they are doing now, that the Theodore Roosevelt carrier was to leave Norfolk on Friday at a 92 percent compliment. The last carrier that left there had 86 percent.

□ 1715

We have problems in defense. There is no doubt that the Republican budget is not going to solve it. Why is it not going to solve it? It all has to do with outlays versus authorization.

The Blue Dog budget is $11 billion more than the Republican budget. It was $13 billion, and now it is $11 billion, and of course $18 billion more than the President. It is evenhanded. It is mostly on outlays. That is what is important. I would ask this body, please support the thing.

I have a memo here, and we can put that in. ''Conservatives should not accept this phony increase and should insist on a new program.'' This came from the New American Century, Bill Crystal's group.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD).

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding me this time.

First of all, I want to thank Speaker Hastert and the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman KASICH) and the gentleman from California (Chairman DREIER) for allowing us to have this open debate. We did not get that last year.

Most of the speakers that are opponents of the Blue Dog bill, the budget, have spent their time addressing a budget which received two votes about an hour and a half ago. The reason they do not talk about this budget is because they cannot. They cannot in good conscience compare it to their own.

There are three good reasons. Number one is that this budget, contrary to what the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman KASICH) said, spends $11 billion more in defense over the next 5 years. Secondly, it spends $6 billion more in agricultural outlays over the next 5 years. Thirdly, it spends $10 billion more in veterans spending over the next 5 years.

I would implore my colleagues to take a good, close look at the tricks and the smoke and the mirrors and vote for the Blue Dog budget.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY).

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota for yielding me this time, and I appreciate the work he has done on this budget.

I rise today in support of the Blue Dog budget. It is an honest and fair budget. The Republicans say they want to help America's farmers. Who are we kidding? The Republican bill slashes the funding to farmers by 10 percent at the time when they need it most.

The Republican bill does nothing to pay down the national debt. It spends and spends and spends. Every last drop of the surplus it spends, driving our country further into debt, rising interest rates, bankrupting our farmers and their children.

The Blue Dog budget contains $7 billion more for agriculture and recommends a sensible tax cut that will help our farmers. The Blue Dog budget devotes 50 percent of the surplus to deficit reduction, strengthening our economy, and saving for the future.

I challenge any Republican who votes for their leadership's budget resolution to go home, look their farmers in the eye and tell them, ''I support agriculture.'' Do not be surprised if they do not believe you.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE) has 6 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE).

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

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Chairman, health care is a front burner issue this year, and it does not matter what one's race or age or sex or where one is from or even what one's party affiliation is. If we do not have good health care, we cannot do any of the other things that people have been up here talking about.

In the Blue Dog budget, we provide $8.6 billion more than the Republican budget over the next 5-year period. Our budget preserves funding for discretionary programs through the year 2002 and then allows for increases after 2002, whereas the Republican budget makes deeper cuts in discretionary spending for health care. The health and well-being of our Nation cannot stand for that.

The Blue Dog budget would allow increases for research, for funding, for NIH, and make sure that our rural health care areas of concern are not left on the back burner. These higher increases are made within the context of a balanced budget and do not cut other health programs like the Republican budget does. Let us not overlook or undercut the very health and well-being of our country. Without good health, we cannot do anything else.

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

I am pleased to note that we agree with the gentleman on the other side about the importance of taking care of health care services in this country.

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

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE).

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, first I would like it start by complimenting the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE) on the budget proposal that he has put forth and the rest of the Blue Dog Coalition.

There are two budgets that will be up for consideration today that I would have to suggest to my colleagues are not phony. The Republican budget and the Blue Dog budget are very similar.

There are a couple of things where we differ. As I think the Blue Dogs will readily admit, they bust the caps in fiscal year 2001. That is where they are coming up with all of these, whether it is for health care, and out of respect, I suggest they are correct, their budget does spend a little bit more for health care, a little bit more for veterans. But they do it by busting the caps.

So we want to suggest that, do they want to do that? It is a choice. Do they want to bust the caps which got us to fiscal discipline, got us to balance in the first place, or do they not? That is the first issue. But I commend them. They are exactly right. That is what they are doing.

The other budget, the Clinton budget, is totally phony when it double counts Social Security; and the same is exactly true for the Spratt budget. But at least we have got two budgets to consider.

The second big issue that we have got to consider today is what to do with the surplus. The surplus, I would suggest to my colleagues, it comes to us in two different ways. One is the Social Security surplus. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE) and the Republicans, the Blue Dogs and the Republicans, say set it all aside. Amen. Finally we have gotten to that point. The gentleman and I have worked on that for many years. Both budgets do that.

The real issue, though, is what do we do with the rest? What do we do with the rest? There we have a choice. It is an honest choice. Choice number one, the Blue Dogs say spend a little bit of it, and tax relief a little bit of it, and debt reduction a little bit of it. That is fine. I respect that. That is a good choice that people can decide on.

What the Republicans say is this is not our money. We always talk about Federal dollars as if they are in our pockets out here and they are like our money. They are not. People work hard every single day of the week in order to send us that money. What they know is that they have sent enough, if not too much.

What they are hoping for is that once we have done the responsible thing, once we have met the priorities of the government, once we have set aside Social Security, then and only then, which is what our budget does, only when we have set aside Social Security this year, this year do we look out and do we say the surplus ought to go back to the people that sent it here in the first place.

That is why I reluctantly oppose the budget of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE), because of that choice.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PHELPS).

Mr. PHELPS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota for the opportunity to speak today.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise to support the Blue Dog budget because it represents responsible budget policy while still providing critical funding for education and health care programs.

This budget provides $10 billion more for education and $8.6 billion more for health care than the Republican budget.

In my district, let me tell my colleagues, these funds are critical, not only to close the disparity gap for those disadvantaged children, but also just making the tools available for those who try to make it in the real world.

In my district, home health and rural health centers are the only point of access to health care for many people. Funding of these programs, which are included in the Blue Dog alternative, literally can mean life or death for these programs and the patients they serve.

In 1997, with the balanced budget amendment, we asked our citizens to accept cuts to put us on a fiscally secure future. Now we are fiscally responsible and we have a surplus. It is our duty to also use the surplus responsibly by investing in kids' education and providing access to necessary health care to our citizens. The Blue Dog alternative best meets these goals.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) to discuss our continuing commitment to education.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, America's working families, farmers, and businesses know that we must approach the Nation's budget the same way they approach their own, with a balanced view.

Our Blue Dog budget alternative is balanced. It protects Social Security, offers targeted tax cuts, reduces the national debt, and most importantly recommits our Nation to educating our children.

If America hopes to maintain our status as the world's economic superpower, we cannot continue to send off our kids to schools with inadequate adequate facilities and outdated technology.

Our Blue Dog budget provides $10 billion more for education and training than the Republican budget. It allows for an increase in elementary and secondary education without forcing cuts in other education programs. It allows for spending on discretionary and training programs to grow by an average of 3.6 percent a year through 2004.

This balanced, fiscally responsible approach to the budget is the same formula for success that American families want. I urge my colleagues to support our Blue Dog budget alternative.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding me this time.

Back in the 1980s, back home in Indiana, I saw Congress make a mistake, and that mistake was embracing the idea of supply side economics and offering a huge tax cut in this country.

Some would say that it fueled the economy but at a great expense. Back in the 1980s, the budget deficit or budget debt was $1 billion. It grew to over $4 trillion.

Now as a Member of this Congress, I see the Congress about ready to make another mistake and offer huge tax cuts to the people of Indiana or to the people of this country. I think this is a serious mistake in light of the fact that we have a tremendous debt to pay off.

Our priority ought to be paying off the debt first. That is what we should do as well as saving Social Security. If we do this, we will be doing the responsible thing for the people of this country, the responsible thing for our kids and our grandchildren.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE) has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), who has been an outstanding leader in the Blue Dog Coalition and worked effectively with us on budget and tax policy.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, let me sum up the Blue Dog budget this way: First, let me say that for the 21st consecutive year I have been allowed to oppose and vote against a President's budget because it spends too much, nine times with Democrats, 12 times with Republican presidents.

The Blue Dog budget before us cuts taxes over the next 5 years by $41.2 billion. Anyone that suggests anything else is not being factual. The Blue Dog budget maintains the spending caps until we balance the budget without counting the Social Security surplus.

To those who choose to criticize us because we spend too much on defense in 2001 and 2002, be prepared to live with those numbers within my colleagues' own caucus because they will find it is going to be very difficult to do it.

Also with agriculture, be prepared to live with those numbers my colleagues advocate in criticizing our budget. If my colleagues are, they are honest, and I respect that. Be prepared to live with the veterans numbers and stay with them all the way through, if my colleagues criticize our budget for recognizing those priorities.

Now, let us talk about our main priority, debt reduction. Our budget, at the end of 5 years, produces $85 billion less debt than the Republican budget. If we take it for 10 years, it is $450 billion. I submit to my colleagues, the Blue Dog budget is better for our country by reducing debt than the Republican budget.

Finally, in summation, let me say the Blue Dogs give first priority to reducing the $5 trillion plus national debt. As a result, the Blue Dog budget is not able to provide as much spending as some would like to see on both sides of the aisle.

So I ask my colleagues to join in thanking the leadership for allowing us to have this vote today. I appreciate the kind remarks that have been made by the other side recognizing the credibility. I believe what I have stated is factual and should warrant some overwhelming support from both sides of the aisle.

□ 1730

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time; and as did the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), chairman of the Committee on the Budget, I too want to add my thanks and my appreciation to the Blue Dogs for coming forward with this budget.

As I look across the aisle there and individually see the ones coming forward to speak in support of this, most of those Members are my close friends on that side of the aisle, and they are also the same individuals that talk like I do, who, with the exception of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE), come from my part of the country. And I have a great appreciation for that fact also.

But, Mr. Chairman, I want to say a couple of things in closing here. While the Blue Dog budget takes huge steps in the right direction, I think it is flawed in a couple of areas. The two primary areas that I have concerns about are:

Number one, defense. We do spend more in both budget authority as well as budget outlay in defense. With our manager's amendment, it increases the defense spending from our original numbers. And, obviously, that is what we are talking about, the final numbers.

Secondly, the thing that really concerned me when I ran for Congress in 1994, and the thing that concerns me today, and the thing that my good friends on the other side who are supporting this budget have continually said is, we have to pay down that debt.

And what has caused that debt? What has caused that debt is too much Federal spending. The Blue Dog budget calls for 25 percent of the surplus to go to spending. I have a problem with that.

My friend, the gentleman from Arkansas, was very critical of the Ag portion of the Republican budget. I have in my hands letters from eight national farming organizations, from the American Farm Bureau Federation, to the National Cotton Council, the Farm Credit Council, the American Soybean Association, the National Peanut Council, the Southern Peanut Farmers Federation, and several others, endorsing the Republican budget.

All of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who are Blue Dogs, particularly those on the Committee on the Budget, know that when the President came out with zero dollars for crop insurance reform, Republicans led the fight to put money in the budget. I am appreciative that they followed suit with that, but for those reasons, I respectfully say that we are going to have to vote against this budget. But I do thank them, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 134, noes 295, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 75]

AYES—134

Abercrombie
Andrews
Baird
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berry
Bilbray
Bishop
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boyd
Capps
Cardin
Castle
Chenoweth
Clayton
Clement
Coburn
Condit
Cramer
Crowley
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
Deutsch
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Duncan
Edwards
Emerson
Engel
Etheridge
Farr
Ford
Frost
Ganske
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Green (TX)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kind (WI)
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Larson
LaTourette
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McIntyre
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Metcalf
Minge
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Neal
Oberstar
Ortiz
Ose
Pallone
Pascrell
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pickering
Pomeroy
Reyes
Rodriguez
Roemer
Roukema
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sawyer
Scarborough
Scott
Sherman
Shimkus
Shows
Sisisky
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Stabenow
Stenholm
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thune
Thurman
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Visclosky
Watt (NC)
Wexler
Wise
Wynn

NOES—295

Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barr
Bartlett
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capuano
Carson
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Crane
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (IL)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Doolittle
Dreier
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
English
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey

Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
Lantos
Largent
Latham
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Velazquez
Vento
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—4

Burton
Pelosi
Stupak
Weldon (PA)

□ 1752

Messrs. FOSSELLA, BECERRA, BLAGOJEVICH, HULSHOF, TOWNS, ROTHMAN, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Ms. MCKINNEY changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. WISE, DEUTSCH, SHERMAN, NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mrs. CLAYTON changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall No. 75. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no''.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CAMP). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in Part 2 of House Report 106–77.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. SPRATT

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order under the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 in the Nature of a Substitute printed in Part 2 of House Report 106–77 Offered by Mr. SPRATT:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000.

The Congress declares that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000 and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2001 through 2014 are hereby set forth.

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

(a) SPECIAL RULE.—In this resolution, all references to years are fiscal years and all amounts are expressed in billions.

(b) ON-BUDGET LEVELS (EXCLUDING SOCIAL SECURITY AND OTHER OFF-BUDGET AGENCIES.—The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2014:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,408.5.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,439.2.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,497.3.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,552.0.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,622.2.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,697.5.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,775.9.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,855.9.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,940.0.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,029.3.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,115.9.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,207.4.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,300.8.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,396.6.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,494.4.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $0.0.
Fiscal year 2001: −$5.9.
Fiscal year 2002: −$11.0.
Fiscal year 2003: −$11.3.
Fiscal year 2004: −$11.9.
Fiscal year 2005: −$13.4.
Fiscal year 2006: −$14.8.
Fiscal year 2007: −$15.5.
Fiscal year 2008: −$16.2.
Fiscal year 2009: −$16.4.
Fiscal year 2010: −$17.8.
Fiscal year 2011: −$17.8.
Fiscal year 2012: −$17.8.
Fiscal year 2013: −$17.8.
Fiscal year 2014: −$17.8.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,425.8.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,481.9.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,507.9.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,573.5.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,630.3.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,708.3.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,754.5.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,825.0.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,902.2.
Fiscal year 2009: $1,979.8.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,054.8.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,135.6.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,218.1.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,321.2.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,420.5.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,408.0.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,432.3.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,495.8.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,551.6.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,621.7.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,684.8.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,735.3.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,803.9.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,882.9.
Fiscal year 2009: $1,958.2.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,045.1.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,134.8.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,226.3.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,338.4.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,442.0.

(4) SURPLUSES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the surpluses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $0.5.
Fiscal year 2001: $6.9.
Fiscal year 2002: $1.5.
Fiscal year 2003: $0.2.
Fiscal year 2004: $0.5.
Fiscal year 2005: $12.9.
Fiscal year 2006: $40.7.
Fiscal year 2007: $52.1.
Fiscal year 2008: $57.0.
Fiscal year 2009: $71.0.
Fiscal year 2010: $70.8.
Fiscal year 2011: $72.6.
Fiscal year 2012: $74.6.
Fiscal year 2013: $58.2.
Fiscal year 2014: $52.4.

(c) UNIFIED BUDGET LEVELS (INCLUDING ALL FEDERAL PROGRAMS).—The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2014:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,876.5.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,927.0.
Fiscal year 2002: $2,003.6.
Fiscal year 2003: $2,079.4.
Fiscal year 2004: $2,172.1.
Fiscal year 2005: $2,274.3.
Fiscal year 2006: $2,377.7.
Fiscal year 2007: $2,484.2.
Fiscal year 2008: $2,594.4.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,710.6.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,826.5.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,948.5.
Fiscal year 2012: $3,073.2.
Fiscal year 2013: $3,201.0.
Fiscal year 2014: $3,331.6.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $0.0.
Fiscal year 2001: −$5.9.
Fiscal year 2002: −$11.0.
Fiscal year 2003: −$11.3.
Fiscal year 2004: −$11.9.
Fiscal year 2005: −$13.4.
Fiscal year 2006: −$14.8.
Fiscal year 2007: −$15.5.
Fiscal year 2008: −$16.2.
Fiscal year 2009: −$16.4.
Fiscal year 2010: −$17.8.
Fiscal year 2011: −$17.8.
Fiscal year 2012: −$17.8.
Fiscal year 2013: −$17.8.
Fiscal year 2014: −$17.8.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—The appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,752.9.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,821.4.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,857.6.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,935.8.
Fiscal year 2004: $2,005.7.
Fiscal year 2005: $2,097.8.
Fiscal year 2006: $2,159.2.
Fiscal year 2007: $2,245.6.
Fiscal year 2008: $2,340.5.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,439.3.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,540.2.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,648.4.

Fiscal year 2012: $2,762.9.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,903.0.
Fiscal year 2014: $3,044.0.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—The appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:
Fiscal year 2000: $1,735.1.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,771.9.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,845.4.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,914.0.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,997.2.
Fiscal year 2005: $2,074.5.
Fiscal year 2006: $2,140.1.
Fiscal year 2007: $2,224.7.
Fiscal year 2008: $2,321.2.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,417.9.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,530.5.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,647.5.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,771.2.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,920.2.
Fiscal year 2014: $3,065.5.

(4) SURPLUSES.—The amounts of the surpluses are as follows:
Fiscal year 2000: $141.4.
Fiscal year 2001: $155.1.
Fiscal year 2002: $158.1.
Fiscal year 2003: $165.3.
Fiscal year 2004: $174.9.
Fiscal year 2005: $199.9.
Fiscal year 2006: $237.7.
Fiscal year 2007: $259.5.
Fiscal year 2008: $273.2.
Fiscal year 2009: $292.7.
Fiscal year 2010: $296.0.
Fiscal year 2011: $301.0.
Fiscal year 2012: $302.0.
Fiscal year 2013: $280.8.
Fiscal year 2014: $266.1.

(d) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:
Fiscal year 2000: $3,500.4.
Fiscal year 2001: $3,361.3.
Fiscal year 2002: $3,219.2.
Fiscal year 2003: $3,070.3.
Fiscal year 2004: $2,910.7.
Fiscal year 2005: $2,725.0.
Fiscal year 2006: $2,500.6.
Fiscal year 2007: $2,253.4.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,991.7.
Fiscal year 2009: $1,710.2.
Fiscal year 2010: $1,426.2.
Fiscal year 2011: $1,137.3.
Fiscal year 2012: $847.2.
Fiscal year 2013: $577.5.
Fiscal year 2014: $322.4.

(e) TRANSFERS FROM THE GENERAL FUND TO THE HI AND OASI TRUST FUNDS.—

(1) AMOUNTS TRANSFERRED TO HI TRUST FUND.—The amounts to be transferred from the General Fund to the HI Trust Fund are as follows:
Fiscal year 2000: $26.2.
Fiscal year 2001: $28.2.
Fiscal year 2002: $29.9.
Fiscal year 2003: $31.5.
Fiscal year 2004: $33.3.
Fiscal year 2005: $37.8.
Fiscal year 2006: $44.2.
Fiscal year 2007: $47.8.
Fiscal year 2008: $50.2.
Fiscal year 2009: $53.1.
Fiscal year 2010: $54.3.
Fiscal year 2011: $54.9.
Fiscal year 2012: $54.9.
Fiscal year 2013: $51.6.
Fiscal year 2014: $49.3.

(2) AMOUNTS TRANSFERRED TO OASI TRUST FUND.—The amounts to be transferred from the General Fund to the OASI Trust Fund are as follows:
Fiscal year 2000: $108.5.
Fiscal year 2001: $116.7.
Fiscal year 2002: $123.5.
Fiscal year 2003: $130.1.
Fiscal year 2004: $137.7.
Fiscal year 2005: $156.2.
Fiscal year 2006: $182.8.
Fiscal year 2007: $197.7.
Fiscal year 2008: $207.4.
Fiscal year 2009: $219.6.
Fiscal year 2010: $224.3.
Fiscal year 2011: $226.8.
Fiscal year 2012: $226.9.
Fiscal year 2013: $213.2.
Fiscal year 2014: $203.7.

(3) RESULTING ON-BUDGET DEFICITS.—The on-budget deficits resulting from this resolution including the transfers under paragraphs (1) and (2) are the following:
Fiscal year 2000: −$110.3.
Fiscal year 2001: −$118.0.
Fiscal year 2002: −$136.7.
Fiscal year 2003: −$151.8.
Fiscal year 2004: −$167.0.
Fiscal year 2005: −$182.1.
Fiscal year 2006: −$191.5.
Fiscal year 2007: −$207.1.
Fiscal year 2008: −$225.4.
Fiscal year 2009: −$238.1.
Fiscal year 2010: −$258.9.
Fiscal year 2011: −$276.3.
Fiscal year 2012: −$292.1.
Fiscal year 2013: −$313.1.
Fiscal year 2014: −$327.9.

(4) RESULTING OFF-BUDGET SURPLUSES.—The off-budget surpluses resulting from this resolution including the transfers under paragraphs (1) and (2) are the following:
Fiscal year 2000: $251.8.
Fiscal year 2001: $273.0.
Fiscal year 2002: $294.8.
Fiscal year 2003: $316.9.
Fiscal year 2004: $341.9.
Fiscal year 2005: $382.1.
Fiscal year 2006: $429.2.
Fiscal year 2007: $466.7.
Fiscal year 2008: $498.5.
Fiscal year 2009: $530.8.
Fiscal year 2010: $554.9.
Fiscal year 2011: $577.3.
Fiscal year 2012: $594.1.
Fiscal year 2013: $593.8.
Fiscal year 2014: $594.0.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and budget outlays for fiscal years 2000 through 2009 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $280.4.
(B) Outlays, $273.6.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $300.2.
(B) Outlays, $281.6.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $302.1.
(B) Outlays, $291.7.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $312.5.
(B) Outlays, $303.6.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $321.4.
(B) Outlays, $313.5.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $326.0.
(B) Outlays, $318.0.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $330.7.
(B) Outlays, $322.5.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $335.4.
(B) Outlays, $327.1.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $340.2.
(B) Outlays, $331.8.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $345.0.
(B) Outlays, $336.5

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12.5.
(B) Outlays, $14.8.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $12.8.
(B) Outlays, $15.4.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $12.0.
(B) Outlays, $14.8.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $13.6.
(B) Outlays, $14.4.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $15.0.
(B) Outlays, $14.5.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $16.3.
(B) Outlays, $15.1.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $17.2.
(B) Outlays, $15.5.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $17.8.
(B) Outlays, $15.8.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $18.6.
(B) Outlays, $16.3.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $19.3.
(B) Outlays, $16.4.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $18.0.
(B) Outlays, $18.2.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $18.7.
(B) Outlays, $18.4.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $18.8.
(B) Outlays, $18.7.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $18.9.
(B) Outlays, $18.8.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $19.2.
(B) Outlays, $19.1.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $21.7.
(B) Outlays, $21.1.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $22.4.
(B) Outlays, $22.1.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $23.3.
(B) Outlays, $23.0.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $25.5.
(B) Outlays, $24.2.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $27.7.
(B) Outlays, $25.8.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $0.0.
(B) Outlays, −$0.7.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$0.0.
(B) Outlays, −$1.8.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$0.2.
(B) Outlays, −$1.2.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$0.1.
(B) Outlays, −$1.2.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$0.0.
(B) Outlays, −$1.2.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $0.1.
(B) Outlays, −$1.0.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $0.5.
(B) Outlays, −$0.6.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $0.7.
(B) Outlays, −$0.3.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $1.1.
(B) Outlays, $0.0.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $1.2.

(B) Outlays, $0.1.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $24.5.
(B) Outlays, $23.6.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $24.4.
(B) Outlays, $24.0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $24.4.
(B) Outlays, $23.9.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $24.5.
(B) Outlays, $24.1.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $25.4.
(B) Outlays, $25.0.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $27.6.
(B) Outlays, $26.5.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $28.6.
(B) Outlays, $27.8.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $28.9.
(B) Outlays, $28.2.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $30.4.
(B) Outlays, $29.7.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $32.3.
(B) Outlays, $30.6.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $14.7.
(B) Outlays, $13.3.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $14.1.
(B) Outlays, $12.2.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $12.4.
(B) Outlays, $10.6.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $12.7.
(B) Outlays, $11.0.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $13.4.
(B) Outlays, $11.8.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $14.2.
(B) Outlays, $12.5.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $15.2.
(B) Outlays, $13.4.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $16.0.
(B) Outlays, $14.2.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $16.9.
(B) Outlays, $14.9.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $17.3.
(B) Outlays, $15.1.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $98.
(B) Outlays, $4.5.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $12.0.
(B) Outlays, $7.1.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $16.3.
(B) Outlays, $11.9.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $16.3.
(B) Outlays, $12.6.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $16.2.
(B) Outlays, $12.8.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $14.7.
(B) Outlays, $11.4.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $14.6.
(B) Outlays, $11.1.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $14.7.
(B) Outlays, $10.9.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $14.6.
(B) Outlays, $10.5.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $14.4.
(B) Outlays, $9.9.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $50.6.
(B) Outlays, $45.8.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $52.2.
(B) Outlays, $47.7.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $52.6
(B) Outlays, $47.2.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $54.2.
(B) Outlays, $48.5.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $54.2.
(B) Outlays, $48.7.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $54.2.
(B) Outlays, $50.6.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $54.6.
(B) Outlays, $53.9.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $54.8.
(B) Outlays, $55.1.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $55.3.
(B) Outlays, $56.4.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $55.5.
(B) Outlays, $56.7.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $8.6.
(B) Outlays, $10.6.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $7.8.
(B) Outlays, $9.3.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $8.8.
(B) Outlays, $8.8.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $8.9.
(B) Outlays, $9.2.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $9.1.
(B) Outlays, $9.3.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $10.8.
(B) Outlays, $10.0.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $11.8.
(B) Outlays, $10.7.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $12.8.
(B) Outlays, $11.6.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $13.8.
(B) Outlays, $12.8.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $14.8.
(B) Outlays, $13.8.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services:
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $68.6.
(B) Outlays, $64.3.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $67.3.
(B) Outlays, $66.1.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $67.5.
(B) Outlays, $66.7.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $69.9.
(B) Outlays, $68.5.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $71.8.
(B) Outlays, $70.7.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $74.1.
(B) Outlays, $72.5.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $76.3.
(B) Outlays, $75.3.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $80.2.
(B) Outlays, $78.4.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $83.5.
(B) Outlays, $82.5.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $87.5.
(B) Outlays, $86.1.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $157.1.
(B) Outlays, $153.4.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $167.3.
(B) Outlays, $163.9.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $177.2.
(B) Outlays, $177.1.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $188.9.
(B) Outlays, $189.0.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $203.5.
(B) Outlays, $204.2.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $220.8.
(B) Outlays, $220.0.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $238.7.
(B) Outlays, $238.7.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $259.3.
(B) Outlays, $258.7.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $280.1.
(B) Outlays, $279.2.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $303.2.
(B) Outlays, $302.2.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $208.8.
(B) Outlays, $208.8.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $222.2.
(B) Outlays, $222.3.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $231.0.
(B) Outlays, $230.7.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $251.2.
(B) Outlays, $251.4.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $269.1.
(B) Outlays, $269.3.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $269.3.
(B) Outlays, $295.9.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $307.6.
(B) Outlays, $307.8.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $338.5.
(B) Outlays, $338.7.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $366.7.
(B) Outlays, $366.3.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $395.3.
(B) Outlays, $395.5.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $245.7.
(B) Outlays, $248.4.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $257.2.
(B) Outlays, $258.5.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $267.3.
(B) Outlays, $268.3.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $276.8.

(B) Outlays, $277.8.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $286.1.
(B) Outlays, $287.8.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $300.6.
(B) Outlays, $301.6.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $307.3.
(B) Outlays, $309.0.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $313.8.
(B) Outlays, $316.1.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $327.7.
(B) Outlays, $330.7.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $338.4.
(B) Outlays, $341.8.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $14.2.
(B) Outlays, $14.3.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13.8.
(B) Outlays, $13.8.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $15.6.
(B) Outlays, $15.6.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $16.3.
(B) Outlays, $16.3.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $17.1.
(B) Outlays, $17.1.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $18.0.
(B) Outlays, $18.0.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $19.1.
(B) Outlays, $19.0.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $20.2.
(B) Outlays, $20.1.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $21.4.
(B) Outlays, $21.4.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $22.7.
(B) Outlays, $22.6.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $45.6.
(B) Outlays, $45.5.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $46.3.
(B) Outlays, $46.4.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $46.8.
(B) Outlays, $46.7.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $48.1.
(B) Outlays, $48.3.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $48.4.
(B) Outlays, $48.8.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $53.5.
(B) Outlays, $53.9.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $52.1.
(B) Outlays, $52.5.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $53.5.
(B) Outlays, $51.9.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $54.7.
(B) Outlays, $55.2.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $57.0.
(B) Outlays, $57.4.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $23.4.
(B) Outlays, $25.3.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $24.7.
(B) Outlays, $24.9.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $24.7.
(B) Outlays, $24.9.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $25.9.
(B) Outlays, $25.7.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $27.7.
(B) Outlays, $27.6.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $29.9.
(B) Outlays, $29.3.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $31.2.
(B) Outlays, $30.2.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $32.9.
(B) Outlays, $32.5.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $34.5.
(B) Outlays, $34.0.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $35.5.
(B) Outlays, $35.2.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12.3.
(B) Outlays, $13.5.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $12.1.
(B) Outlays, $12.6.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $12.1.
(B) Outlays, $12.3.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $12.1.
(B) Outlays, $12.2.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $12.4.
(B) Outlays, $12.4.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $13.2.
(B) Outlays, $12.8.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $14.0.
(B) Outlays, $13.7.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $.
(B) Outlays, $.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $.
(B) Outlays, $.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $.
(B) Outlays, $.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $.
(B) Outlays, $.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $.
(B) Outlays, $.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $.
(B) Outlays, $.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $265.2.
(B) Outlays, $265.2.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $263.3.
(B) Outlays, $263.3.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $260.6.
(B) Outlays, $260.6.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $257.7.
(B) Outlays, $257.7.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $254.8.
(B) Outlays, $254.8.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $250.7.
(B) Outlays, $250.7.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $246.7.
(B) Outlays, $246.7.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$9.3.
(B) Outlays, −$9.5.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$4.5.
(B) Outlays, −$4.4.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$4.3.
(B) Outlays, −$5.7.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$4.1.
(B) Outlays, −$4.3.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$4.4.
(B) Outlays, −$4.4.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, −$4.5.
(B) Outlays, −$4.4.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, −$4.3.
(B) Outlays, −$4.3.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, −$4.3.
(B) Outlays, −$4.3.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, −$4.4.
(B) Outlays, −$4.3.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, −$4.2.
(B) Outlays, −$4.2.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$35.1.
(B) Outlays, −$35.1.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$37.9.
(B) Outlays, −$37.9.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$44.9.
(B) Outlays, −$44.9.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$38.3.
(B) Outlays, −$38.3.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$38.6.
(B) Outlays, −$38.6.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, −$39.8.
(B) Outlays, −$39.8.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, −$40.8.
(B) Outlays, −$40.8.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, −$42.5.
(B) Outlays, −$42.5.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, −$43.6.
(B) Outlays, −$43.6.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, −$44.8.
(B) Outlays, −$44.8.
(21) Multipurpose (970):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $0.0.
(B) Outlays, $0.0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $0.0.
(B) Outlays, −$19.0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $0.0.
(B) Outlays, $10.0.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $0.0.
(B) Outlays, −$1.0.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $0.0.
(B) Outlays, $10.0.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $0.0.
(B) Outlays, $0.0.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $0.0.
(B) Outlays, $0.0.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $0.0.
(B) Outlays, $0.0.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $0.0.
(B) Outlays, $0.0

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, $0.0

(B) Outlays, $0.0.

SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

(a) FIRST RECONCILIATION BILL.—Not later than July 1, 1999, the House Committee on Ways and Means shall report to the House a reconciliation bill that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction necessary—

(1) to ensure (A) that the surplus of all trust fund receipts over outlays of the social security trust funds is invested in special purpose bonds backed by the full faith and credit of the United States, and (B) that such funds are applied by the Treasury solely to pay off the outstanding debt of the United States held by the public; and

(2) to ensure further that the Treasury shall issue bonds backed by the full faith and credit of the United States Government to the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance Trust Funds and to the Board of Trustees of the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund in an amount specified in this resolution which equals the public debt retired through fiscal year 2014. 81 ½ percent of such bonds shall be issued to the social security trust funds and 19 ½ percent to the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund.

(b) SECOND RECONCILIATION BILL.—If the reconciliation bill referred to in subsection (a) is enacted, then, not later than the 20th calendar day beginning after the date of such enactment, the House Committee on Ways and Means shall submit its recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the House. After receiving those recommendations, the Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(1) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce revenues as follows: −$40.1 in the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004 and −$116.5 in the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2009.

(2) The policy of this concurrent resolution is that the bill reported under section 4(b)(1) accommodate high priority tax relief of approximately $62 billion over five years, $166 billion over ten years, and $295 billion over fifteen years upon enactment of legislation that extends solvency of the Social Security trust funds until 2050 and solvency of the Medicare Trust Fund until at least 2020. Of these amounts, $22 billion over five years, $50 billion over ten years, and $90 billion over fifteen years would fully offset revenues lost by closing or restricting unwarranted tax benefits. Such tax relief should—

(1) expand tax credits to alleviate the costs of child care for working families;

(2) reduce financing costs for primary and secondary public school modernization;

(3) mitigate ''marriage penalties'' in the tax code;

(4) ensure that working families eligible for child tax credits are unaffected by the Alternative Minimum Tax;

(5) create tax incentives for working families to establish savings accounts for retirement;

(6) extend long-supported and previously renewed tax benefits that soon will expire, such as the Work Opportunity and Research and Experimentation credits;

(7) accommodate the revenue effects of enacting the Dingell bill (H.R. 358), legislation improving rights for medical patients and providers in managed care health plans;

(8) provide tax relief to assist working families with long-term care needs; and

(9) provide tax credits to purchasers of Better American Bonds which will support State and local environmental protection initiatives.

SEC. 5. EXTENDING THE SOLVENCY OF SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE.

Until enactment of the legislation required by this section, none of any budget surplus shall be obligated or expended. Upon enactment of this legislation, the on-budget surplus may be used to increase programs or to offset tax reduction, subject to the discretionary spending caps and the pay-as-you-go rules as enacted by H. Con. Res. 67 (105th Congress) or as subsequently amended. It is the objective of this resolution to extend the solvency of Social Security at least until 2050 and the solvency of Medicare at least until 2020, and to prohibit obligation or expenditure of any budget surplus until these objectives are met. The Balanced Budget Agreement of 1997 set discretionary caps for fiscal years 1998 through 2002 based upon explicit funding levels for national defense (Function 050) for fiscal years 1998 through 2002. The President's budget for fiscal year 2000 requests a baseline increase in Function 050 amounting to $84 billion in budget authority for each of the next 5 years. The purpose of the increase is to address problems of readiness and retention and to meet requirements for modernization of forces, which were not anticipated in the Balanced Budget Agreement of 1997. This request changes fundamentally the assumptions on which the agreement was made; therefore, baseline spending should be increased in order to provide sufficient funds for nondefense discretionary spending needs while meeting the President's request for additional defense spending. Therefore, upon enactment of legislation making Social Security and Medicare solvent, as required by section 4(a), the discretionary spending caps applicable to fiscal years 2001 and 2002 should be adjusted upward to reflect the additional defense spending request from the President's budget.

SEC. 6. UPDATED CBO PROJECTIONS.

Each calendar quarter the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall make an up-to-date estimate of receipts, outlays and surplus (on-budget and off-budget) for the current fiscal year.

SEC. 7. RELINQUISHING THE FEDERAL SHARE OF MEDICAID FUNDS RECOUPED AS A RESULT OF TOBACCO SETTLEMENTS BETWEEN THE STATES AND TOBACCO COMPANIES.

The resolution assumes the Federal share of Medicaid funds recouped as a result of tobacco settlements between the States and tobacco companies will be relinquised to the States. The resolution assumes that the release of the Federal Government's claim to these funds in favor of the States will be made by law, and will be subject to certain conditions and activities prescribed by law including, but not limited to, programs which improve public health, programs designed to prevent youth smoking, other health activities or education, and compensation for tobacco farmers.

SEC. 8. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) persecution of individuals on the sole ground of their religious beliefs and practices occurs in countries around the world and affects millions of lives;

(2) such persecution violates international norms of human rights, including those established in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Helsinki Accords, and the Declaration on the Elimination of all Forms of Intolerance and Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief;

(3) such persecution is abhorrent to all Americans, and our very Nation was founded on the principle of the freedom to worship according to the dictates of our conscience; and

(4) in 1998 Congress unanimously passed, and President Clinton signed into law, the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998, which established the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom to monitor facts and circumstances of violations of religious freedom and authorized $3,000,000 to carry out the functions of the Commission for each of fiscal years 1999 and 2000.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) this resolution assumes that $3,000,000 will be appropriated within function 150 for fiscal year 2000 for the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom to carry out its duties; and

(2) the House Committee on Appropriations is strongly urged to appropriate such amount for the Commission.

SEC. 9. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ASSET-BUILDING FOR THE WORKING POOR.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) 33 percent of all American households have no or negative financial assets and 60 percent of African-American households have no or negative financial assets;

(2) 46.9 percent of all children in America live in households with no financial assets, including 40 percent of caucasian children and 75 percent of African-American children;

(3) in order to provide low-income families with more tools for empowerment, incentives which encourage asset-building should be established;

(4) across the Nation numerous small public, private, and public-private asset-building initiatives (including individual development account programs) are demonstrating success at empowering low-income workers;

(5) the Government currently provides middle and upper income Americans with hundreds of billions of dollars in tax incentives for building assets; and

(6) the Government should utilize tax laws or other measures to provide low-income Americans with incentives to work and build assets in order to escape poverty permanently.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that any changes in tax law should include provisions which encourage low-income workers and their families to save for buying their first home, starting a business, obtaining an education, or taking other measures to prepare for the future.

SEC. 10. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ACCESS TO HEALTH INSURANCE AND PRESERVING HOME HEALTH SERVICES FOR ALL MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES.

(a) ACCESS TO HEALTH INSURANCE.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) 43.4 million Americans are currently without health insurance, and that this number is expected to rise to nearly 60 million people in the next 10 years;

(B) the cost of health insurance continues to rise, a key factor in increasing the number of uninsured; and

(C) there is a consensus that working Americans and their families and children will suffer from reduced access to health insurance.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON IMPROVING ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE INSURANCE.—It is the sense of Congress that access to affordable health care coverage for all Americans is a priority of the 106th Congress.

(b) PRESERVING HOME HEALTH SERVICE FOR ALL MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 reformed medicare home health care spending by instructing the Health Care Financing Administration to implement a prospective payment system and instituted an interim payment system to achieve savings;

(B) the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act,

1999, reformed the interim payment system to increase reimbursements to low-cost providers, added $900 million in funding, and delayed the automatic 15 percent payment reduction for one year, to October 1, 2000; and

(C) patients whose care is more extensive and expensive than the typical medicare patient do not receive supplemental payments in the interim payment system but will receive special protection in the home health care prospective payment system.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ACCESS TO HOME HEALTH CARE.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(A) Congress recognizes the importance of home health care for seniors and disabled citizens;

(B) Congress and the Administration should work together to maintain quality care for patients whose care is more extensive and expensive than the typical medicare patient, including the sickest and frailest medicare beneficiaries, while home health care agencies operate in the interim payment system; and

(C) Congress and the Administration should work together to avoid the implementation of the 15 percent reduction in the interim payment system and ensure timely implementation of the prospective payment system.

SEC. 11. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON MEDICARE PAYMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) a goal of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 was to expand options for Medicare beneficiaries under the new Medicare+Choice program;

(2) Medicare+Choice was intended to make these choices available to all Medicare beneficiaries; and unfortunately, during the first two years of the Medicare+Choice program the blended payment was not implemented, stifling health care options and continuing regional disparity among many counties across the United States; and

(3) the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 also established the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare to develop legislative recommendations to address the long-term funding challenges facing medicare.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that this resolution assumes that funding of the Medicare+Choice program is a priority for the House Committee on the Budget before financing new programs and benefits that may potentially add to the imbalance of payments and benefits in Fee-for-Service Medicare and Medicare+Choice.

SEC. 12. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON ASSESSMENT OF WELFARE-TO-WORK PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It is the sense of the House that, recognizing the need to maximize the benefit of the Welfare-to-Work Program, the Secretary of Labor should prepare a report on Welfare-to-Work Programs pursuant to section 403(a)(5) of the Social Security Act. This report should include information on the following—

(1) the extent to which the funds available under such section have been used (including the number of States that have not used any of such funds), the types of programs that have received such funds, the number of and characteristics of the recipients of assistance under such programs, the goals of such programs, the duration of such programs, the costs of such programs, any evidence of the effects of such programs on such recipients, and accounting of the total amount expended by the States from such funds, and the rate at which the Secretary expects such funds to be expended for each of the fiscal years 2000, 2001, and 2002;

(2) with regard to the unused funds allocated for Welfare-to-Work for each of fiscal years 1998 and 1999, identify areas of the Nation that have unmet needs for Welfare-to-Work initiatives; and

(3) identify possible Congressional action that may be taken to reprogram Welfare-to-Work funds from States that have not utilized previously allocated funds to places of unmet need, including those States that have rejected or otherwise not utilized prior funding.

(b) REPORT.—It is the sense of the House that, not later than January 1, 2000, the Secretary of Labor should submit to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, in writing, the report described in subsection (a).

SEC. 13. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PROVIDING HONOR GUARD SERVICES FOR VETERANS' FUNERALS.

It is the sense of Congress that all relevant congressional committees should make every effort to provide sufficient resources so that an Honor Guard, if requested, is available for veterans' funerals.

SEC. 14. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE PRESIDENT'S LIVABILITY AGENDA AND LANDS LEGACY INITIATIVE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) States and localities across the country are taking steps to address the problems of traffic congestion, urban sprawl, the deterioration of recreational areas, and the disappearance of wildlife habitat and open space;

(2) the Government should be a strong partner with States and localities as they strive to address these problems and build livable communities for the 21st century;

(3) the Government can and should also take independent actions to protect critical lands across the country and to preserve America's natural treasures; and

(4) the President's Lands Legacy Initiative and Livability Agenda represent two comprehensive proposals that advance these goals.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the President's Land Legacy Initiative and Livability Agenda should be considered high priorities by the Appropriations Committees as they make spending decisions for fiscal year 2000 and beyond.

SEC. 15. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CHILD NUTRITION.

It is the sense of Congress that both Democrats and Republicans understand that an adequate diet and proper nutrition are essential to a child's general well-being. Furthermore, the lack of an adequate diet and proper nutrition may adversely affect a child's ability to perform up to his or her ability in school. Because of this fact, as well as the current Federal role in school nutrition programs and the commitment on behalf of both Republicans and Democrats to helping children learn, it is the sense of Congress that the Committee on Education and the Workforce and the Committee on Agriculture of the House should examine our Nation's nutrition programs to determine if they can be improved, particularly with respect to services to low-income children.

SEC. 16. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING STATES' FLEXIBILITY TO HELP LOW-INCOME SENIORS MEET MEDICARE'S COST SHARING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) Congress and the States through Medicaid have established two vital programs to help senior citizens pay medicare premiums, deductibles, and copayments through the Qualified Medicare Beneficiary (QMB) and the Specified Low-Income Medicare Beneficiary (SLMB) programs;

(2) a recent Families, USA study found that between three and four million low-income seniors are not getting the help to which they are legally entitled, which is nearly 40 percent of those eligible for these programs; and

(3) for many senior citizens with limited means, these medicare premiums, deductibles, and copayments can be a significant burden on their monthly budgets.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that these low-income seniors be enrolled in Medicaid by allowing the Social Security Administration to automatically assume that these seniors are eligible for Medicaid, while States make final determinations.

SEC. 17. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON EQUITABLE REIMBURSEMENT FOR FEDERALLY QUALIFIED HEALTH CENTERS.

The Balanced Budget Act of 1997 contained a provision to phase out Medicaid cost-based reimbursements from States to FQHC's beginning in August of 1999 and phasing out completely by 2002. It is anticipated that the phase-out of these reimbursements will put a tremendous strain on the ability of FQHC's to meet the healthcare needs of Medicaid beneficiaries and the uninsured, particularly in rural areas of the United States. It is the sense of Congress that a fair and equitable Medicaid reimbursement policy should be developed for FQHC's in recognition of their unique patient and service mix.

SEC. 18. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING STATE'S FLEXIBILITY TO PROVIDE CHILDREN WITH HEALTH INSURANCE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) according to the 1997 current population survey data from the United States Census Bureau, 11.3 million children are uninsured and 4.4 million of them are eligible for Medicaid;

(2) under the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, States have a new option under Medicaid to grant ''presumptive eligibility'' to children through pediatricians, community health centers, other health providers, Head Start centers, WIC agencies, and State or local child care agencies that determine eligibility for child care subsidies; and

(3) it is more cost effective to enroll these children in Medicaid and ensure that they are receiving preventive care through a family doctor, rather than through an emergency room where children are sicker and taxpayers will end up paying more through higher Medicaid expenditures, local taxes, or insurance premiums.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that these low-income children be enrolled in Medicaid by allowing schools, child care resource and referral centers, child support agencies, workers determining eligibility for homeless programs, and workers determining eligibility for the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) to automatically assume that these children are eligible for Medicaid, while States make final determinations.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) each will control 20 minutes.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, if we were voting on final passage on the Spratt amendment, I would vote against it, because it and all other budgets before us today pretend that both parties will

make deep cuts in health, environment, education, international responsibilities, and defense that in the end neither party, in my view, will accept.

But this vote is not to pass the Spratt amendment. It is to substitute the Spratt amendment for the Republican budget, and I will vote to do that. Because, with all of its false premises, it is far less reckless, far more balanced and responsible than the Republican alternative that it amends.

Now, why do I say that? It is because I was here in 1981 and I remember the Republicans and a lot of conservative Democrats ramming the disastrous Reagan budgets through this House, which promised that we could double defense spending, provide huge tax cuts aimed at the wealthy, and still balance the budget.

Instead, those budgets tripled the deficits and tripled the national debt. And it took us some 19 years to dig out of that hole to the point where a President could finally present a balanced budget to the Congress.

I vowed never again will I cooperate in that kind of outrageous activity. But now the Republicans in their approach bring us the same patent medicine snake oil that they gave us in 1981.

The Spratt amendment does not. The Spratt amendment extends the solvency of Social Security and Medicare. It is better for veterans. It is better for education. It is better for health care. And in the future, it makes some of the investments that we will need to create greater opportunity for all of our American families.

□ 1800

But I caution all of my colleagues. After the budget resolution passes today, they will then face the appropriations process. In that process, I predict that neither party will be willing to vote for the cuts in education, in health care, in agriculture, in veterans, in environmental cleanup, in defense that all of these resolutions promise today.

I really believe that Members fundamentally misunderstand what is happening in the budget process, and I would ask this question: Does anybody on this floor really believe that in the end in the appropriations process they will cut 10 percent below current services this year, or 20 to 25 percent below current services in the coming 5 years in some of the program areas I have just described? The answer is very simple. They simply will not do it.

The budget process in my view has become fundamentally flawed and phony. It politically rewards phonies. It allows Congress to pretend that it is making cuts at the macro level, which it will never deliver at the micro program level. And we desperately need to change it if we want to bring reality back to the process and integrity back to the debate about budgeting. Unless we do that, the public will not understand a single thing we do here on budgets, and in a democracy, that is unacceptable.

And so I would simply say in closing, while I would not support the Spratt amendment if it were final passage because I believe all of these budgets before us today are fundamentally phony, this is by far the most balanced, the most equitable, the most thoughtful in terms of providing the long-term investments that we will eventually need in this country, and I would urge its adoption as a substitute to the Republican vehicle now before us.

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say, and I hope all my colleagues share this view, the gentleman from Wisconsin, who is the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations and has to deal most pointedly with the reality as opposed to the rhetoric, invariably in my opinion speaks the truth not only to us but to the American public. I voted for the Blue Dog and I am going to vote for the Spratt budget, but those of us who serve on the Committee on Appropriations know that, in the final analysis, Members are not going to pass bills within their constraints that we now have on the floor, and that is what the gentleman from Wisconsin is talking about. I want to congratulate him for his leadership, for his honesty and for his service in this institution. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman, and I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

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

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in opposition to the Spratt amendment.

I rise in opposition to the Spratt amendment and in support of the Republican resolution which secures Social Security and Medicare, and increases education. The Republican resolution is the only budget that takes the first steps necessary toward improving benefits for veterans and restoring the health of national defense.

As I stand here today, our dedicated service men and women who are deployed throughout the world, are unselfishly putting their lives at risk in support of our national security interests—in Kosovo, Iraq and North Korea to name a few.

The Subcommittee on Military Personnel, which I chair, has had very good hearings concerning pay, retirement, retention and health care. The concerns that are affecting our soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines are real!

During these investigations I received a letter, which I would like submitted for the RECORD, from a young officer in the Navy. He, like the rest of the outstanding military personnel loves what he does and takes great pride in supporting and protecting our country. He only asks that we provide him with qualified people, tools and training to complete their mission and to pay them an honest day's wage for an honest day's work. These men and women and their families deserve better than this—there is no excuse that they do not have the proper tools and equipment, work and live in substandard facilities and are paid so poorly they have to work two jobs to support their families. Our force is undermanned and overworked. The operation tempo is so high that many of these men and women have spent the last two Thanksgivings and Christmases away from their families. This is insulting to them and to this country which they so unselfishly support.

I heard one of my colleagues from across the aisle say "We have a moral obligation to support defense and that he would support the proposal that provides the most for defense." We do have a moral obligation to support defense and the Republican budget resolution with the manager's amendment takes the first steps necessary toward providing for defense. It will provide more dollars in fiscal year 2000, (3 billion more than the Spratt amendment or the President's) than any other proposal.

In addition, the Republican budget provides over $1 billion for the veterans who have also sacrificed so much for this country.

Unlike the Spratt amendment the Republican budget resolution will fulfill our promise to veterans and work toward maintaining a strong national defense.

I strongly oppose the Spratt amendment and support the Republican budget and urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

To whom it may concern:

For the last 17 years I have served my country as a sailor in the United States Navy. I have seen what I believe to be the decline in discipline reach an all time low in the last 2 years. I believe that boot camp has become too lax and fails to produce sailors that could go immediately into combat and survive. We also take those same sailors and send them to Pensacola for follow on training where they live better than most senior fleet sailors. They are cuddled the whole time they are in school. They arrive in the fleet with little or no concept of discipline. After they complete training they show up at various stations around the world in live in what is little more than a slum. We always say, "if you take care of your sailors, then they will take care of you." Taking care of them may be in the form of a good ass chewing to get them back on track. If we cuddle them as airman then what is there to look forward to?

It takes a special breed of person to stay in the Navy. Sailors that stay in the Navy are, for the most part, not in it for fame or fortune. They stay in the Navy because they love what they do, pride in the hardest job in the world, well done. There is no greater satisfaction then watching the fruits of your labor launch off the pointy end of an aircraft carrier loaded with all the ordnance it can possibly carry and go take a piece of American policy to those who need it most. They stay because of camaraderie. They stay because of honor, courage and commitment.

Honor, courage and commitment are words that are often used in just. What they should say is honor the sailor and respect the job and sacrifice that he endures. Have the courage to give those who risk their life everyday in the defense of our country and democracy the proper equipment to do their job. Make the commitment to the basic human needs

that every human being, even sailors; need for themselves and their families.

Most sailors are held to an even higher standard then the people who send them to their deaths in battle. Many have a hard time living with the double standard that they are held to. If our Commander-in-Chief can admittedly lie to congress about his improprieties, then why must an active duty military person have their lives ruined and be forced from the service of his country, because he went to a convention that honors all of those who have ever landed an aircraft on the pitching deck of an aircraft carrier.

We need to provide the fleet with all the tools to maintain all our assets. Just in time manning and ramping up for deployment is ludicrous, people and assets need to be in position and onboard to benefit from the rigors of the training cycle. Sailors need to be properly trained. They need to have the proper support equipment to test the systems, be it on a ship or aircraft. They need publications that are up-to-date. They need the various hand and automated tools to actually perform the maintenance and maintain the equipment. They need adequate space to perform their maintenance and stow their gear. Recently it took us 2 days to complete what should have been a 2-hour procedure for all of these reasons: We could not get a hydraulic test stand that worked correctly. The support equipment people could not fix the hydraulic test stand because they did not have the correct publications. The publications had not been updated to reflect the new tool requirements. Nobody knew how to operate the new test equipment. If we do not have the people or tools to fix the aircraft then the aircraft can not fly. Aircrews need to fly to stay proficient. Aircrews love to fly and that is their job.

We must fulfill the basic human needs of every sailor in order for them to continue to be happy at their job. Pay them an honest days wage for an honest days work. A sailor that works on the flight deck of an aircraft carrier, the most dangerous work place in the world, gets $3 a day (before taxes), provided the ship or squadron has enough billets to pay him. Pay them for the sacrifices that they make by providing adequate housing (when ashore), quality health care for them and their families. We need to provide affordable (pay grade based) 24 hour a day 7 days a week daycare.

Manning is probably one thing that gets pinged on the most, but just throwing a body at a problem will not fix it, if it is not the right body. It does not matter if I have 10 mechanics if I have an electrical problem. Of the 200 people assigned to the maintenance department, 25 are temporarily assigned duties out side the command. 140 people are actually assigned to production work centers. The 140 people include 7 in corrosion, 17 ordies, 5 tarpies, 3 PR's, and 28 line rats. This leaves 80 people to perform 97% of the scheduled and unscheduled, documented, direct maintenance on the aircraft. However, on any given day we lose approximately 15 of the 75 people from these work centers due to leave, school, watch, SIQ, LIMDU, appointments, etc. This all means that on an average day we have 65 maintainers performing maintenance on our aircraft. Currently the average direct maintenance man-hour per flight hour, for the F–14 is 60.5. Based on an eight-hour day, five days a week we would perform 11,960 hour of on aircraft maintenance per month. This would equate to 198 flight hours per month or 99 sorties, which would break down to approximately 16 flight hours, or 8 sorties per month for each pilot. This is not enough to stay proficient. This also does not account for any of the other ''collateral'' duties, administrative requirements or additional tasking these sailors have. What do you think is not gonna be done?

I don't know what the fix is and I don't know all the answers but I will tell you I have never seen the Navy in such a sad state of affairs. I love this business and have always believed that there was honor in my chosen profession. Where else in the world can a high school drop out become an Officer and a key person in a maintenance department with $500 million of assets. We have created most of the problems ourselves through inflated decrees of readiness and continually providing more with less, but at what cost? Sailors are ingenious and will find ways to put ''hot steel on target'' no matter what it takes, because that is our job. When we have to work harder to get the job done then some other program is not getting the attention it needs. In many cases those are the paper programs that the bureaucracy has created in order for someone to ''cover their ass'' or have a ''claim to fame.'' So every cut back has a cost. In this case I think we cut too deep. Unfortunately we elected those bureaucrats that created those paper programs. We are WARRIORS and our job is to be prepared to fight wars.

ROCKY A. RILEY, *LTJG, USN.*

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I must confess a certain degree of confusion. Last month, the author of this amendment, this alternative budget, praised the President's budget with a glowing review. Today he proposes a budget that is diametrically opposed to and completely incompatible with the President's budget, so I am confused. I do not know in which direction my colleagues on the other side of the aisle really want to go. I suppose we will find out soon. But in the meantime, I want to urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the obvious alternative, the best budget, the Republican budget proposal.

I came to Congress just 3 months ago as a small businessman, accustomed to the discipline that the free market imposes on business budgets and frustrated by the irresponsible lack of discipline we have often seen in many government budgets. Perhaps the most egregious example of this irresponsibility has been the raid on the Social Security trust funds. I am proud to be a member of the Republican Committee on the Budget that is bringing an end to that irresponsible practice.

The Republican budgets saves 100 percent of Social Security funds, every penny of payroll taxes, every penny of interest owed to the Social Security trust fund. That is $1.8 trillion over the next 10 years, considerably more than the President's budget. In addition, the Republican budget spends more on elementary and secondary education, more on defense, more on Medicare, and then after those priorities are addressed, the Republican budget, unlike any of the Democratic alternatives, provides meaningful tax relief for overtaxed working Americans, all of this accomplished within the context of the 1997 budget agreement.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for senior citizens, to stand up for our students, to stand up for our soldiers and for our taxpayers. Reject the Spratt alternative and vote ''yes'' on the Republican budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

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

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Spratt amendment and in opposition to the Kasich bill. Our amendment provides for the next generation rather than just the next election.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend Mr. SPRATT for crafting a substitute that wills save all of the surplus until we ensure the solvency of Social Security and Medicare. Congress must exercise fiscal discipline and save Social Security first.

I also want to thank committee Democrats for adding my bill, the Etheridge School Construction Act, to the Spratt Substitute. This legislation will provide critically needed help for local schools like those in my District that are bursting at the seams. As the former Superintendent of my state's schools, I call on this Congress to make the education of our children our top priority.

Despire the rhetoric from the other side of the aisle, the Kasich budget does nothing for school construction and abandons the 100,000 new teachers initiative. The Kasich budget cuts higher education by $36.3 billion over ten years. As the first member of my family to graduate from college, I know firsthand that affordable access to a quality education is the key to the American Dream, and Congress must not cut financial aid.

This is a question of our values and our priorities. A budget should be about the next generation not just the next election. Vote for the future and the Spratt Substitute.

HOUSE BUDGET COMMITTEE DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

The Democratic alternative requires the enactment of legislation extending the solvency of the Social Security Trust Fund to 2050 and the Medicare Hospital Insurance (HI) Trust Fund for 12 additional years prior to the enactment of net new tax cuts or net new spending initiatives. If the solvency of the Social Security and Medicare HI Trust Funds is extended, the Democratic alternative provides for education, training, and social services initiatives.

REPUBLICANS DEVASTATE EDUCATION FUNDING

Despite Republican rhetoric about supporting education, the House Republican budget resolution drastically cuts funding for education, employment and training, and social service programs.

Republicans Cut Education by $1.2 Billion in 2000—The House Republican budget cuts education funding for 2000 by $1.2 billion below a freeze at the 1999 level.

Republicans Cut Purchasing Power by 18.1 Percent by 2009—These cuts in education funding translate into a 6.9 percent decrease in purchasing power by 2004, and an astounding 18.1 percent decrease in purchasing power by 2009.

HIGHER EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING, AND SOCIAL SERVICES

The Republicans deeply cut funding that provides higher education assistance, college preparation, social services (such as Head

Start), and job training in order to increase spending for elementary and secondary education. (The Republicans do not say which education programs they eliminate.)

Republicans Cut Higher Education and Social Services by $16.7 Billion over Five Years—The Republican budget cuts funding for higher education, training, and social services—programs such as Pell Grants and Head Start—by $1.7 billion for 2000, by $16.7 billion over five years, and by $36.3 billion over ten years compared with the 1999 freeze level.

Republicans Cut Education by 5.7 Percent for 2000, 16.2 Percent for 2009—The magnitude of cuts in the Republican budget requires an across-the-board cut of 5.7 percent for 2000 in programs other than those for elementary and secondary education. By 2009, the Republican budget cuts these programs by 16.2 percent compared with the 1999 freeze level.

DEMOCRATS BOOST EDUCATION FUNDING

The Democratic budget rejects the Republicans' damaging cuts in education programs. It provides $2.6 billion more for education for 2000 than the Republican budget. Over time, the difference between the Democratic and Republican budgets gets even greater; the Democratic budget provides $10.2 billion more than the Republicans over five years (2000–2004), and $51.4 billion more over ten years (2000–2009).

Protect Higher Education, Employment and Training, and Social Services—Unlike the Republican budget, the Democratic alternative does not cut higher education, training, and social services to increase elementary and secondary education programs. The Democratic alternative increases the overall education budget.

Hire 100,000 Teachers—The Democratic budget increases spending by enough to continue the President's initiative to hire 100,000 new teachers over seven years in order to reduce the average class size in first through third grade. Congress funded 30,000 new teachers last year, and the Democratic alternative supports those teachers and allows the hiring of 8,000 more.

Modernize Schools—The Democratic budget includes new tax credits starting in 2000 to pay the interest on almost $25 billion in bonds to build and modernize up to 6,000 public schools. It also continues welfare-to-work and employer-provided post secondary education tax credits.

Increase Special Education—Because the Democratic budget provides $2.6 billion more for 2000 than the Republican budget, Democrats have more room to increase funding for special education. The Republicans increase elementary and secondary education funding by only $500 million above a freeze. Unless they cut other elementary and secondary education programs, they can only increase funding for special education by the same amount.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Spratt amendment. I voted against the Balanced Budget Amendment of 1997 because I knew it was unrealistic. I knew that when we got to this backloaded end of this process, we would be facing absolute impossibilities in meeting the needs of this country. We are there.

The gentleman from South Carolina has written a budget within the rules. Those rules are caps on spending that Members are going to find impossible to appropriate within between now and the end of this session. I know everybody on the other side is waiting for the June estimates from CBO, hoping that God will come with billions more dollars to spend and that suddenly we will have some relief. But the fact is that what is happening in this House, and the American people have to understand it, is that those people who want to reduce the size of government are using a very interesting technique. The technique is, erode the tax base so that there is no money and then put social programs and defense head to head. We are headed for some very serious problems.

Now, my belief was that all the mistakes that the gentleman from Wisconsin talked about were very real back in the 1980s, but now we have $5 trillion worth of debt. The gentleman from South Carolina says, ''Let's deal with Social Security, let's deal with Medicare, let's pay down the debt.'' The Republican alternative is, ''Let's figure out some way to shuffle it around on a two-page document, smoke and mirrors, and come to the Committee on Ways and Means and give away billions of dollars in taxes again.''

Now, if you will not pay your credit card debt, you deserve to lose your credit card. What is happening in this budgeting process is you have all this credit card debt that you have built up all those years, you now have a surplus, and you say, ''Let's go on another spending spree.'' This budget that the gentleman from South Carolina has says, ''We're going to take care of the essentials.'' What people worry about is their security when they are old, their Social Security, their Medicare. Yes, when the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) gets old, he will worry about his Medicare, too, and so will his mother and so will everybody else's mother and uncle and aunt if we do not deal with those issues.

The Republican alternative has not one single penny of additional money in the budget for dealing with the problems of Medicare. It should fail. The Spratt amendment should pass.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

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

Mr. SPENCE. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, when it comes to national security, there is no debate about which plan under consideration best provides for our men and women in uniform. Over the President's objection and under threat of veto, the Republican budgets in fiscal years 1996 through 1998 increased defense spending by more than $20 billion over the President's budget in an effort to address some of our military's most critical unfunded quality of life, readiness and modernization shortfalls. The funds were desperately needed, but it was not enough.

Last fall, the Nation's military leadership indicated that the President's defense budget was short by at least $150 billion in critical areas, like pay, housing, modernization, spare parts, maintenance funding and on and on and on. What was the President's response? His budget provides for only about 50 percent of what the Joint Chiefs said was needed. And even that 50 percent is explicitly held hostage to the President's domestic political agenda, while also assuming that the spending caps are broken.

The military's needs are real. The President's defense budget, which itself falls short of meeting the military's minimum requirements, is not. Under the leadership of the Speaker and with the support of our chairman of the Committee on the Budget the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the Republican budget goes a long way towards addressing the Joint Chiefs' unmet requirements. Under the leadership of the Speaker and with the support of the gentleman from Ohio, the Republican budget adds $30 billion to the defense budget, including more than $8 billion next year. And contrary to earlier accusations made by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the Republican budget will provide $3 billion in additional outlays just next year alone. These extra funds will provide for everything from a 4.8 percent pay raise to better family housing, to more robustly modernized and dramatically improved readiness.

So contrary to concerns expressed by some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, again the Republican budget will take care of the troops, will take care of their families, will take care of readiness and will take care of modernization shortfalls far more effectively than the President's budget will. There is no contest.

Support the troops. Support the Republican budget.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks and express my appreciation for his leadership dealing with our national defense.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the Spratt alternative and in opposition to the Republican budget resolution.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Spratt Alternative and in opposition to the budget resolution before us because I call it the Fable of three evils.

This budget will continue and even accelerate trends away from a progressive tax system. We rely more and more on payroll and property taxes and are less dependent on a progressive income tax. This budget offers tax

relief for the rich and uncertainty for everyone else.

Secondly, only as this process moves into appropriation reality will the American people understand the basic unfairness, the cold-heartedness which lie at the base of these numbers presented here today.

This budget calls for $200 billion dollars in discretionary cuts in future years. Imagine what this could mean for veterans, senior citizens, children, schools and hospitals.

Thirdly, this budget is built on forecasts which may or may not become real. The Congressional Budget office warns that if economic conditions change, the budget deficit or surplus projections could be off by more than $85 billion dollars and become a political football.

This budget does not reflect the needs of my district where the median income is $25,250. This budget cuts the heart out of senior citizens with the $9 billion Medicare cuts and puts healthcare at risk for millions with the $1.2 billion cut in Medicaid.

I fully support a pay raise for our soldiers in the military; solvency for the social security trust fund; food stamps for elderly immigrants, medicaid for children, pregnant women and legal immigrants with disabilities. Therefore, I support the Spratt Alternative and urge its passage.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, many American children go to school each morning in crumbling schools with poor heating in winter, leaky pipes and paint peeling off the ceiling. Our children deserve better than this.

Many American children are in classrooms with one teacher for 30, 35 or 40 students. Our children deserve better than this.

Our future is only as bright as the education we provide for our children today. I know people are used to Members of Congress talking about the importance of educating our children, but actions speak louder than words. The Democratic budget provides for 100,000 new teachers so that our children get more individualized attention in the classroom. The Democratic budget has an initiative to modernize our aging public schools. The Democratic budget invests in higher education so that everyone who earns a place in college can go to college. We Democrats believe that education needs to be a top priority.

Republicans have a different set of priorities. They cut $16.7 billion over 5 years for higher ed and social services. They cut education by 16 percent by the year 2009. They would rather give a big tax break to someone earning $200,000 a year or more than provide a good school for a child to realize their God-given capabilities. They would rather spend $775 billion on a tax cut than use that money to make sure our schools provide for a world-class education. Of course it is tough to know exactly how they will fund their tax cuts for the wealthy because they do not tell us. Will it come from Head Start? From college student loans and aid? Or maybe they will do what they first tried to do when they became the majority and eliminate the entire Department of Education.

Their budget is like playing Russian roulette with our children's future. That clearly is the difference between Republicans and Democrats, having a different vision of the future. The one that we need is the Spratt Democratic substitute. It provides for the type of vision that educates our children in the next century.

□ 1815

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY).

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

Mr. Chairman, let me just get to the point of matter. This is really very simple.

Every young Member, every young working man and woman in this country, young couple with their own children, their own family, their own hopes for their own life, is paying a very heavy payroll tax, many times on both incomes. Doing what they can to support their family but paying that heavy payroll tax; for what? For what they believe is the Social Security, retirement security, Medicare, health security of their grandma and their grandpa, and bless their hearts. These little guys, these young men and women, they make that payment. They make that payment because they believe this government is being honest. They think this government is taking that money for grandma and grandpa's retirement, and now they found out that has not been the case.

As late as 1994, the last year the Democrats were in the majority, $100 billion of their hard-earned tax dollars did not go to grandma and grandpa's retirement security or to their health security but to other welfare programs, for all kinds of things. That is not only a betrayal of grandma and grandpa, but that is a betrayal of each and everyone of those young working men and women, these young parents that are working so hard and making such a sacrifice.

How do we change that? The first thing we did was get rid of the deficit. We reformed welfare, we saved Medicare from insolvency, we reformed five major entitlement spending programs, and today for the first time in their life we have an opportunity to tell every young working man and woman in this country that every dime that they pay in payroll taxes will go for the purpose that they pay it, to support grandma and grandpa's and then, yes, some day their own retirement security through Social Security and Medicare. The Democrats are pretending to that, but they compromise it. They cut it off. They cut back because they cannot give up their big spending programs.

But what makes this budget different that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) and this Republican committee has brought to the floor is right here: $200 billion more. To Mr. Young Working America: ''Those payroll taxes that are such a burden in your family are in fact being saved for your retirement security through Social Security than what is done by the President. Two hundred billion dollars more of that money that you pay for that purpose that you are promised by this government will be used for that purpose.''

It is time, Mr. Chairman, that this government get honest with the working people of this country and pay the respect to their grandmother and grandfather that they paid when they pay those payroll taxes. The one fundamental thing we must know about this, every dime of those payroll taxes goes to Social Security and Medicare. We set more of their hard-earned tax dollars aside for Social Security and Medicare than the President, and for the first time we are being honest with both the grandma and the grandpa and the young 20 and 30 year-old young parent that is struggling for their children.

This is our chance to do the one thing we never thought would get done in our lifetime. Let us do it tonight. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for having yielded the time to me.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN).

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the House budget resolution sponsored by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH). This budget is a solid step forward in the idea of limited government, of fiscal discipline and protecting Social Security and tax relief. By setting aside 1.8 trillion dollars over the next 10 years, the entire Social Security surplus plus interest, the Republican budget provides more money for the protection of Social Security and Medicare than does the President's budget. In addition, it locks this money away so it can only be used for reforming these important programs or for paying down the national debt. This is a great signal of our commitment to preserving the quality of life and income security of our Nation's seniors that they so richly deserve.

Mr. Chairman, retirement should be a time to enjoy things, the company of friends and family. It should not be spent worrying about where our money is going to come from to retire, about access to health care, about paying the rent.

The Republican budget also provides $800 billion worth of tax relief over the next 10 years.

The Congressional Research Service recently reported that the average American family will end up paying $5,307 more in taxes over the next 10 years than is necessary to operate government, and this is over and above the Social Security surplus. This represents a direct overpayment in taxes on the part of hard-working Americans. Incredibly the President's budget

actually increases taxes on working Americans. According to the Tax Foundation 38. 5 percent of his budget, the President's tax increase, will be born by individuals who earn less than $25,000 a year. Mr. President, how much is enough?

Mr. Chairman, I cannot think of a better way to begin the new millennium than by reestablishing trust with the taxpayers whom we represent by letting them keep more of their hard-earned dollars. I urge my colleagues to reject this alternative and accept our commitment to taxpayers, to the seniors, and support the Republican budget. It is their money; let us give it back.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding this time to me.

Our folks in the Armed Services need more ammunition, they need spare parts for readiness, they need better equipment, and they need better pay. They have told us what we need and what they need, and we should give it to them. There is not a budget here that gives them everything that they have requested for this year. Nobody's budget does that. But the Republican budget comes closer than anybody else. It gives 8 billion more in spending authority for the troops, and it gives 3 billion more in outlays.

Mr. Chairman, that means if my colleagues vote for the Republican budget, we are going to have better pay for our troops, we are going to have more spare parts, we are going to have a better chance of them coming home alive.

My colleagues should vote for the Republican budget if they care about defense.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), our Minority Leader.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the Democratic alternative and against the Republican budget, and I want to say tonight that I think we have to look at this issue from the viewpoint of people sitting around their kitchen table at home tonight looking at the issues that are involved in this budget.

It is not about charts, it is not about graphs, it is not about statistics, it is not about numbers. It is about ideas that make sense to ordinary Americans, working families who are sitting around the breakfast table or the dinner table talking about the problems that they face. What would they like to see happen in this budget?

First of all, they want Medicare and Social Security stabilized and extended, probably the two most important programs in peoples' lives. They are popular programs, important programs on an everyday basis. The Democratic budget extends the life of Medicare by 12 years and the life of Social Security by 18 years.

We have a letter from the actuaries that say that our budget does that. They are not Republican actuaries or Democratic actuaries. They are actuaries, and their job is to give us information about ideas, and the Democratic idea they say extends the life of those two programs; in the one case, by 12; in the other case, by 18 years.

The Republican budget does not have that letter from the actuaries, so if our colleagues are worried about Medicare and Social Security, then they ought to vote for the Democratic budget.

The second thing people, I think, would like to do is pay down debt, pay down back debt so that we pass along less back debt to our children and grandchildren and we have less carrying cost or interest cost in future budgets. The Democratic budget is much better on that score.

The third thing they would like is targeted tax cuts, tax cuts that go to their problems. What are their problems? Long term care for their parents; that is a problem. We can have a targeted tax cut under the Democratic budget for that. They want tax cuts that have to do with U.S.A. accounts. I think the idea of being able to put more savings behind their Social Security so that they can have additional moneys to live on in their retirement is a very attractive idea that is in our budget.

The fourth thing that I think they are interested in is being able to have more funds available for education, for smaller class size, for more teachers, for health care, for housing, for the needs that people have on an everyday basis.

To me this whole issue is very simple. If we look at it through the eyes of ordinary American families who are out there tonight sitting around a table, if we are looking at the things that they care about, what I call kitchen table, everyday problems, this Democratic budget is far superior to the Republican budget on those issues, on those grounds.

This is a simple choice that Members have to make tonight.

I urge Members to vote for the Democratic alternative. If we get the votes to pass it tonight, it will be the budget of the United States, and I think it should be the budget of the United States because it is the budget of working families in this country.

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

Mr. Chairman, the Minority Leader summed it up very nicely. Every time that the majority has wanted a budget to target, to tackle, today, they have pulled out the President's budget and dragged it like a red herring across the path of this debate. Well, this is not the President's budget. It is like it in some respects, but different in other respects. This is a different piece of work.

But there is a key aspect to it, the crowning aspect to it, that is like the President's budget. We Democrats created Social Security, and for the last 65 years we have been its guardians, and now that it faces the strain and stress it will face the next 25 years, we are not going to fail it.

So, if our colleagues look at our budget, by golly, we extend the life of Social Security until the year 2050, and we have a letter from a chief actuary of the Social Security Administration to prove it.

Secondly, next in pride and importance to us is one of our creations, Medicare. In 1968 we created it, and we have sustained it and protected it. The actuaries at the Health Care Finance Administration tell us it will run dry in the year 2008. The Republican budget leaves it in the lurch. Notwithstanding this warning from the actuaries, they do not put one thin dime. Out of all the billions that we see on the rise in the way of surpluses, not a nickel for Medicare. We, on the other hand, put several billions of dollars into this trust fund to sustain and extend its life until the year 2020.

That is what we do first. We do not rush into tax cuts until we have first protected Social Security and Medicare.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell my colleagues something else we do. Now that we are in the position to do it, we treat the trust funds generated, the surpluses generated by Social Security with sanctity. We do not touch them, we do not use any of the money, and we provide in our resolution reconciliation instructions that call for a real lockbox; no, a strong box; not something that rests on a thin reed of a point of order, the kind that gets overridden around here every week, they are honored in the breach. No, we have got statutory instruction to the Treasury that will ensure that this money is used only for the security and benefit of the Social Security Administration.

□ 1830

The proof of all of this is on the bottom line. There is the bottom line. If Members vote for the Republican resolution, the Social Security trust fund will have a balance of $1.8 trillion 10 years from now. Now, that is not chump change.

Look what happens if Members vote for the Democratic resolution. Ten years from now, the trust fund will have a balance of $3.4 trillion and it will keep growing through the year 2014.

What about Medicare? Vote for the Republican resolution and in 10 years it will be scraping bottom, $14 billion, barely enough to operate on in the trust fund.

We will have a $400 billion balance still left to ensure its solvency into the year 2020. Those are the differences between our budget and their budget. These are significant differences.

We have got a letter from the Health Care Financing Administration also certifying we extend the life of this program until the year 2020.

Furthermore, we spent some money doing this, but we pay down the debt more than my Republican colleagues do. Over 10 years, we pay down the debt $146 billion more; over 15 years, by our calculation, $474 billion more.

What does that mean? That these two programs which will depend upon a treasury not burdened with debt, not overwhelmed with debt service, will be in better condition than ever. Even though we save more, we also spend more. We understand what my colleagues on the Republican side are saying about tax cuts. We do some in our own budget and, in time, if these surpluses materialize, I think we will come back and do more tax reduction.

In this particular budget, we say we believe in people to the extent of wanting to invest in people because we think the investment in human resources and education and housing, in the environment and health is absolutely critical. If we are going to save Social Security and Medicare, when we have 2.13 people working for every person retired, then they have got to be productive citizens, and we invest in the productive citizenry.

What do my friends on the other side do? At every turn, they opt for a tax cut. Now, there is nothing wrong with tax cuts but this budget is fixated on them, and a lot of the problems that we have been able to poke holes in today arise from the fact that my Republican colleagues are so totally committed to that and nothing else. In the area of health care, they brag about plussing up NIH but in truth they diminish the function for health.

In the case of the veterans, their own chairman said they needed $1.9 billion. The committee spurned him, gave him $900 million one year and nothing, $500 million less than the freeze for the next 5 years. In the case of agriculture, they set up a crop insurance program. So do we. $6 billion a year. In the year 2004, they quit funding it. About the time it gets established they pull the pumps out. We put $9 billion more in.

Why do my Republican colleagues do that? Why do the cuts get so big in the outyears? Because they have to make room for this enormous tax cut that keeps growing and growing and growing.

Let me say what the consequences are. This tax cut is $779 billion over 5 years. By our extrapolation, if we extend it forward at the rate of growth in the economy, it will be $1.11 trillion in the period 2009 to 2014.

Now, why is that period significant? That is the very time when the Social Security trust fund will start taking in less payroll taxes than it pays out in benefits, and at that point in time the budget of my Republican colleagues, their tax cut, takes its heaviest toll on the treasury, placing the treasury in jeopardy of securing these two programs.

No, my friends on the other side do not cut them. They do not cut Medicare and they do not cut Social Security but they cut taxes in a way that could very well jeopardize their future because of that huge, mounting, swelling tax cut in those outyears when the money is needed most.

Are there differences between these two budgets? We better believe there are differences. This is a better budget. We save more. We spend more. We spend it more responsibly, and we can go down our checklist to see.

We would like to put more teachers in the classrooms in the elementary years. Talking about investing in people, that is when it really pays off. I believe in that. We provide for it. We would like to build better schools, better structures, and we want to help those districts that are poor districts and cannot do it. So we put in the Tax Code some tax credits to help them float school bonds.

We think working mothers deserve better child care credit. We expand them. On down the list, this is a better budget. It is better for Democrats, better for Republicans, better for the country. I suggest everybody vote for it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to first of all compliment the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT). He is a great gentleman. He is also a very smart man and an incredible father of children who are, frankly, accomplishing more than he has accomplished here. They are doing great. They are all doctors.

Mr. SPRATT. I thank the gentleman for his compliment.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I must oppose the gentleman for about four or five reasons. Number one, it spends $515 billion more over the next 10 years than the Republican budget. Secondly, it provides almost $30 billion less for defense than the Republican budget over the next 5 years. It provides only $115 billion of net tax relief over 10 years, less than a penny on the dollar, and it also breaks the caps, the spending authority, the proposal we passed in 1997 to balance the budget, by $23 billion in budget authority and $16 billion in outlays. It increases our national debt to about $8.5 trillion by 2009.

So I would ask the Members of the House to oppose the Spratt budget. It spends too much. There is too little for defense, too little in tax relief for Americans. It unfortunately breaks down the discipline of the 1997 budget agreement and adds to our national debt. For those reasons, while I have great respect for the gentleman from South Carolina I would ask the Members to reject the Spratt amendment, and then we will move on to final passage in a short period of time.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Democratic Budget Alternative.

Given the great amount of time we have paid over the past several years to the critical issues of paying down the national debt, ensuring the solvency of Medicare and Social Security, and targeting tax cuts in a fiscally responsible manner, I am pleased that the Democratic Alternative embodies these important priorities.

In my view, a comparison of the Democratic and Republican budget proposals clearly indicates who has been listening to the American people and who has not. The annual budget is meant to serve as a barometer of what our country needs to thrive and be successful now and in the future. While the Democratic Alternative provides thoughtful guidelines to keep our country on course, the Majority's proposal can be likened to an uncontrollable storm that threatens to decimate the significant amount of progress that has been made in getting our nation's financial house in order.

Let's take a quick look at some of the differences.

The Democratic Alternative provides $40 billion in targeted tax cuts for those in need of dependent-care credits, long-term care credit, and school bond credits.

The Republican Proposal has $143 billion in tax cuts in the next four years—and $636 billion in tax cuts in the four years after that. In total, a whopping $1 trillion dollars in tax cuts in ten years. These figures are so staggering that by FY 2009, these ill-advised tax cuts would become so large that they would exceed the entire non-Social Security surplus projected for those years.

The Democratic Alternative extends the solvency of Social Security to 2050 and the solvency of Medicare to 2020.

The Republican Proposal does not add one day of extended solvency to either of these critical programs.

And the Democratic Alternative pays down $146 billion more debt than the Republican Proposal.

I also want to express my serious concerns about adequate funding for our nations veterans. I am troubled that those of us who sit on the Veterans Affairs Committee were prevented from even speaking about our alternative which included $3.2 billion more for critical veterans programs than the Administration's funding levels. Representative Clement's efforts on behalf of veterans were treated equally as poorly by Republicans on the Budget Committee and Rules Committee. It is absolutely disingenuous what Republicans today have said about their concern for veterans, and quite frankly is a slap in the face of all veterans and a blatant slam to their intelligence.

Again, putting rhetoric aside and looking at the cold facts that the numbers illustrate—The Democratic Alternative provides an increase of $2 billion in FY 2000 discretionary spending for veterans and $106 billion in budget authority over 5 years. The Republican Proposal on the other hand offers our veterans the paltry crumbs of a $900 million increase in FY 2000—which doesn't even cover the costs of inflation and pay for hard working VA employees. And then they turn around and slash funding for veterans by $1.1 billion in FY 2001.

Mr. Chairman, the numbers speak for themselves. The Democratic Alternative reflects the priorities and needs of the American people. I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 173, noes 250, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 76]

AYES—173

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sawyer
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shows
Sisisky
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Strickland
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—250

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Costello
Cox
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pastor
Paul
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Souder
Spence
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Traficant
Upton
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Barcia
Brown (CA)
Burton
Cooksey
Dingell
Hostettler
Metcalf
Pelosi
Smith (TX)
Stupak

□ 1853

Messrs. PHELPS, EHLERS, and CAMPBELL changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall No. 76. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no''.

The CHAIRMAN. The final period of general debate is now in order.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) each will control 5 minutes.

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

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

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I will need to take the 5 minutes allotted me. Before Members make the decision to vote for this resolution and put the country potentially on this fiscal path for a number of years to come, I want to suggest that Members think twice. I want to point out the consequences of it.

I am not opposed to tax cuts. Members will find in our budget resolution $62 billion in the first 5 years, $164 billion in the second 5 years.

□ 1900

As I said in the debate, when we find whether or not these surpluses are for real, whether these billions of dollars are actually going to materialize out in time, then we can revisit tax reduction and do it on a sensible basis and not bet on the come, bet as if everything projected on paper is going to take place, and we can do a $779 billion tax cut with no consequences to the budget.

These are the tax cuts that we plotted here: $143 billion in the first 5 years, $436 billion in the next 5 years. Then, if we extrapolate those tax cuts at the rate of growth of the economy, in the third 5-year period, between 2009 and 2014, they will grow, by our calculation, to a loss of revenues of $1.11 trillion.

What does that mean? It means, first of all, that in the years we are talking about, 2009 to 2014, when the Social Security program may need assistance because the administrator of the Social Security Administration will be taking in less in payroll taxes than he is paying out in benefits, my colleagues' tax cut will take maximum toll on the Treasury.

Indeed, if these surpluses do not materialize, my colleagues may indeed be cutting into the Social Security surpluses to bite their protestations that they will not touch them. This tax cut may lead inevitably to that. That is somewhat speculative, but I think it is a real risk. This is not a risk.

The reciprocal of these tax cuts is a matching decline in discretionary spending. So while my colleagues have talked about doing more for education, if they look at their budget, when they get to the out years, starting in 2005, they do $50 billion less than we provided.

If my colleagues go through the budget, there are all kinds of anomalies in the budget. These are the reasons for it. When my colleagues get to NIH, both in the Senate and in the House, the Republicans touted the National Institutes of Health, said we were going to do more. We looked to see how they did it, only to find that the health function was shrinking.

NIH is 52 percent of the health function in this budget. How in the world are my colleagues going to enlarge NIH while they shrinking the function is a

mystery to me. It certainly comes out of the hide of other important public health programs.

Look at veterans programs. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP), the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, wrote the committee, the Committee on Budget, after a vote taken by his Committee on Veterans' Affairs and said, I need a minimum of $1.9 billion to keep the promises we have made to our veterans every year.

What my colleagues did in their budget was give him $900 million, not $1.9 billion, but $900 million. Then, in 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, it disappeared. It did not recur. As a consequence, over that 5-year period of time, instead of giving veterans more to meet the benefits of the World War II population, which is getting older and older, they gave them less, $500 million less than a 1999 freeze.

Why did my colleagues do it? They are trying to accommodate this tax cut. This budget is fixated on a tax cut. There is nothing wrong with going with tax reduction, particularly when we see these surpluses, but that is all they have got in this budget.

Let me take the case of agriculture. My colleagues' committee put $6 billion in the budget for the creation of a crop insurance program. That is a centerpiece of what agriculture wants this year. Six billion dollars over a 5-year period of time. We matched it.

But guess what happens in 2005, about the time my colleagues are getting this crop insurance program up and running and well established? The funding disappears. My colleagues tell the Committee on Agriculture, go find mandatory sources to offset the cost, which will be $9.1 billion. We were able to squeeze it in our budget. My colleagues were not because of their fixation on doing the biggest tax cut since Kemp-Roth. Throughout the budget, that holds true.

Let me tell my colleagues where it really holds true: national defense. My colleagues went to the trouble of putting $29.6 billion in this budget for national defense. They did not fund the out years. They are lower than the President. They have got a flat budget. In the near term, the $30 billion that they put up is not matched by outlays. All of it because this is an unbalanced budget. It is not a balanced budget is not a balance. It ought to be rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, this majority took control in 1995. The first budget that we saw in our majority was from the President that showed deficits as far as the eye could see. We fought very hard. We took some real political hits because we wanted to deal with programs that had never been dealt with before.

In the process of dealing with Medicare, something that we paid a high political price for, not only did we deal with the problems of Medicare, but we extended the life of the program for 13 years. We are very proud of that.

In addition to that, we got to 1997, and we stayed on our path towards a balanced budget. Because of our persistence and because of some of the bipartisan support from people on the other side of the aisle, we joined together, and we worked with the President, and we created a historic agreement in 1997.

Now we take a look at the situation in regard to the future and now, rather than having deficits as far as the eye could see, we have surpluses as far as the eye can see.

We want to use those surpluses to do several things, things that we never thought were possible in 1995 when we won the majority. For the first time, we are going to keep our mitts off the money that we collect from Social Security and Medicare. Politicians have only been talking about it.

Frankly, there were some on the other side of the aisle that said that we ought to move it off budget, and I pay tribute to them. But do my colleagues know what? We have been able to be intellectually honest to take the money from Social Security, the payroll taxes, and lock it up and keep our fingers off of it.

In the meantime, we are going to pay down some of the national debt. Many of my colleagues who have served here for 25 years, did they ever think, did they ever think, not only would we have a balanced budget, but we begin to reduce the publicly held debt last year by $50 billion. We all should take credit for that. Then this year, under our proposal, we will reduce the publicly held national debt by an additional $125 billion. Unthinkable in the past.

We intend to save the $1.8 trillion. Do my colleagues know what we really want to do with it? We not only, all of us, not only want to protect the programs for our mothers and fathers, but we want to use the surplus as a leverage to transform Social Security and Medicare so that it will use this surplus to, not just save the programs for our parents, the elderly who does not want the rug pulled from under them, but do my colleagues know what else we can do with this surplus? We can use the power of the American system, the American economy, to set ourselves free so that, not only mom and dad are going to get the benefits, but there will be hope for the baby boomers and their children.

We must not squander this opportunity to transform these programs, to make them more personal, and to make sure, not only mom and dad, but all of us and our children will have the same kind of retirement security that we all hope and dream for.

At the same time, we have decided not to walk away from the 1997 budget agreement. We want to live within the spending caps. But within those caps, we want to emphasize defense. We want to say that our troops need more, that we need better readiness, we need better training, that we can buy the needed equipment.

Over these next 5 years, we are going to struggle to do it, and we were going to work with the Committee on Armed Services to make sure that our military is second to none.

At the same time, we are going to prioritize education. Maybe at some point we will actually be able to look at the special education programs that we have mandated on local schools and say that we will keep our promise to those school districts.

Does that mean some tough choices have to be made? Let me tell my colleagues, with my friends on the Committee on Appropriations, they are not walking around the floor winking at one another. I know they are ready to start the job to make some choices.

I do not think we want to abandon the 1997 agreement. It is too important to all of us. We all have a stake in it. If we can stay with it, we will not get in the way of this economic growth.

Then, finally, Mr. Chairman, as it relates to tax relief, look, we are going to have on budget surplus aside from Social Security and Medicare. I would love to tell my colleagues that we could just leave it here and use it to pay down more debt. But we have all been here long enough to know that the temptations of spending that money to create bigger government are inevitable.

So what we really want to do, if we want to return power to people, if we really want to emphasize the dignity and power of the individual in the next century, we want people to have more power, more control over their lives; and tax cuts are the best manifestation of it. Do my colleagues know why? Because the more one has in one's pocket, the more one's children has in their pockets, the more one's parents has in their pockets, the more they can pursue their destiny and the American dream.

Every day, we ought to work to meet the challenges that the government must meet, but at the same time empower people.

What this resolution does is historic. It begins to transform the programs that provide retirement security while maintaining fiscal discipline while returning a big chunk of the revenue of the Federal Government back in the pockets of the taxpayers. Approve the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. CAMP, Chairman 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. 68) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2009, pursuant to House Resolution 131, he reported the concurrent resolution, as amended by

the adoption of that resolution, back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the concurrent resolution, as amended.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 208, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 77]

YEAS—221

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Upton
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—208

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

NOT VOTING—5

Burton
Paul
Pelosi
Smith (TX)
Stupak

□ 1924

So the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall No. 77. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on the vote for final passage of H. Con. Res. 68.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the concurrent resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 1141. An act making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 1141) ''An Act making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes,'' requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. STEVENS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. BOND, Mr. GORTON, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. BURNS, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. GREGG, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CRAIG, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. KYL, Mr. BYRD, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. HARKIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. REID, Mr. KOHL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DORGAN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. DURBIN, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

THANKS TO THOSE INVOLVED IN BUDGET PROCESS

(Mr. KASICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment to thank the members of the Committee on the Budget, in particular the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), for his great work throughout this process.

And, of course, the people who are the unsung heroes, the members of the staff, Wayne Struble and his whole team. They have done a fantastic job and worked many late nights.

The same would go for Mr. Kahn, the staff director of the minority side. Without the staff and without the members of the Committee on the Budget, of course, we would never be successful.

Furthermore, I would like to just spend a second to pay a little tribute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), because while he is as tough a partisan fighter as I have ever been up against, at the same time he does it with style. He is not looking to be a cheap-shot artist. And when he can give us a break on our side, he does, and we try to do the same for him.

I think the Committee on the Budget, really, over the years, has been a place where we have been able to fight it out, yet still be collegial at the same time.

□ 1930

So I want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT); the members of his staff; my staff, in particular Mr. Struble, and all the folks under him; the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS); the members of the Committee on the Budget; and the members of the Republican Conference; and the Whip team for their work.

IN APPRECIATION OF MINORITY STAFF OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

(Mr. SPRATT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to echo the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH). He and I came here together in 1983. We have been great friends since then, and that friendship is carried over to the work on the committee together. We disagree strongly, but we do it in an agreeable way continually, and it is because he is a gentleman, he is affable, he is wonderful to work with. And I say the same for his staff, particularly Wayne Struble.

I would like to say something for our staff on the minority side, because we in the minority have a small staff and we have to really put out to put a product together. But they have done a gargantuan job over the last several weeks, and I want to mention them individually.

Susan Warner, Medicare. Richard Kogan; I do not know anybody in town who knows the budget better than Richard, number cruncher super. Pepper Santalucia, she just joined us. Sheila McDowell. Linda Bywaters. Hugh Brady on defense and discretionary spending. Lisa Irving. Sara Abernathy. Dale Coldwell. Jim Klumpner, who just joined us, our chief economist. Andrea Weathers. Marian Worthington. Craig Bomberger. Sandy Clark, who is on maternity leave, about to have twins, but nevertheless is connected with us by modem. And, above all, my friend, my colleague, and my tireless worker, our chief of staff on the minority side, Tom Kahn.

They have put in a Herculean job over the last several weeks. We did not win but we came to the floor in fine fashion because of the work they did.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, APRIL 9, 1999, TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 851, SAVE OUR SATELLITES ACT OF 1999

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask consent that the Committee on Commerce be permitted to file its report on the bill, H.R. 851, no later than midnight, April 9, 1999.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE AND THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following privileged Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 23) providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and the House of Representatives:

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 23

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Thursday, March 25, 1999, Friday, March 26, 1999, Saturday, March 27, 1999, or Sunday, March 28, 1999, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, April 12, 1999, or until such time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, March 25, 1999, or Friday, March 26, 1999, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 12:30 p.m. on Monday, April 12, 1999, for morning-hour debate, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and House, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate concurrent resolution is concurred in.

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DESIGNATION OF HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA OR HON. FRANK R. WOLF TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS THROUGH APRIL 12, 1999

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 25, 1999.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CONSTANCE A. MORELLA or, if not available to perform this duty, the Honorable FRANK R. WOLF to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through April 12, 1999.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the designation is agreed to.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of 15 U.S.C. 1024(a), the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Joint Economic Committee:

Mr. Stark, California;
Mrs. Maloney, New York;
Mr. Minge, Minnesota; and
Mr. Watt, North Carolina.

There was no objection.

H.R. 45 IS A FAIRY TALE

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, April 1, April Fool's Day, is less than a week away, literally just around the corner. But the jokes, yes, the jokes are already here.

The nuclear power lobbyists are trying to pull the wool over the eyes of Members of Congress. They want us to believe that if we support H.R. 45, the nuclear waste problems at 72 nuclear power plants will just disappear, puff, gone. Well, I am not sure how many of my colleagues believe in fairy tales. But that is exactly what it is, a fairy tale of monumental proportions.

The truth is that there are 72 nuclear waste sites around the country and if H.R. 45 is passed, we would have a total of, let us see, 73, not less but more. And it would take 30 to 40 years and a thousand mobile Chernobyls going through your neighborhood to take this waste to the site.

Let us not get caught up in the April Fool's joke or succumb to the attitude of ''Don't worry, be happy.'' Remember something my mother told me. When the circus is in town, beware of the clown.

H.R. 45 is nothing more than a fairy tale, and I am sure my colleagues heard it before. Do not believe it again.

YEAR 2000 BUDGET

(Mr. SESSIONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, we have now finished the debate, a hot debate that has taken place on the floor of the House of Representatives about the budget for the year 2000. And for the American people that are watching, I want them to know that what has occurred is that the Republican plan has been victorious.

But it is more than just a Republican plan. It is a plan that is based upon principles of the marketplace. And those principles of the marketplace are, among other things, living within the budget that we have, doing what we said we would do, and doing things for the middle class of this country.

The budget that was passed tonight, the resolution, is for the middle class

of this country and for us to live within the means that we have. We, I think, can be proud of the work that was done today; and it was done for each and every one of us, Republican principles following market-based ideas.

BUDGET BREAKS CONTRACT WITH U.S. VETERANS

(Mr. FILNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I was very happy to hear that the principle on which the Republican budget was based was helping the middle class. I want America to know that the budget that just passed broke the contract with our Nation's veterans.

The motion that was just passed cut $3 billion over the life of that resolution from our veterans' programs. Under that budget, veterans' hospitals can close, our veterans with Persian Gulf War illness will not get treated, those with Hepatitis C will not be treated, our national cemeteries are in danger of being vastly undertreated.

I am very glad to hear the principles under which this budget was passed. This budget breaks the contract with our Nation's veterans. This budget is unconscionable, it is shameful, and America ought to reject it.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET KEEPS FAITH WITH VETERANS

(Mr. HAYWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, I must lament the fact that there are those who feel they must come to the floor and, amidst partisan vitriol and venom, misrepresent what was done for the Nation's veterans. Because, Mr. Speaker, I too have the honor and privilege of serving on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and it is time for some facts.

President Reagan said, ''Facts are stubborn things.'' It is important for my friend from California and all those who would lampoon and lambast this budget to understand this: An additional $1 billion was added for the Nation's veterans. $1,000 million, $1 billion, was added for our Nation's veterans. That is a fact.

The sad fact is the President of the United States came to the well of this House a few months ago and in the span of 77 minutes made over 80 promises, but he failed to answer to the call of the Nation's vets. That is why a version of his budget today received only a handful of votes.

And I would just hope, Mr. Speaker, that my friends on the minority who say they want to help veterans will extend that help to young men and women in the service now, giving them the proper equipment and training.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Is it appropriate when announcing the orders of the day to provide certain editorial comments?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is not appropriate.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, point of order.

Is it appropriate when the gentleman makes remarks on the floor that they read the budget with——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will advise the Member that the gentleman is not stating a point of order.

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER, MAJORITY LEADER, AND MINORITY LEADER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS AND MAKE APPOINTMENTS AUTHORIZED BY LAW OR BY THE HOUSE NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Monday, April 12, 1999, the Speaker, majority leader and minority leader be authorized to accept resignations and to make appointments authorized by law or by the House.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 14, 1999

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, April 14, 1999.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of the special order by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS).

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

NATIONAL HOLIDAY TO HONOR A NONVIOLENT FIGHT FOR JUSTICE; THE LIFE OF CESAR CHAVEZ

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

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, a number of us are rising this evening to commemorate the birthday next week of Cesar Chavez, a great national hero whose March 31 birthday we believe should be recognized as a national holiday.

This Nation and the world lost a great civil rights leader nearly 6 years ago when Chavez died after a tireless struggle for social change. March 31 is a State holiday in my State of California; and countless schools, roads, libraries, and other public institutions have been named after Cesar Chavez. It is now time that the entire Nation honor his enduring legacy with a Federal holiday.

From humble beginnings in 1927 on a small farm near Yuma, Arizona, Cesar Chavez rose to be a major force in American history, leading millions of people to better lives, inspired by his message of a nonviolent fight for peace and justice.

As the son of migrant farm workers, he knew well the oppression these hard-working laborers faced. Influenced by the writings of Ghandi and other proponents of nonviolence, he began to register his fellow farm workers to vote and then to educate them about their rights to a safe workplace and a just wage.

In 1962, Cesar Chavez and his family founded the National Farm Workers Association, which organized thousands of farm workers to confront one of the most powerful industries in our Nation. He inspired them to join together and nonviolently demand safe and fair working conditions.

□ 1945

Through the use of a grape boycott, he was able to secure the first union contracts for farm workers in the United States. These contracts provided farm workers with the basic services that most workers take for granted, services such as clean drinking water and sanitary facilities. Because of Cesar Chavez' fight to enforce child labor laws, farm workers could also be certain that their children would not be working side by side with them and would instead attend the migrant schools that he helped to establish. In addition, Cesar Chavez made the world aware of the exposure to dangerous chemicals that farm workers, in fact all consumers, face every day.

But his influence extended beyond agriculture. He worked in urban areas, organized voter registration drives, brought complaints against mistreatment by governmental agencies. He taught community members how to deal with governmental, school and financial institutions and empowered

many to seek further advancement in education and politics. There are countless stories of judges, engineers, lawyers, teachers, religious leaders, I might add Congressmen and other hardworking professionals who credit Cesar Chavez as the inspiring force in their lives.

During a time of great social upheaval, he was sought out by groups from all walks of life and religions to help bring calm with his nonviolent practices. Our country's leaders joined with Cesar literally and often figuratively in prayer and in acts of solidarity in his many fasts for justice. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. sent Chavez a message on the occasion of his first fast. Dr. King told Chavez, ''Our separate struggles are really one, a struggle for freedom, for dignity and for humanity.''

It is that struggle that earned him the admiration and respect of millions of Americans, including those of this Congressman and other of our colleagues who will join us tonight. We represent a fraction of the cosponsors of House Joint Resolution 22, which would commemorate Chavez' birthday and his legacy with a Federal holiday.

I am proud that hundreds of people from the area I represent, San Diego, joined the thousands of people, in fact over 50,000, who came in caravans from Florida to California to attend the funeral of this national giant which was held near the United Farm Workers headquarters in Delano, California.

We in Congress must join them in their reverence and must make certain that the movement Cesar Chavez began and the timeless lessons of justice and fairness he taught be preserved and honored in our national conscience. To make sure these fundamental principles are never forgotten, I urge my colleagues to support House Joint Resolution 22, which would declare March 31 a Federal holiday in honor of Cesar Chavez. In his words, in the words of the United Farm Workers, si, se puede, yes, we can.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Cesar Chavez not only because he was one of the great leaders of our country, but also because he was my friend. He was a man of courage, faith and love who shared his great strength with thousands and inspired millions of Americans.

To know Cesar was to stand in awe of the enormous task he set for himself and the great moral leadership he gave to the campaign to challenge injustice and achieve peaceful change.

His struggle for oppressed farmworkers fired our conscience. He insisted that this nation acknowledge that every human being, regardless of origin, is of worth and is entitled to reach for a better tomorrow.

What made Cesar Chavez larger than life was that he *lived* the principles of truth and courage he preached. He knew what it was like to be treated without respect, to work all day, everyday, with little to show for it. A lesser man might have burned up with anger. But what burned inside Cesar Chavez was a love of justice.

Cesar's struggle for justice is far from over and we must continue to help others help themselves.

In Congress, still today, there are bills that would bring foreign guestworkers into our fields. The growers still want cheap labor from foreign workers without those pesky rights won by the sweat and tears of Cesar and Dolores Huerta and Arturo Rodriguez and *hundreds* of others.

Cesar helped us see through the eyes of farmworkers—and what they saw was a dark and hopeless world. But under his leadership, farmworkers began to see a new world, one of strength and hope, united against poverty and exploitation. Under UFW contracts, they won higher pay and for the first time—health coverage and pension benefits.

This is how the legacy of Cesar Chavez was born—and we will never let it die!

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

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

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTION RECOGNIZING KIDNEY DONORS

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

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced a resolution to recognize the generous contribution made by each living kidney donor to save a life and to acknowledge the advances in medical technology that have enabled living kidney transplantation to become a viable treatment option for an increasing number of individuals needing kidney transplant.

Since 1989, over 250,000 Americans have lost their lives to kidney failure. In 1996, some 250,000 patients were treated for end stage renal disease. An additional 73,000 began treatment for the first time. Of those new patients, nearly half were persons with diabetes. Also in 1996, over 12,000 kidneys were transplanted in the United States. Thirty percent of these organs came from living donors.

Over the last 10 years, the number of patients on the waiting list for a kidney transplant has almost tripled, from 14,000 to over 40,000. In 1988, the number of kidney donations made it possible to provide transplants to almost half the number of patients waiting for a kidney. Because the numbers on the waiting list have grown more quickly than the supply of organs, today only about a quarter will benefit from a transplant.

While the annual number of cadaveric kidneys available for transplant has increased only about 40 percent over the last 10 years, the number of living donors has increased over 100 percent. From the period 1985 to 1994, the 10-year survival rate for dialysis patients was just 10 percent. Survival rates for patients with cadaveric kidney transplants jumped to 55 percent. And for those who received a kidney from a living family member, fully 75 percent would have the chance to live 10 additional years.

Thirty-three of my colleagues have expressed their support for this resolution by signing on as cosponsors. I invite other interested Members of the House to recognize living kidney donors by signing on to this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, just a week or so ago, I received a phone call from former Senator Jake Garn of Utah who served in the other body with great honor and distinction for many years. He called in support of this resolution because he as a father donated a kidney to one of his daughters, and she has lived very well over the last few years despite having some complications from diabetes and other diseases. She has recently undergone additional kidney repair and is hanging in there today as we speak.

The point is that Senator Garn and others are due great recognition for their commitment to their families, for their commitment to good health and for their self-sacrifice to make sure that others can live and have kidney transplants. Senator Garn is a wonderful example of many other people who donate kidneys in this United States.

I also urge the Committee on Commerce as it considers this resolution to take up this resolution at the earliest possible time to give hope to people who are in need of kidney transplantation.

This budget resolution which we passed today, I also want to add, makes due consideration for increases in biomedical research for the National Institutes of Health. As a cochairman of the Diabetes Caucus along with former Representative Elizabeth Furse from Oregon, now the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), we have over 240 members of this House who have signed on to the Diabetes Caucus and who are supportive of diabetes research through NIH but also supportive of cancer research, Alzheimer's research, multiple sclerosis research, polycystic kidney disease research and many other diseases that are going to be cured in our lifetimes, in the very near future, by increased funding for the National Institutes of Health and the perpetuation of basic research to help cure disease and make life better for all of us as we age and go through health problems of our own or health problems that our families may have.

I commend this House for passing this budget resolution, giving the Committee on Appropriations adequate flexibility to address National Institutes of Health. I hope that people will get involved in this resolution that I have introduced to recognize kidney donors.

GUN SAFETY

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I do identify with the comments of my colleague, a livable community where our families are healthy.

I wanted to reference just for a moment a concern about the health of American families. One-third of a century ago, the automobile was the focus of our concern. Ralph Nader published a famous book on ''Safe At Any Speed,'' and this Congress, the Federal Government, the industry, embarked upon an aggressive program to make the automobile safer. As a result of extensive data collection, reengineering, legal regulation and, of course, the automobile for years has been personalized so it could only be operated by somebody authorized to use it, today we have seen spectacular increases in automobile safety and a reduction in deaths despite the fact that miles traveled have exploded.

Today, in many communities, gun violence is now surpassing the automobile as the major source of accidental death. Today, I sponsored a forum on Capitol Hill with three leading experts to deal with gun violence. For every 90 minutes in this country, another child dies. The evidence was overwhelming from these experts that gun violence can in fact be reduced.

We had testimony from Professor Stephen Teret of the Johns Hopkins Center for Public Policy and Research; Dr. Steve Hargarten of the Firearm Injury Center at the Medical College of Wisconsin; and Dr. Garen Wintemute of the Violence Prevention Research Program at the University of California-Davis. What these gentlemen were able to demonstrate is that we can in fact take simple steps to do something about the epidemic of gun violence in our community.

First and foremost, we can promote policies that promote safe gun storage. Starting with the State of Florida, 15 States now have enacted legislation that promotes responsible gun ownership and safe gun storage and we have seen a resulting reduction in firearm violence among children.

Second, it does make a difference if we prevent criminals from gaining access to guns at the front end, and there is persuasive evidence that by extending the prohibitions under the Brady law to more criminals, to prevent them from access to guns, that we can have a reduction in their use of guns in their hands.

Finally, there was attention given to something that is often ignored, the design of weapons in the United States. Indeed, it is a sad commentary that there are more restrictions over the product safety of toy guns than of real guns. There is no reason for us to manufacture and sell guns in this country today that do not tell you whether or not there is a bullet in the chamber. There is no reason today that we have to have guns with automatic clips that when you disengage the clip that it does not sweep the bullet from the chamber. For a few cents to a few dollars, guns can be built that provide this safety device. Many have it. Tragically, too many do not.

Last, and I think most significant, there is no longer any reason for us not to personalize a gun just like we personalize a car with a key, so that somebody who steals that gun, somebody who wrestles a gun away from a law enforcement professional would have that gun disabled. The technology is available today and it is sad that we have not yet taken steps to make sure that it is available to us.

The same strategy that resulted in a dramatic reduction in automobile fatalities in this country can be employed to reduce gun violence. Get good information instead of spreading it over a dozen different agencies in the Federal Government. Have the courage to use and analyze that information and to implement policies that will make a difference for America's families. It is my fervent hope that as we talk about ways to make our communities more livable that we will take safe, simple, commonsense steps to reduce gun violence for the sake of our children. I hope this Congress has the courage to act.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise proudly to celebrate Greek Independence Day, an event which marked the symbolic rebirth of democracy.

On March 25, 1821, Greece finally rebelled against more than four hundred years of Turkish oppression. The revolution of 1821 brought independence to Greece and emboldened those who still sought freedom across the world. I commemorate Greek Independence Day each year for the same reasons we celebrate our fourth of July. It proved that a united people, through sheer will and perseverence, can prevail against tyranny. The lessons the Greeks and our colonial forefathers taught us provide strength to victims of persecution throughout the world today.

The Greek people, like our colonists, sought the right to govern themselves and determine their country's destiny. In drafting our constitution, American colonial leaders cited Greek and Roman sources. The very basis of our constitution derives from Aristotle and was put into practice in ancient Rome. Our Founding Fathers emulated the efforts of the ancient Greeks in order to establish a balance of powers. The framers sought to avoid the disintegration of government which marked other political systems throughout history. Polybius, an ancient Greek, wrote: ''when one part, having grown out of proportion to the others, aims at supremacy and tends to become too dominant, none of the three is absolute.''

And so, today, we celebrate the independence of Greece and the principles of democracy that have endured through the present day.

By honoring the Greek struggle for independence, we reaffirm the values and ideas that make our nation great. We also remember why freedom is so important. Abraham Lincoln said ''what has once happened will invariably happen again, when the same circumstances which combined to produce it, shall again combine in the same way.''

I want to provide some background on Greek Independence Day for the benefit of our colleagues who are not familiar with it. The war of independence, as many call it, began on March 25, 1821. Alexander Ypsilantis and 4,500 volunteers assembled near the Russian border to launch an insurrection against four centuries of Ottoman rule. The Turkish army initially massacred the Greek volunteers, who were poorly organized and insufficiently armed.

When news of Greek uprisings spread, the Turks killed Greek clergymen, clerics, and laity in a frigtening display of force. In a vicious act of vengeance in 1822, the Turks invaded the island of Chios and slaughtered 25,000 of the local residents. The invaders enslaved half the island's population of 100,000.

Although the Greeks lacked training, their leaders redoubled efforts to gain independence. ''Eleftheria I thanatos''—liberty or death—became the Greek patriots' battle cry. Although many died, they were undeterred from their ultimate goal.

Many acts of heroism fill this history of the Greek war for independence. I would like to share some of these stories with you. Theodoros Kolokotronis was the leader of the Klephts, resilient Greeks who refused to submit to Turkish domination. The Klephts attacked from their mountain strongholds by surprise, battering their oppressors into submission. Kolokotronis assembled an army of 7,000 men who prevented their rivals from replenishing their provisions.

Another great battle took place near Corinth. After a few weeks, the Turks were eventually defeated. Kolokotronis was successful because ordinary citizens displayed extraordinary courage and morale. Despite the odds, Kolokotronis managed to capture Tripolitsa and engineer the Greek victory over the Turkish army of Dramali, which had invaded the Peloponnese with 30,000 men.

Another wave of rebellion against Turkish oppression was ignited by the Suliotes, villagers who took refuge from Turkish authorities in the mountains of Epirus. The fiercely patriotic Suliotes bravely fought the Turks in several battles. News of their victories spread throughout the region and encouraged other villages to revolt. When the Suliote women, left alone, learned that Turkish troops were fast approaching their village, they began to dance the ''Syrtos,'' a patriotic Greek dance. One by one, they committed suicide by throwing themselves and their children off Mount Zalongo. They chose to die rather than surrender and face slavery.

I recount these stories because they underscore Greece's absolute commitment to independence. As we all know, the price of liberty can be very high . . . hundreds of thousands of lives. Socrates, Plato, Pericles, and many other great minds throughout history warned that we maintain democracy only at great cost. The freedom we enjoy today is due to the sacrifices made by men and women in the past.

To continue living freely, we must also live responsibly. If people are to govern themselves democratically, then they must also govern themselves responsibly. The same holds true for nations. If not, either anarchy or tyranny will follow.

Even as we speak, tensions persist around the globe, particularly between Greece and Turkey. One cannot enjoy the fruit of freedom without first planting the seeds of peace. Unfortunately, the struggle for peace continues in the republic of Cyprus today.

Turkey still illegally occupies a large part of Cyprus, as it has since its brutal invasion—code named ''Attila''—in 1974. Since the invasion, 1,614 Greek-Cypriots and five Americans have been missing. Because of congressional influence, our government discovered the remains of one of these Americans—a young boy, Andrew Kasapis, last year.

Free people everywhere share a moral obligation to promote democracy and end oppression. The United States has exerted its influence to promote peace in the middle east and northern Ireland. Now it is time to do the same in Cyprus.

The United States cannot be the world's policeman, but we must help others who share our passion for liberty and peace. Our nation has always been willing to fight for freedom for others. We must not—and cannot—remain idle while Cyprus remains divided.

The U.S. did not remain neutral when imperialism shook Europe's foundations during world war I. The U.S. did not fail to act when the clouds of German and Japanese atrocity descended upon the world during world war II. Throughout the history of the United States, we have answered freedom's call. As the leader of the free world, our nation must continue to actively oppose tyranny.

Finding a fair resolution for Cyprus will help stabilize a region marked more often by conflict than accord. Turkey continues to refute U.N. resolutions on Cyprus. Turkey's position contradicts the goals of seeking a peaceful solution in the island republic.

In the Aegean, Turkey more recently violated international law by claiming territorial ownership of the Grecian islet of Imia. Turkey blatantly disregarded previous treaties which clearly recognize Greece's sovereignty over Imia. Tensions between Greece and Turkey on this matter continue today. I have joined Congressman Pallone in introducing legislation expressing the sense of congress that Imia is a sovereign territory of Greece under international law.

Turkey also has failed to properly protect the ecumenical patriarchate in Istanbul. In 1997, his all holiness, Patriarch Bartholomew, graced the congress with his visit here. The Patriarch is the spiritual leader of 300 million Orthodox Christians worldwide, including five million Americans. He was honored by the Congress, which awarded him the Congressional Gold Medal. It is important to remember that while the Patriarch spreads his message of peace throughout the entire world, the ecumenical patriarchate in Istanbul has been repeatedly subjected to terrorist attacks. My legislation urging the U.S. government to provide protection to the Patriarchate and its personnel became law last year. Unfortunately, the administration has failed to convince Turkey that we are serious about this matter.

Our nation has the influence to encourage Turkey to abide by international law and to respect Greek sovereignty. I only hope we have the corresponding will. To continue to permit aggression against Greece and Cyprus dishonors the legacy of Greek independence and the values we hold so dear.

Mr. Speaker, we celebrate Greek independence to reaffirm the common democratic heritage we share. Greek Independence Day, like the Fourth of July, reminds us that we have the duty to defend liberty—whatever the cost. To maintain our freedom, we can take neither it nor its architects for granted. That is why we honor those who secured independence for Greece so many years ago.

Mr. MCNULTY. Mr. Speaker, the American people join with the people of Greece in celebrating the 178th anniversary of the revolution that freed the Greek people from the Ottoman Empire.

The bedrock of our close relationship with Greece is our mutual devotion to freedom and democracy and our unshakable determination to fight, if need be, to protect these rights. Greek philosophers and political leaders—Cleisthenes and Pericles and their successors—had great influence upon America's Founding Fathers in their creation of these United States.

We, as a nation, owe a great debt to Greece. ''To the ancient Greeks,'' Thomas Jefferson said, ''we are all indebted for the light which led ourselves (American colonists) out of Gothic darkness.''

Greece is the birthplace of American democracy. We will always remember the words of Pericles:

> Our administration favors the many instead of the few: this is why it is called a democracy. The laws afford equal justice to all alike in their private disputes, but we do not ignore the claims of excellence. When a citizen distinguishes himself, then he will be called to serve the state, in preference to others, not as a matter of privilege, but as a reward of merit; and poverty is no bar.

Democracy has been called the fastest growing form of government in the world. As we prepare to enter the 21st century, an increasing number of countries are throwing off the yoke of dictatorship and evolving into fledgling democracies.

In a broad sense the English poet, Percy Bysshe Shelley declared: ''We are all Greeks! Our laws, our literature, our religion, our art, have their roots in Greece.''

I congratulate the people of Greece and wish them a Happy National Birthday.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I join my colleagues today to recognize the 178th anniversary of Greek Independence Day. As the U.S. Representative of a region with over 5,000 people of Greek descent, I know that this important event will be joyously celebrated throughout Northwest Indiana.

I would like to honor not only this important day in Greek history, but the strong and unique relationship that exists today between the United States and Greece. The development of modern democracy has its roots in ancient Athens. The writings of Plato, Aristotle, Cicero and others were the first to espouse the basic tenets of a government of the people and by the people. While these ideals were not always followed in ancient Greece, these writings provided a roadmap for later governments in their attempts to establish democracy in their countries.

The Founding Fathers of the United States were particularly influenced by the writings of the ancient Greeks on democracy. A careful reading of ''The Federalist Papers'' reveals the significant part the early Greeks played in the formation of our government. Thomas Jefferson called upon his studies of the Greek tradition of democracy when he drafted the Declaration of Independence, espousing the ideals of a government representative of and accountable to the people. Decades later, these ideas were a catalyst in the Greek uprising and successful independence movement against the Ottoman Empire—the event we celebrate today.

On March 25, 1821, the Archbishop of Patros blessed the Greek flag at the Aghia Laura monastery, marking the proclamation of Greek independence. It took eleven years for the Greeks to finally defeat the Ottomans and gain their true independence. After this long struggle against an oppressive regime, Greece returned to the democratic ideals that its ancestors had developed centuries before.

Today, this country's relationship with Greece is as strong as ever. Greece has been our ardent supporter in every major international conflict of this century, and they play an important role in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the European Union. Greece is also a key participant in the United Nations peacekeeping force in Bosnia, providing troops and supplies. In turn, the United States has worked to attain a peaceful settlement to the conflict in Cyprus, the island nation that was brutally invaded by Turkey in 1974.

Mr. Speaker, I would thank our colleagues, Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mrs. MALONEY, for organizing this Special Order, and I join all of our House colleagues in recognizing Greek Independence Day. I salute the spirit of democracy and family that distinguish the Greek people, as well as their courage in breaking the bonds of oppression 178 years ago. I look forward to may more years of cooperation and friendship between our two nations.

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join in this special order commemorating Greek Independence Day. Congress recognizes Greek Independence Day each year because the struggle of the Greek people to win their freedom was an inspirational epic worthy of commemoration by all free people.

Americans, whose forbearers had to fight for their own freedom in the 1700s, have always been sympathetic to oppressed people around the world who fight to win their independence. Many Americans supported the struggles of the people of Central and South America to throw off the yoke of imperial Spain in the 1800s, for example. Americans in recent times have supported the efforts of the people of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union to end their domination by that evil empire. And the united States strongly supported the movement to end colonial rule in the wake of World War II. Consequently, it should come as no surprise that many Americans supported the struggle of the Greek people when, in 1821, they undertook to free themselves and their lands from the rule of the Ottoman Empire.

The war for Greek Independence lasted nearly ten years, and many lives were lost. In the end, however, the Greek people won their freedom and established an independent nation. The Greek people's struggle was a popular cause in the United States not just because it echoed our own relatively recent

struggle against an imperial power, but because Americans educated in the classics associated Greece with its heritage as the ancient birthplace of democracy and western culture.

Greece today is a trusted and valued ally of the United States, and many people of Greek ancestry are hardworking, productive American citizens. I am pleased to join my colleagues and our country's Greek-American citizens in celebrating Greek Independence Day.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to rise on the floor of this chamber of American democracy in honor of Greek Independence Day.

Today we are marking the 178th anniversary of the beginning of the revolution that freed the Greek people from the Turkish Ottoman Empire and the 51st anniversary since the Greek people regained their independence after Nazi occupation in World War II.

This is a day that rings with the bells of liberty, the songs of freedom, and the choirs of democracy.

All the world looks to Greece as the fountain and inspiration for every modern-day democracy, including our own.

Greece is one of only three nations, beyond the former British Empire, that has been allied with the United States in every major international conflict this century. Over 600,000 Greeks died fighting on the side of the Allies in World War II and in the civil war that followed—that's nine percent of the entire population of Greece at that time.

During the early 1900s, one in every four Greek males between the ages of 15 and 45 departed for the United States, the ''founding fathers,'' if you will, of today's very successful Greek-American community. According to U.S. census data, the first Greeks who became U.S. citizens ranked only 18th of the 24 nationalities in education attainment. Their children, however, leapt to the top by 1970 to rank number one among American ethnic nationalities.

Among those Greek-Americans who have made major contributions to our national and international life are Dr. George Papnicolaou, who invented the Pap test for cancer; Dr. George Korzias, who developed L-dopa to combat Parkinson's disease; Maria Callas, the Brooklyn-born soprano, considered the greatest opera diva of all time; and Pete Sampras, the number one tennis player in the world for the past several years.

I also want to honor the contributions made by Greek-Americans in my own district in central Massachusetts. Since the turn of the century, over 5,000 Greek men, women and children have made Worcester, Massachusetts their home. Greek-Americans like Mrs. Katherine Singas, the owner of Worcester House of Pizza, and retired high school principal Christopher Dionis have contributed significantly to all aspects of civic life and community affairs.

The Greek Orthodox Cathedral of St. Spyridon in Worcester, under the leadership of Father Dean Paleologos, reminds us of this vibrant Greek-American community. In Worcester, this important day is celebrated by teaching children to recite poetry and songs commemorating their past and their heritage. Discussion groups are held to honor the memory and history of the heroic deeds and patriotism of the Greek and Greek-American men and women who fought and died for the freedom I and my constituents enjoy today.

Similar celebrations are held throughout my district—in Fall River and Dartmouth, in Attleboro and Seekonk.

No one standing on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives can fail to honor the contributions of Greece to American democracy, freedom, literature and philosophy. Throughout this Capitol and this city, everywhere you might look, you will see homage to Greek ideas and ideals. They are engraved on our buildings, enshrined in our laws, and they surely influenced the minds and hearts of the men and women who founded this nation.

Greece is enjoying a new era of prosperity and looking forward to joining the European Economic and Monetary Union by January 1, 2001. The most recent report of the organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) issued in Paris on January 14, 1999, concludes that ''thanks to continuous efforts in recent years, the target date seems to be feasible for Greece.'' And like many of my House colleagues, I am looking forward to the 2004 Olympic Games, which will return to their home in Greece for the first time in 108 years. I'm sure that the Athens Games will help heal the wounds of the current scandals affecting the International Olympic Committee.

I want to thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICHAEL BILIRAKIS]—a fine example of the contribution Greek heritage continues to make to American democracy—and to the gentlelady from New York [Mrs. CAROLYN MALONEY] for organizing this special order on this historic occasion.

I would like to remind them that, if Massachusetts would have had its way, we might have had two Greek-Americans as President of the United States. And so I thank them for their leadership of the Hellenic Caucus and for all their fine efforts to educate and involve other Members on the issues challenging Greek and U.S policy today.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, today, I wish to celebrate an important day in Greek history, the 178th anniversary of Greece's independence. I wish to thank my colleagues from Florida and New York for taking the initiative to organize this special order to honor Greece on this important day and for organizing the Congressional Caucus on Hellenic Issues. I am pleased to be part each year of this organized and concerted effort to speak out on those issues which are important to Greece, Cyprus, and our constituents of Hellenic descent.

Greek and American history are closely linked. Both nations owe a large part of their national identity today, to the influence of the other in the past. When Thomas Jefferson was writing the Declaration of Independence and our founding fathers were writing our Constitution, they drew upon the work of Greek scholars and philosophers. Indeed, our system of Democracy could never have existed without the influence of these ancient Greek scholars. Similarly, Greece looked to the United States and the American Revolution as a point of inspiration when it began its struggle for independence on March 25, 1821.

Furthermore, modern Greek culture has become a vital part of the culture of the United States through the entrance of Greek immigrants into the United States. Their hard work has made a tremendous impact on their communities. In my own state of Rhode Island, there are incredibly strong and productive Greek communities in Providence, Pawtucket, and Newport. In these cities, Greek immigrants built businesses, neighborhoods, churches, schools, and raised families. Our country is richer because of all that communities such as these have given.

Because of the influence of Ancient Greece upon our founding fathers, the contributions of Greek immigrants to American culture, and the American influence of a Greece's struggle of independence, it is quite fitting that we celebrate the anniversary of Greece's independence. Again, I thank my colleagues for all their hard work in making this Special Order possible and look forward to further work with the Hellenic Caucus.

Ms. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 178th anniversary of Greece's independence from the Ottoman Empire, and to celebrate the shared democratic heritage of Greece and the United States. I thank Congressman BILIRAKIS and Congresswoman MALONEY for organizing this special order and for their leadership on issues of importance to the Greek-American community.

On March 25, 1821, after more than 400 years of Ottoman Turk domination, Greece declared its independence and resumed its rightful place in the world as a beacon of democracy.

The people of Greece and the United States share a common bond in their commitment to democracy. Our Founding Fathers looked to the teachings of Greek philosophy in their struggle for freedom and democracy. And the American experience in turn inspired the Greek people who fought so hard for independence 176 years ago.

This bond between our two peoples stretches beyond the philosophy of democracy. The relationship between the U.S. and Greece has grown stronger and stronger through the years, and Greece remains today one of our most important allies.

And the contribution Greece makes to life in America is even stronger than the ties between our two countries. Greek-Americans are a vital part of our cultural heritage. My district in New York would not be what it is today without the valuable contributions made by the Greek-American community.

I am proud to stand today in commemoration of Greek independence and in recognition of the contribution Greece and Greek-Americans have made to our country.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Greek Independence Day. A a member of the Congressional Caucus on Hellenic Issues, I join my colleagues in saluting the strong and enduring ties between the United States and Greece.

The link between our two great nations stretches back to the very beginning of the United States' days as an independent nation. Our founding fathers, recognizing the compelling example set by Greece's experience with democracy, were inspired by the writings of the ancient Greek philosophers. Indeed, our own experiment with democracy has proven successful to a large extent because of what we learned from the Greeks. The Greek influence can be seen throughout our society even as we gaze upon the architecture of this great building in which we serve.

Today, as we rise in tribute to the 178th anniversary of the beginning of Greece's struggle for independence, we are reminded of the importance of maintaining strong ties with

Greece and its people. As a member of NATO, Greece has shown a commitment to the same values of international peace and security to which the United States aspires.

One of the great men from my home state of Massachusetts was Charles Eliot Norton. Norton, a professor at Harvard, was devoted to strengthening the ties between Greece and the United States. In 1879, he founded the Archaeological Institute of America, in an effort to foster greater appreciation of the treasures of Greek history. As Norton said, ''A knowledge of Greek thought and life, and of the arts in which the Greeks expressed their thought and sentiment, is essential to high culture. A man may know everything else, but without this knowledge he remains ignorant of the best intellectual and moral achievements of his own race.''

These words are as true today as when Norton wrote them in 1885. The modern Greek nation continues to be an inspiration to the United States and the rest of the world. I look forward to joining in this weekend's related ceremonies in the Boston area, and I am pleased to be able to offer my congratulations to the people of Greece on this happy occasion.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the 177th anniversary of Greek independence. There are, of course, no final victories in the long struggle to extend the principles of equality and democracy. Thus, we should take advantage of every appropriate opportunity to celebrate the triumphs of freedom over tyranny.

In this spirit, our annual remembrance of the Greek delivery from Ottoman oppression merits special attention, for it was Aristotle himself who said, ''Democracy arises out of the notion that those who are equal in any respect are equal in all respects; because men are equally free, they claim to be absolutely equal.'' In effect, we celebrate the 177 years that have followed the redemption of Aristotle's ancient promise.

As we listen to the urgent bulletins from the Balkans, we are reminded every day of the fragility of the ancient Greek ideal. Wherever tyranny and ethnic cleansing prevail, the principles of equality and democracy are under siege. Listen once again to the profound wisdom of Aristotle: ''If liberty and equality, as is thought by some, are chiefly to be found in democracy, they will be best attained when all persons alike share in the government to the utmost.''

On this day, let us remember how intimately intertwined are the histories of the United States and Greece. Look at the Declaration of Independence. Look at the Constitution of the United States. Look at the very architecture of our beautiful Capitol. Greek to the core, all of them. Indeed, Thomas Jefferson was quite explicit about our connectedness: ''To the ancient Greeks,'' declared our third President, ''we are indebted for the light which led ourselves out of Gothic darkness.''

In turn, America has opened its heart to multitudes of Greek immigrants and has, of course, reaped the rewards of that enlightened generosity. In San Francisco, certainly, we have reaped enormous benefits from the vibrant presence of our spirited Greek-American community. And Americans also responded with the Marshall Plan, immediately following World War II, to the plight of a seriously weakened and imperiled Greece.

As we brood today over the darkening skies in the Balkan countries, we should pause for a moment to give thanks for the continuing relevance of ancient Greece and the continuing example of modern Greece.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, today marks a great anniversary for every Greek citizen and those who cherish Democracy and freedom worldwide. 178 years ago on this date, courageous Greeks, determined to cast off the chains of oppression, rose up against the Ottoman Empire and firmly sounded the cry of freedom. It was fitting that the nation that gave the world the very concept of democracy was to be a free and sovereign land once again.

Sadly, like all struggles for freedom, good people lose their lives striving to uphold what they believe. It is important that we as a democracy never forget the sacrifices of those brave individuals whose selfless sacrifices and dedication to democratic ideals gave us the freedoms and liberties we enjoy today.

I salute those gallant Greeks who stood against oppression so many years ago today and with happiness and joy for Greek citizens worldwide.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise to acknowledge and celebrate the 178th Greek Independence Day. This great day in Greek history commemorates the successful struggle of the Greek people for national sovereignty. It is no secret that the United States and Greece have shared a close relationship since Greece's independence. In fact, Greece is one of the very few countries in the world that has stood alongside the United States during every major conflict of this last century.

The United States shares many common threads with Greece, including a commitment to democracy, peace, and respect for human rights. I think it's safe to say that the Founding Fathers of Greece and the United States would be proud of the tremendous achievements of both nations as well as their closeness. The strong bond that is shared by these two countries is now approaching its third century, and as we rapidly approach the twenty-first century, I think its imperative that we recognize countries such as Greece that are eager to move into the next millennium hand-in-hand with the United States.

Greek-Americans all around the country are celebrating this great day for their homeland. Parades, dances, songs and feasts will be occurring all over this country in celebration of Greek independence. The celebrations both here and in Greece will no doubt demonstrate the fortitude of its people. Throughout the past 200 years there have been repeated challenges to the independence of Greece, yet its people have stridently fought to maintain both their democracy and independence—and the United States and its people have been proud to stand by her and provide strength, assistance and friendship to overcome those struggles.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to once again celebrate Greek culture and toast the Greek people. It is an honor to rise and commemorate the 178th Greek Independence Day. On this day we celebrate more than just Greece's independence, we celebrate Greece as a country and as a friend.

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 178th anniversary of Greek independence. This date marks the beginning in 1821 of the successful revolution to restore the ideals of democracy to the Greek people after almost 400 years of oppression and persecution under the Ottoman Empire.

One cannot stand in these chambers and participate in our system of representative democracy without recognizing the significant influence of the teachings of ancient Greek philosophers. In the words of Percy Bysshe Shelly, ''We are all Greeks! Our laws, our literature, our religion, our art, have their roots in Greece.'' Tragically, despite the democratic writings and dialogues of great thinkers like Aristotle, Plato, and Polybius, the Ottoman Empire ignored those inspirational principles of equality, freedom, and self rule, and stripped Greek citizens of their civil rights.

Thankfully, freedom fighters in Greece prevailed and restored the principles and benefits of democracy to the Greek people. Much as ancient Greece influenced our founding fathers, so did the United States in its infancy inspire those rebels who struggled against the Ottoman rulers. In fact, Greek intellectuals translated the Declaration of Independence and used it as their own declaration.

Since then, Greece has also battled and triumphed over the spread of Communism, losing nine percent of its own population in the process. Throughout all of this strife and upheaval, Greece has remained a staunch and loyal ally to the United States; furthermore, as President Dwight D. Eisenhower said, ''Greece asked no favor except the opportunity to stand for those rights which it believed, and it gave to the world an example of battle . . . a battle that thrilled the hearts of all free men and free women everywhere.''

I congratulate Greece on this day marking its 178th anniversary of independence, and I applaud the Greek people for their constant devotion to and fierce protection of the democratic principles of equality, freedom, and self rule. Let us all look to their example as inspiration in the continuing fight to promote and expand democracy throughout the world.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Greece, a trusted ally and partner of the United States, on the occasion of Greek Independence Day, which will be celebrated on March 25th.

It is especially fitting that we in the House of Representatives, the very embodiment of representative democracy, pay tribute to the accomplishments of a nation which gave us the gift of democracy and developed the concept of a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Beginning with ancient Greece, the cradle of democracy, and extending all the way into modern times, the people of Greece have continued to give gifts of political philosophy, culture, and friendship to the world. The special relationship between the United States and Greece has been reinforced throughout our country's short history, from the emulation of ancient Greek democracy by our founding fathers to our steadfast alliance during every major international conflict in the 20th century and our partnership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

In tribute to Greece—our partner in times of war and peace, our reliable friend, and a nation which has, over the millennia, contributed key political and social principles to world society—I rise on the occasion of the 178th anniversary of the revolution which led to Greek independence from the Ottoman Empire. For

the United States, this revolution was particularly auspicious, as it led to the creation of one of our most faithful allies.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am here with my colleagues to commemorate the 178th anniversary of Greek Independence Day which is a national day of celebration of Greek and American Democracy.

While commemorative resolutions are no longer allowed in the House, there is support for Greek Independence Day. Every year since 1986, a resolution has been cosponsored by over 50 Senators and passed in the Senate. The President has once again signed a proclamation this year recognizing this as Greek Independence Day, and I would like to insert a copy of this in the RECORD.

''Our Constitution is called a democracy because power is in the hands not of a minority but of the whole people. When it is a question of settling private disputes, everyone is equal before the law; when it is a question of putting one person before another in positions of public responsibility, what counts is not a membership of a particular class, but the actual ability which the man possesses,'' This could have been written by Thomas Jefferson, but it was written by Pericles in an address made in Greece 2,000 years ago.

Plato said, ''Democracy is a charming form of government, full of variety and disorder, and dispensing a kind of equality to equals and unequals alike.'' Isn't that a wonderful way to describe democracy?

Thomas Jefferson once said, ''. . . to the ancient Greeks . . . we are all indebted for the light which led ourselves out of Gothic darkness.''

Just as Greek ideas of democracy and individual liberties became the foundation of our government, the American Revolution became one of the ideals of the Greeks as they fought for their independence in the 1820's.

Greek intellectuals translated the Declaration of Independence of the United States and used it as their own declaration.

A Greek Commander in Chief (Petros Mavromichalis) appealed to the citizens of the United States, saying: ''Having formed the resolution to live or die for freedom, we are drawn toward you by a just sympathy since it is in your land that liberty has fixed her abode, and by you that she is prized as by our fathers. Hence, honoring her name, we invoke yours at the same time, trusting that in imitating you, we shall imitate our ancestors and be thought worthy of them if we succeed in resembling you . . . it is for you, citizens of America, to crown this glory . . .''

Greece has been a long and trusted ally. In fact, they fought along side of us in every major international conflict this century.

During the early 1900s, one of every four Greek males between the ages of 15 and 45 departed for the United States. And, I might add that many of them settled in Astoria, Queens which I am fortunate enough to represent. Astoria is one of the largest and most vibrant communities of Greek and Cypriot Americans in this country.

It is truly one of my greatest pleasures as a Member of Congress to be able to participate in the life of this community, and the wonderful and vital Greek American friends that I have come to know are one of its greatest rewards.

I have also had the pleasure of establishing the Congressional Caucus on Hellenic Issues with the gentleman from Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS. This caucus allows Members of the House to join together to find ways to work toward better United States-Greek and Cypriot relations.

We are here today because 177 years ago today, the revolution which freed the Greek people from the Ottoman Empire began. Greece had remained under the Ottoman Empire for almost 400 years, and during this time the people were deprived of all civil rights.

Many volunteers from various localities in the United States sailed to Greece to participate in Greece's war for independence.

On this joyous occasion, we should also direct our attention to the island of Cyprus which, for 25 years now, has been striving for an end to its tragic division and the illegal Turkish occupation of 37 percent of its territory. Again, Cyprus is on the verge of becoming a flashpoint for regional conflict because of Turkey's hardline stance with unrealistic conditions to any peace talks.

It is now time to reaffirm our commitment to a peaceful solution. We must use Cyprus's EU accession as an impetus for positive progress and not let Turkey use it as an excuse for heightened tensions.

A positive contribution by Turkey to help resolve the situation in Cyprus would facilitate Turkey's aspirations to become a member of the European Union. We should use our influence in the region to help Turkey understand this.

Hopefully, soon we will also celebrate Cyprus Day when once again the entire island will be united.

However, the reason that we are here today is to celebrate the 178th anniversary of Greek Independence.

Daniel Webster said of this time in Greek history, ''This [Greek] people, a people of intelligence, ingenuity, refinement, spirit, and enterprise, have been for centuries under the atrocious unparalleled Tartarian barbarism that ever oppressed the human race.''

There has always been a special bond of friendship between our two countries, and I would like to leave you with a quote from Percy Shelley.

''We are all Greeks! Our laws, our literature, our religion, our art, have their roots in Greece.''

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to rise today to mark the 178th anniversary of Greek independence from the Turkish Ottoman Empire. I would like to thank Congressman BILIRAKIS and Congresswoman MALONEY for their steadfast leadership on Greek issues and for organizing this Special Order to recognize this historic event.

Mr. Speaker, for over two centuries, the United States and Greece have enjoyed a strong and enduring relationship. During the Second World War, fighting alongside American troops, more than 600,000 Greek soldiers died fighting against the Axis powers illustrating Greece's strong commitment to the United States and freedom loving people everywhere. Today, Greece's commitment to peace and democracy throughout our world continues through their participation in NATO, modern history's most successful alliance.

Our bonds are deeper still, however, for we are joined by blood, culture, and a profound commitment to shared values. Greek ideals of democracy and freedom inspired our Nation's founders and breathed life into America's experiment with democratic self-government. Generations of Greek Americans have enriched every aspect of our national life, in the arts, sciences, business, politics and sports. Through hard work, love of family and community, they have contributed greatly to the prosperity and peace that we all enjoy as Americans today.

Mr. Speaker, I have the great honor of representing a number of Greek-Americans in the Seventh District of New York. Their influence and active participation in the life of their communities has fostered economic, political and social growth throughout New York City.

But as we celebrate Greek independence, we must keep in mind the ongoing struggle for freedom and demand for human rights on the island of Cyprus.

Turkey's tragic and illegal occupation of 37 percent of the island and continued unwillingness to negotiate a peaceful settlement to the crisis threatens to ignite renewed fighting on the island, which would be devastating to chances for a lasting peace. I believe the United States and the international community must remain steadfast in our resolve to bring peace and unity to an island that has been home to violence and division for far, far too long.

In closing Mr. Speaker, let me reiterate my strong commitment to Greek communities in my district, the country, and throughout the world. Their strength and dedication to democracy and peace in the world has made them a shining star of modern civilization.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlemen from Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and the gentlelady from New York, Ms. MALONEY for organizing this Special Order to honor the 178th anniversary of Greece's independence. They are tireless in their promotion of close ties between the United States and Greece, and I have enjoyed working with them over the years to strengthen relations with one of America's greatest allies.

I would like to begin by congratulating Greece and the Greek community in America for 178 years of independence. I would also like to reaffirm the special relationship the United States has with Greece.

The issue I want to focus on tonight is Turkey's threat to use military force against Greece in response to the Ocalan affair. Settling differences with military force is an option to be used only as the last resort after all diplomatic channels have been exhausted. Turkey, however, seems to salivate at the prospect of a military confrontation with Greece. At every conceivable opportunity Ankara threatens Greece with the use of military force.

Shortly before the Ocalan affair erupted, Turkey threatened to attack Greece if Greece deploys the defensive S–300 missile system in Crete. That deployment is scheduled as part of a gesture put forward by the Cypriot government to defuse tensions in Cyprus over the initial plan to deploy that system on Cyprus. I should also add that part of the Cypriot plan to defuse that crisis and move the peace process forward includes a reiteration of the standing offer to demilitarize the island accompanied by a new offer to pay for a peacekeeping force following the demilitarization. This peaceful proposal has to date been rejected by the Turks, who, as I say seem interested only in threatening to use force against Greece.

As with all Turkish threats, the threat to use force in response to the Ocalan affair must be taken seriously. The endless stream of threats

to use force by Ankara are destabilizing to the already tense Mediterranean region, to NATO and ultimately to all of Europe. They are also counter to US interests. In my view the United States government needs to be much more forceful in communicating to the Turks that these threats are unacceptable and that there will be severe consequences to US-Turkey relations if Ankara resorts to the use of military force.

Many in Greece and the Greek community in the United States speculate that one of the reasons why Turkey has been issuing threats as of late is to spark another confrontation over sovereign Greek territory in the Aegean. ''A short military confrontation,'' observes a recent editorial in the GreekAmerican on Turkey's claims to Greek territory ''may be just the ticket.''

Two years ago, Turkey was almost successful in sparking just such a confrontation over the Greek islets of Imia. The confrontation was avoided only after President Clinton personally intervened, but the issue is not resolved. Turkey continues to make unfounded claims of sovereignty over the islets of Imia. I am hopeful the Administration will be prepared to act swiftly should this issue again flare up. In order to keep it on the front burner, I introduced H Con Res 36 in February, which expresses the sense of Congress that the islets of Imia are sovereign territory under international law. It also states that Turkey should agree to bring this matter before the International Court of Justice at the Hague for a resolution.

Again, I think it is important to keep examples like these in mind in the wake of the Ocalan affair and discount Turkey's attempt to slander Greece's commitment and readiness to resolve conflicts peacefully and in full accordance with international law. It is precisely this commitment to peace and democracy that we have must keep in mind as we celebrate 178 years of Greek independence. And I just want to point out, to its credit, the State Department has rejected Turkey's ridiculous assertion following Ocalan's capture that Greece supports terrorism.

Before I conclude, Mr. Speaker, there is one last observation I want to make about the way the US government has handled the Ocalan affair. Notwithstanding its rejection of Turkey's propaganda regarding Greece, there are aspects of this case that are very troubling.

The US government's role in helping the Turks capture Ocalan is well documented. What troubles me about the American government's role is its willingness to help the Turk's capture Ocalan knowing full well the chances he will receive a fair trial are slim to none. Already the Turks have refused to allow Ocalan's attorney's to defend him. Instead the Turkish courts appointed 15 lawyers to defend him, two of which recently resigned after receiving death threats. Unsurprisingly, the other 13 are also expected to resign. Ankara has also decided to bypass its regular court system and bring Ocalan before some kind of three-judge tribunal with no jury and no foreign observers.

The US government's claim that it was trying to upheld justice is specious at best. In turning Ocalan over to the Turks, the American government saw an opportunity to curry favor with Ankara. In my view, this was done in support of an inexplicable American policy toward Ankara that overlooks a myriad of unconscionable Turkish policies—most notably those involving Cyprus and Armenia—in exchange for continued access to Turkish military facilities and airspace.

It is the willingness of the US government to ignore the notorious abuses and show trials in the Turkish judicial system that I find troubling. If the US government was truly interested in insuring justice be carried out in a fair manner, it should have helped deliver him to a court where fair judicial proceedings are the norm, such as the International Court of Justice at the Hague.

With that, I once again congratulate Greece on the anniversary of its independence and thank my colleagues once again for holding this Special Order.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is an occasion for celebrating the strong ties and traditions that bind America with our friends in Greece. I commend the gentleman from Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, the co-chairman of our Hellenic Issues Caucus for his diligence in ensuring each year that the House mark this important day by way of a special order. In commemorating the 178th anniversary of the independence of Greece from the Ottoman overlords, we should bear in mind that it was to the practices and institutions of ancient Athens that our forefathers looked for an example and inspiration as they set in place the principles of democracy that have guided our great Nation and its people.

It was to our young nation, where the spirit of democracy was reborn in the modern era, that the people of Greece looked as they fought for and won their own independence in 1821.

Today, we are preparing for a new round of strife in the Balkans that could very likely involve the armed forces of our own country. We note with gratitude the efforts made by the government of Greece in trying to find a peaceful solution to the conflict in Kosovo. The leaders of Greece have made numerous trips to Belgrade in an effort to persuade Milosevic that he must yield to the demands of the international community and cease his brutal policies against the people of Kosovo. Greece is also in the forefront of those countries providing assistance to the government of Albania, helping to restore order to Albania's society after the civil strife that nearly destroyed the country 2 years ago.

Since 1821 when the people of Greece triumphed in their heroic fight for independence, the people of Greece and the United States of America have been as one in the struggle to promote and protect democratic freedoms and human rights around the world. Today, as we face new challenges to that tradition in the Balkans and elsewhere, we value our friends in Greece for their continued support and encouragement. Accordingly, I urge that our colleagues continue the effort to keep the mutual spirit of friendship thriving. Yasou. Efkaristo!

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

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

IN HONOR OF WORLD WAR I VETERAN WILLIAM ''CAPTAIN GLADY'' OGLESBY

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, a French author once said, ''Freedom is a system based on courage.''

Madam Speaker, the freedoms we enjoy today are built upon a foundation of courage, fostered by the individuals who served and sacrificed for America, our Nation's veterans.

Last September marked the 80th anniversary of Armistice Day, a day to commemorate the signing of the armistice which marked the end of World War I. The United States sent over 4.5 million troops into battle during the war and over 100,000 never came home. They gave their lives to protect our country and our freedom. World War I was called ''the Great War'' and was fought to make the world safe for democracy.

Today, we have approximately 3,200 living United States World War I veterans. I am proud that the Third District of North Carolina, which I have the honor to represent, is home to at least one of these courageous soldiers, a gentleman who joined his fellow Americans in the fight against tyranny, Mr. William Gladstone Oglesby.

Madam Speaker, on April 2, 1917, then President Woodrow Wilson called Congress into session to condemn German warfare as a ''war against all nations.'' He said: ''It is a fearful thing to lead this great peaceful people into war, into the most terrible and disastrous of all wars, civilization itself seeming to be in the balance. But the right is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things we have always carried dear to our hearts.''

Madam Speaker, President Wilson was speaking of democracy, freedom, and the brave men and women who risked their lives to protect it. Within 4 days, the United States had declared war against Germany. At the time, William Gladstone Oglesby of Morehead City, North Carolina, had just turned 21. Later that year, he would begin his service in the United States Army during the height of war. He would join the almost 2 million Americans sent across the ocean to fight alongside French soldiers and would serve in Company B, 322d Infantry Division as part of the American Expeditionary Forces.

Now, just shy of 103 years old, William Oglesby, or Captain Glady as he is more commonly known, is one of the surviving World War I veterans to receive France's highest decoration, the Legion of Honor medal.

The French government is marking the anniversary of the World War I armistice by honoring Captain Glady and other surviving Americans and Allied personnel who fought in the Great War on French soil.

□ 2000

Madam Speaker, I cannot be more proud to represent such a fine soldier of freedom.

Madam Speaker, Captain Glady served with French soldiers for 1 year before receiving an honorable discharge. His efforts in the name of freedom are unforgettable and worthy of the recognition and tribute he has received.

Captain Glady's service to his country can only be matched by his service to his church, his community and his family. As one of the first honorably discharged veterans to join the American Legion, Captain Glady has dedicated 80 years to caring for other veterans and their widows.

After his discharge, Captain Glady spent 30 years working at sea in the North Carolina fishing industry. He spent 20 years as a menhaden fishing boat captain where he received his nickname, ''Captain Glady.'' He was married to his late wife, Ruth, for 72 years, and has a daughter, Sarita Shaw, and two granddaughters, Catherine Watkins and Elizabeth Duff.

Madam Speaker, William Gladstone Oglesby is a good man, a good American, and truly one of our Nation's soldiers of freedom. He answered his country's call to duty. His dedication to protect our country and preserve the principles that America was founded upon has helped to ensure and provide for the survival of this Nation.

As President Wilson said: ''To such a task we can dedicate our lives and our fortunes, everything that we are and everything that we have . . . with the pride of those who know that the day has come when America is privileged to spend her blood and her might for principles that gave her birth and happiness and the peace which she has treasured.''

Madam Speaker, my grandfather was gassed during World War I at the Battle of the Argonne forest. Thankfully he was fortunate to survive, but not everyone was as lucky. Many lost fathers, brothers, husbands and sons. Their courage and the courage of all who serve this Nation, have provided for the free and democratic Nation that we enjoy today.

Captain Glady and all who serve this country represent the America that rose to greatness on the shoulders of ordinary citizens. They are the men and women who accept the highest responsibility and make the ultimate sacrifice to preserve peace and freedom for all of its citizens.

Captain Glady, with your 103rd birthday approaching on April 4, I would like to extend to you a happy birthday, and best wishes to you, and I thank you and your country thanks you for your heroic courage in the name of freedom.

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

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

H.J. RES. 22—MAKING THE BIRTHDAY OF CESAR ESTRADA CHAVEZ A NATIONAL HOLIDAY

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

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor an inspiring and beloved man, Cesar Estrada Chavez. Today we honor him in anticipation of his birthday next week, and I ask the Members of the House of Representatives to join us in paying respect to a man who brought dignity to men, women and children who have continued to struggle in the fields.

In January Cesar Chavez was bestowed one of the greatest honors when he was inducted into the U.S. Department of Labor's Hall of Fame. This honor is solely reserved for Americans whose contributions to the field of labor have enhanced the quality of lives of millions.

Not only did he enhance the lives of millions, but he touched us deeply with his compassion and commitment to La Causa. La Causa, the cause of the poor; La Causa, the cause of nonviolence; La Causa, representing those who do not have representation.

As my colleagues may know, Cesar Chavez rose from a fruit and vegetable picker to be the head of the United Farm Workers of America. From the beginning, Cesar Chavez instilled in the UFW the principles of nonviolence as practiced by Gandhi and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. When the United Farm Workers began the strike in the 1960's to protest the treatment of farm workers, the strikers took a pledge of nonviolence. Many of my colleagues may remember the 25-day fast conducted by Cesar Chavez which reaffirmed the United Farm Workers' commitment to nonviolence.

For those of us who lived through those years, those troubling years, in that time period, we heard of the great odds Chavez faced, and we recognized, a lot of us were involved directly in his efforts, as he led a successful 5-year strike boycott. Through this boycott Chavez was able to forge a national support coalition of unions, church groups, students, minorities and consumers. By the end of the boycott, everyone knew the chant that unified the group: ''Si se puede,'' yes, we can, and it was a chant of encouragement, pride and dignity.

Although we knew him for his advocacy on behalf of farm workers, he was influential in various other areas. He helped communities to mobilize by assisting them with voter registration drives and insisting that minority communities had a right to an education, had a right to have access to a quality education.

Many of us today look to Cesar Chavez for inspiration, even here in the Halls of Congress. Those of us who continue this fight do so in order to give voices to the voiceless and dignity that is deserved by all laborers who, no matter what their work, will recognize their work and recognize them with dignity.

Throughout the country, like in San Antonio, there will be celebrations. I know in San Antonio Jamie Martinez, a labor leader, will be conducting a parade and a march in his honor, not only in his honor but on his causes and the importance of his cause.

Americans have seen few leaders such as Cesar Chavez. To honor his work and deeds I ask that you join myself and 56 other colleagues in supporting H.J. Res. 22 to make his birthday a national holiday. To all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I tell them tonight: ''Si se puede.'' Together, yes, we can.

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

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. THUNE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time allocated to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH), that I be allowed to use that.

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

There was no objection.

DO NOT BUY THE LIE

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

Mr. THUNE. Madam Speaker, for the past three months I have listened as our friends on the other side have extolled the virtues of the President's budget. Today we had an opportunity to vote on a series of alternative budgets, one of which was the President's budget, and I just have one question:

Where did all the President's men and all the President's women go when it came time to vote on that budget? The President's budget, today when it was voted on in the House, got two, two votes out of 435, and when it was voted on in the Senate the other day, it got two votes in the Senate.

Now we have to ask ourselves, why is that? Why did the President's budget only get two votes in the House and two votes in the Senate? I think that once the smoke had cleared and the dust had settled, it became clear that the charade was over.

Maybe it is because the President spends the Social Security surplus in his budget, maybe it is because the President's budget raises taxes by $172 billion. Maybe it is because in the President's budget there was no funding for priorities that he mentioned in his State of the Union address, priorities that rolled out like they were never going to end, like agriculture, and he did not put any money in his budget for important priorities like reforming the crop insurance program.

Maybe there were only two votes in the House today on the President's budget because the President cuts Medicare. In spite of all the rhetoric about saving Medicare and putting aside 15 percent, the President's budget cut Medicare by about $10 million.

Maybe it was because the President's budget busted the budget caps. I mean it could be any of those reasons, but the fact of the matter is that when all the posturing was done in this Chamber and all the lofty rhetoric was put aside, it came time to vote, nobody was there to vote in favor of the President's budget.

So we rolled out an alternative, the Republican budget plan, today, and already for weeks our friends on the other side, the Democrats, have been assailing that budget. But then, as my colleagues know, the rhetoric started to tone down a little bit because they looked at it, and they said: ''Well, you know we want to attack the Republican budget for Social Security,'' and then they realized that we were locking up, walling off the Social Security Trust Fund, making sure that all the payroll tax was actually going into the trust fund where it should. And then they thought, well maybe we can attack the Republicans again on Medicare because they did not fall for the President's percentages game and say, well, we are going to do 15 percent here and 62 percent here, and 20 percent here, 10 percent here. But then they realized that by locking up the payroll tax the Republican budget puts aside more money for Social Security and Medicare than the President's budget.

So, that issue is off the table, and the fact of the matter is they could not attack, they want to attack for the veterans budget, but the Republican budget actually funded veterans at $1 billion more than the President's budget. It funded agriculture at $6 billion more than the President's budget.

So then it was the old traditional line about it is tax cuts for the rich. Well, as my colleagues know, if we look at the budget, there are not any tax cuts specified in there. Yes, we believe that we ought to have a debate. Once we have walled off Social Security and taken care of that program and Medicare, and there is $800 billion projected over the next 10 years that comes in over and above that, then we believe we ought to engage in debate in this city about whether or not to give that back to the American people or whether to spend it here in Washington. But we will have that debate when and if the time comes. But in the meantime we need to do the responsible thing and the honest thing, and that is to wall off Social Security and make sure that it is there for the next generation of Americans.

In fact, I want to read something here that AARP, Mr. Horace Deets, the Executive Director of AARP, said about the Republican budget plan. It says: ''AARP believes it is important to protect Social Security's growing reserves and is pleased that the House budget resolution provides that protection. Over the next 10 years, Social Security is projected to contribute $1.8 trillion of the unified surplus. Preserving Social Security's reserves not only allows our country to better prepare for the impending retirement of the baby boom generation, but also gives us greater financial flexibility to enact long-term reform in both Social Security and Medicare once the options have been carefully considered and their impact understood.''

That is from the AARP, and what I would simply say to the American people here this evening is:

''When you listen to all this rhetoric over the course of the next few months, who are you going to trust to solve these problems, Social Security and Medicare? Are you going to trust the people who are going to be honest with you and say that we are going to put the payroll tax, Social Security and Medicare, aside where it should be walled off to be used for those purposes, or are you going to trust the people who want to keep raiding it like we have in the past?''

I think the American people are wise, I think the Americans in this country who are currently benefiting from Social Security and Medicare have figured this out, and I have one simple message for them this evening, and that is:

Do not buy the lie. We have heard it before, we are going to hear it again. Work with us in a constructive way to build a better future for the 21st century.

Madam Speaker, I look forward to the opportunity, when we get past all the posturing and all the rhetoric, to work with my colleagues on the other side to come up with a budget that takes care of these important priorities.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. PELOSI addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks).

TRANSPORTATION EMPLOYEE FAIR TAXATION ACT OF 1999

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

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to introduce important legislation to provide tax fairness for thousands of hard-working Americans throughout this Nation who are employed by interstate water carriers. I am talking about river boat pilots, I am talking about men and women who work on barges, and I am talking about

other hard-working crew members who do an honest day's work and want a fair shake when it comes to paying their taxes.

Madam Speaker, I am deeply concerned that a significant number of interstate waterway employees who are employed on vessels that operate on the Columbia River, the Mississippi, the Ohio, the Missouri, the Kanawha, and many other inland waterways throughout this Nation may be double or even triple-taxed for their labor. These river pilots, officers and other crew members perform most of their work on rivers which flow through multiple States, and in many cases these folks are subject to income tax filings and additional withholdings from multiple States.

The rivers these folks navigate, whether it be for shipping, for transporting passengers, for tourism or other purposes often course through the territories of multiple States. That is a fact of nature, and because of that fact the folks who ply their trade on these rivers are subject to taxation by several States. That is simply not fair.

When truck drivers, railway workers and aviation employees go about their jobs, all of whom are required to conduct their work in States other than their home State, Congress has seen fit to grant them an exemption from this double or triple taxation unless a majority of the work is performed in another State.

□ 2015

This is not so for interstate waterway employees. No. If one is a crew member on a barge, they can be required to pay taxes in several States, and that is simply not fair.

An airline pilot, for example, is subject to taxation by the State in which the pilot resides, period. Only if pilots earn 50 percent or more of their income while working in another State are they subject to taxation by that other State. This restriction, for all practical purposes, exempts airline employees from multiple taxation. However, interstate water carriers, bargemen, river boat pilots, ferry boat operators, for some reason these people are treated differently, and that is simply not fair.

Frankly, Madam Speaker, it is a clear example of taxation without representation, an obvious oversight of this body.

Over the past 22 years, Congress has acted to address inequities in the Tax Code when it dealt with interstate transportation employees. I am asking my colleagues today to again take action to address and correct this problem.

Interstate waterway employees are devoted, hard working folks, who provide essential transportation services throughout our Nation and pay their fair share of taxes in their home States. Additionally, the companies which employ these workers contribute significantly to the economic well-being of the State's concerns. Yet, Madam Speaker, due to an existing oversight, workers living in my district in southwest Washington may be subject to additional tax burdens imposed by other States along the Columbia River.

The current law allows States to impose additional taxes based on the percentage of time their vessel was docked or operating in those States' waters and I will say it again, that is simply not fair.

Madam Speaker, we can do something about that. We can make the law fair and we can make it apply equally to everyone.

Madam Speaker, the legislation I am introducing today, the Transportation Employee Fair Taxation Act of 1999, will correct this oversight.

My bill will expressly prohibit the taxation of income earned by waterway workers by States other than the ones in which the workers reside. It will close the unfortunate loophole that says we treat all the other groups of interstate workers one way and bargemen and river pilots the other.

It is not complex legislation. It is very straightforward. It is not lengthy legislation. It is a two-page bill. But it is good legislation. It is needed legislation and it is fair legislation. I am proud to say also that it is bipartisan legislation.

Of the 12 original cosponsors of this measure, 8 are Democrats and 4 are Republicans. So I urge my colleagues from both parties to join in this effort, to ensure tax fairness for all of our citizens by taking swift action to pass this bill.

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

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

NEEDED: JUSTICE AND A POLITICAL SOLUTION FOR THE KURDISH PEOPLE

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, before we adjourn for our spring district work period, I wanted to draw attention to the plight of the Kurdish people.

There was a lot of attention to this otherwise usually ignored issue last month with the apprehension of Abdullah Ocalan, the leader of the Kurdistan Workers Party, the PKK.

Mr. Ocalan has been fighting for autonomy for the Kurdish people who are the victims of oppression by Turkey, as well as Iraq, Iran and Syria. The Turkish regime refuses to even acknowledge the Kurds' existence, referring to them as Mountain Turks, prohibiting all expression of Kurdish culture and language in an effort to forcibly assimilate them, and jailing, torturing or killing Kurdish leaders.

The Iraqi regime has used poison gas on its Kurds and has destroyed 4,000 Kurdish villages. The Iranian regime has lined them up against firing squads, while the Syrian regime barely tolerates them with no rights.

Madam Speaker, while the treatment of the Kurds in Iraq, Iran and Syria is deplorable, the Turkish mistreatment of the Kurdish people is particularly shocking for a very basic reason. Turkey is considered an ally of the United States, a member of NATO, and the recipient over many years of millions in economic and especially military assistance courtesy of the American taxpayer. This embarrassing record of American support for the Turkish regime reached a new low last month when our intelligence and diplomatic services actually helped a Turkish commando team to capture Mr. Ocalan in Kenya. This action violates the spirit of the torture convention to which the United States is a signatory.

Mr. Ocalan, had he been here in the United States I cannot imagine that he would have been turned over to Turkey, just as Italy refused to do so when he was in Italy. This shameful collaboration with Turkey has resulted in Mr. Ocalan being held in solitary confinement on an island prison in Turkey with no access to his international team of lawyers.

Plans call for him to be tried in a secret military-type court with no jury and no foreign observers.

Given the unlawfulness of this abduction and the illegitimacy of the state security court's tribunal, there is ample reason to assume that Mr. Ocalan will not receive a fair trial.

Madam Speaker, I want to note that the injustice of the Ocalan abduction and trial and the much larger issue of the oppression of the Kurdish people has not gone unnoticed around the world. Here in Washington over the past weekend, a rally was held across the street from the Turkish Embassy. The Congressional Human Rights Caucus and the Human Rights Alliance recently commemorated the 11th anniversary of Saddam Hussein's massacre of over 5,000 Kurds in the village of Halabja.

The suffering of the Kurdish people has not gone completely unnoticed but we need to do more for the Kurdish people. The government of Turkey's undeclared war on the Kurds has claimed close to 40,000 lives and caused more than 3 million people to become refugees.

Mr. Ocalan's appearance in Rome with a pledge that he was ready to renounce violence presented an opportunity for peace but neither Turkey nor the United States took him up on his offer.

Madam Speaker, let me say it is not too late. We should use our leverage

over Turkey to demand that an international tribunal prosecute Mr. Ocalan since Turkey is at war with the Kurds and cannot be expected to conduct a fair trial. I hope that the European Union to which Turkey is seeking admission will also put pressure on Turkey. We must demand a fair trial for Mr. Ocalan but this should only be a first step in our efforts to press Turkey to enter into negotiations to achieve a political solution to this ongoing struggle. This is fundamentally in Turkey's interest, too, in the long run, since they cannot continue to keep down 35 million people living in their midst.

On January 21, we celebrated, or the Kurds celebrated their new year, which is called Newroz, symbolizing a day of resistance and deliverance from tyranny for the Kurds. In that spirit, I hope that we will soon witness a turning point from the terrible tragedies that the Kurdish people have experienced and instead see the rebirth of a strong and free Kurdistan.

Madam Speaker, this week U.S. forces have gone into the battle in the former Yugoslavia in an effort to prevent the genocide of the Kosovar people. I strongly support that effort which shows America at its best and I hope that the same resolve and sense of outrage that caused us to act to protect the Kosovars will finally motivate America and the free world to put an end to the genocide of the Kurdish people.

Let me point out that the Kurdish new year, Madam Speaker, was actually last Sunday, March 21, Newroz, and that was the day when the Kurds celebrate their new year.

ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION FROM CHINA

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Madam Speaker, I take this opportunity to speak to one issue which is of some national significance because it evidences a pattern that is occurring, and that is illegal immigration from China.

I would like to point out that, Madam Speaker, that Guam is a very isolated community from Washington, D.C. It is some 9,000 miles away and it is the closest U.S. soil to China.

During the past year, there has been an inordinate amount of illegal immigration into Guam from China, and we assumed that it was from perhaps nearby the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas, but as it has turned out these are illegal immigrants who come in on fishing boats directly from the Province of Fuqing inside China.

This kind of illegal immigration is not the kind of illegal immigration that we normally assume exists, which is that people are fleeing either for political reasons or looking for an economic better way of life.

All of those might be part of this, but usually when we watch the kinds of things that occur on our southern border or perhaps some of the illegal immigration which is coming from Haiti or in the Caribbean Sea, other parts of the Caribbean Sea, we witness people who are risking life and limb in order to better themselves economically. If they are successful, they go on and live their lives as members of individual families and indeed frequently find a better way of life.

In this case, what we have is an illegal stream of immigrants that is primarily orchestrated by criminal organizations inside China commonly referred to as ''snakeheads.'' Last year, and Guam last a very small population, it is estimated that over 700 arrived through this manner and since the beginning of this year alone there has already been 254, and some 97 were simply apprehended off the coast of Guam, in Agat, last weekend.

What these people undergo is that they pay anywhere from $10,000 to $30,000 for the privilege of being put in a fishing boat usually under a hundred feet and there may be as many as 200 or 300 of them inside this fishing boat. Then they are taken out in the open ocean and they arrive on Guam, and they usually try to come in on small boats so we do not know what exactly the dynamics of the stream is like. If they are caught, they immediately ask for political asylum.

If they are successful in this, and they invariably are, they then enter a period of what can only be termed as indentured servitude for these snakehead organizations for the next 10 to 20 years, probably working below the minimum wage in some underground economy inside this country.

So this problem, and the use of political asylum on Guam, and claims to political asylum by these illegal immigrants, do not necessarily benefit the immigrants themselves but is part of a well constructed, well organized criminal activity that is orchestrated from inside China in the Fuqing province.

The People's Republic of China themselves are embarrassed by this, as I understand it. These are criminal organizations that are acting on their own.

The way to solve this problem is to eliminate or narrow the gap for claims of political asylum on Guam. This in no way means that I myself or the people of Guam are not in favor of political asylum, but in this instance what has happened is that these snakehead organizations have used the political asylum mechanism in order to benefit their criminal activities, which are well documented in these articles, and to create and to prey on the hopes of these people inside China and then to continue to prey upon them once they are successfully brought into this country.

I have introduced legislation for this purpose, to give latitude to INS officers in Guam, and this is possible under the Immigration and Naturalization Act, to carve out special laws and regulations for insular jurisdictions of the United States.

I hope that there is widespread support for this. This is an important issue not only for us but it is a good way to stop illegal immigration and to benefit criminal organizations inside China.

Madam Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD six articles of the Pacific Daily News. These articles point out in great detail the dynamics of this.

95 APPREHENDED IN AGAT—6 WOMEN, 12 CHILDREN AMONG GROUP IN INS CUSTODY

(By Hiroshi Hiyama.—Pacific Daily News)

Six women and a dozen children are among 95 Chinese nationals who were apprehended early yesterday morning after their ship ran aground on a reef off Agat.

It was the largest number of suspected illegal immigrants and smugglers caught at one time, followed by the 79 apprehended in January.

Yesterday's apprehension brings the tally to about 235 suspected illegal immigrants caught on and around Guam this year.

It began when 32 people were spotted on the beach by police Officer Frank Cepeda, who was patrolling near the old Agat cemetery around 2 a.m., according to police spokesman Marc Howard.

Their ship had run aground earlier on the reef off Agat, according to the U.S. Coast Guard. The rusty, 120-foot fishing vessel had no identifying markings.

After the accident, the ship's six-member crew jumped on a smaller boat, telling their passengers that they would go ashore to get help.

Shortly afterward, 32 passengers jumped off the fishing vessel, suspecting that the crew members wouldn't come back to rescue them, Coast Guard Chief Petty Officer John Howk said.

They were the group approached by Cepeda at the Agat beach. They offered no resistance, and a handful of police officers marched the group to the Agat precinct, Howard said.

At the same time, police contacted the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Guam police and fire officials launched their own boats to check the fishing vessel. The Coast Guard also launched the cutter Galveston Island and a Navy HC–5 helicopter to tend the vessel.

On the ship, local and federal officers found 57 people huddled together, waiting for assistance, Howk said.

Officials later caught the six crew members on an Agat shoreline, bringing the total number of apprehensions to 95, Howk said.

The Chinese nationals hadn't had food or water for the past few days, said Joe Galoski, INS supervisory special agent.

None showed signs of illness, and they were fed and cleaned by federal and local officials.

They spent roughly 11 days at sea traveling from the Fujian province in southern China to Guam, Galoski said.

They were taken to the Department of Corrections yesterday, where they spent the night with dozens of other suspected Chinese illegal immigrants who had been apprehended in previous incidents.

A few who have been here awhile have picked up a few English words and helped local prison officials to clean the newcomers' belongings.

The investigation into yesterday's apprehension will continue today, officials said.

The fishing vessel was towed to Victor Wharf, where the Coast Guard office is located.

Coast Guard officials said they haven't noticed any obvious signs of oil leaks, or other contaminants in the environment in the waters off Agat.

CHINESE DREAM OF LIFE ABROAD

(By Brad Wong)

FUQING, China—In an alleyway off a main shopping street in this coastal city of Fujian province, a group of peasants leaned against their rusty bicycles and chatted with one another in an open-air market one day last month.

With people buying food and milling about among pig heads, pile of leafy vegetables and mounds of oranges, one farmer stood next to his produce, spread on a plastic tarp on the ground. How much, he wondered would his cabbage cost in the United States?

In a black sedan with tinted windows that normally shuttles Taiwanese and Hong Kong business executives around town, a driver with thinning gray hair and a tan, weathered complexion offered a visitor $24,000 for help to immigrate to the United States, a place the Chinese call ''beautiful country.'' He boasted how his daughter could speak English, and called her on his cellular phone to prove it.

The man talked about a friend in the United States who gives him regular reports about living abroad. ''The homes are very good and there are a lot of vehicles,'' he said.

In the streets and alleys of this city, with its shiny new hotels and tiny brick huts, residents don't disclose it initially, but the dream is tucked in minds and hearts, never far from thought.

The desire: to go abroad, seek wealth and give their children better opportunities than they've had. And clerks, restaurant owners and others from all walks of life all say the same thing: They want to earn money in the United States. Some even cite a saying popular in the new market-oriented China to describe those who take risks in pursuing profits and opportunities.

They call it, ''Jumping in the sea.''

According to Chief Petty Officer John Howk, in charge of operations at the Coast Guard's Guam center, since April 1998, more than 500 smugglers and fortune seekers from this city and province have jumped and landed illegally on Guam or have been apprehended trying to make it to Guam's shores.

On Sunday, the Immigration and Naturalization Service took 97 Chinese nationals into custody after a fishing vessel from Fujian province hit the reef off Agat. It was the largest number of suspected illegal immigrants caught entering the United States' westernmost territory at any one time, but Howk said the Coast Guard believes that practice will either continue at its present rate of increase.

The immigrants are typically poor peasants from a country of 1.2 billion people, where such residents make up 70 percent of the population. Many Fujian residents say it's difficult to obtain a legal visa to live and work in the United States.

So they look to the sea as a way out and for new opportunities.

SNAKEHEADS

After a two-week boat trip from China, the immigrants often arrive on Guam wet, hungry and sometimes ill or carrying contagious diseases. They lack English language skills, Chinese passports and U.S. visas.

Behind the arrivals on Guam's shores are smugglers from this city and province. Called ''snakeheads'' in Chinese, these organized criminals orchestrate human-cargo shipments, charging as much as $15,000 per person for passage to Guam, $20,000 to Mexico and $30,000 to the continental United States, observers here say.

In return, the immigrants enter into modern-day contracts of indentured servitude, working in underground economies earning substandard U.S. wages to repay their transportation debts.

Still, the money they earn illegally in the United States—even if it's $1 an hour—is more than they can earn here as farmers.

The smugglers control almost every aspect of the immigrants' lives once they arrive at their destination.

They also wield enormous power in the immigrants' hometowns in case someone rebels, tries to flee or fails to pay back the debt, according to Chinese and U.S. observers.

DESTINATION GUAM

While residents of Fujian have followed family members and friends to New York City's Chinatown since the 1980s and to work in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands' garment industry, observers say it's only recently that immigrants have started washing ashore in large numbers on Guam.

One reason Guam has become a gateway is because immigration officials in larger, more desirable destinations have clamped down on those entry points, according to a writer in Fuzhou, the provincial capital.

Lin Yan, who has written about emigration for Chinese newspapers, said smugglers are eyeing lightly protected areas where they can slip in unnoticed.

''Now, it's not easy to go to Japan and New York. So many Fujianese will go to Pacific Islands. But they don't know where they're going,'' he said through a translator. ''Their main purpose is to leave.''

Since last summer, Lin said, U.S. and Japanese authorities have repatriated between 20 and 30 groups of Fujian residents.

A chinese citizen is fined, but not heavily, after returning from an immigration attempt, he said.

[From the Pacific Daily News, Mar. 23, 1999]

CHINESE NATIONALS WAIT FOR DAY IN COURT

(By Frieda Bush)

It could be weeks before 97 Chinese nationals apprehended early Sunday morning will get their day in court.

Included in the group of suspected illegal immigrants are six women and 12 young males, said Robert Johnson, acting officer in charge of the Immigration and Naturalization Service on Guam.

The boys, who said they are minors, will visit a dentist today to help determine their age, Johnson said, but it is thought they are in their late teens.

INS and police officials initially reported 95 were apprehended Sunday. Officials were unavailable last night to resolve the discrepancy.

This latest group is the largest number of suspected illegal immigrants captured on Guam at one time, Johnson said. And it's the sheer volume of interviews the INS is required to conduct that will keep them from getting a rapid trial. Each person must be interviewed through an interpreter, Johnson said. As of yesterday, there were only three people on island qualified to do the interviews. Two of those interpreters flew in from Hawaii yesterday.

The suspected illegal immigrants are from Fujian province in southern China, said Joe Galoski, INS supervisory agent. Their rusty, 120-foot ship ran aground on a reef off Agat early Sunday morning. They were apprehended after a police officer found 32 people who had left the ship and come ashore.

In the meantime, the Chinese nationals will continue to cool their heels at the Department of Corrections facility in Mangilao. The $97-per-person per day cost of boarding the men and women there ultimately will be borne by the U.S. Immigration service, Galoski said.

All of the 97 people in custody are expected to ask for asylum, Johnson said.

That means asylum interviews must be flown in from California to determine whether the men and women have a ''credible fear'' of being harmed if they return to China.

''The initial level is easily met,'' Johnson said. After clearing the initial hurdle, immigrants must go before an immigration judge and prove they need to stay in the United States. The process, Johnson said, is long and complicated. ''But it's been my experience that most will (eventually) be ineligible.''

[From the Pacific Daily News, Mar. 24, 1999]

UNDERGROUND TRIP STARTS ON GUAM

(By Brad Wong)

(Editor's note. Pacific Daily News reporter Brad Wong has reported from China on the conditions that have led hundreds of residents of Fujian province to immigrate illegally to Guam. In this second of three parts, he describes the underground economies that support the immigrants. Look for the third and final installment of the story in Thursday, Pacific Daily News.)

Fuqing, China—Peter Kwong, an Asian-American Studies professor at Hunter College in New York City, is the author of ''Forbidden Workers,'' a book about illegal immigration, such as Guam has experienced in the past year.

No matter the entry point, established underground economies absorb the workers once they land, he said.

''Smugglers wouldn't send people there if they don't think they can get jobs and pay them back,'' Kwong said in a telephone interview from New York City.

It's not an idea,'' he said. ''It's something that already has been worked out.''

In its apparent status as a new gateway, Guam joins Mexico and the Caribbean as smaller entry points for Chinese immigrants en route to larger U.S. mainland cities, where there are more opportunities and better support networks.

FUELING A GROWING ECONOMY

The money the immigrant generate for smugglers, Chinese banks and all parties involved help buttress Fujian's rapidly-growing economy, Kwong said. In New York alone, he said Fujianese immigrants who work in small businesses, restaurants and the garment industry, paid smugglers $200 million in transportation debt in 1998—five times what Hong Kong, Taiwanese, Japanese, U.S. and European companies invested in the province during the same year, according to Professor Sun Shaozhen of the Fujian Teachers' University.

The underground economies that keep the immigrants working once they arrive in the United States have sprouted up in Atlanta, Los Angeles and in cities along the East Coast according to Kwong.

''It's spreading very far and very wide,'' he said.

The Fujianese immigrants arriving illegally by boat on Guam illustrate a philosophical dilemma; people trying to improve their standing in life—but contracting with organized criminals and breaking U.S. law to do so.

Provincial characteristics, geography and history all have combined to fuel this phenomenon, Sun said. Fujianese historically have been courageous, adventurous and daring, he said, referring to the lyrics of a local folk song that he says many have taken to heart: ''If you love the struggle, you will be the winner.''

According to Sun, acceptance of struggle as a way to economic salvation best explains why so many Fujianese risk their lives and attempt to emigrate over seas, often in crowded and unsafe boats.

Lin Yan, who has written about emigration for Chinese newspapers, tells of a Fujianese woman who traveled about 900 miles to China's southwest Yumnan province and crossed the borders into Burma.

After making her way to Cambodia, she departed from Laos by boat to Mexico. She lived with Mexican Indians and eventually climbed through the mountains into the United States, where authorities apprehended her.

CIRCUMSTANCES, DREAMS AND HISTORY

A shortage of arable land in Fujian also plays a part in the emigration. Mountains cover 90 percent of the densely populated province, leaving little room for farmers to grow crops.

And even if they are able to grow produce, many peasants are hard-pressed to earn enough.

The average Fujianese farmer's salary is about $33 per month, an increase from the $2 per month that a peasant earned in the early 1980s, but still too little to support families on, some growers said.

Western movies and television programs, like the popular beach show ''Baywatch,'' also influence residents' perceptions of life in the United States.

''They think America is so free and rich,'' Sun said. ''The cities are modern and the lifestyle is so relaxed.''

Emigration has been part of Fujianese history since the Ming and Qing dynasties and dates back at least 300 years, Sun and Lin said.

Famine and poor living conditions historically have prompted the Fujianese to leave the province, and many former residents of the province have helped develop Taiwan, Singapore, Southeast Asia and the United States. Some Fujianese have moved as far away as Hungary, Poland and Cyprus, according to Sun.

Those who have struck it rich in the United States and return for visits are seen as success stories that others want to emulate. And while some residents realize that life abroad can be difficult, others focus on the money—without examining how it was earned.

''Nobody tells them that they had a miserable life,'' Lin said. ''(Locals just) say, 'Oh, you've earned a lot of money.' ''

[Pacific Daily News, Mar. 25, 1999]

'THEY JUST WANT TO CHANGE THEIR LIFE'

(By Brad Wong)

FUQING, CHINA.—From this province, there are three main departure points along 300 miles of jagged shoreline nicked by inlets and peppered with tiny islands; Fuqing, Changle and Pingtan, on an island with many boats.

Peasants with little education and few opportunities to work in rural factories and small businesses are most likely to leave, according to Sun Shaozhen, a professor at Fujian Teachers' University. They sometimes think a Pacific island is part of the continental United States, he said.

Would-be emigrants can contract through an employment office that recruits people for overseas work or talk directly to the smugglers, said Lin Yan, who has written about emigration for Chinese newspapers.

Because family members often rely on the same network of contacts, residents often follow one another to the same destination. Families and entire villages have gone to California, Hawaii and New York. That pattern also may explain why so many people from Fuqing and Fujian show up on Guam.

The long and ragged shoreline makes it easy for smugglers to hide boats and people without being noticed, Sun and Lin said. The government doesn't have enough patrol boats to stop them, Sun said.

NO WAY OUT

Once a Chinese citizen enters into a contract with smugglers, it initiates a cycle that is difficult to escape according to Peter Kwong, an Asian-American studies professor at Hunter College in New York and author of ''Forbidden Workers,'' a book about illegal immigration.

If the peasants don't repay the transportation debt, the smugglers may intimidate them or their family members with threats of burning their homes or kidnapping their children, Sun and Lin said.

Many immigrants believe they can eventually pay off their contracts and earn their freedom, Kwong said. But the reality is different.

''It's simply you're making money mainly for the smugglers and these greedy employers,'' he said. ''If you pay off all your debt, you're still in the same trap. You're not going to be able to learn the language. You won't be assimilated into the mainstream.''

Smugglers and employers know that immigrants want freedom in the United States. So smugglers will raise transportation fees and employers will lower an immigrant's wages to keep the cycle working to their advantage, Kwong said.

Kwong, Coast Guard and Immigration and Naturalization Service officials said they don't know how many people from Fujian province might succeed in entering the United States illegally through Guam or what happens to those who do.

Kwong said such immigrants often succeeded in the past by working hard, saving money and buying restaurants or garment factories. But the explosive increase in the number of people attempting illegal immigration and the high costs of passage to the United States or elsewhere—$15,000 to Guam, $20,000 to Mexico or $30,000 to the continental United States—combine to keep many immigrants in underground service-sector, restaurant and construction jobs that pay less than minimum wage, Kwong said.

Even if law enforcement officials arrest the immigrants and repatriate them, they are still bound to pay off the contract for the overseas passage. And the debt, crushing especially by Chinese standards, essentially bars an individual from returning to earn an average salary. So they often look to the sea again for escape.

''It's impossible to earn that amount of money in China, so they try again,'' Lin said.

While repatriated immigrants used to face prison time during the 1960s and 1970s, today the Chinese government fines them for trying to leave the country, Lin and Sun said. Sun estimates the fine at between $300 and $500. The Chinese government has sentenced smugglers to prison, he said.

A GROWING CHINA

Ironically, the immigrants' arrival on Guam comes in the midst of an aggressive push by China to modernize and grow economically.

Before the Asian financial crisis in 1997, the country experienced double-digit economic growth this decade, surpassing the United States' growth rate and dazzling business and Wall Street analysts.

China also has weathered the Asian economic turmoil better than South Korea, Japan and Thailand, though it has felt the sting and residents say business has fallen off.

Since China opened its doors to the West in the late 1970s, international investors have poured billions of dollars into the country, particularly into small- and medium-sized factories in Fujian.

Since the 1980s, Taiwanese business executives—including many whose families came from Fujian—have funneled $224 billion in investments in this coastal province, according to Sun.

U.S. fast-food giant McDonald's has planted its golden arches in this coastal area of about 200,000 people, and gleaming new hotels clad in marble and glass cater to the business classes from Hong Kong and Taiwan. New concrete apartments house residents, and modern buses shuttle them between cities.

But as new buildings continue to go up, peasants from this area and poorer neighboring provinces line Fuqing's streets, sitting on stools and waiting to shine shoes for 12 to 24 cents a pair.

While this coastal city develops, the surrounding countryside and the region's mountainous inland are still waiting for infusions of wealth.

In many inland areas, peasants live in wooden huts with single light bulbs hanging from the ceilings. Their narrow rows of crops are crowded in between railroad tracks and rocky, unfarmable mountains.

WHY SO CROWDED?

In part, Guam and the other Pacific Islands that are among the new destinations for these modern-day Chinese immigrants are feeling the impact of the large work force envisioned by former Chairman Mao Tse-tung. Mao, a peasant himself, pushed for a large population during the Cultural Revolution from 1966 to 1970 so he could have a formidable work force to build his socialist state.

Sun believes that if peasants can pool enough money together to send a family member overseas or anticipate that they can raise the necessary amount, they should invest it in a growing China.

''It's foolish, because if you have $30,000, you can do some business here,'' he said.

Still, emigrating to the United States in search of a better life remains a goal for many.

Many peasants, especially in Fujian's mountainous regions, live in brick huts that are constantly cold during the winter. They dream about having a warm room—and they'll do anything to get more money.

''It's hard to imagine,'' Lin said.

''The poorest try their best to become rich, so they do their best to become a foreigner,'' Sun said. ''They just want to change their life conditions.''

That quest for wealth and a better life consumes even the better off among Fuqing's residents. Even the sedan driver, the one with the thinning hair and the daughter who can speak English, hands out a business card with a phone number where he can be reached.

On the card next to his name in Chinese characters is a picture of a shiny new sports car.

[From the Pacific Daily News, Mar. 24, 1999]

CHINESE DETAINEES START ASYLUM PROCESS

(Hiroshi Hiyama)

Dozens of suspected illegal Chinese immigrants caught on a boat off Agat last weekend will go through expedited immigration proceedings because they hadn't entered the United States when they were apprehended.

Immigration officials apprehended a total of 97 suspected illegal Chinese immigrants and smugglers Sunday. They caught 95 in the morning, and Guam police apprehended two others in the afternoon.

Dental examinations conducted yesterday indicated that nine of the suspected illegal

immigrants are minors. The youths will be sent to a juvenile detention facility on the U.S. mainland, said Robert Johnson, acting officer in charge of the Immigration and Naturalization Service's Guam office. A dozen people originally claimed they were minors, Johnson said.

All 88 adults will continue to stay at the Department of Corrections in Mangilao, where federal officials are interviewing them for possible indictment. Six are suspected smugglers. Six women have been housed in the women's facility at the Department of Corrections, Johnson said.

The suspected illegal immigrants were apprehended after their rusty fishing boat ran aground on a reef off Agat sometime between Saturday night and early Sunday morning. Of the 97 people on the ship, 40 left the ship to come ashore, while 50 remained on board.

Those who arrived on shore are suspected of having made illegal entry into the United States and will face regular deportation and asylum processes, Johnson said.

The other 57 people, whom U.S. law enforcement officials apprehended while they were still on the boat, will go through expedited removal procedure, Johnson said. They will see federal asylum officers before they appear before an immigration judge for further proceedings.

The overwhelming majority of the immigrants are expected to apply for asylum, Johnson said.

It's not clear how long the suspects will stay at the Department of Corrections.

It costs $97.71 per person to house people at the department's detention center, but the federal government doesn't have the money to move them to mainland federal facilities or to pay for them to stay on Guam, Johnson said.

The government of Guam has made a commitment not to release the suspected illegal immigrants. Gov. Carl Gutierrez is working with federal attorneys and immigration officials to come up with ways to pay the costs of caring for the detainees, said Ginger Cruz, Gutierrez's spokeswoman.

As of yesterday morning, the INS had 166 illegal immigrants stayed at the Department of Corrections, Johnson said. The detainees include some who have overstayed their visas, Johnson said.

Angel Sablan, director of corrections, said his facility already is crowded with local inmates and it doesn't have space to hold additional federal detainees.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. EMERSON (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today until 12 noon on account of her mother's surgery.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FILNER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GUTIERREZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BECERRA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. PELOSI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BAIRD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WAXMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of North Carolina) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. NETHERCUTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. THUNE, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 68. An act to amend section 20 of the Small Business Act and make technical corrections in title III of the Small Business Investment Act.

H.R. 92. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 251 North Main Street in Winston-Salem, North Carolina, as the ''Hiram H. Ward Federal Building and United States Courthouse''.

H.R. 158. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 315 North 26th Street in Billings, Montana, as the ''James F. Battin United States Courthouse''.

H.R. 233. An act to designate the Federal building located at 700 East San Antonio Street in El Paso, Texas, as the ''Richard C. White Federal Building''.

H.R. 396. An act to designate the Federal building located at 1301 Clay Street in Oakland, California, as the ''Ronald V. Dellums Federal Building''.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 314. An act to provide for a loan guarantee program to address the Year 2000 computer problems of small business concerns, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 68. To amend section 20 of the Small Business Act and make technical corrections in title III of the Small Business Investment Act.

H.R. 92. To designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 251 North Main Street in Winston-Salem, North Carolina, as the ''Hiram H. Ward Federal Building and United States Courthouse''.

H.R. 158. To designate the United States courthouse located at 316 North 26th Street in Billings, Montana, as the ''James F. Battin United States Courthouse''.

H.R. 233. To designate the Federal building located at 700 East San Antonio Street in El Paso, Texas, as the ''Richard C. White Federal Building''.

H.R. 396. To designate the Federal building located at 1301 Clay Street in Oakland, California, as the ''Ronald V. Dellums Federal Building''.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Madam Speaker, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 23, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 23 of the 106th Congress, the House stands adjourned until 12:30 p.m., Monday, April 12, 1999, for morning hour debates.

Thereupon (at 8 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 23, the House adjourned until Monday, April 12, 1999, at 12:30 p.m., for morning hour debates.

OATH OF OFFICE—MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Members of the 106th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

Attachment

ALABAMA

1. Sonny Callahan
2. Terry Everett
3. Bob Riley
4. Robert B. Aderholt
5. Robert E. (Bud) Cramer, Jr.
6. Spencer Bachus
7. Earl F. Hilliard

ALASKA, At Large, Don Young

ARIZONA

1. Matt Salmon
2. Ed Pastor
3. Bob Stump
4. John B. Shadegg
5. Jim Kolbe
6. J. D. Hayworth

ARKANSAS

1. Marion Berry
2. Vic Snyder
3. Asa Hutchinson
4. Jay Dickey

CALIFORNIA

1. Mike Thompson
2. Wally Herger
3. Doug Ose
4. John T. Doolittle
5. Robert T. Matsui
6. Lynn C. Woolsey
7. George Miller
8. Nancy Pelosi
9. Barbara Lee
10. Ellen O. Tauscher
11. Richard W. Pombo
12. Tom Lantos
13. Fortney Pete Stark
14. Anna G. Eshoo
15. Tom Campbell

16. Zoe Lofgren
17. Sam Farr
18. Gary A. Condit
19. George Radanovich
20. Calvin M. Dooley
21. William M. Thomas
22. Lois Capps
23. Elton Gallegly
24. Brad Sherman
25. Howard P. 'Buck' McKeon
26. Howard L. Berman
27. James E. Rogan
28. David Dreier
29. Henry A. Waxman
30. Xavier Becerra
31. Matthew G. Martinez
32. Julian C. Dixon
33. Lucille Roybal-Allard
34. Grace F. Napolitano
35. Maxine Waters
36. Steven T. Kuykendall
37. Juanita Millender-McDonald
38. Stephen Horn
39. Edward R. Royce
40. Jerry Lewis
41. Gary G. Miller
42. George E. Brown, Jr.
43. Ken Calvert
44. Mary Bono
45. Dana Rohrabacher
46. Loretta Sanchez
47. Christopher Cox
48. Ron Packard
49. Brian P. Bilbray
50. Bob Filner
51. Randy''Duke'' Cunningham
52. Duncan Hunter

COLORADO

1. Diana DeGette
2. Mark Udall
3. Scott McInnis
4. Bob Schaffer
5. Joel Hefley
6. Thomas G. Tancredo

CONNECTICUT

1. John B. Larson
2. Sam Gejdenson
3. Rosa L. DeLauro
4. Christopher Shays
5. James H. Maloney
6. Nancy L. Johnson

DELAWARE, At Large, Michael N. Castle

FLORIDA

1. Joe Scarborough
2. Allen Boyd
3. Corrine Brown
4. Tillie K. Fowler
5. Karen L. Thurman
6. Cliff Stearns
7. John L. Mica
8. Bill McCollum
9. Michael Bilirakis
10. C. W. Bill Young
11. Jim Davis
12. Charles T. Canady
13. Dan Miller
14. Porter J. Goss
15. Dave Weldon
16. Mark Foley
17. Carrie P. Meek
18. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen
19. Robert Wexler
20. Peter Deutsch
21. Lincoln Diaz-Balart
22. E. Clay Shaw, Jr.
23. Alcee L. Hastings

GEORGIA

1. Jack Kingston
2. Sanford D. Bishop, Jr.
3. Mac Collins
4. Cynthia A. McKinney
5. John Lewis
6. Johnny Isakson
7. Bob Barr
8. Saxby Chambliss
9. Nathan Deal
10. Charlie Norwood
11. John Linder

HAWAII

1. Neil Abercrombie
2. Patsy T. Mink

IDAHO

1. Helen Chenoweth
2. Michael K. Simpson

ILLINOIS

1. Bobby L. Rush
2. Jesse L. Jackson, Jr.
3. William O. Lipinski
4. Luis V. Gutierrez
5. Rod R. Blagojevich
6. Henry J. Hyde
7. Danny K. Davis
8. Philip M. Crane
9. Janice D. Schakowsky
10. John Edward Porter
11. Jerry Weller
12. Jerry F. Costello
13. Judy Biggert
14. J. Dennis Hastert
15. Thomas W. Ewing
16. Donald A. Manzullo
17. Lane Evans
18. Ray LaHood
19. David D. Phelps
20. John Shimkus

INDIANA

1. Peter J. Visclosky
2. David M. McIntosh
3. Tim Roemer
4. Mark E. Souder
5. Stephen E. Buyer
6. Dan Burton
7. Edward A. Pease
8. John N. Hostettler
9. Baron P. Hill
10. Julia Carson

IOWA

1. James A. Leach
2. Jim Nussle
3. Leonard L. Boswell
4. Greg Ganske
5. Tom Latham

KANSAS

1. Jerry Moran
2. Jim Ryun
3. Dennis Moore
4. Todd Tiahrt

KENTUCKY

1. Ed Whitfield
2. Ron Lewis
3. Anne M. Northup
4. Ken Lucas
5. Harold Rogers
6. Ernest L. Fletcher

LOUISIANA

1. Bob Livingston
2. William J. Jefferson
3. W. J. (Billy) Tauzin
4. Jim McCrery
5. John Cooksey
6. Richard H. Baker
7. Christopher John

MAINE

1. Thomas H. Allen
2. John Elias Baldacci

MARYLAND

1. Wayne T. Gilchrest
2. Robert L. Ehrlich, Jr.
3. Benjamin L. Cardin
4. Albert Russell Wynn
5. Steny H. Hoyer
6. Roscoe G. Bartlett
7. Elijah E. Cummings
8. Constance A. Morella

MASSACHUSETTS

1. John W. Olver
2. Richard E. Neal
3. James P. McGovern
4. Barney Frank
5. Martin T. Meehan
6. John F. Tierney
7. Edward J. Markey
8. Michael E. Capuano
9. John Joseph Moakley
10. William D. Delahunt

MICHIGAN

1. Bart Stupak
2. Peter Hoekstra
3. Vernon J. Ehlers
4. Dave Camp
5. James A. Barcia
6. Fred Upton
7. Nick Smith
8. Debbie Stabenow
9. Dale E. Kildee
10. David E. Bonior
11. Joe Knollenberg
12. Sander M. Levin
13. Lynn N. Rivers
14. John Conyers, Jr.
15. Carolyn C. Kilpatrick
16. John D. Dingell

MINNESOTA

1. Gil Gutknecht
2. David Minge
3. Jim Ramstad
4. Bruce F. Vento
5. Martin Olav Sabo
6. Bill Luther
7. Collin C. Peterson
8. James L. Oberstar

MISSISSIPPI

1. Roger F. Wicker
2. Bennie G. Thompson
3. Charles W. 'Chip' Pickering
4. Ronnie Shows
5. Gene Taylor

MISSOURI

1. William (Bill) Clay
2. James M. Talent
3. Richard A. Gephardt
4. Ike Skelton
5. Karen McCarthy
6. Pat Danner
7. Roy Blunt
8. Jo Ann Emerson
9. Kenny C. Hulshof

MONTANA, At Large, Rick Hill

NEBRASKA

1. Doug Bereuter
2. Lee Terry
3. Bill Barrett

NEVADA

1. Shelley Berkley
2. Jim Gibbons

NEW HAMPSHIRE

1. John E. Sununu
2. Charles F. Bass

NEW JERSEY

1. Robert E. Andrews
2. Frank A. LoBiondo
3. Jim Saxton
4. Christopher H. Smith
5. Marge Roukema
6. Frank Pallone, Jr.
7. Bob Franks
8. Bill Pascrell, Jr.
9. Steven R. Rothman
10. Donald M. Payne
11. Rodney P. Frelinghuysen
12. Rush D. Holt
13. Robert Menendez

NEW MEXICO

1. Heather Wilson
2. Joe Skeen
3. Tom Udall

NEW YORK

1. Michael P. Forbes
2. Rick Lazio
3. Peter T. King
4. Carolyn McCarthy
5. Gary L. Ackerman
6. Gregory W. Meeks
7. Joseph Crowley
8. Jerrold Nadler
9. Anthony D. Weiner
10. Edolphus Towns
11. Major R. Owens
12. Nydia M. Velázquez
13. Vito Fossella
14. Carolyn B. Maloney
15. Charles B. Rangel
16. José E. Serrano
17. Eliot L. Engel
18. Nita M. Lowey
19. Sue W. Kelly
20. Benjamin A. Gilman
21. Michael R. McNulty
22. John E. Sweeney
23. Sherwood L. Boehlert
24. John M. McHugh
25. James T. Walsh
26. Maurice D. Hinchey
27. Thomas M. Reynolds
28. Louise McIntosh Slaughter
29. John J. LaFalce
30. Jack Quinn
31. Amo Houghton

NORTH CAROLINA

1. Eva M. Clayton
2. Bob Etheridge
3. Walter B. Jones
4. David E. Price
5. Richard Burr
6. Howard Coble
7. Mike McIntyre
8. Robin Hayes
9. Sue Wilkins Myrick
10. Cass Ballenger
11. Charles H. Taylor
12. Melvin L. Watt

NORTH DAKOTA, At Large, Earl Pomeroy

OHIO

1. Steve Chabot
2. Rob Portman
3. Tony P. Hall
4. Michael G. Oxley
5. Paul E. Gillmor
6. Ted Strickland
7. David L. Hobson
8. John A. Boehner
9. Marcy Kaptur
10. Dennis J. Kucinich
11. Stephanie Tubbs Jones
12. John R. Kasich
13. Sherrod Brown
14. Thomas C. Sawyer
15. Deborah Pryce
16. Ralph Regula
17. James A. Traficant, Jr.
18. Robert W. Ney
19. Steven C. LaTourette

OKLAHOMA

1. Steve Largent
2. Tom A. Coburn
3. Wes Watkins
4. J. C. Watts, Jr.
5. Ernest J. Istook, Jr.
6. Frank D. Lucas

OREGON

1. David Wu
2. Greg Walden
3. Earl Blumenauer
4. Peter A. DeFazio
5. Darlene Hooley

PENNSYLVANIA

1. Robert A. Brady
2. Chaka Fattah
3. Robert A. Borski
4. Ron Klink
5. John E. Peterson
6. Tim Holden
7. Curt Weldon
8. James C. Greenwood
9. Bud Shuster
10. Don Sherwood
11. Paul E. Kanjorski
12. John P. Murtha
13. Joseph M. Hoeffel
14. William J. Coyne
15. Patrick J. Toomey
16. Joseph R. Pitts
17. George W. Gekas
18. Michael F. Doyle
19. William F. Goodling
20. Frank Mascara
21. Phil English

RHODE ISLAND

1. Patrick J. Kennedy
2. Robert A. Weygand

SOUTH CAROLINA

1. Marshall 'Mark' Sanford
2. Floyd Spence
3. Lindsey O. Graham
4. Jim DeMint
5. John M. Spratt, Jr.
6. James E. Clyburn

SOUTH DAKOTA, At Large, John R. Thune

TENNESSEE

1. William L. Jenkins
2. John J. Duncan, Jr.
3. Zach Wamp
4. Van Hilleary
5. Bob Clement
6. Bart Gordon
7. Ed Bryant
8. John S. Tanner
9. Harold E. Ford, Jr.

TEXAS

1. Max Sandlin
2. Jim Turner
3. Sam Johnson
4. Ralph M. Hall
5. Pete Sessions
6. Joe Barton
7. Bill Archer
8. Kevin Brady
9. Nick Lampson
10. Lloyd Doggett
11. Chet Edwards
12. Kay Granger
13. Mac Thornberry
14. Ron Paul
15. Rubéon Hinojosa
16. Silvestre Reyes
17. Charles W. Stenholm
18. Sheila Jackson-Lee
19. Larry Combest
20. Charles A. Gonzalez
21. Lamar S. Smith
22. Tom DeLay
23. Henry Bonilla
24. Martin Frost
25. Ken Bentsen
26. Richard K. Armey
27. Solomon P. Ortiz
28. Ciro D. Rodriguez
29. Gene Green
30. Eddie Bernice Johnson

UTAH

1. James V. Hansen
2. Merrill Cook
3. Chris Cannon

VERMONT, At Large, Bernard Sanders

VIRGINIA

1. Herbert H. Bateman
2. Owen B. Pickett
3. Robert C. Scott
4. Norman Sisisky
5. Virgil H. Goode, Jr.
6. Bob Goodlatte
7. Tom Bliley
8. James P. Moran
9. Rick Boucher
10. Frank R. Wolf
11. Thomas M. Davis

WASHINGTON

1. Jay Inslee
2. Jack Metcalf
3. Brian Baird
4. Doc Hastings
5. George R. Nethercutt, Jr.
6. Norman D. Dicks
7. Jim McDermott
8. Jennifer Dunn
9. Adam Smith

WEST VIRGINIA

1. Alan B. Mollohan
2. Robert E. Wise, Jr.
3. Nick J. Rahall II

WISCONSIN

1. Paul Ryan
2. Tammy Baldwin
3. Ron Kind
4. Gerald D. Kleczka
5. Thomas M. Barrett
6. Thomas E. Petri
7. David R. Obey
8. Mark Green
9. F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr.

WYOMING, At Large, Barbara Cubin

PUERTO RICO, At Large, Carlos A. Romero-Barceló

AMERICAN SAMOA, At Large, Eni F.H. Faleomavaega

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, At Large, Eleanor Holmes Norton

GUAM, At Large, Robert A. Underwood

VIRGIN ISLANDS, At Large, Donna MC Christensen

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1282. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Force Management Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department of Defense Education Activity (DoDEA) Accountability Report and the Accountability Profiles for the Department of Defense Dependents Schools, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 924; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1283. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communication Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (West Tisbury, Massachusetts) [MM Docket No. 98–235; RM–9379] received March 23, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1284. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Long Beach and Shallotte, North Carolina) [MM Docket No. 98–149; RM–9331] received March 19, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1285. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Refugio, Texas) [MM Docket No. 98–165; RM–9322] received March 23, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1286. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule—Implementation of Torture Convention In Extradition Cases [Public Notice 2991] received February 23, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

1287. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee For Purchase From People Who Are Blind Or Severly Disabled, transmitting the Committee's final rule—Additions—received March 19, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1288. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the revised performance goals and corporate management strategies for the Department of Transportation's fiscal year (FY) 1999 Performance Plan; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1289. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Groundfish by Vessels Using Non-pelagic Trawl Gear in the Red King Crab Savings Subarea [Docket No. 981222313–8320–02; I.D. 021299B] received March 15, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1290. A letter from the Senior Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Disclosure of code-sharing arrangements and long-term wet leases [Docket Nos. 49702 and 48710] (RIN: 2105–AC10) received March 15, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1291. A letter from the Chief, Regs and Admin Law, USCG, DOT, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Regulated Navigation Area: Navigable Waters within the First Coast Guard District [CGD01–98–151] (RIN: 2115–AE84) received March 15, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1292. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; AlliedSignal Avionics, Inc. Models GNS-Xls and GNS-X1 Flight Management Systems [Docket No. 97–CE–07–AD; Amendment 39–11064; AD 97–05–03 R1] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 15, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1293. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model AS 332C,L, and L1 and L2 Helicopters [Docket No. 98–SW–01–AD; Amendment 39–11068; AD 99–06–04] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 15, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1294. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Fairchild Aircraft, Inc. SA226 and SA227 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98–CE–65–AD; Amendment 39–11066; AD 99–06–02] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 15, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1295. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; The New Piper Aircraft, Inc. Models PA–31, PA–31–300, PA–31–325, PA–31–350, and PA–31P–350 Airplanes [Docket No. 97–CE–152–AD; Amendment 39–11065; AD 99–06–01] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 15, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1296. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model AS–365N, N1, and N2 Helicopters [Docket No. 97–SW–64–AD; Amendment 39–11067; AD 99–06–03] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 15, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1297. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Fort Dodge, IA [Airspace Docket No. 98–ACE–61] received March 15, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1298. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Columbus, NE [Airspace Docket No. 98–ACE–62] received March 15, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1299. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the annual report on the Federal government's use of voluntary consensus standards, pursuant to Public Law 104–113, section 12(d)(3) (110 Stat. 783); to the Committee on Science.

1300. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Trade or Business Expenses [Revenue Ruling 99–14] received March 15, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1301. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Weighted Average Interest Rate Update [Notice 99–15] received March 23, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. DELAY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. DIXON, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. ROTHman, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. SALMON, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. HULSHOF, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. WEINER, Mr. BAKER, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. HAYES, Mr. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. ROGAN):

H.R. 1281. A bill to allow media coverage of court proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin:

H.R. 1282. A bill to amend title 11, United States Code, to limit the value of certain real and personal property that an individual debtor may elect to exempt under State or local law; to make nondischargeable consumer debts for luxury goods and services acquired in the 90-day period ending on the date a case is commenced under such title; and to permit parties in interest to request the dismissal of cases under chapter 7 of such title; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE (for himself, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. DELAY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. WELLER, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma):

H.R. 1283. A bill to establish legal standards and procedures for the fair, prompt, inexpensive, and efficient resolution of personal injury claims arising out of asbestos exposure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. POMBO, Mr. SCHAFFER, and Mr. RADANOVICH):

H.R. 1284. A bill to provide for protection of the Minnesota Valley National Wildlife Refuge and endangered species and other protected species of fish and wildlife that inhabit or use that refuge, to ensure that scarce wildlife refuge land in and around the Minneapolis, Minnesota, metropolitan area is not subjected to physical or auditory impairment, and to ensure that the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 is adequately implemented; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FROST, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. SANDLIN):

H.R. 1285. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, Public Health Service Act, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans provide coverage of cancer screening; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. EVANS (for himself, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Ms. CARSON, Mr. REYES, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. OLVER, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. KLECZKA, and Mr. FROST):

H.R. 1286. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the list of diseases presumed to be service connected with respect to radiation-exposed veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WELLER (for himself, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. QUINN, Mr. LAHOOD, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. METCALF):

H.R. 1287. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to grant relief to participants in multiemployer plans from certain section 415 limits on retirement plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINCHEY (for himself, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BISHOP, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. OLVER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. KIND, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. CLYBURN):

H.R. 1288. A bill to require Medicare providers to disclose publicly staffing and performance in order to promote improved consumer information and choice, to protect employees of Medicare providers who report concerns about the safety and quality of services provided by Medicare providers or who report violations of Federal or State law by those providers, and to require review of the impact on public health and safety of proposed mergers and acquisitions of Medicare providers; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H.R. 1289. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to waive recoupment of the Federal government Medicaid share of tobacco-related State settlements under certain conditions; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. BAKER, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. TAUZIN, and Mr. ARMEY):

H.R. 1290. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act relating to wetlands mitigation banking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. EWING, Mr. POMBO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. WELLER, Mr. MICA, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. REGULA, Mr. WOLF, Mr. GOODE, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. STEARNS, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BAKER, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. LINDER, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. OSE, Mr. CAMP, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. BARCIA, and Mr. SCARBOROUGH):

H.R. 1291. A bill to prohibit the imposition of access charges on Internet service providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WELLER (for himself, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. HAYWORTH):

H.R. 1292. A bill to provide that no Federal income tax shall be imposed on amounts received by Holocaust victims or their heirs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAIRD (for himself, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. EVANS, Ms. LEE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. METCALF, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. WISE):

H.R. 1293. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to provide equitable treatment with respect to State and local income taxes for certain individuals who perform duties on vessels; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAKER (for himself, Mr. MCCRERY, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 1294. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the period for filing for a credit or refund of individual income taxes from 3 to 7 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARR of Georgia:

H.R. 1295. A bill to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to provide for the explusion from school and termination of educational services with respect to a child with a disability who carries a weapon to school or to a school function; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

H.R. 1296. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish an outpatient clinic in the Seventh Congressional District of Georgia; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H.R. 1297. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to reduce losses caused by repetitive flooding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

H.R. 1298. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to permit public schools and certain other entities to determine presumptive eligibility for children under the Medicaid Program; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BERRY (for himself and Mrs. EMERSON):

H.R. 1299. A bill to provide a safety net for farmers through reform of the marketing loan program under the Agricultural Market Transition Act, expansion of land enrollment opportunities under the conservation reserve program, and maintaining opportunities for foreign trade in United States agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOEHLERT (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. HORN, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. QUINN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. BASS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BERRY, Mr. PORTER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. WALSH, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. LEACH, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. GOSS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. KING, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. THUNE, Ms. DANNER, Mr. COOK, and Mr. MCHUGH):

H.R. 1300. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to promote brownfields redevelopment, to reauthorize and reform the Superfund program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mrs. EMERSON, Ms. DANNER, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. TALENT, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. SKELTON):

H.R. 1301. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to prohibit the listing of liquefied petroleum gas under section 112(r) of that Act; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BOEHNER (for himself and Mr. ANDREWS):

H.R. 1302. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exempt from the minimum wage recordkeeping and overtime compensation requirements certain specialized employees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina):

H.R. 1303. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for dry cleaning equipment which uses reduced amounts of hazardous substances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. BAKER, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HORN, Mr. FROST, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. PAUL, Mr. COBURN, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. KLINK):

H.R. 1304. A bill to ensure and foster continued patient safety and quality of care by making the antitrust laws apply to negotiations between groups of health care professionals and health plans and health insurance issuers in the same manner as such laws apply to collective bargaining by labor organizations under the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

H.R. 1305. A bill to prohibit funding to the International Monetary Fund (IMF) until debt owed to the United States by heavily indebted poor countries has been canceled; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 1306. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for an additional place of holding court for the Western Division of the Central Judicial District of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASTLE (for himself, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BOEHNER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. CARSON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. INSLEE, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. QUINN, Mr. REGULA, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. UPTON, Mrs. WILSON, and Mr. WISE):

H.R. 1307. A bill to provide for grants, a national clearinghouse, and a report to improve the quality and availability of after-school programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN (for herself and Mr. UNDERWOOD):

H.R. 1308. A bill to extend the supplemental security income benefits program to Guam and the United States Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 1309. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Energy to provide compensation and increased safety for on-site storage of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CRANE (for himself, Mr. COYNE, Mr. HERGER, and Mrs. THURMAN):

H.R. 1310. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow non-itemizers a deduction for a portion of their charitable contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRANE (for himself and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts):

H.R. 1311. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to waive the income inclusion on a distribution from an individual retirement account to the extent that the distribution is contributed for charitable purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. STARK, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. COYNE, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California):

H.R. 1312. A bill to impose a moratorium on increases in the rates charged for cable television service, to require the Federal Communications Commission to conduct an inquiry into the causes of such increases and the impediments to competition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself, Mr. STARK, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. FORD, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WYNN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Ms. BERKLEY):

H.R. 1313. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to restrict the use of physical and chemical restraints and seclusion in certain facilities receiving Medicare or Medicaid funds, to require recording and reporting of information on that use and on sentinel events occurring in those facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DICKS (for himself, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 1314. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a portion of the Columbia River as a recreational river, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. DREIER:

H.R. 1315. A bill to amend the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 to eliminate the fiscal year limitation on the cap on the percentage of community development block grant funds received by the City and County of Los Angeles, California, that may be used to provide public services and to provide that all communities in the County of Los Angeles receiving such block grant funds may use the same percentage of such amounts to provide public services as the City and County of Los Angeles; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. DREIER (for himself and Mr. JEFFERSON):

H.R. 1316. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce employer and employee Social Security taxes to the extent there is a Federal budget surplus; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DUNN (for herself, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. COLLINS, and Mr. HERGER):

H.R. 1317. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable credit for taxpayers owning certain commercial power takeoff vehicles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DUNN (for herself, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 1318. A bill to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the products of Kyrgyzstan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 1319. A bill to assure that innocent users and businesses gain access to solutions to the year 2000 problem-related failures through fostering an incentive to settle year 2000 lawsuits that may disrupt significant sectors of the American economy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1320. A bill to regulate interstate commerce by electronic means by permitting and encouraging the continued expansion of electronic commerce through the operation of free market forces, and other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 1321. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the holding period for long-term capital gain treatment to 6 months; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLEGLY (for himself, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. FROST, Mr. SHOWS, and Mr. WEYGAND):

H.R. 1322. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the limits on the amount of nondeductible contributions to individual retirement plans and to adjust the amount of deductible contributions to individual retirement accounts for inflation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. FROST, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. BALDACCI, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. HORN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. FORD, Ms. CARSON, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. NORTON, Ms. RIVERS, Mrs. EMERSON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. WYNN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. WILSON, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. HULSHOF, and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 1323. A bill to promote research to identify and evaluate the health effects of silicone breast implants, and to ensure that women and their doctors receive accurate information about such implants; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HALL of Ohio (for himself and Mrs. EMERSON):

H.R. 1324. A bill to amend the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983 to authorize appropriations to purchase and to make available to emergency feeding organizations additional commodities for distribution to needy persons; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HALL of Ohio (for himself and Mr. HOUGHTON):

H.R. 1325. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the amount of the charitable deduction allowable for contributions of food inventory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEFLEY (for himself, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. HILL of Indiana):

H.R. 1326. A bill to continue and expand the program to provide assistance to separated and retired members of the Armed Forces to obtain certification and employment as teachers, to transfer the jurisdiction over the program to the Secretary of Education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon:

H.R. 1327. A bill to designate the United States Postal Service building located at 34480 Highway 101 South in Cloverdale, Oregon, as the ''Maurine B. Neuberger United States Post Office''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. HOUGHTON (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. WELLER, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. FOLEY, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. SHOWS, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. CRANE, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. CAMP, Mr. METCALF, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. KLECZKA):

H.R. 1328. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the research credit for expenses attributable to certain collaborative research consortia; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself and Mrs. BONO):

H.R. 1329. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that tips received for certain services shall not be subject to income or employment taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 1330. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to increase the mandatory minimum penalties provided for possessing, brandishing, or discharging a firearm during and in relation to a crime of violence or drug trafficking crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUCINICH (for himself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FROST, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H.R. 1331. A bill to promote youth entrepreneurship education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LAFALCE (for himself, Mr. VENTO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. HINCHEY):

H.R. 1332. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to expand protections for consumers by adjusting statutory exemptions and civil penalties to reflect inflation, to eliminate the Rule of 78s accounting for interest rebates in consumer credit transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. LAFALCE (for himself, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. BENTSEN, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. WEYGAND, Ms. LEE, Mr. MOORE, Mr. FROST, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. NADLER, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SISISKY, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. GEJDENSON, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, and Mr. DEUTSCH):

H.R. 1333. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide assistance to first-time homebuyers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAHOOD (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington):

H.R. 1334. A bill to provide for the enhanced implementation of the amendments made to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act by the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LAMPSON (for himself, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. STARK, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. FROST, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. VENTO, Mr. SHOWS, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE):

H.R. 1335. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, the Public Health Service Act, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend COBRA continuation coverage for surviving spouses; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Commerce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LAZIO (for himself, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. WALSH):

H.R. 1336. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide enhanced vouchers for rental assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 for low-income elderly and disabled tenants of housing projects with expiring contracts for Federal rental assistance to ensure that such tenants can afford to retain their previously assisted dwelling units, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky (for himself, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. WATKINS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. COBURN, Mr. KLECZKA, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. WYNN, Mr. SHOWS, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. MCCRERY, Ms. DUNN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mrs. THURMAN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. SHAW):

H.R. 1337. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the tax on vaccines to 25 cents per dose; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself and Mr. HOYER):

H.R. 1338. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Federal Election Commission for fiscal year 2000 and succeeding fiscal years; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 1339. A bill to require insured depository institutions, depository institution holding companies, and insured credit unions to protect the confidentiality of financial information obtained concerning their customers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

H.R. 1340. A bill to require brokers, dealers, investment companies, and investment advisers to protect the confidentiality of financial information obtained concerning their customers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MARTINEZ (for himself and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 1341. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to establish a national family caregiver support program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York:

H.R. 1342. A bill to protect children from firearms violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself and Mrs. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 1343. A bill to provide for the continued maintenance and preservation of Governors Island, New York, by the Administrator of General Services; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. NUSSLE (for himself, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. KIND, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. BERRY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. NEY, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. WALSH, Mr. FROST, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. RAHALL):

H.R. 1344. A bill to promote and improve access to health care services in rural areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. OBEY (for himself and Mr. KLECZKA):

H.R. 1345. A bill to eliminate the mandate that States require people to provide their Social Security numbers on applications for recreational licenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 1346. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to safeguard public health and provide to consumers food that is safe, unadulterated, and honestly presented; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. PICKERING (for himself and Mr. MORAN of Kansas):

H.R. 1347. A bill to provide for a Medicare subvention demonstration project for veterans, to improve the Department of Defense TRICARE program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Commerce, Armed Services, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RYUN of Kansas (for himself and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi):

H.R. 1348. A bill to establish a moratorium on the Foreign Visitors Program at the Department of Energy nuclear laboratories and to require the establishment of a counterintelligence program at each of those laboratories; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SALMON (for himself, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. COBURN, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. COOK, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. FOLEY, and Mr. CASTLE):

H.R. 1349. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to combat the over-utilization of prison health care services and control rising prisoner health care costs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SANCHEZ (for herself, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mrs. MORELLA, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLVER, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. LEE, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Ms. WATERS, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BALDACCI, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FROST, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. CARSON, Mr. ROTHman, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE):

H.R. 1350. A bill to restore freedom of choice to women in the uniformed services serving outside the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCARBOROUGH:

H.R. 1351. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the estate and gift tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 1352. A bill to provide housing assistance to domestic violence victims; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. FROST, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. DELAY, and Mr. BONILLA):

H.R. 1353. A bill to authorize the conveyance of the Naval Weapons Industrial Reserve Plant No. 387 in Dallas, Texas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BOEHNER, and Mr. BEREUTER):

H.R. 1354. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage a strong community-based banking system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHAYS (for himself, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 1355. A bill to make available funds appropriated for the payment of United Nations arrearages; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 1356. A bill to end international sexual trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Banking and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SOUDER (for himself, Mr. FROST, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. FORBES, Mr. PAUL, Mr. WYNN, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, and Mr. GARY MILLER of California):

H.R. 1357. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the maximum amount which may be contributed annually to an individual retirement plan to $5,000 and to increase the maximum amount which may be contributed annually to an education individual retirement account to $2,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMAS (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HERGER, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 1358. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax credits for making energy efficiency improvements to existing homes and for constructing new energy efficient homes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 1359. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse to be constructed at 10 East Commerce Street in Youngstown, Ohio, as the ''Frank J. Battisti and Nathaniel R. Jones Federal Building and United States Courthouse''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WALSH (for himself, Mr. HOUGHTON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. FORBES):

H.R. 1360. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to provide for equitable duty treatment for certain wool used in making suits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BONIOR, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CLYBURN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 1361. A bill to bar the imposition of increased tariffs or other retaliatory measures against the products of the European Union in response to the banana regime of the European Union; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. WOOLSEY:

H.R. 1362. A bill to make satisfactory progress toward completion of high school or a college program a permissible work activity under the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Mrs. MORELLA, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. BERMAN):

H. Con. Res. 78. Concurrent resolution expressing the commitment of the Congress to continue the leadership of the United States in the United Nations by honoring the financial obligations of the United States to the United Nations; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. GRANGER (for herself and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD):

H. Con. Res. 79. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the regulatory burdens on home health agencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. RUSH, Mr. PORTER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. HORN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. BLAGOJEVICH):

H. Con. Res. 80. Concurrent resolution calling for a United States effort to end restrictions on the freedoms and human rights of the enclaved people in the occupied area of Cyprus; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HORN, Mr. LEACH, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mrs. KELLY, Mrs. BONO, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. SHOWS, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. STARK, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. FILNER, Mr. WISE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. FROST, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MATSUI, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ROEMER, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. LEE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LUTHER, Ms. CARSON, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. FOLEY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. RIVERS, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. WYNN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. DANNER, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DIXON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H. Res. 133. A resolution recognizing the significance to society of issues relating to mental illness and expressing full support for the White House Conference on Mental Health; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself, Mr. SAWYER, and Mr. LAHOOD):

H. Res. 134. A resolution supporting National Civility Week, Inc. in its efforts to restore civility, honesty, integrity, and respectful consideration in the United States; to the Committee on Government Reform.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 5: Ms. KILPATRICK and Mr. MICA.

H.R. 7: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. PITTS, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 8: Mr. BLUNT, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. WALSE, and Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 25: Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 39: Mr. GREENWOOD.

H.R. 44: Mr. BILBRAY and Mr. DICKS.

H.R. 49: Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 51: Mr. RUSH and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 53: Mr. PICKERING, Mr. WISE, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. POMBO, Mr. HERGER, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 58: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 65: Mr. DICKS and Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 82: Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 111: Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TOWNS, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 116: Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 119: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. WOLF, Mr. POMBO, Mr. BARCIA, and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 120: Mr. POMBO.

H.R. 122: Mr. POMBO.

H.R. 123: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. TALENT, Mr. COX, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. HORN, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. COBLE, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. WICKER, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. RILEY, Mr. REGULA, Mr. COBURN, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. POMBO, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. BAKER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. LINDER, Mr. DELAY, Mr. SPENCE, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. HERGER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. PORTER, Mr. NEY, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. SAXTON, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mrs. BONO, Mr. CRANE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KASICH, Mr. STUMP, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Ms. DANNER, Mr. SOUDER, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. GOODE, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. WAMP, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. PICKERING, and Mr. PACKARD.

H.R. 147: Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 148: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. LARSON, and Mr. CONDIT.

H.R. 152: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 165: Ms. PELOSI and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 170: Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 175: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 202: Mr. BAKER, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. PASTOR, and Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 237: Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. NUSSLE, and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

H.R. 261: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 262: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. NEY.

H.R. 274: Mr. HOLT and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 303: Mr. DICKS and Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 311: Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 325: Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 347: Mr. METCALF.

H.R. 351: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LAZIO, and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 352: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. POMBO, and Mr. CLEMENT.

H.R. 357: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 371: Mr. BERMAN and Mr. SCARBOROUGH.

H.R. 380: Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. REYNOLDS.

H.R. 383: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. KIND, Mr. KING, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. FROST, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 392: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 423: Mr. GARY MILLER of California and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 424: Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. FORD.

H.R. 425: Mr. NADLER, Ms. LOGREN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. LEE, Mr. KUCINICH, and Ms. CARSON.

H.R. 464: Mr. FORBES, Mr. GOODE, Mr. FORD, and Mr. BURR of North Carolina.

H.R. 488: Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 492: Mr. METCALF.

H.R. 516: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 528: Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 531: Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 538: Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 541: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 544: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 552: Mr. GOODLING, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 555: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 561: Ms. LEE, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

H.R. 566: Mr. KLINK and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 573: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MICA, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. LEACH, Mr. PORTER, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. OSE, Mr. TALENT, Mr. NEY, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. CALLAHAN and Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 576: Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 580: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 582: H.R. Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 586: Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 588: Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 597: Ms. CARSON, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H.R. 600: Mr. BILBRAY and Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 608: Mr. PICKERING and Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 629: Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. FARR of California, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 644: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 664: Ms. BALDWIN and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 682: Mr. PICKERING.

H.R. 691: Mr. CANADY of Florida.

H.R. 701: Mr. COLLINS, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. EWING, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, and Mr. CLYBURN.

H.R. 708: Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 710: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. COOK, Mr. HERGER, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. REYNOLDS, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 716: Mr. TANNER, Mr. LARSON, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MOORE, and Mr. BISHOP.

H.R. 721: Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. COOK, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GEJDENSGON, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. TANNER, and Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 728: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. WISE.

H.R. 738: Mr. COOK and Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 742: Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. FORBES, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. WU.

H.R. 746: Mr. DEUTSCH.

H.R. 749: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 750: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 760: Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. METCALF, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. FROST, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 772: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 773: Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. BISHOP, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 775: Mr. BRYANT, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. GOSS, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. SHADEGG, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. WAMP, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. KASICH, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. TANCREDO.

H.R. 783: Mr. ROTHMAN and Mr. KLINK.

H.R. 784: Mr. WOLF, Mr. MICA, Mr. GIBBONS, Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. BONO, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. FROST, and Mr. METCALF.

H.R. 785: Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. FROST, and Mr. SANDLIN.

H.R. 792: Mr. ROGAN, Mr. SALMON, Mr. PORTER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. STENHOLM, and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 793: Mr. HILLEARY.

H.R. 796: Mr. CARDIN.

H.R. 806: Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. FARR of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. DIXON, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 817: Mrs. EMERSON and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 828: Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 833: Mr. BOYD.

H.R. 835: Ms. PRICE of Ohio, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MINGE, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 837: Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 844: Mr. TERRY, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. SMITH of Michigan.

H.R. 845: Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 850: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. SHOWS.

H.R. 852: Mr. MOORE, Mr. COBURN, Mr. POMBO, and Mr. PHELPS.

H.R. 854: Mr. SHOWS, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. FROST, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 864: Mr. FORD, Mr. QUINN, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr.

BAIRD, Mr. VENTO, Mr. BERRY, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. GOODLING, and Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.

H.R. 872: Mr. SANDLIN, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 883: Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 884: Mr. EVANS, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Ms. DANNER, and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 899: Mr. LAZIO.

H.R. 904: Mr. CLYBURN and Mr. SPENCE.

H.R. 906: Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 909: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 927: Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 932: Mrs. CLAYTON and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 950: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. FARR of California, and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 957: Mr. MASCARA, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. MOORE, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. CANNON, Mr. GANSKE, and Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 959: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 961: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BONIOR, Mrs. THURMAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. SANCHEZ, and Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 984: Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. DREIER, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 989: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. WEYGAND.

H.R. 993: Mrs. KELLY.

H.R. 997: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 998: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 999: Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.R. 1000: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. QUINN, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1001: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1002: Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 1017: Mr. NUSSLE.

H.R. 1021: Mr. SHOWS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. FROST, and Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 1032: Mr. HILLEARY.

H.R. 1039: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut and Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 1043: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 1046: Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 1051: Mr. MASCARA, Mr. KLINK, and Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 1053: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 1054: Mr. MICA, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. LARGENT, and Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 1057: Mr. DOYLE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1062: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 1064: Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 1070: Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. COOK, and Mr. GIBBONS.

H.R. 1075: Mr. BOUCHER and Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 1076: Mr. BOUCHER and Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 1082: Mr. WALSH and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 1083: Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. RILEY, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1084: Mr. TALENT and Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 1085: Mr. SHOWS.

H.R. 1086: Mr. RUSH, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1091: Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. WELLER, and Mr. KING.

H.R. 1093: Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. WU, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. GORDON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. LAZIO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 1097: Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 1107: Mr. SHOWS, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1111: Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 1116: Mr. COMBEST, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, and Mr. COBURN.

H.R. 1118: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1123: Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 1129: Ms. PELOSI, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PAUL, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1130: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 1142: Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. SHOWS.

H.R. 1144: Mr. TURNER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1145: Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 1146: Mr. ADERHOLT and Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 1154: Mr. PICKERING, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 1159: Mr. GREENWOOD, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. CASTLE.

H.R. 1160: Mr. FROST and Mr. MASCARA.

H.R. 1172: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. COYNE, Mr. WELLER, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. TAUZIN, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. CASTLE.

H.R. 1177: Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 1180: Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. NUSSLE, and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 1187: Mr. FORBES, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. COX, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. KLINK, Mr. COOK, and Mr. DEUTSCH.

H.R. 1190: Mr. SISISKY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. REGULA, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. ROEMER, Ms. CARSON, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. HILL of Indiana, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. NEY.

H.R. 1193: Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. SPENCE, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 1203: Mrs. BONO, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 1206: Mr. RYUN of Kansas.

H.R. 1213: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 1214: Mr. FARR of California.

H.R. 1216: Mr. QUINN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. BALLENGER, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 1219: Mr. SCARBOROUGH.

H.R. 1222: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1233: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.

H.R. 1244: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. CAMP, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 1250: Mr. ORTIZ and Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 1259: Mr. GALLEGLY and Mrs. KELLY.

H.J. Res. 1: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.J. Res. 5: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.J. Res. 22: Ms. BERKLEY and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.J. Res. 25: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SNYDER, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. WALSH, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. CANADY of Florida, and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.J. Res. 31: Mr. SOUDER.

H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. PHELPS.

H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Ms. BALDWIN.

H. Con. Res. 22: Mr. GALLEGLY and Mr. WU.

H. Con. Res. 25: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.

H. Con. Res. 30: Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H. Con. Res. 31: Ms. BERKLEY.

H. Con. Res. 51: Mr. DAVIS of Florida and Mr. PORTER.

H. Con. Res. 54: Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LUTHER, and Mr. RAMSTAD.

H. Con. Res. 57: Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. CANADY of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 58: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HILL of Indiana, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mrs. THURMAN.

H. Con. Res. 59: Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. DOYLE.

H. Con. Res. 60: Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. KLINK, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. KLECZKA, and Ms. STABENOW.

H. Con. Res. 64: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FORBES, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H. Con. Res. 66: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. BATEMAN.

H. Con. Res. 75: Mr. OLVER and Mr. WAXMAN.

H. Con. Res. 77: Mr. MCKEON, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. FOLEY, MR. CAPUANO, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. DIXON.

H. Res. 15: Mr. BROWN of California.

H. Res. 19: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. METCALF, Mr. DIXON, Mr. HORN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mr. BATEMAN.

H. Res. 35: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mrs. SWEENEY, Mrs. PELOSI, Mrs. WU, Mrs. JEFFERSON, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. KIND, Mr. KLINK, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

H. Res. 41: Mr. COBLE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H. Res. 89: Mr. GOSS and Mr. HOEFFEL.

H. Res. 106: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TAUZIN, and Mrs. FOWLER.

H. Res. 109: Mr. SHOWS, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. KASICH, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. GOODE, Mr. BUYER, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. TAUZIN, and Mr. COSTELLO.

H. Res. 115: Mr. KING, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FLINK, and Mr. BROWN of California.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 25, 1999 No. 48

Senate

The Senate met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Gracious Father, thank You for this time of prayer when our minds and hearts can be enlarged to receive Your Spirit. You are the answer to our deepest need. More than any secondary gift You give, we long for the primary gift of Yourself, offered in profound love and acceptance. We have learned that when we abide in Your presence and are receptive to Your guidance, You inspire our minds with insight and wisdom, our hearts with resiliency and courage, and our bodies with vigor and vitality.

In the quiet of this moment, we commit all our worries to You. We entrust to You our concerns over the people in our lives. Our desire is to give ourselves to the work of this day with freedom and joy. Especially give the Senators strength when they are weary, fresh vision when their wells run dry, and indefatigable hope when others become discouraged. In the name of our Lord. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the distinguished President pro tempore.

On behalf of our distinguished majority leader, I have been asked to make the following announcement. This morning the Senate will immediately resume consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 20. There are now 10 hours remaining for consideration of the bill. As announced last night, there will be no rollcall votes this morning prior to 11:00 a.m. However, Members should expect rollcall votes throughout the remainder of today's session as the Senate attempts to complete action on the budget bill.

All Members will be notified of the voting schedule today as it becomes available. Also, the leader has announced that if the Senate completes action on the budget resolution today, there will be no rollcall votes during Friday's session.

Finally, all Senators are reminded that pursuant to a unanimous consent agreement reached yesterday, all first-degree amendments must be offered by 12 noon today.

I thank my colleagues for their attention.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COLLINS). Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. Con. Res. 20, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 20) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 2000 through 2009.

The Senate resumed consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Pending:

Specter/Harkin amendment No. 157, to provide for funding of biomedical research at the National Institutes of Health.

Craig amendment No. 146, to modify the pay-as-you-go requirement of the budget process to require that direct spending increases be offset only with direct spending decreases.

Dodd amendment No. 160, to increase the mandatory spending in the Child Care and Development Block Grant by $7.5 billion over five years, the amendment reduces the resolution's tax cut and leaves adequate room in the revenue instructions for targeted tax cuts that help families with the costs of caring for their children, and that such relief would assist all working families with employment related child care expenses, as well as families in which one parent stays home to care for an infant.

Voinovich amendment No. 161, to use on-budget surplus to repay the debt instead of tax cuts.

Reed amendment No. 162, to provide for certain Federal revenues, total new budget authority, and total budget outlays.

Crapo/Grams amendment No. 163, to create a reserve fund to lock in additional non-Social Security surplus in the outyears for tax relief and/or debt reduction.

Graham amendment No. 164, to express the sense of the Senate that funds recovered from any Federal tobacco-related litigation should be set-aside for the purpose of first strengthening the medicare trust fund and second to fund a medicare prescription drug benefit.

Graham amendment No. 165, to express the sense of the Senate that the Congress and the President should offset inappropriate emergency funding from fiscal year 1999 in fiscal year 1999.

Lautenberg amendment No. 166, to express the sense of the Senate on saving Social Security and Medicare, reducing the public debt, and targeting tax relief to middle-income working families.

Lautenberg (for Schumer) amendment No. 167, to express the sense of the Senate that the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) Program should be reauthorized in order to provide continued Federal funding for the hiring, deployment, and retention of community law enforcement officers.

Lautenberg (for Feinstein) amendment No. 168, to express the sense of the Senate regarding school construction grants, and reducing school sizes and class sizes.

Lautenberg (for Feinstein) amendment No. 169, to express the sense of the Senate on the social promotion of elementary and secondary school students.

Lautenberg (for Reid) amendment No. 170, to express the sense of the Senate regarding social security ''notch babies'', those individuals born between the years 1917 and 1926.

Lautenberg (for Boxer) amendment No. 171, to ensure that the President's after school initiative is fully funded for fiscal year 2000.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

Lautenberg (for Murray) amendment No. 172, to fully fund the Class Size Initiative, the amendment reduces the resolution's tax cut by ten billion dollars, leaving adequate room in the revenue reconciliation instructions for targeted tax cuts that help those in need and tax breaks for communities to modernize and rebuild crumbling schools.

Lautenberg (for Murray) amendment No. 173, to express the sense of the Senate on women and Social Security reform.

Lautenberg (for Hollings) amendment No. 174, to continue Federal spending at the current services baseline levels and pay down the Federal debt.

Lautenberg (for Boxer) amendment No. 175, to ensure that the substantial majority of any income tax cuts go to middle and lower income taxpayers.

AMENDMENT NO. 157

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, parliamentary inquiry. Yesterday evening, the pending amendment which had been offered on behalf of Senator HARKIN and myself, as principal sponsors, on the National Institutes of Health, was debated shortly before 8 p.m., when voting started on four items. I believe the order was that we would resume consideration today with that pending amendment. My inquiry is, is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Senator has 5 minutes 20 seconds remaining under his control.

Mr. SPECTER. Parliamentary inquiry, Madam President. That seems not correct to me. I debated this issue for maybe 10 minutes at the most yesterday. Isn't there an hour allotted to each side on each amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the amount allocated to the amendment was reduced to a half-hour for each side for all first-degree amendments.

Mr. SPECTER. A half-hour for each side for all first-degree amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SPECTER. We did not use 24 minutes yesterday, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania spoke from 7:40 to 7:55. The Senator from Iowa spoke from 9:28 to 9:38.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I am advised by my staff that it would be appropriate to ask for some time off the bill. I ask for an additional 15 minutes off the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair.

Madam President, to briefly recapitulate, this amendment seeks to add $1.4 billion to the allocation for the National Institutes of Health. The NIH is the crown jewel of the Federal Government, having made really phenomenal advances on medical research in its drive to conquer so many of the maladies confronting mankind today.

Last year the budget for NIH was increased by $2 billion and, in the view of the Members, at least the chairman and the ranking, on the appropriations subcommittee having jurisdiction over the Department of Health and Human Services, $2 billion are absolutely necessary by way of increase of the existing budget for NIH, which now is $15.6 billion. There have been really remarkable advances in so many lines, with the research on stem cells having been completed, posing the opportunity for curing so many of the very, very serious ailments.

Testimony was given before the appropriations subcommittee that with diseases like Parkinson's, the cure may be in the range of 5 to 10 years. Great strides have been made on Alzheimer's, on cancer, and so many very other serious matters. We have an offset to cover the $1.4 billion by changing the rules on deductibility from the tobacco settlement.

Madam President, after consulting with the managers on the second slot, which had been reserved, it is my intention to offer a sense-of-the-Senate resolution on behalf of Senator THURMOND, Senator HATCH, Senator SESSIONS, Senator ASHCROFT, Senator SCHUMER, and myself which would increase the funding to the Department of Justice on the prosecution of gun cases from $5 to $50 million. We have seen examples, in Richmond, VA, in Philadelphia, PA, and in Boston, MA, where gun cases have been handled with great success. This follows the passage in 1984 of the armed career criminal bill which provided that any career criminal, someone with three or four major convictions, found in possession of a firearm, would receive a sentence up to life imprisonment.

In 1988, there was an experiment with a program called Trigger Lock in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania which produced extraordinary results, again, focusing on guns. It was a national model. More recently, in Richmond, VA, there has been experience with prosecutions as to guns and also a special program again in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, coordinated with New Jersey across the river, with $1.5 million going to the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and $800,000 to New Jersey—again, very remarkable results.

In this year's budget, the Department of Justice has allocated only $5 million to this important function. An important hearing was held on Monday of this week, presided over jointly by Senator THURMOND and Senator SESSIONS, on two Judiciary Committee subcommittees. And there the evidence was very forceful about the effectiveness of this gun program.

Madam President, I am not going to offer this amendment at this time, but I did want to utilize just a few moments, as I have, this morning to explain the purpose of the amendment. It will be offered in due course.

How much time remains, Madam President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 4 and a half minutes.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I wonder if I might make an inquiry of the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, if I might have the attention of Senator DOMENICI.

The second slot was reserved, Mr. Chairman, and has been used for a sense of the Senate on guns, as I have just explained. I wonder if it would be acceptable to the managers if the amendment was sent to the desk and offered at this time, or would it be preferable to wait until a later point to make the submission for the Record?

Mr. DOMENICI. I say to the Senator, if you are asking me, it would be preferable to wait, if you would.

Mr. SPECTER. I will be glad to accommodate the chairman's schedule.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair, and I also thank the Chair for the additional time. And I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ROTH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 176

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding the modernization and improvement of the medicare program)

Mr. ROTH. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the previous amendments will be set aside. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. ROTH] for himself, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. FRIST, Mr. KERREY, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. GRASSLEY and Mr. HATCH, proposes an amendment numbered 176.

Mr. ROTH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE MODERNIZATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) The health insurance coverage provided under the medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) is an integral part of the financial security for retired and disabled individuals, as such coverage protects those individuals against the financially ruinous costs of a major illness.

(2) Expenditures under the medicare program for hospital, physician, and other essential health care services that are provided to nearly 39,000,000 retired and disabled individuals will be $232,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2000.

(3) During the nearly 35 years since the medicare program was established, the Nation's health care delivery and financing system has undergone major transformations. However, the medicare program has not kept pace with such transformations.

(4) Former Congressional Budget Office Director Robert Reischauer has described the medicare program as it exists today as failing on the following 4 key dimensions (known as the ''Four I's''):

(A) The program is inefficient.

(B) The program is inequitable.

(C) The program is inadequate.

(D) The program is insolvent.

(5) The President's budget framework does not devote 15 percent of the budget surpluses to the medicare program. The federal budget process does not provide a mechanism for setting aside current surpluses for future obligations. As a result, the notion of saving 15 percent of the surplus for the medicare program cannot practically be carried out.

(6) The President's budget framework would transfer to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund more than $900,000,000,000 over 15 years in new IOUs that must be redeemed later by raising taxes on American workers, cutting benefits, or borrowing more from the public, and these new IOUs would increase the gross debt of the Federal Government by the amounts transferred.

(7) The Congressional Budget Office has stated that the transfers described in paragraph (6), which are strictly intragovernmental, have no effect on the unified budget surpluses or the on-budget surpluses and therefore have no effect on the debt held by the public.

(8) The President's budget framework does not provide access to, or financing for, prescription drugs.

(9) The Comptroller General of the United States has stated that the President's medicare proposal does not constitute reform of the program and ''is likely to create a public misperception that something meaningful is being done to reform the Medicare program''.

(10) The Balanced Budget Act of 1997 enacted changes to the medicare program which strengthen and extend the solvency of that program.

(11) The Congressional Budget Office has stated that without the changes made to the medicare program by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, the depletion of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund would now be imminent.

(12) The President's budget proposes to cut medicare program spending by $19,400,000,000 over 10 years, primarily through reductions in payments to providers under that program.

(13) While the recommendations by Senator John Breaux and Representative William Thomas received the bipartisan support of a majority of members on the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare, all of the President's appointees to that commission opposed the bipartisan reform plan.

(14) The Breaux-Thomas recommendations provide for new prescription drug coverage for the neediest beneficiaries within a plan that substantially improves the solvency of the medicare program without transferring new IOUs to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund that must be redeemed later by raising taxes, cutting benefits, or borrowing more from the public.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions contained in this budget resolution assume the following:

(1) This resolution does not adopt the President's proposals to reduce medicare program spending by $19,400,000,000 over 10 years, nor does this resolution adopt the President's proposal to spend $10,000,000,000 of medicare program funds on unrelated programs.

(2) Congress will not transfer to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund new IOUs that must be redeemed later by raising taxes on American workers, cutting benefits, or borrowing more from the public.

(3) Congress should work in a bipartisan fashion to extend the solvency of the medicare program and to ensure that benefits under that program will be available to beneficiaries in the future.

(4) The American public will be well and fairly served in this undertaking if the medicare program reform proposals are considered within a framework that is based on the following 5 key principles offered in testimony to the Senate Committee on Finance by the Comptroller General of the United States:

(A) Affordability.

(B) Equity.

(C) Adequacy.

(D) Feasibility.

(E) Public acceptance.

(5) The recommendations by Senator Breaux and Congressman Thomas provide for new prescription drug coverage for the neediest beneficiaries within a plan that substantially improves the solvency of the medicare program without transferring to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund new IOUs that must be redeemed later by raising taxes, cutting benefits, or borrowing more from the public.

(6) Congress should move expeditiously to consider the bipartisan recommendations of the Chairmen of the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare.

(7) Congress should continue to work with the President as he develops and presents his plan to fix the problems of the medicare program.

Mr. ROTH. Madam President, this amendment is sponsored by myself, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. FRIST, Mr. KERREY, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. HATCH.

Madam President, one of the most important bipartisan efforts we will undertake in the months ahead will be to address the challenges confronting the Medicare program—a program whose reach and importance in the lives of Americans cannot be overstated. In years past we have looked at the demographics, studied the statistics, and struggled with a sense of vulnerability concerning Medicare and its future.

Our population is aging. Health care costs seem to be growing exponentially. New and necessary technologies are becoming more expensive. And the financial base of the Medicare program provided by working Americans is shrinking in proportion to the number of seniors who depend on it. In less than 10 years, the population of Medicare beneficiaries will begin growing at a rate unseen in the program's history.

In the past, the Medicare population has grown by about 1 percent a year. Beginning very soon, that growth rate will begin to double. In just 10 years, the Medicare program will be required to serve a population that is 20 percent larger than it is today—that is, 46 million seniors—and at that point the baby-boom generation will have only just begun to retire.

Concerning the growth in the cost of health care services, Gene Steuerle of the Urban Institute recently testified before the Finance Committee that an average couple retiring now receives about $250,000 in lifetime Medicare benefits. Once the baby-boom generation is in full retirement, that amount will double. As a result, we will need to dedicate a larger and larger portion of the Nation's budget to pay for Medicare. Medicare is expected to consume an expanding share of the Nation's economy.

In 1998, Medicare spending was an estimated 2.6 percent of the gross domestic product. It is projected to grow to $518 billion—or 3.5 percent of GDP—in 2010. By 2030, Medicare is forecasted to grow to $2.2 trillion, representing 5.9 percent of the GDP.

It is good news that people are living longer, that they are spending almost a decade more in retirement than they were when the Medicare program began. These are demographics we have worked long and hard to bring to pass and we should celebrate them.

However, these were, and continue to be, serious challenges to the Medicare trust fund. The balance in the Part A Hospital Insurance Trust Fund is declining. The end-of-year balance began to drop in 1995, when payments from the trust fund began to exceed income to the trust fund. The Balanced Budget Act of 1997 helped to delay the bankruptcy of the trust fund for a few years, but it will still occur in our lifetimes if something is not done now.

As I said, each of these represents a serious concern, Madam President. But as of late, there appears to be a growing sense of optimism that we can take the favorable economic conditions our Nation is enjoying and, with bipartisan leadership, we can find long-term solutions to these pressing challenges.

Not only is there consensus on both sides of the aisle that something must be done, but there is growing confidence that something can be done. An important component of the answer, we have come to see, rests in the potential of a strong economy and with the willingness of the American people.

Toward meeting the challenges confronting Medicare, we must be guided by five specific criteria:

First, our efforts, if they are to succeed, must have bipartisan support, and they will require leadership from the White House. President Clinton must articulate his strategy for securing and strengthening the Medicare program.

Second, we must assure that the measures we adopt do not undermine the economic growth our Nation needs to continue providing jobs, opportunity, and security for Americans now and in the future.

Third, we must see that our policies are fair, that those who are being called upon to strengthen the system in the short term have the confidence of knowing that the system will be there for them in the long run.

Fourth, reform measures must be holistic in nature, taking into account the challenges we have to preserve and strengthen Social Security and to coordinate other programs that can serve the same constituency benefited by the Medicare and Social Security programs.

Fifth, our reform efforts must find acceptance with the American people.

They must take what has been a good program and make it better—make it better by making it financially sound and easily accessible to those who depend on it.

I am hopeful that the President will provide the genuine leadership required to address the future of Medicare. I encourage him and his administration to come work with us on the Finance Committee. We look forward to working with them. Certainly there are few issues as importnt as this one.

It demands our immediate attention, and the best effort we have to offer. Our work must go beyond the few items he included in his budget. It must take into account the long-term needs of the program, a careful analysis of benefit expansion, such as pharmaceutical drugs, and other concerns.

We must look at how we can best serve the Medicare program in a way that the reforms we offer will positively affect Medicaid. Too often lost in the debate over Medicare reform is the direct impact that Medicare changes will have on Medicaid. These two programs are most obviously linked through the 5.4 million low-income elderly and disabled individuals who are eligible for both. For this dually eligible population, Mediaid essentially serves as a source of wraparound benefits, providing among other important services nursing home care and prescription drugs.

In addition, nearly 600,000 low-income Medicare beneficiaries receive Mediaid financial support to meet Medicare's cost-sharing requirements.

Together, these six million individuals represent 16 percent of the Medicare population, but they consume 30 percent of all Medicare spending and 35 percent of all Medicaid spending. Medicare reform proposals that would impact these low-income populations must be very carefully undertaken to avoid simply shifting costs or responsibilties from one program to the other.

As we face the challenges of reforming the Medicare program, we must explore opportunities to substantially improve the health care experiences of these dually eligible populations. Currently, efforts to coordinate the services covered by the two programs are stymied by barriers to integration.

These barriers include the need for complicated waivers, arbitrary restrictions on mingling Medicare and Medicaid dollars, and difficulties in coordinating program oversight. A reform process undertaken by this Senate presents an opportunity to better meet the needs of a very vulnerable population.

Immediately after passage of this budget, I will begin, as chairman of the committee that has jurisdiction over the Medicare and Medicaid programs, the process of developing a bipartisan, consensus proposal for real Medicare reform. In developing this plan, the Finance Committee will conduct a series of hearings to take testimony from Medicare consumers, trustees, providers, and other experts who are intricately involved with this program and who are in a position to make worthy recommendations on how to proceed with improving the Medicare program.

We will indeed carefully study the recommendations of the bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare led by Senator BREAUX. Senator BREAUX and the other members of the bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare worked very hard and committed a great deal of time during the past year to try to find a solution to the impending Medicare crisis. They deserve our appreciation for their efforts. The discussions that they had has certainly furthered the Medicare debate and will be invaluable to us as we proceed with this important work. In addition to these measures, the committee will also take into consideration the many concerns and proposals of Senators—on both sides of the aisle—for improving this program which is so important for all of those we represent and are here to serve.

Our effort to lay a solid foundation for the future of Medicare will be a major undertaking. I believe that the budget resolution we are considering now provides the necessary framework. The budget committee has set aside on-budget surplus funds of up to $133 billion that—if needed—can be used for Medicare reform, including prescription drug benefits. Once we have achieved a bipartisan agreement on a comprehensive Medicare plan, we may indeed find it necessary to revisit this budgetary framework—and I expect that we would be able to obtain the necessary votes to proceed with such adjustments.

I strongly urge my colleagues to set aside attempts to legislate Medicare reform in the budget resolution. This is not the time or place for such a complex undertaking. Instead, I urge that we work together over the next few months on a Medicare reform plan. Such a plan should provide the nation's current and future seniors the assurance of health care that is comprehensive in benefits, superior in quality and financially sustainable. This is important to them. It is important to the future. And it is something that can and will be done.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, how much time has the Senator used?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 15 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Senator ROTH is in control of 15 more minutes, so if the Senator desires to yield time.

Mr. ROTH. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Madam President, I want to ask a couple of questions, if I may, because I'm struck by a paragraph on page 5, beginning with line 8:

> This resolution does not adopt the President's proposal to reduce medicare spending by $19,400,000,00 over 10 years, nor does the resolution adopt the President's proposal to spend $10,000,000,000 of medicare program. . .

That is followed by:

> Congress will not transfer to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund new IOUs that must be redeemed later by raising taxes on American workers, cutting benefits, or borrowing more from the public.

Would that preclude any use of surpluses if there were additional surpluses that arose?

How can you attribute a tax increase, or more borrowing, directly to this? This is out of the general revenues, and I am curious how the connection is made and whether or not a surplus would be able to be used.

Mr. ROTH. I say to my distinguished colleague that if there are surpluses in the budget, they could be used for Medicare.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. So we are specifically targeting raising taxes. Could this be competitive by using—and this is said with all due respect to the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee. If tax cuts are put into place, or attempted to be put into place, would the response be, then—and if we prohibit that by virtue of an agreement here and in the House, would that be considered raising taxes if we didn't cut taxes? Would that, in turn, be considered a tax increase?

Mr. ROTH. If I understand your question, no. If we fail to make a tax cut, I don't see that in and of itself being considered a tax increase.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. So that it is possible that there could be a competitive environment where tax cuts are competing with our capacity to continue to fund Medicare. You know, we have a debate about these transfers and whether IOUs are really significant. If we transferred $1 billion in cash to the Medicare trust fund—the insurance trust fund, and they were to go out into the public marketplace and buy $1 billion worth of insurance bonds, or what have you, those IOUs would have established their value—that cash, rather, I am sorry, would have established its value.

Why wouldn't an IOU from the Federal Government, which is where so many companies and individuals put their money because it is the full faith and credit of our Nation, thereby guaranteed by strength more there than anyplace else—why wouldn't those IOUs be considered the same as a cash transfer? It is true that they are going to come out of general revenues to be paid for, but it would also ensure that no pressure on the Appropriations Committee could say, all right, we are not going to be able to fund that, and then a later Congress says, OK, we are going to have to cut back on benefits by raising age or raising deductible, raising copays, or what have you. This at least ensures that that money will be there; those funds will be there off into the future; am I correct or not on that?

Mr. ROTH. Well, let me answer you in general, and then I will ask the distinguished chairman of the Budget

Committee. But it is our position that there are adequate funds both to provide reform of the Medicare program, to ensure its solvency in the long term, as well as to provide for a tax cut and, of course, protect and strengthen Social Security. As to the specifics, I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Madam President, I yield 4 minutes to Senator KENNEDY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I am interested in asking, is there anything in this proposal of the Senator from Delaware that will provide the additional funding for Medicare, as we are attempting to move forward, to try to bring about the reforms? These two members of the Budget Committee are here. I am interested in understanding, as we are trying, in the final hours of the budget debate, to make sure the budget is going to have the additional 15 percent so that we can put it on a sound financial basis. I am wondering if there is any indication in this proposal that the Senator from Delaware wants to make sure of the financial security of Medicare before tax cuts, before we are going to go ahead with tax cuts. Is there anything in this resolution I have just received—maybe the Senator from North Dakota or the Senator from New Jersey can show me anyplace in here where this resolution says, all right, let's move ahead with the reform of Medicare before we go ahead and provide these major tax cuts. Is there anything in this resolution that the ranking minority member can tell the membership?

That is really what I think has been the heart of the debate of the proposal of the Senator from North Dakota and others—that we are going to put in place a sound, solid solvency for the Medicare system before we go to tax cuts. And now that we have a new resolution, I am just wondering whether this resolution says we are going to defer the tax cuts, we are going to make sure of the financial stability of the Medicare system and move toward perhaps even a consideration of the Breaux proposal as we consider reforms in the future.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Madam President, I ask the Senator from North Dakota to oblige, or we will refer it to the author of it.

Mr. KENNEDY. Maybe you should ask the author of the proposal. I ask the author of the proposal whether there is any provision in this part that says we are going to defer tax cuts for wealthy individuals, across-the-board tax cuts that are mentioned in the report of the budget—that we are going to defer that until we get Medicare on a sound financial basis? Is there any reference to that in the proposal? Or if we accept this proposal, is it still the position that we are still going to go ahead and have the tax cuts now in the budget?

Mr. ROTH. In answer to my friend and colleague, I say there is no language in the budget resolution that sets these priorities. But as I said earlier, it is my intent, as chairman of the Finance Committee, which has jurisdiction over these matters, to begin hearings and to develop a consensus on Medicare when we return from the Easter recess. This will be a bipartisan effort. There is no way we can get anything done unless we are able to develop, as I said, a bipartisan consensus. It is my intent to move as expeditiously as possible upon our return.

Mr. KENNEDY. Just to clarify it further, then, it is the position of the Senator from Delaware to go ahead and pass a budget resolution that commits us on a course for significant tax cuts prior to the time that we are going to have the hearings in the Finance Committee to develop a bipartisan proposal on Medicare; that is his position? Or are you going to recommend that we defer the tax cuts until we have the kind of hearings the Senator has suggested and really shape a proposal to put Medicare on both a sound fiscal basis and also to deal with some of the inadequacies of Medicare, like the prescription drug issue?

Mr. ROTH. Well, as I indicated, it is the intent of the chairman to proceed expeditiously, upon our return, with hearings and developing a program on Medicare. As far as tax cuts are concerned, I don't intend to begin work on them probably until sometime early fall. But it is my intention to work immediately on Medicare.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Madam President, the Senator from Massachusetts asked the very question that I was trying to find out about. And that is that it has the appearance of another attempt to limit the development of a solvent Medicare program in deference to the possibility of across-the-board taxes. That is the sense, with all due expect, that I get out of this. I don't know whether the Senator from Massachusetts views it the same way. But it would be good if we could kind of straighten that out before a vote occurs on it.

Mr. KENNEDY. If I could just ask, because I see others on their feet, on page 2 of the proposal, at the bottom, line 22 says, ''The President's budget framework does not devote 15-percent budget surpluses to the Medicare Program.''

This has been the intention of the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from North Dakota. It is a goal I support—that we provide at 15 percent. The Senator's resolution says it does not devote the 15 percent. Would the Senator tell us whether he would support the 15-percent allocation? He has it in the resolution, saying that the Federal budget does not devote the 15 percent. Does the Senator want us to devote that 15 percent, or not?

Mr. ROTH. Madam President, let me just point out that as far as the so-called 15 percent is concerned, the Comptroller General said that the President's proposal does nothing to alter the imbalance between the program's tax receipts and benefits payments. It has been cash deficits since 1992, and remains a cash deficit even with the new Treasury securities. Thus, the President's proposal does provide additional claims on the Treasury, not additional cash to pay benefits.

Let me make it very clear, under this resolution we intend to do three things: To strengthen and preserve Social Security, to reform Medicare, and to provide a major tax cut for the working people of America.

Let me stress that this resolution has been carefully crafted by the chairman and others on the Budget Committee to do exactly that. That is our intent, and we shall follow through on the policies laid down in this resolution.

I think the distinguished Senator from Louisiana may care to comment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Who yields time to the Senator?

Mr. ROTH. I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ROTH. Madam President, before that, may I ask that Senator THOMPSON be added as a cosponsor? I did include Senator GRASSLEY and Senator HATCH.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BREAUX. Madam President, I support the Senator's sense-of-the-Senate resolution. I will start off by saying that sense-of-the-Senate resolutions are pretty senseless, because it really is not making law; it is just an expression of what people think. To that extent, it is very important.

Let me just start off by saying that if the debate on Medicare is whether we want a tax cut or whether we want to reform Medicare, we will never reform Medicare. Medicare has been here since 1965, and it has been a political football every year. Every year that we run out of money with Medicare, we fix it by using the SOS approach—same old, same old. Every year when there was a shortfall, we simply tried to reduce reimbursements to doctors and hospitals and said, ''Well, we fixed it because we gave them less money to treat 40 million Americans who need health care in this country.''

The President's budget this year again talks about approximately $20 billion in further cuts to the Medicare program. That is $20 billion less that is going to be available to provide medical benefits to 40 million seniors. That, I would suggest, is not reform. That, I would suggest, doesn't fix anything. That, I would suggest, just makes the problem greater and not less.

The reason I call into question the concept that a 15-percent transfer of the surplus in the form of IOUs to the

Medicare trust fund is not what it seems to be is that, in fact, it is not.

The GAO came to the Senate Finance Committee and they testified very specifically on this proposal. What they said, in bipartisan, unequivocal economic language that I think everyone can understand, is the following. They said this transfer ''. . . has no effect on the current and projected cash-flow deficits that have faced the [Medicare program] since 1992—deficits that taxpayers will continue to finance through higher taxes, lower spending elsewhere or lower pay downs of publicly-held debt than the baseline. Importantly, the President's proposal would not provide any new money to pay for medical services.''

So the concept of saying we are going to fix Medicare by taking 15 percent of the surplus and putting IOUs in the trust fund and that somehow we have fixed the problem is nonsensical. It does not make any sense economically. It is not good policy. It gives us a false sense of security that somehow we have solved Medicare by loading up the trust fund with IOUs. That is not reform. That is not saving the program. That is not giving the program one nickel more in money. It is merely giving the trust fund more IOUs. We are in effect transferring publicly held debt from one account and putting it in another account and saying we fixed the program.

I could not live with that, because I don't think it does anything. It doesn't help the program. It doesn't hurt the program, but it doesn't fix the program.

This resolution says in essence that we are going to have to work in a bipartisan fashion to look at real reform. Our National Bipartisan Commission worked on this for a year. We have a recommendation which will be submitted in the form of legislation. We will have hearings in the Senate Finance Committee. I would like them to report on exactly what we send over there. But if they don't, hopefully it will be something similar. Hopefully, it will be real reform. Hopefully, it will be something that we can quit arguing about—whether we want tax cuts, or whether we want to save Medicare.

The program needs more money. There is no question about that. But it desperately needs reform. The 1965 model runs like a 1965 car, and putting more gas in an old car, it is still an old car. And putting more IOUs in the Medicare trust fund doesn't make it a modern, efficient delivery system for health care in this country.

I think the resolution is a good resolution. It is offered in a bipartisan fashion. It is a sense of the Senate. Big deal. I don't think it will change public policy. But it is so important that it needs a discussion on how we solve this particular issue. It says that Congress should move expeditiously in a bipartisan fashion to reform the program. Yes; we should. It says that Congress should continue to work with the President as he develops and presents his plan to fix the problem with the Medicare program. Yes; he should.

We are not going to fix it. We are going to be looking for issues to beat each other over the head once again. That is the old way of doing it. That is old politics. And people are sick and tired of it on both sides of the political spectrum outside of Washington. Maybe in Washington we love to play political games. We beat them up, they beat us up, and nothing gets done. We end up arguing about failure: It is their fault we didn't fix it. No; it is your fault we didn't fix it. And absolutely nothing is ever fixed with that kind of a procedure.

How much better would it would be for us to gather and work together and fix it? And we can always argue the political argument about who fixed it: We fixed it. No; they fixed it. But at least we are arguing about success about fixing something instead of trying to argue about whose fault it is that nothing gets done on something as important as Medicare, and trying to figure out which wedge issue we are going to use this week and which wedge issue they are going to use next week. Is it not time that we kind of come together and say, ''Look, we have a big problem''?

Today, we spend more money in Medicare than we take in in revenues to pay for it. Today, not in 20 years. Today. If you use all of the revenues in the trust fund, plus the revenues coming in, we are totally insolvent in the year 2008. My fear is that in the year 2007 we are going to still be arguing about whether we want to fix Medicare or whether we want to have a tax cut. That is not the appropriate argument. That is not the discussion we should be engaged in. We can argue whether we need a tax cut, and how we should craft it, and who should benefit from it. That is a separate argument.

We should concentrate now on how to reform Medicare in a bipartisan fashion. I think this sense-of-the-Senate resolution suggests that.

It makes the point that the 15-percent surplus is nothing more than IOUs in the trust fund. It does not add a nickel to the trust fund. That is a correct statement, and that is why I support the resolution.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I yield myself 2 minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President and fellow Senators, we have before us a historic resolution, a sense-of-the-Senate resolution with historic and brave Senators on it. If we adopt this and follow it, we will save the Medicare program instead of arguing about it. The basic contention here, plain and simple, is that prominent Democrat Senators are joining with Republicans saying let's quit arguing; let's fix it.

That is the principal thrust of this resolution. I say to Senator BREAUX, Senator KERREY, the chairman of the Finance Committee, and Senator FRIST, you are to be commended and lauded, because I predict on this day we have started down a short path before the year ends of fixing Medicare for the seniors permanently. We do not have to sit around here and argue about IOUs that the President wants to transfer to a trust fund without dedicating any revenue to the trust fund.

How do you fix a trust fund by putting in IOUs when it is all based on revenues coming into the trust fund to pay the bills?

I join Senators—I am the fifth Member—as the Budget chairman, because I believe you are on the way, on the road to real success for our seniors.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CONRAD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

AMENDMENT NO. 176, AS MODIFIED

Mr. ROTH. Madam President, I send a modification to the desk. On page 4, line 15, subparagraph 13 will read:

The recommendations by Senator John Breaux and Representative William Thomas received the bipartisan support of a majority of members on the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare.

We delete the words with respect to the Presidential appointees.

Just let me say as a followthrough on the statement by the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, the Senator stated it exactly correct. We are on the road to real reform. We want to make sure that this Medicare program exists not only for the seniors today but indefinitely in the future. I pledge to the Senator that that is what my committee will do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the right to modify his amendment.

The amendment (No. 176), as modified, is as follows:

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE MODERNIZATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) The health insurance coverage provided under the medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) is an integral part of the financial security for retired and disabled individuals, as such coverage protects those individuals against the financially ruinous costs of a major illness.

(2) Expenditures under the medicare program for hospital, physician, and other essential health care services that are provided to nearly 39,000,000 retired and disabled individuals will be $232,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2000.

(3) During the nearly 35 years since the medicare program was established, the Nation's health care delivery and financing system has undergone major transformations.

However, the medicare program has not kept pace with such transformations.

(4) Former Congressional Budget Office Director Robert Reischauer has described the medicare program as it exists today as failing on the following 4 key dimensions (known as the ''Four I's''):

(A) The program is inefficient.

(B) The program is inequitable.

(C) The program is inadequate.

(D) The program is insolvent.

(5) The President's budget framework does not devote 15 percent of the budget surpluses to the medicare program. The federal budget process does not provide a mechanism for setting aside current surpluses for future obligations. As a result, the notion of saving 15 percent of the surplus for the medicare program cannot practically be carried out.

(6) The President's budget framework would transfer to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund more than $900,000,000,000 over 15 years in new IOUs that must be redeemed later by raising taxes on American workers, cutting benefits, or borrowing more from the public, and these new IOUs would increase the gross debt of the Federal Government by the amounts transferred.

(7) The Congressional Budget Office has stated that the transfers described in paragraph (6), which are strictly intragovernmental, have no effect on the unified budget surpluses or the on-budget surpluses and therefore have no effect on the debt held by the public.

(8) The President's budget framework does not provide access to, or financing for, prescription drugs.

(9) The Comptroller General of the United States has stated that the President's medicare proposal does not constitute reform of the program and ''is likely to create a public misperception that something meaningful is being done to reform the Medicare program''.

(10) The Balanced Budget Act of 1997 enacted changes to the medicare program which strengthen and extend the solvency of that program.

(11) The Congressional Budget Office has stated that without the changes made to the medicare program by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, the depletion of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund would now be imminent.

(12) The President's budget proposes to cut medicare program spending by $19,400,000,000 over 10 years, primarily through reductions in payments to providers under that program.

(13) The recommendations by Senator John Breaux and Representative William Thomas received the bipartisan support of a majority of members on the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare.

(14) The Breaux-Thomas recommendations provide for new prescription drug coverage for the neediest beneficiaries within a plan that substantially improves the solvency of the medicare program without transferring new IOUs to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund that must be redeemed later by raising taxes, cutting benefits, or borrowing more from the public.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions contained in this budget resolution assume the following:

(1) This resolution does not adopt the President's proposals to reduce medicare program spending by $19,400,000,000 over 10 years, nor does this resolution adopt the President's proposal to spend $10,000,000,000 of medicare program funds on unrelated programs.

(2) Congress will not transfer to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund new IOUs that must be redeemed later by raising taxes on American workers, cutting benefits, or borrowing more from the public.

(3) Congress should work in a bipartisan fashion to extend the solvency of the medicare program and to ensure that benefits under that program will be available to beneficiaries in the future.

(4) The American public will be well and fairly served in this undertaking if the medicare program reform proposals are considered within a framework that is based on the following 5 key principles offered in testimony to the Senate Committee on Finance by the Comptroller General of the United States:

(A) Affordability.

(B) Equity.

(C) Adequacy.

(D) Feasibility.

(E) Public acceptance.

(5) The recommendations by Senator Breaux and Congressman Thomas provide for new prescription drug coverage for the neediest beneficiaries within a plan that substantially improves the solvency of the medicare program without transferring to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund new IOUs that must be redeemed later by raising taxes, cutting benefits, or borrowing more from the public.

(6) Congress should move expeditiously to consider the bipartisan recommendations of the Chairmen of the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare.

(7) Congress should continue to work with the President as he develops and presents his plan to fix the problems of the medicare program.

Mr. ROTH. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. CONRAD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will the Senator yield for a UC?

Mr. CONRAD. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to seek the yeas and nays on an additional amendment that is pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask for the yeas and nays on amendment No. 161, the Voinovich amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. CONRAD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. As a member of the Budget Committee and a member of the Finance Committee and somebody who was worked and voted for Medicare reform in the Finance Committee as part of a group cochaired by Senator BREAUX along with Senator CHAFEE, I believe we must have reform of the Medicare program. There is no question about that. I applaud the efforts of Senator BREAUX. Nobody has worked harder over a longer period of time to try to get the job done.

As a part of the centrist coalition, I voted in the Finance Committee for a series of difficult steps to begin the process of reforming the Medicare program.

I think my record on the question of being willing to cast tough votes to reform Medicare is beyond question. But I must say, as I look at this amendment that has been offered by the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, I have real doubts about this. It looks to me to be a political statement as much as it is an interest in reforming Medicare. When I see in the resolution the suggestion that the President's budget framework does not devote 15 percent of the budget surplus to the Medicare program, I do not think that is a true statement. I have read the President's framework, and it says very clearly that of the surpluses over the next 15 years, 15 percent is dedicated to Medicare. He does it by making a transfer to the trust fund.

People get up and quote the Comptroller General all of the time around here, only they leave out something very important that he said. The Comptroller said in his statement before the Finance Committee that the President's proposal ''provides a grant of a new set of Treasury securities for the Medicare Hospital Insurance Program which would extend the life of the trust fund from 2008 to 2020.''

That is the testimony of the Comptroller General before the Senate Finance Committee. Others have stood in the Chamber and said that he denigrated the proposal. Well, he certainly did raise questions about it in certain ways, but he also made the very clear statement that the President's proposal does extend the solvency of the Medicare trust fund from 2008 to 2020.

Those who stand in this Chamber and tell our colleagues and the American people that the President's proposal does not do anything are not telling the truth. To just be selective in their quotations of the Comptroller General does a disservice to this body and a disservice to anybody else who is listening.

Let's be direct and honest. The President's proposal is to reserve 15 percent of the surpluses over the next 15 years for Medicare. That is a break in policy, without question. It is a change. We should debate the wisdom of that change. But to stand up here and say it makes no difference, that is not factual and it is not honest as far as I am concerned.

Mr. BREAUX. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CONRAD. I would like to complete the thought and then I will be happy to yield.

As I read this resolution, it is suggesting that it makes no sense to make any transfer from the general fund to the HI trust fund. I do not agree with that. I think that is flat wrong. You can question the policy. You can say, gee, we should not be doing that, but to suggest that in this resolution, to

adopt in this resolution that we are just going to be opposed to a transfer I think is a mistake. That has the cart before the horse.

As I go through this resolution, there are other things that trouble me. I, for one, value the work of the Medicare Commission. I value the work of Senator BREAUX, Mr. THOMAS, and the others who served there, but as I read this resolution it is suggesting that what they came up with in terms of a proposal is what we ought to adopt. I am not prepared to say that because they also proposed a dramatic change in policy. They proposed, instead of what we know now as the Medicare program, a system of vouchers. People would be able to go out in the marketplace and buy insurance, and they would get from the Federal Government, instead of the coverage provided by Medicare, a voucher for a certain amount of money to go out and purchase insurance.

That may be an excellent idea. I do not know. I think we are a long way from making a determination that that is the right course. We have not completed a hearing process in the Finance Committee on that question. As I read this resolution, it is fundamentally endorsing that approach.

Also included in the recommendation of the Commission is an increase in the age of eligibility. That may be necessary, but I do not think we ought to conclude that in the Chamber here today.

So, Madam President, I respect those who bring the amendment before us but I, for one, would not vote for it. I do not think saying, in effect, that we should not make a transfer from the general fund to strengthen Medicare is something we ought to be saying. In fact, I offered an amendment last night that said just the opposite, that we ought to, as part of a reform proposal, put more resources into the Medicare plan. I think it needs more resources.

I also believe it has to be reformed. I think we need both. I am certainly not going to vote for an amendment that suggests that what the President has proposed is wrong. I also think, as I indicated, that some of the statements here are just factually incorrect.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. ROTH. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BREAUX. Madam President, I do not necessarily disagree with everything the distinguished Senator from North Dakota has pointed out. It is important for everyone to understand that the suggestion of the administration of 15 percent of the surplus in the form of IOUs into the Medicare trust fund does not give the trust fund one nickel, one dime, one dollar more money. It only gives the trust fund IOUs in the form of Treasury securities on which, in the future, Medicare can go to the general fund and make a claim. That is all it does.

Basically, that is the same situation as we have today because it is an entitlement program. People are entitled to it. The question I have is, are we going to have no limit on how much of the general fund is going to be used to finance Medicare?

Madam President, 37 percent of the money today comes out of general revenues. It was supposed to start off as a payroll tax and that was how it was to be funded. Are we going to go to 40 percent without any concern? Are we going to go to 50 percent without any concern? How much of the general revenues are going to finance Medicare to the detriment of the national defense or anything else that we have as a nation?

I suggest to use this transfer of IOUs without making formal decisions and having serious debate about it is not good policy because it doesn't help Medicare at all. That is why it is important to understand it does not provide any new money to the Medicare program at all.

We should have that debate. We suggested a way of looking at it, but I think just saying 15 percent of the surplus solves the Medicare problem to the year 2030 is very, very erroneous. It is incorrect. We should not rely on that as a way of saving Medicare.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTS). Who yields time?

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I yield such time as the Senator from Massachusetts consumes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from North Dakota will respond to a question? I listened to my friend from Louisiana. He talked about the IOUs. I find it somewhat difficult to understand how the IOUs can be used for a tax cut of some, I guess, $778 billion but cannot be used for the Medicare trust system.

I have in my hand, from the Office of the Actuary of the Department of Health and Human Services in his submission to the Finance Committee—he is the chief actuary for HHS, and I will make this part of the RECORD—but it says, under this budget proposal, referring to the President's proposal, it would postpone the exhaustion of the trust fund for an estimated 12 years.

I guess we have Members of the Senate saying these are IOUs and you are not going to really do anything by getting that kind of IOU for the Medicare trust fund. Here we have the chief actuary for HHS saying exactly the opposite, that it will extend it to the year 2020. I fail to follow the logic, where you have the IOUs and they are going to be used by our majority, our Republican friends, for tax breaks for wealthy individuals. I wonder if he can help clarify this dichotomy for me?

I ask unanimous consent the letter dated January 27, 1999, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES,
Baltimore, MD, January 27, 1999.

From: Richard S. Foster, Office of the Actuary.

Subject: Estimated year of exhaustion for the HI Trust Fund under a proposal to augment HI financing with general fund transfers.

To: Nancy-Ann Min DeParle, administrator.

This memorandum responds to your request for the estimated year of exhaustion for the Hospital Insurance trust fund under a legislative proposal developed for the President's Fiscal Year 2000 Budget. At this time, we do not know the full specifics of this proposal. It is our understanding that the proposal would create a new transfer of revenues from the general fund of the U.S. Treasury to the HI trust fund for each year from 2000 through 2014. The transfer amount each year would be set equal to a specified percentage of the HI taxable payroll for the year.[1] The applicable percentages would be specified in the legislation and would equal 15 percent of the unified budget surpluses projected for the President's Fiscal Year 2000 Budget, expressed as a percentage of the projected HI taxable payrolls.

Under the proposal, the future transfers from the general fund would depend only the specified percentages of HI taxable payroll and would not be affected if actual future unified budget surpluses differed from the Fiscal Year 2000 Budget projections. We understand that, in contrast to the associated proposal for the Social Security program, there would be no change in current-law investment practices for the HI trust fund. Similarly, the estimates in this memorandum reflect Medicare's current benefit provisions as specified under present law.

We were provided with projected additional HI revenues under this proposal based on the intermediate set of assumptions from the 1998 Trustees Report, as estimated by the Office of Management and Budget and the Social Security Administration's Office of the Chief Actuary. These amounts are listed below (in billions):

CALENDAR YEAR

[Dollars in billions]

2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2000–2004	2000–2009	2000–2014
$17.6	$19.6	$27.2	$26.0	$29.5	$32.6	$40.0	$45.4	$50.0	$55.7	$60.9	$65.9	$70.2	$73.7	$75.5	$119.9	$343.8	$689.9

[1] "HI taxable payroll" is the total amount of all wages, salaries, and net income from self-employment that is subject to the HI payroll tax under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act (FICA) and the Self-Employment Contributions Act (SECA).

Based on the intermediate assumptions and the projected general fund transfers listed above (15% of surplus), we estimate that the assets of the HI trust fund would be depleted in calendar year 2020 under this proposal, as compared to 2008 under present law. Thus, this Budget proposal would postpone the year of exhaustion by an estimated 12 years.

This estimate is subject to change if our understanding of the proposal is incorrect. In addition, it is important to note that the financial operations of the HI trust fund will depend heavily on future economic, demographic, and health cost trends. For this reason, the estimated year of depletion under this proposal is very sensitive to the underlying assumptions. In particular, under adverse conditions such as those assumed by the Trustees in their ''high cost'' assumptions, asset depletion could occur significantly earlier than the intermediate estimate. Conversely, favorable trends would delay the year of exhaustion. The intermediate assumptions represent a reasonable basis for planning.

The estimated year of exhaustion is only one of a number of measures and tests used to evaluate the financial status of the HI trust fund. If you would like additional information on the estimated impact of this proposal, we would be happy to provide it.

RICHARD S. FOSTER, F.S.A.,
Chief Actuary.

Mr. CONRAD. The Senator from Massachusetts makes an interesting point. We have to be very careful in our use of language around here. When people talk about Government instruments as being IOUs, I suppose in a way that is true. But it probably leaves people with a misimpression. These are Government bonds, U.S. Government bonds. There is no more valued instrument in the world than a U.S. Government bond. I would love to have somebody give me Government bonds worth $700 billion. The suggestion that that has no value is an absurdity. It is an absurdity. They are backed by the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government. There has never, ever been a default on an obligation of the U.S. Government. So this kind of careless use of language I think misleads people.

Of course they have value. They have exactly the value that is on their face. These are bonds that have $700 billion worth of value, plus they earn interest. The fact is, this suggestion that it doesn't make any difference if you transfer these instruments, these bonds, to the trust fund is just wrong. They extend the solvency of the Medicare trust fund by 12 years.

Is that the only thing we should do? Certainly not. Senator BREAUX is exactly right. That is not the only thing we should do. Maybe it is not even the first thing we should do. But we have to decide on a budget resolution right now. We do not have the luxury of waiting until the reform plan is passed. We have to make a decision how resources are going to be used around here. What we are suggesting is the resources ought to be used in a certain priority order.

The first priority is using every penny of the Social Security surplus for Social Security. Then we are saying, in the non-Social Security surplus, the next priority ought to be to strengthen Medicare. We think that is a priority of the American people. Yes, there ought to be reform as well, and then we ought to also have some resources that are available for high-priority domestic needs like education and defense—and, yes, tax relief. But the first priority of the non-Social Security surplus is not tax relief, especially tax cuts that are designed to go to the wealthiest among us.

We had, yesterday, a discussion of what some on the other side want in terms of an across-the-board cut. To those who are earning $800,000 a year, they would give $20,000. To those earning less than $38,000 a year on average, they would give $99. I think it is a higher priority for the American people to strengthen Social Security and extend its solvency than to go out and give back $20,000 to somebody who is making almost $1 million a year. That is a question of priorities. It is the difference between us. The Senator from Massachusetts is right on this question.

Mr. KENNEDY. As I understand it, and the Senator could correct me—maybe this is better directed to the Senator from Louisiana—even with the Commission's recommendation—according to the Commission's own report, that will only extend the solvency of the Medicare system 3 to 4 years, on the one hand, even if we went ahead.

I am not disputing that there may be recommendations filed by the Commission that may be worthwhile. But on the one hand we have the opportunity to extend it 12 years under the transfer. On the other hand, even if we accept the Medicare Commission, it is only 3 or 4 years.

So as I understand the position of the Senator, we ought to have the longer extension, we ought to consider the Breaux commission report, and then move ahead and take what steps we need to take in order to strengthen and improve the program, which would certainly include the prescription drugs.

I thank the Senator from North Dakota for yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The distinguished Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I hope people think very carefully about this amendment as drafted. Because it seems to me, if they vote for it, they are saying they do not want to do anything to extend the solvency of the Medicare trust fund. They are adopting, it seems to me, a view that, at least with respect to the surpluses that are projected over the next 15 years, they do not want to dedicate any of that money to extend the Medicare trust fund solvency, and the fact is the Medicare trust fund is in more immediate danger than is the Social Security trust fund.

We expect insolvency in the Medicare trust fund by 2008. That is why some of us feel strongly that we ought to keep alive the possibility of transferring some of these surpluses that we now project to strengthen and preserve the Medicare system.

Beyond that, I think we have to ask the question, are we ready to say that the solution we want to adopt is what the National Commission on the Future of Medicare adopted? They couldn't reach agreement in terms of the supermajority that was required of them to make a recommendation. It seems to me we ought to keep our powder dry until we consider all of the options that we might want to adopt to reform Medicare.

Again, I say this with the greatest of respect for Senator BREAUX and Senator KERREY and other Members who served on that Commission, along with Mr. THOMAS and others. I have real concerns about what is included in this amendment. Part of it, I think, is just factually wrong. The suggestion that the President is not reserving 15 percent in his framework for Medicare defies the facts. It defies what is clearly in his plan. I do not think it is wise to adopt something that makes false statements.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

Mr. CONRAD. How much time would the Senator like?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Could I have 5 minutes?

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from North Dakota. Let me first say that sometimes what happens is, you find out about an amendment and you don't have time to really prepare. I have just a couple of observations, nothing really well rehearsed or well prepared about this amendment.

Let me just say to my good friend from Delaware that not only do I think the amendment doesn't give justice to some of the President's proposals, I want to express some very serious reservations about the work of the Commission. It is out of respect for my colleague from Louisiana, but it is just honest disagreement.

I will say this right away: I have respect for Senators who are willing to stake out a position that they think is the right thing to do. Even if there is lots of opposition, they have the courage to do so. Senator BREAUX is that kind of Senator.

For my own part, there are at least two major concerns that I have and that I think should be laid out in this Senate discussion. One is I really do worry a lot about the effort to, if you will, voucherize Medicare. It worries me that we will create a system where those people who are wealthier and probably healthier can opt out for additional kind of coverage, additional plans and, therefore, I think you get

into the problem of adverse risk selection. I think the very thing that has made Medicare such a stirring success for our country, which is sort of we are all in this together, we all pay into it, I think we do serious damage to that principle. I worry that the Medicare system will end up being a system where really what you had left were those that were the frailest and the sickest of our elderly, and we could not sustain it economically. I think that does serious damage to the universality principle of Medicare.

The second point I want to make is that I think the reliance on managed care is profoundly mistaken. I think the record of managed care in rural American is a not a good one. I think the reason we are going to have a major debate on patients' protection, I say to my colleague from Massachusetts, is that many people feel that what has happened is that with the eight or nine largest insurance companies owning and controlling well over 60 percent of the managed care plans, what you have going on in the country is bottom line medicine, where the bottom line is the only line. It has become increasingly corporatized and bureacratized and not at all user-friendly.

I think senior citizens will not do well with a system that relies so much on managed care.

Finally, I want to express my major opposition—and before Senators vote on this, I think they should think about this question—to extending the age from 65 to 67. With all due respect, I don't think we should create yet another group of people who have no health insurance coverage or another group of citizens, in this particular case, 65 to 67, who maybe will purchase the coverage, but they won't be able to afford it.

I think that it is a grave mistake to support this amendment that my colleague from Delaware has brought to the floor. Frankly, I think we should be talking about Medicare for all—universal coverage. I certainly think we should be talking about expanding Medicare to include prescription drug coverage for senior citizens. I have introduced a bill with BARNEY FRANK on the House side to do this, and other colleagues have done this. I think, out of respect for my colleague, it is an honest difference of opinion.

I think this amendment, supporting the work of the Commission, goes in the wrong direction. A, it voucherizes Medicare; leads to adverse risk selection; no longer has the principle of universality applying; those people who are sickest and poorest will be left in, and the system will not sustain itself. That is a mistake. B, the reliance on managed care is mistaken. C, in no way, shape, or form, should we extend the age from 65 to 67.

I yield to my colleague from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for yielding. I say to my colleagues from Delaware and Louisiana, I have listened to this. I regret to say we are going to be voting on this, because there are a lot of things in this Commission report that I think warrant the support of our colleagues, and things where obviously, as my colleagues from Massachusetts and Minnesota and others have pointed out, there is serious disagreement as well.

My concern is that we are going to have a vote on this resolution, and it kind of hardens positions a lot earlier than we should be. This is very serious work. When you get involved in this kind of a vote, people casting positions on a resolution that has no value in law, it seems to me it is not in the best interest, as we try to grapple with a very serious and complex set of questions.

I am caught in a situation where there are a lot of things the Commission did I like. There are things the Commission did I disagreed with. If forced to vote up or down, I guess I have to vote no, but I don't want my vote ''no'' to be construed as disagreeing with everything the Commission has done. If I thought the vote really was going to change the Medicare system, that would heighten the value of the vote, I suppose, to some degree. But since it doesn't have any real impact in law, and I am being asked, as a Member, to make a choice on this, I don't think it is really smart or wise for us to be put in that position on something as important and as complex, where there are serious disagreements over how we ought to proceed.

I don't know procedurally what is possible, but this has been an interesting discussion. I suggest that maybe there is some way this could be vitiated and considered an interesting discussion and debate. But let's not ask Members to vote on a resolution that casts us in a position of making choices on a Commission where there will be a lot of legitimate disagreements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time requested by the distinguished Senator has expired.

Mr. DODD. I thank my colleagues for listening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I point out to my distinguished colleague from Connecticut that we are not voting up or down the work of the Bipartisan Commission. We very clearly say in this resolution:

> Congress should work in a bipartisan fashion to extend the solvency of the Medicare program and to ensure that benefits under this program will be available to beneficiaries in the future.

We go on, on the next page, paragraph 6:

> Congress should move expeditiously to consider the bipartisan recommendation of the chairman of the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare.

Paragraph 7:

> Congress should continue to work with the President as he develops and presents his plan to fix the problems of the Medicare program.

Mr. President, what I am saying is, we ought to forget this debate, trying to argue about surpluses and so forth.

What we want to do is to get on with the job, to work in a bipartisan spirit. I think the Finance Committee is known for working in a bipartisan spirit. I say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, when I say that we are going to start work on this after the recess, that is what I mean and that is what we will do. I think the distinguished Senator knows me well enough to know that I am a man of my word.

I ask that we proceed. Let us get the job done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I have respect for the Senate Finance chairman. When he says he is going to do something, my experience with him is, he does it. That is not at issue here or at question.

But I must tell you, I do not read this as a bipartisan amendment. There may be some Democrats who are on it—and I can understand why they are on it—but I tell you, this does not look, to me, like a real bipartisan message that is being sent with this amendment. It looks, to me, like a lot of bash-the-President's proposal and suggestions that what is at the heart of the President's proposal, to transfer some resources from the general fund to strengthen Medicare, has no merit and that the answer is what the bipartisan reform Commission came up with—which did not achieve the necessary agreement of that Commission to make a recommendation.

Frankly, I do not think this body should be in a position now to decide that is the answer. I do not think a plan to——

Mr. WELLSTONE. Would my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. CONRAD. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Right here:

> (6) Congress should move expeditiously to consider the bipartisan recommendations of the chairmen of the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare.

That sounds to me like an endorsement of the Commission's proposal. Am I wrong or right about that?

Mr. CONRAD. It reads that way to me. I read the whole thing in its totality.

Mr. WELLSTONE. People can disagree, but then a vote for this would be an endorsement of any number of the different recommendations. That might be good for some, but I want to make it clear to colleagues, if you move the Medicare age up from 65 to 67, you go forward with the notion of ''voucherizing'' Medicare, which is very different from Medicare today. To me, this is an up-or-down vote on these recommendations. I could not possibly

vote for this right now. I hope other Senators will seriously consider that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CONRAD. I just reclaim my time.

Mr. President, I hope colleagues will resist this amendment. I think some of the statements in here are inaccurate. I think it sends a message which is not the message that should be sent at this time. I say that as somebody who is committed to reforming Medicare, as well as one who is committed to putting additional resources into the program.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the Roth amendment. I recognize, as I know all of my colleagues do, that Medicare is facing very serious financial problems. I agree with the proponents of this amendment that Congress must act carefully and expeditiously, in a bipartisan way, to make the structural reforms necessary to preserve Medicare for both current and future seniors. And I want to commend Senator BREAUX and all of the members of the Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare, for working so hard in this effort and creating a starting point for reform.

However, at this point, that's what the Breaux plan is—a starting point. I do not necessarily agree with every piece of the Breaux plan, but frankly, it is just too early for the Senate to endorse it. The Commission only finished its work last week, and most of us have not had a chance to study the plan in detail. In addition, the Roth amendment dismisses too quickly the President's proposal to devote 15% of the surplus to Medicare. Even with enactment of structural reforms, it is likely that more money will be needed for Medicare, and we shouldn't have to cut other health and education programs to find it. Even more importantly, in order for Medicare reform to be truly successful, it is essential that we all work cooperatively with one another—and with the President. It is unnecessary to pass an amendment that blasts the President's proposal without giving it full consideration.

Mr. President, while I believe we must address Medicare reform, the Budget Resolution is not an appropriate nor meaningful place to do it. The Roth amendment would tie the Senate's hands. It would force us to declare right now that the Breaux plan is the best plan, and that we will not put even a fraction of the surplus into Medicare. I think that would be a mistake. I urge my colleagues to vote against the Roth amendment, and I yield the floor.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, through his work on the Medicare Commission, Senator BREAUX has offered some very strong recommendations to deal with our long-term problems in Medicare, and I hope that the Finance Committee will act expeditiously in considering these and other reform elements. While I share many of the sentiments expressed in this amendment, I don't believe it will bring us closer toward finding common ground on the Medicare question. Realization of comprehensive Medicare reform will require a genuine bipartisan effort from all parties involved, and we ought to be working to keep the political tension surrounding this debate to a minimum. I'm concerned that the wording of the amendment offered by Senator ROTH will further divide us rather than bring us together on this important issue. For this reason, I will oppose it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. We would like to proceed, if we can, with the Kennedy amendment. I ask the Senator, you are on that same amendment, are not you?

Mr. DODD. Yes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Let me just say, we can leave time for more debate on this. The problem is, we are going to run out of time, and people are not going to get any time on a score of amendments that they think are very, very important, also. From my standpoint, you have control of plenty of the time. If we can get on with the next one, you can reclaim time and use it off the bill if there is somebody who wants to discuss this issue.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, we would be pleased to go to the next amendment and lay this one aside. If someone wants to return to it later, we can provide time to them. But we are ready to move on.

Mr. DOMENICI. Let me ask, in terms of time, we still have how much time on the bill? Something like 8 and a half hours?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct; approximately 8 and a half hours.

Mr. DOMENICI. How much time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eight hours 29 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Has the time been yielded on the amendment itself?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 3 minutes 14 seconds; the distinguished Senator from North Dakota has 5 minutes 13 seconds.

Mr. DOMENICI. I am not going to ask them to yield back their time. I ask unanimous consent that we set this aside temporarily while the Kennedy amendment proceeds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Hearing none, without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. If I could ask the floor managers, the Senator from New York would like to have general time for 15 minutes, and then we will move ahead with this amendment. We will try to move it along rapidly and not take all the time.

Mr. DOMENICI. I say to the Senator, we will not take it off yours, but take it off the bill. We will charge it equally.

How much time, I ask the Senator?

Mr. SCHUMER. Fifteen minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Fifteen minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank my colleagues, the Senators from New Mexico, North Dakota, and Massachusetts, for allowing me to make this address, which is of real importance to the people in my State.

PROTECT ME AND RESPECT ME

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, like many New Yorkers, I have spent a great deal of time in the aftermath of the Amadou Diallo killing reflecting about our city, our police, our country, and our people.

During my career, I think I have been considered a friend of both law enforcement and the minority community. But I have always been troubled by the rift between minorities and the police. And I have always felt that this rift has caused pain and harm to both communities.

There are men, women and children, black and white, alive today because of the work of the New York City Police Department—their fine work. New Yorkers are proud of that fact. Most cops are decent, honorable, and hard-working—and it is wrong to judge all cops by the actions of the bad few.

But what we all must realize is that the momentous drop in crime and the model behavior of many officers does not undo the plain truth that black men and women in New York City who have never broken the law and who should have absolutely no reason to fear law enforcement, are all too often hassled and made to feel like lawbreakers, and that it is different for minorities than for the average white person in the city.

Many whites seem to feel that widespread frisking and patting down is a small price to pay for a steep reduction in crime. But most white people have never been frisked and have no conception of how pervasive the practice is.

But if you talk to black stockbrokers on Wall Street and black lawyers downtown—people who wear a suit and a tie every day—to a person they have a story of being stopped, frisked, and harassed by a police officer.

If you talk to minority co-workers or attend services at African American churches and ask the men and women from the congregation about their interaction with the police—they talk about how they or their law-abiding children were stopped, questioned and searched by the police.

And they will tell you, as they have said to me, that they know this doesn't happen as often to white people. They know that white people are treated differently.

All people, black and white, want very much for their neighborhoods to

be safe and to feel confident that when they send their children or grandchildren to the corner store for a carton of milk they will come home safely. But in addition to these feelings, minorities are humiliated and angered by the indignity of being treated all too often as presumptive criminals.

And if you take the time to listen, the views of minorities about the relationship they want to have with the police can be summed up in five words: ''Protect me, and respect me.''

This poem was left on the shallow doorway where Amidou Diallo was killed:

When you look at me what do you see;
Am I innocent until proven guilty;
Am I your enemy;
Or were you sent here to protect me.

Protect me and respect me.

Whatever facts emerge from the killing of Amidou Diallo, or for that matter, the killing of a Syracuse man, Johnny Gammage, by the Pittsburgh police—whether it is guilty, not guilty, suspension, or removal—our society must deal with the underlying problem of race and law enforcement.

There has been a great deal of rhetoric and anger in the aftermath of the Diallo shooting, I can understand why. But I wish to take a different approach.

I offer today, what I believe are constructive solutions that transcend any one set of circumstances and will allow both the ''protect me and respect me'' parts of the equation to coexist and even flourish.

First, for the sake of the city and for the sake of the police force, the NYPD must immediately put in place a system that more quickly gets bad cops off the street.

It was well known among police, for example, that Justin Volpe, one of the cops who turtured Abner Louima was a bad, bad seed with multiple complaints against him. It was well known that officer Francis Livoti was a ticking time bomb for years before he strangled Anthony Baez in 1994.

The force knew it and did nothing about it. That attitude of silence, protecting your own, sweeping problems under the rug has got to end, not only for the sake of future victims, but for the police department itself.

The tens of thousands of good, honest, hardworking officers pay a price when the Volpes are not removed. For that reason, it is in their interest to end any policy of silence.

The mayor, the police chief, police union leaders, community leaders and church leaders should all urge police officers to come forward when there is a bad element on the force. It should be an honorable action, not a shameful action, to come forward.

Second, minority recruitment at the NYPD must improve. The force is more than two-thirds white; the city is nearly three-fifths minority.

When mostly white cops patrol high-density, minority neighborhoods resentment is bound to follow.

The city should at last fully fund the Cadet Corps to recruit qualified, college educated minority applicants through the City University. The program is on the books, but until this crisis was basically ignored.

Also, the city should take advantage of a program created last year by Reverend Johnny Ray Youngblood and me to recruit and train young minority applicants through the churches and to help them become police officers who will patrol the neighborhood from where they came.

Next, beyond minority recruitment, New York City should look to what works in other places.

Two efforts stand out: Boston's Ten-Point Coalition and the military's Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute.

Boston had the same problems as New York: a rift between police and the African-American community; several high profile incidents of abuse by certain officers; and clergy that took on the role of police critics.

Their hatred exploded into the open with the stabbing death of Carol Stuart, a pregnant white woman. The husband, Charles Stuart, told police that a black man committed the crime.

The Boston Police hit the streets in full force. They stopped and searched every black male that fit the general description. The neighborhood residents complained about the tactics, but the crime was so horrible no one listened.

They arrested William Bennett, a black man. Carol Stuart's husband, it was learned months later, was the killer. Bennett was innocent.

And Boston was on the verge of a meltdown.

With no place else to go, the police and the clergy agreed to stop fighting and to sit down to develop a plan to stop crime on the one hand, and preserve dignity on the other.

They initiated a five-point contract.

The heart of it was this: The ministers and respected community leaders agreed to help identify those in the neighborhood who were the real troublemakers. They took the responsibility of telling the police who was dealing drugs and committing violent crime.

The flip side is that when ministers and community leaders took responsibility and identified the troublemakers, others were left alone. And because most crime in each neighborhood is caused by just a few people, the use of the standard stop in frisk procedure that the community found so oppressive greatly diminished.

If an officer is abusive or disrespectful, ministers and community leaders have an open line to the police. If the police did not act, or if they refused to address the problem, the ministers and community leaders were free to go to the media.

The plan worked. The crime rate in Boston has dropped even faster than in New York. Serious youth crime is almost non-existent. And the important but difficult relationship between police and the minority community is vastly improved.

Last month in the Bronx, 100 members of the clergy met in the office of the Bronx Borough President and said they have always wanted to work with the police. They said, ''We could be a resource. But they're not using us. The police don't even know us. They don't come and talk to us.''

The Boston model will work in New York and we should move quickly to implement it here.

The military—and our prayers are with the American soldiers fighting over Kosovo—has also found a way to confront bigotry while increasing effectiveness.

The Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute, developed in the early 1970s to confront segregation and racial hostility among soldiers in Vietnam, is one of the reasons that the armed forces is the most integrated institution in America.

The military learned that unless bigotry was ended in the armed forces, America could not have an effective military. So by necessity they developed a program that lasts to this day.

Officers and supervisors take a course to confront their own stereotypes and to identify problems within their unit. They have a simple goal: change people's behavior. The rule is that if you've got a problem with race, it better not show up in your words or actions.

The thrust of the program is this: DEOMI, as it is called, continuously surveys enlisted soldiers and officers about race relations on their base. The results are made known only to the commanding officer and to people at DEOMI. When there is a problem on a base, a mobile team of trainers moves in to solve it.

The model has been so successful that DEOMI has signed contracts to work with police organizations. New York City should sign a contract as soon as possible.

In conclusion, this has been one of the most trying and emotional times in New York in years. We are a city, right now, divided. No good has ever come from divisiveness. No job was ever created. No street made safer. No school made better by pulling ourselves apart.

I worry about two things:

First, is that division in ours, the most diverse city on earth, has the potential to pull us down.

Second, failure to deal with this problem will ultimately weaken our efforts to fight crime and perhaps, forfeit the gains we made in crime reduction. That is unacceptable and unnecessary given that options abound if we choose them.

New York City is undoubtedly a safer place in every neighborhood from the far end of the Bronx to the tip of the Rockaways. But it is not necessarily a better place for every neighborhood.

Dr. Martin Luther King taught us that ''we are tied together in the single garment of destiny, caught in an inescapable network of mutuality. And

whatever affects one directly affects all directly.''

The killing of Amdiou Diallo; the killing of Johnny Gammage affects us all directly.

We all love our city. Let's each side—as hard as it is to do—put aside our frustration and distrust so we can move past confrontation and collaborate constructively on solutions that protect and respect.

I again thank the Chairman and my colleagues for their consideration and I yield the floor.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I want to commend the Senator from New York on his maiden speech here in the Senate Chamber. The first speech by any member is one of the most important, and I think the Senator from New York chose well when he chose this subject. Obviously, it is a matter of urgent concern in New York, and the Senator has spoken movingly and persuasively about what must be done to respond to the crisis there. I want to thank the Senator from New York for bringing this to the attention of his colleagues and for doing a masterful job of informing us of what is facing the people of New York.

I again thank and commend the Senator on his initial speech here in the Chamber. In my 12 years in the Senate, I believe the Senator from New York is one of the most impressive new members and we are very happy to have him here.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000

The Senate continued with consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 177

(Purpose: To reduce tax breaks for the wealthiest taxpayers and reserve the savings for Medicare)

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, through an agreement with the floor managers, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] proposes an amendment numbered 177.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

Increase the levels of Federal revenues in section 101(1)(A) by the following amounts:

(1) Fiscal year 2000: $0.
(2) Fiscal year 2001: $3,000,000,000.
(3) Fiscal year 2002: $25,000,000,000.
(4) Fiscal year 2003: $13,000,000,000.
(5) Fiscal year 2004: $18,000,000,000.
(6) Fiscal year 2005: $31,000,000,000.
(7) Fiscal year 2006: $57,000,000,000.
(8) Fiscal year 2007: $58,000,000,000.
(9) Fiscal year 2008: $59,000,000,000.
(10) Fiscal year 2009: $56,000,000,000.

Change the levels of Federal revenues in section 101(1)(B) by the following amounts:

(1) Fiscal year 2000: $0;
(2) Fiscal year 2001: $3,000,000,000;
(3) Fiscal year 2002: $25,000,000,000;
(4) Fiscal year 2003: $13,000,000,000;
(5) Fiscal year 2004: $18,000,000,000;
(6) Fiscal year 2005: $31,000,000,000;
(7) Fiscal year 2006: $57,000,000,000;
(8) Fiscal year 2007: $58,000,000,000;
(9) Fiscal year 2008: $59,000,000,000; and
(10) Fiscal year 2009: $56,000,000,000.

Reduce the levels of total budget authority and outlays in section 101(2) and section 101(3) by the following amounts:

(1) Fiscal year 2000: $0;
(2) Fiscal year 2001: $0;
(3) Fiscal year 2002: $1,000,000,000;
(4) Fiscal year 2003: $2,000,000,000;
(5) Fiscal year 2004: $3,000,000,000;
(6) Fiscal year 2005: $4,000,000,000;
(7) Fiscal year 2006: $6,000,000,000;
(8) Fiscal year 2007: $10,000,000,000;
(9) Fiscal year 2008: $13,000,000,000; and
(10) Fiscal year 2009: $17,000,000,000.

Increase the levels of surpluses in section 101(4) by the following amounts:

(1) Fiscal year 2000: $0.
(2) Fiscal year 2001: $3,000,000,000.
(3) Fiscal year 2002: $26,000,000,000.
(4) Fiscal year 2003: $15,000,000,000.
(5) Fiscal year 2004: $21,000,000,000.
(6) Fiscal year 2005: $35,000,000,000.
(7) Fiscal year 2006: $63,000,000,000.
(8) Fiscal year 2007: $68,000,000,000.
(9) Fiscal year 2008: $72,000,000,000.
(10) Fiscal year 2009: $73,000,000,000.

Decrease the levels of public debt in section 101(5) by the following amounts:

(1) Fiscal year 2000: $0.
(2) Fiscal year 2001: $3,000,000,000.
(3) Fiscal year 2002: $26,000,000,000.
(4) Fiscal year 2003: $15,000,000,000.
(5) Fiscal year 2004: $21,000,000,000.
(6) Fiscal year 2005: $35,000,000,000.
(7) Fiscal year 2006: $63,000,000,000.
(8) Fiscal year 2007: $68,000,000,000.
(9) Fiscal year 2008: $72,000,000,000.
(10) Fiscal year 2009: $73,000,000,000.

Decrease the levels of debt held by the public in section 101(6) by the following amounts:

(1) Fiscal year 2000: $0.
(2) Fiscal year 2001: $3,000,000,000.
(3) Fiscal year 2002: $26,000,000,000.
(4) Fiscal year 2003: $15,000,000,000.
(5) Fiscal year 2004: $21,000,000,000.
(6) Fiscal year 2005: $35,000,000,000.
(7) Fiscal year 2006: $63,000,000,000.
(8) Fiscal year 2007: $68,000,000,000.
(9) Fiscal year 2008: $72,000,000,000.
(10) Fiscal year 2009: $73,000,000,000.

Decrease the levels of budget authority and outlays in section 103(18) for function 900, Net Interest, by the following amounts:

(1) Fiscal year 2000: $0.
(2) Fiscal year 2001: $0.
(3) Fiscal year 2002: $1,000,000,000.
(4) Fiscal year 2003: $2,000,000,000.
(5) Fiscal year 2004: $3,000,000,000.
(6) Fiscal year 2005: $4,000,000,000.
(7) Fiscal year 2006: $6,000,000,000.
(8) Fiscal year 2007: $10,000,000,000.
(9) Fiscal year 2008: $13,000,000,000.
(10) Fiscal year 2009: $17,000,000,000.

Reduce the levels in section 104(1) by which the Senate Committee on Finance is instructed to reduce revenues by the following amounts:

(1) $0 in fiscal year 2000.
(2) $59,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004.
(3) $320,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2009.

On page 46, strike section 204.

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON EXTENDING THE SOLVENCY OF MEDICARE.

It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that the savings from the amendment reducing tax breaks for the wealthiest taxpayers should be reserved to strengthen and extend the solvency of the Medicare program.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, over these past 2 days, we have had some good debates and discussions about what is in the budget, and also what is not in the budget; and the particular emphasis and thrust of these various debates and discussions have been primarily on the issues of Medicare and Social Security.

The thrust of the amendment that I offer today, on behalf of myself and others, is targeted on the issue of Medicare. It basically gives an opportunity for the Senate of the United States to say we are going to deal with the shortfalls in terms of the financial situations in Medicare prior to the time that we are going to consider a tax cut for wealthy individuals in this country. That will be the real choice for the Members here—whether we are going to say that at least meeting the financial obligations of Medicare comes before the tax breaks for wealthy individuals.

As we have seen over the past 2 days, there is broad agreement that we not only need to provide financial security for the Medicare system, but we are also going to have to deal with the serious kinds of changes in the Medicare system. One of the important changes, I believe, is to put in place an effective prescription drug benefit for the elderly.

In 1965, I remember being on the floor of the Senate when this issue came up. At that time, most health care plans did not include a benefit program for prescription drugs. At that time, we were attempting to follow what was a generally agreed benefit program. We did that. We did not include prescription drugs. Now prescription drugs are part of about 98 percent of all of the private company programs. We want to make sure we have an effective prescription drug benefit, not only because most companies have that benefit, but because of the enormous need our elderly have for getting prescription drugs at reasonable prices, and also because as we have all seen the breakthroughs in the use of prescription drugs in relieving suffering, illness, and sickness.

So it is very simple, Mr. President. We are saying, let's move toward what has been recommended by the President, what we have referred to in general debate on other Social Security and Medicare issues, that before we are going to expend, over the 10-year budget period, $778 billion in tax cuts, we will put aside some $320 billion over the 10-year period in order to meet the financial needs of Social Security. That is basically what this amendment is all about.

The fact is, Mr. President, if you look through the budget recommendation that has come from the Budget Committee, there is not one single penny in this budget resolution, in addition to current services, being put aside for the protection and the continuity of the Medicare system—not one, not a single penny. There will be references out here during the course of the debate that we have put aside $190 billion, which is a new infusion of resources. That really represents current services. If you didn't do that, you would be having cuts in existing Medicare benefits. That $190 billion, over the 10-year period, which is referred to by the Budget Committee members, is just the current services program. To say we are going to keep what we are currently providing in the Medicare system, that has been understood and recognized.

Secondly, there is a reference by some on the Budget Committee that, well, we have an additional $100 billion that can be used at some time for the Medicare system. But as we have seen over the course of the debate, those funds are also being designated, on the one hand, for natural disasters. It has been pointed out by members of the Budget Committee that they average about $9 billion to $10 billion a year over a 10-year period. There is the $100 billion. When our Budget Committee friends are asked how we are going to deal with the issues of natural disasters, the response is that we have the $100 billion in there to deal with natural disasters. If Budget Committee members are asked how are we going to provide additional funds for Medicare, they say, well, we have a $100 billion reserve that can be used for Medicare. Then when they are asked, well, where in this program is there a prescription drug benefit, they say, oh, haven't you seen the part of the Budget Act that is going to provide for prescription drugs? This is the most overutilized $100 billion that we can possibly imagine.

As I pointed out in the RECORD, we will not see any of those funds realized, really, for the first 5 years. There is effectively a deficit in the first year of more than $6 billion, and effectively zero for the next 4 years is returned. So none of those funds are going to be available to try to deal with Medicare or any of these other issues for at least 5 years. Mr. President, what we are saying is that the money is out there.

The other point that is made and has been recently debated is, you really can't get the 15 percent of the budget surplus earmarked for Medicare because it will be IOUs. I think my friend and colleague from North Dakota addressed that issue in the earlier debate and discussion. I found it interesting that they can use the IOUs for tax breaks, but they cannot use IOUs for Medicare. Clearly, you can use it for Medicare. That is what we are attempting to do.

The vote will be very clear: whether we, on the one hand, are going to set aside the $320 billion—over the 10-year period—of the $778 billion and say we are going to do that first. After we set aside that $320 billion, there will still be $458 billion that will be remaining.

There is a difference in this body on whether that money should be used for the Republican tax cuts or whether we ought to use $273 billion out of that for the President's tax cuts. We can debate that at another time. But there will still be a generous amount of resources available there for tax reduction.

This amendment assures that we put priorities first. That is a very simple and fundamental concept—that is, whether we are going to put tax breaks first or whether we are going to be putting the protection of Medicare first. That is the choice. That is the issue that will be before the Senate. Without this particular amendment, we are not going to provide the needed financial resources in time for the preservation of Medicare.

Now, Mr. President, I think it is important to realize who those funds we are talking about really belong to. The amounts I am talking about—$320 billion in this amendment, or the GOP tax cut, $778 billion—those are basically the revenues that have been paid in by hard-working men and women in recent years. They have been paying into the Medicare system as well as into Social Security. That reflects the resources of hard-working men and women that are paid into the Federal Government. The question now is whether those resources that effectively have been paid in by working families, we are asking whether we ought to use those resources to protect the Medicare system, or whether they ought to be used for tax breaks for wealthy individuals. I don't think there is really a question about what the answer would be. This amendment gives the opportunity to do so. That is what we are attempting to do.

Now, Mr. President, let's look at who these people are. The average Medicare recipient's income is $10,000 a year, is 76 years old, lives alone, has one or more chronic diseases, and is paying 19 percent of their income primarily for prescription drugs.

That is the profile across this Nation of the Medicare recipient. When we talk about Medicare recipients on the higher end of the level, we are talking about individuals who are getting $25,000. But the overwhelming number of Medicare recipients are below the $12,000 or $13,000 level. We now asking in the Senate whether we are going to protect the health care system which they depend on prior to granting the tax break. That is the issue. We couldn't be clearer.

As this chart shows, 80 percent of the Medicare expenditures are used for recipients with annual incomes of $25,000 or less. These are not individual incomes, these are household incomes. So you have 60 percent with $15,000 or under, you have 21 percent with $25,000 or under. Effectively, 80 percent of all the expenditures are in that area—families, individuals, elderly people, or elderly couples, who have worked hard, paid into the system.

As we have heard, the Medicare system has serious challenges, serious problems. No one denies that. The issue is, given the fact that the system is going to face ''financial instability''—to use it lightly—by the year 2008, should we effectively put in place, as the President has, the recommended resources that will stabilize that to the year 2020, and then move ahead and implement the kinds of recommendations? That is the issue. These are hard-working retirees who have devoted their lives to this country, built this country, and they depend upon the Medicare system for their livelihood.

If we do nothing at all, what will the alternatives be? If we are going to try to keep the Medicare system functioning to the year 2020 without this, there will be $686 billion necessary in benefit cuts or premium hikes for these elderly people. If we do nothing at all, we are going to have to collect that amount in benefit cuts or premium hikes. Those aren't my figures, those are the figures that have been given by the Commission, by the Budget Committee, by the independent actuaries, by the trustees. Those are the choices.

I doubt if there will be a clearer opportunity for us to go on the record on the issue of priorities. The budget items are issues of national priorities, where we as the elected membership of the people feel the priorities ought to be. We are saying to those who are going to support this amendment that we believe the priority ought to be to provide financial security and stability for the Medicare system to the year 2020 before we give tax breaks to wealthy individuals. It is as simple as that.

Mr. President, I yield such time as the Senator from North Dakota might want.

Mr. CONRAD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for this amendment, because I think it puts into stark relief what the choices are. Fundamentally, this debate is about what we do with the projected surpluses over the next 15 years. On our side, we believe that the best use of the surpluses is, first and foremost, to protect every dollar of Social Security surplus for Social Security.

Then we turn our attention to Medicare, because we believe Medicare is also critically important to this country's future, and we recognize that it is endangered. We recognize that in 2008 it will be insolvent unless we take action. So we say take, of the surplus over the next 15 years, 15 percent of that surplus —15 percent of that total unified surplus—over the next 15 years. Dedicate that to Medicare. That is some $700 billion.

That still leaves resources for high-priority domestic needs like education

and health care, defense, and, yes, tax relief. It is much less in the way of resources available for a tax cut plan than in the Republican priority list, because they really only have two priorities. Their priorities are safeguarding Social Security, which we commend them for; but their other priority is a massive tax cut. They don't provide an additional dollar out of the surpluses that we now project over the next 15 years to strengthen Medicare. We think that is a mistake.

We have heard the other side repeatedly saying that putting this transfer of resources to Medicare will require raising taxes, benefit cuts, or increasing gross debt to pay for Medicare in the future. We have heard that said repeatedly on that side of the aisle. I would like to give an alternative view, because I don't think that is right. It sounds right. If one were expecting budget deficits in the future, it would be right. But that is not what we are anticipating.

The fact is, we now project that there will be a surplus for more than a decade even after we dedicate part of the surplus to Medicare and Social Security. That is because by paying down the publicly held debt, the President's plan reduces net interest costs to the Federal Government and increases economic growth. Therefore, even after we start using the surplus to pay for Medicare and for Social Security, there will still be a budget surplus, hence no need for benefit cuts or for premium increases.

Mr. President, that is central to what we are proposing and what we are advocating. We believe it is critically important to put Social Security first, but also to put Medicare first, because it has made a profound difference in the life of this Nation. We now know that without Medicare and Social Security, a significant chunk of our senior population would be below the poverty level. Two programs in the life of this country have lifted senior citizens out of poverty: Social Security and Medicare.

So we believe that is where the priority ought to be: Social Security, and Medicare. After they are taken care of—after they are taken care of; after they are taken care of—then we can deal with other domestic priorities, certainly education and health care. And, yes, defense. And, yes, there would still be resources available for tax relief—not as much as the tax cut plan in the Republican budget resolution, because they don't provide one thin dime out of these projected surpluses to strengthen Medicare. They provide resources for Social Security surpluses to support Social Security. That is in our plan as well. Where we diverge is on the question of whether or not we are going to use some of these surpluses we now project to strengthen Medicare. That is really at the heart of this debate and this discussion.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise in support of Senator KENNEDY's amendment. This amendment will address critical needs and ensure that education investments are a top budget priority in FY 2000.

Mr. President, as we know the problems facing education today are great. We need a strong commitment and partnership between federal, state and local governments to meet the needs of all students. Senator KENNEDY's amendment will strengthen the effort to reduce class size, provide the full 40% federal share of special education program costs and free up resources for other education priorities. Importantly, this amendment is paid for in the budget we are now debating with a simple 20% reduction in the $778 billion tax cut proposed by the majority.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, some of my colleagues who oppose this amendment are in effect asking school districts to choose between providing smaller class sizes and funding for special education. This is a false choice, Mr. President. Both special education and small class size are important national priorities, both deserve funding and we can responsibly fund these programs without busting the budget. Forcing school districts to choose between these critically important education programs will only dilute the effectiveness of both programs.

Mr. President, funding for smaller class sizes should not be a partisan issue. Last year when we agreed to fund a serious effort to reduce class size there was broad support for the program proclaimed on both sides of the aisle. What has changed Mr. President? Only a few months after praising the class size program, some are now blocking class size funds and have pit one valuable education program against another all to fund a tax cut we cannot yet afford.

Mr. President, there is wide consensus, based on solid research, that investing in smaller class size is the right thing to do. Research shows that smaller classes help teachers provide more personal attention to students and spend less time on discipline, as a result students learn more and get a stronger foundation in the basic skills. My own state of Wisconsin is doing its part to reduce class size. Wisconsin's Student Achievement Guarantee in Education or SAGE class size reduction program, has proven conclusively that smaller classes make a difference in our children's education. Mr. President, SAGE officials in Wisconsin want a partnership with the federal government. Now is the time when school districts in Wisconsin and in other states are making budget decisions, they need to know if Congress will meet its commitment to reduce class size over the next six years to plan effectively.

Again, Mr. President, I support Senator KENNEDY's amendment because I believe Congress should meet both the commitment to help schools reduce class size and increase funding for special education without busting the budget. I hope my colleagues agree that we should not waste this unique opportunity to responsibly make the needed investments in education today for our children's future.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask my colleague from New Mexico—actually, if my colleague wants to respond, I will wait and follow his remarks.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, how much time remains?

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Senator, but I would not do that at this point.

Mr. KENNEDY. How much time remains, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts has approximately 8 minutes and 10 seconds remaining.

Mr. KENNEDY. And the other side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 30 minutes remaining on the majority side.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, the other question I want to ask my colleagues before I go on the time, I know the Senator from Indiana has been waiting to speak now. Would that happen after this debate? He has been waiting patiently. I don't want to precede him, but I wish to know what your plan is.

Mr. DOMENICI. I do not choose to speak at this point.

Mr. WELLSTONE. That is not my question.

Mr. DOMENICI. I did not hear the Senator.

Mr. WELLSTONE. My question was, before I get started, I know the Senator from Indiana has been waiting patiently to speak, I think the first time he has had a chance to speak in the Chamber. I wonder if the Senator wants to wait until after this debate and then he can proceed?

Mr. BAYH. If the Senator has a point he wishes to make, please feel free to go ahead.

Mr. DOMENICI. How much time does the Senator want?

Mr. BAYH. No more than 10 minutes—general debate, not on the bill.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to put the amendment aside and allow the Senator from Indiana to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WELLSTONE. That is fine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senator from Indiana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BAYH. I thank the Chair. I express my appreciation to my colleagues here today and find myself in agreement with what my colleagues from North Dakota and Massachusetts have been saying on this amendment.

Mr. President, my statement today is in the nature of general debate.

I rise to give my first public remarks on the floor of the United States Senate.

I rise at this time because as debate on the last budget of the 20th Century begins, we have an historic opportunity

to build a strong financial foundation for the 21st.

The projected budget surpluses give us a once in a generation opportunity we must not squander. We must seize this moment of good fortune and replace the debt and deficit, borrow and spend mentality of the recent past with a more responsible approach. We must get our priorities right: preserve Social Security and Medicare, pay off our debts, target tax cuts to help working families and make investments in education and national defense.

I believe strongly that the first step toward this more prosperous future must be to save Social Security and stabilize Medicare. To achieve this, I wholeheartedly support preserving 100% of Social Security Trust Funds for Social Security and 40% of other surplus funds for Medicare.

Let me address Social Security first. By ending once and for all the irresponsible practice of raiding the Social Security Trust Fund, we will extend the life of Social Security by 17 years to the year 2049. We owe it to our seniors to ensure that their Social Security will be safe, and our younger workers have a right to know that the system will be there for them one day. Using surplus funds to save Social Security first is the fiscally responsible, socially compassionate way to achieve this.

Medicare, quite frankly, presents an even more urgent challenge. Without action, it will be insolvent in only eight years. To prevent this, I support dedicating an additional $376 billion of the surplus over the next ten years to Medicare. This will more than double its solvency, to 2020.

But let me be very clear. These investments alone are NOT the complete answer to either Social Security's or Medicare's problems. We must be willing to make the difficult decisions needed to save these vital services, not just once, but once and for all.

It won't be easy. None of the solutions is popular. But using the surplus to strengthen both Social Security and Medicare in the near term will make long-term, systemic reforms possible. The American people are much more likely to embrace difficult steps taken gradually than they are the more draconian action that not using the surplus for Medicare would entail. Those who propose nothing for Medicare today, court fiscal disaster tomorrow. We must not let that happen, and under our approach it will not.

Our approach to saving Social Security and stabilizing Medicare has enormous benefits in addition to securing the future for our elderly and keeping commitments to our young. Doing so will also dramatically reduce the national debt.

Paying down the national debt has many virtues. Lower debt will reduce our interest payments. Last year, 15 cents of every tax dollar went for nothing productive. It merely serviced our national debt. Under the approach I favor, interest payments shrink to only 4 cents of every tax dollar in ten years—a savings to taxpayers of $452 billion dollars. And if we continue this approach, the debt will fall to its lowest level—as a percentage of GDP—since 1917.

With spending under control, a balanced budget, and government no longer borrowing hundreds of billions of dollars, interest rates will fall. This makes it easier for private businesses to invest. New investments mean greater productivity growth, higher wages, and more secure jobs for America's working men and women. The bottom line is clear: a better standard of living for all Americans.

This isn't just my opinion. Last month, I had the opportunity to question the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Alan Greenspan, about this very subject. He too believes that paying down the national debt is the best way to guarantee a stronger economy and a responsible federal budget.

As one of the principal architects of our current economic good fortune, Alan Greenspan knows that paying down the national debt is preferable at this point in the economic cycle to either spending increases or dramatic tax reductions the nation cannot afford. As the Chairman told me, ''. . . all of the arguments that one can make for tax cuts you can make for reduction in debt, they are the same forces. . .'' In addition, by paying off our debts now, we preserve the nation's ability to borrow again in the event of a future emergency and hold open the option of more aggressive tax cuts should the economy slow. Simply put: paying down the national debt is the responsible, conservative, economically and fiscally sensible thing to do.

It is the just and morally responsible thing to do as well. It is not right to ask our children and grandchildren to pay our bills. No generation in American history has done so, and we must not become the first.

Our legacy to future generations must be more than an IOU. Paying down the debt will keep faith with America's past and create promise for America's future.

Saving Social Security and Medicare by paying down the national debt is a significant undertaking, but if we act prudently, there is room for our nation's other important priorities, including targeted tax cuts. Throughout my public career, I have been a vigorous advocate for cutting the tax burden on American families. In fact, I believe that when it comes to tax cuts—the more aggressive, the better. As Governor of Indiana, I was proud to be able to give Hoosiers the largest tax cut in our state history.

I strongly support targeted tax cuts here on the Federal level as well—tax cuts that will eliminate the marriage penalty, save family farms and businesses from the ravages of the estate tax, help families meet the expenses of child care or caring for an elderly parent, and create jobs and stimulate investment by reducing the tax on capital gains.

There must be a balance among our priorities. We can't pursue one to the exclusion of all others. If we give into temptation, and recklessly pursue immediate gratification today, we will surely regret it tomorrow. And therein lies the difference between what we accomplished in Indiana and what some now propose in Washington. Our Hoosier tax cut plan was conservative, fiscally responsible, like the approach I support today. We never threatened to throw fiscal caution to the winds or require massive cuts in vital services for children or law enforcement.

I will be the first to sponsor a tax cut bill—the bigger the better—but not one out of all proportion to our ability to pay for it, nor one that risks returning us to the days when America was drowning in a sea of red ink. We must cut taxes as aggressively as possible while still meeting our other important national priorities.

Included in these important priorities are additional investments for national defense, education and law enforcement. These are the kind of areas where even modest investments today yield multiple benefits tomorrow.

Because I strongly believe that government must make investments—within its means, of course—in these important areas, I am troubled by the current budget resolution that would force drastic and unwarranted across the board budget cuts in many important domestic programs ranging from Head Start to the FBI.

Mr. President, it is incumbent upon the Senate to resist the twin temptations of immediate gratification and postponing difficult decisions. Both parties, quite frankly, have been guilty of this for too long. Today it is the Budget Resolution that succumbs to these twin temptations, indulging us immediately with all the things we want while putting off until tomorrow the things we would rather not do but know we really must. This may be good politics. It is not good government.

Despite the fact that we will not achieve a bipartisan solution this week, I am still heartened by how much closer both parties are today on fiscal issues than even in the recent past.

It seems to me there is a national consensus growing, a consensus that cuts across party lines, that believes in some basic core principles: Saving Social Security and Medicare first, paying down the national debt, making targeted tax cuts for working families, and investing in our future. We can start down the road toward accomplishing these goals—something that is well within the grasp of this Senate—and, in so doing, build a better America. Also, we will be able to look our children and grandchildren squarely in the eye, secure in the knowledge that what we have done has not been just easiest for us, but also what is best for them.

Mr. President, I thank you for this opportunity, and for the indulgence of my colleagues, and yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD). The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, let me thank Senator BAYH for his words. It is an honor to be on the floor while you are speaking, and I thank you.

Mr. CONRAD. Will the Senator suspend for just one moment?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I will be glad to, as long as I retain the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time, actually, is controlled by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield time to the Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that John Jennings, a fellow in Senator BINGAMAN's office, be granted the privilege of the floor during the pendency of S. Con. Res. 20, the budget resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Chair.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has about 8 minutes 20 seconds.

Mr. KENNEDY. I just yield myself a minute and a half.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I want to express my admiration and respect to my friend and colleague from Indiana on his maiden speech. It is an important speech because it deals with the economic future of our Nation. He brings a perspective to this issue as someone who has been an effective Governor and has had a broad reputation, not only in his State but throughout the country, as someone who understands the economics of his State well and has a reputation as a skilled Governor, making sure his State prospered and the benefits were going to go to the people.

Now he speaks in the Senate as we are making a judgment, at a very important, critical time, given the change in our financial situation with the size of the surplus, and he has given us a great deal to think about. It is quite clear from his statement he has given it a good deal of thought.

I thank him for his statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield time to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. KENNEDY. How much do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 6 minutes 40 seconds.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I think this amendment that Senator KENNEDY has brought to the floor is a major, what I would call, political economy amendment. It is a major values amendment. This amendment goes to the heart of what we are about as a nation, and we have a couple of choices. Either we can go with this budget resolution, which goes in the direction of massive tax cuts for the years to come disproportionately going to the highest-income citizens, with the Medicare trust fund expiring in the year 2008. Or we can take part of this surplus and use that to strengthen the Medicare program that we have in this country.

If we do not do that—I just want to be really clear, and I know I am right about this, even though I do not want to be right—what we are going to see is either a cut in benefits or we will see the age extended for eligibility for Medicare, or we will see other proposals which will do major damage to the idea of this program as being a universal, comprehensive health care coverage program for senior citizens, albeit in my State of Minnesota only 35 percent of senior citizens have any coverage at all for prescription drug benefits.

We need to expand Medicare, another reason to support the Kennedy amendment and albeit Medicare does not do anything to cover catastrophic expenses, which is a nightmare for people toward the end of their lives if they should have to be in a nursing home or if they look for support from home-based health care.

But I would like to say to colleagues, as far as I am concerned in this budget debate, this amendment is the heart-and-soul amendment. We have a really clear choice. A budget resolution is a resolution; it gives us some general direction. My colleague from New Mexico undoubtedly will have a response. I wish I had time to respond to his response. But from my point of view, this is a values debate. We can, with the surplus, as we look ahead, talk about tax cuts mainly going to those who are most affluent, or we can say we are going to reserve part of this surplus to bolster Medicare, which is a critically important program, not just for about 680,000 seniors in Minnesota with an income profile pretty low, not very high, but, in addition, for their children and their grandchildren.

This is a family values amendment. There ought to be nothing more important for us to do than to give general direction to the proposition and to the idea and to the core value that we are going to reserve part of this surplus to help bolster Medicare.

I can make a lot of other proposals. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 1 minute.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Let me just say to my colleagues, I would like to see also, above and beyond support for this amendment, talk about how we can strengthen Medicare in other areas.

We should double the NIH budget. My colleagues, Senator SPECTER and Senator HARKIN, are right, because the research and finding the cure for some of the diseases in our country like Alzheimer's and diabetes and Parkinson's will do wonders toward reducing Medicare expenditures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 4 minutes have expired.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I will get a chance to speak more on this. This is the critical vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, my friend and colleague from West Virginia wanted to address the Senate on a matter relating to the budget. I am wondering whether there is some time he can use.

Mr. CONRAD. How much time would the Senator from West Virginia like?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. The Senator from West Virginia would like to have 10 minutes.

Mr. CONRAD. I yield 10 minutes off the bill.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, let me say I don't have any objection. Obviously, even if I did, probably I couldn't do anything about it. But I do want to ask Senators if they would be somewhat helpful. I know, now that Senator KENNEDY has a chart up that describes the Democrat plan that doesn't exist, and a Republican plan that doesn't exist, that everybody wants to come to the floor and talk about this. I remind everyone and ask their indulgence and help: We have about 35 to 40 amendments that people want to be heard on. They are legitimately as interested as are colleagues on this issue, which we have already debated three times on three amendments.

I am not going to argue about it. I say go ahead, we will give you 10 minutes, but when you take it off the bill, it means it is not available for anyone at the end of this bill. So I ask we be a little bit helpful in that regard.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I thank the Senator from New Mexico. I understand the point of the Senator. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from North Dakota.

This particular Senator from West Virginia was a member of the Medicare Commission and I know, undoubtedly, several have spoken. But whatever amendments may be remaining, there cannot be many as important as the disposition of Medicare. Medicare is something that is not that well understood even though everybody knows what it is, and therefore it is subject to easy amendments and easy resolutions, and facts are entirely often lost.

There is, I understand, a resolution or whatever praising the Medicaid Commission for its bipartisan efforts

and the rest of it. Those of us who were on that Commission know that isn't and wasn't the case. It was not a bipartisan Commission; it was a Commission that was divided from the very beginning.

It was a Commission in which there was really no give and take. Just so my colleagues can understand, the plan, which was being changed every 5 minutes, as certain Members sought to get votes here and there, was not even finally given to my office until 4 o'clock the day before the vote. I was in West Virginia so I didn't see the plan until an hour before the vote. It was really kind of a shambles of an operation.

But that isn't nearly as important as the fact that beneficiaries pay more under this plan for the same or fewer benefits. It isn't nearly as important as the fact that the sick and the disabled were probably going to have to pay the most. The fact that this plan contemplates and its authors contemplate the numbers of years that 50 to 75 percent of all Medicare beneficiaries will belong to HMOs—of course, I don't believe that is ever going to happen. They do it, and it is reflected in their plan.

Just imagine for a moment what that would mean, because HMOs would naturally attract the most wealthy and the most healthy. So what would that mean for the people in my State who are left in fee-for-service medicine? Fee-for-service would be a very small pot of money which would have to cover an enormous amount of people.

The philosophy of the Medicare Commission fundamentally was that free enterprise can solve the problems of Medicare, and that is why they said 50 to 75 percent will join HMOs over the next 15 to 20 years. Of course, free enterprise had its chance to work with respect to people over 65 and did it so badly, that is the reason we created Medicare, in order not to leave it up to the market system in its entirety and to make sure that every senior had health care coverage.

There was a lot of ideology involved in the Commission. There were a lot of people there primarily because of an ideological commitment, a commitment that was there from the very beginning. It was very obvious. There never really was any discussion of issues. There were speeches, but not much discussion. Seniors, I think, had very little idea of what was in the plan.

Those who remember catastrophic health care—if Congress puts forward a plan and doesn't consult seniors and seniors aren't knowledgeable about it, you can have it thrown right back in your face. Medicare is not something you can fool around with.

Speaking for my own point of view, representing the State of West Virginia, the average senior in West Virginia has a total gross income from all sources, of $10,763. Then, from that amount you subtract $2,000 to pay for their Medigap or their out-of-pocket expenses for health care which they can't get from Medicare, primarily prescription drugs. That means the average senior in the State has a gross income for a year of about $8,500.

I will guarantee you, this Senator isn't fooling around with chances on Medicare. There is no way that I am taking a chance on Medicare, that I am betting on something that did not work prior to 1965, that suddenly people say will work after this Medicare Commission presented its plan which did not pass and which was basically defeated on a partisan vote, which was very, very sad. It was fated from the beginning, and it was very, very sad.

I have chaired four national commissions. This was the fifth one I have been on. It was probably the worst experience I have had since I have been in the Senate. I say that with regret, because I care enormously about health care, and I care enormously about the people who ran the Commission. I thought they tried their very best, but it was fated to fail from the very beginning because of the ideological bent that it carried with it. I think a measure here to praise it is totally out of place.

I mentioned prescription drugs. Everybody understands that when the President was wise enough to put aside 15 percent to pay down the debt so the money would become available because of the lack of higher interest payments for Medicare, that that was a very wise thing to do. That also allows us to contemplate prescription drugs. The Medicare Commission wouldn't even consider the use of that 15 percent. They wouldn't consider it. As a result, prescription drugs are not uniformly available.

Some seniors already have prescription drugs. They get it through Medigap. This would say, well, you would have to be up to 135 percent of poverty, but that just came in in the last week or so. That would disappear, I think, on the floor of the Senate, because I do not think, frankly, that the majority would want to see prescription drugs, because they would say it would cost too much. Well, they might be right. I think they are wrong. Seniors are now paying for it.

Under this plan, they purport that prescription drugs are covered, but they are, indeed, not covered. Many beneficiaries would not have it. They talk about prescription drugs for low-income beneficiaries, but most would not have them.

On one of the most extraordinary things that I think would very much affect the senior Senator from New Mexico, they punt. They don't even punt. They kick at the ball and miss it on the subject of graduate medical education. We do not have doctors in this country by accident. We have doctors in this country because their residencies and their postgraduate experiences are paid for, 50 percent by Medicare. Some people may not think that it should come out of Medicare, but if it doesn't come out of Medicare, then it should come out of some designated fund, an au pair trust fund or something of that sort.

What is incredible about the Medicare Commission is that it simply says, we will leave graduate medical education or direct medical education up to the appropriations process, which is like saying goodbye to all foreign doctors, which are as important in New York City as they are in southern West Virginia, because foreign doctors are well trained and they get further training in their own country.

Fifty percent of their expense is being paid for by Medicare. Under the appropriations process, they would disappear. So will many others. So will many others, because there will be no constant way of funding a very obscure program called Graduate Medical Education, which is the heart and soul of the training of good doctors and, therefore, good health care in our country.

The Federal savings in this matter—and I won't talk on forever here—but the Federal savings in this are generally a sham. I think only about $95 to $96 billion out of the $346 billion or $347 billion that the Commission says they are saving actually comes out of what they call premium supports. All the rest comes out of cutting benefits, out of the Balanced Budget Act, which we passed in 1997, out of a whole series of other things, cutting doctors and hospitals, once again. The savings are made at the expense of the beneficiary, at the expense of good health care. I have very, very strong feelings.

Just consider for one instance that 71 percent of the counties in this country have no medical plan, no HMO whatsoever. I represent a whole State. We have one. So where is the choice? There is no choice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I thank the Presiding Officer. I hope when that resolution comes up for a vote, Senators will vote no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts has 2 minutes 40 seconds remaining on the amendment. The Senator from New Mexico has 30 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I will reserve that time, and I will move on to another amendment, if that is agreeable to the floor managers. If I could have the attention of the floor managers, I am glad to either yield that time, if you were going to yield yours back. If you want to hold yours, I will hold mine. I am quite prepared to go on to another amendment. I do not want to hold up the Senate any further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the leader, that at 12 noon today the Senate proceed to vote on or in relation to the following amendments, the first vote limited to 15 minutes and other votes to 10 minutes each, with 2 minutes equally divided prior to each vote

and no second-degree amendments in order prior to the vote—this has been cleared on both sides—Specter amendment No. 157; Robb amendment No. 176; Kennedy amendment No. 177. Is that the pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the pending amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. I say to Senator KENNEDY, I am just going to use a couple minutes.

Did the Senator want the floor?

Mr. DORGAN. I wonder if I might inquire of the Senator from New Mexico, I had indicated to him I have an amendment that I wanted to lay down. If he would not mind, I would be happy to offer it and ask unanimous consent we set it aside. And then he could proceed. I was hoping perhaps after the three votes we might debate this amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. Sure. I believe the sequencing is, after the Kennedy amendment, we are going to do a Republican education amendment, and then we are going to return to your side for your amendment. If you would like to send it to the desk now, I ask unanimous consent that that be in order. We are not going to debate it now; right?

Mr. DORGAN. That is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. All right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 178

(Purpose: To provide $36,000,000,000 in additional agricultural funding)

Mr. DORGAN. I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of myself, Senators DASCHLE, HARKIN, CONRAD, BAUCUS, JOHNSON, DURBIN, BINGAMAN, and KERREY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BINGAMAN and Mr. KERREY proposes an amendment numbered 178.

Mr. DORGAN. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 43, strike beginning with line 3 through line 6, page 45, and insert the following:

SEC. 201. RESERVE FUND FOR AN UPDATED BUDGET FORECAST.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE UPDATED BUDGET FORECAST FOR FISCAL YEARS 2000–2004.—Pursuant to section 202(e)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Congressional Budget Office shall update its economic and budget forecast for fiscal years 2000 through 2004 by July 15, 1999.

(b) REPORTING A SURPLUS.—If the report provided pursuant to subsection (a) estimates an on-budget surplus for fiscal year 2000 or additional surpluses beyond those assumed in this resolution in following fiscal years, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make the appropriate adjustments to revenue and spending as provided in subsection (c).

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall take the amount of the on-budget surplus for fiscal years 2000 through 2004 estimated in the report submitted pursuant to subsection (a) and in the following order in each of the fiscal years 2000 through 2004—

(1) increase the allocation to the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry by $6,000,000,000 in budget authority and outlays in each of the fiscal years 2000 through 2004;

(2) reduce the on-budget revenue aggregate by that amount for fiscal year 2000;

(3) provide for or increase the on-budget surplus levels used for determining compliance with the pay-as-you-go requirements of section 202 of H. Con. Res. 67 (104th Congress) by that amount for fiscal year 2000; and

(4) adjust the instruction in sections 104(1) and 105(1) of this resolution to—

(A) reduce revenues by that amount for fiscal year 2000; and

(B) increase the reduction in revenues for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004 and for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2009 by that amount.

(d) BUDGETARY ENFORCEMENT.—Revised aggregates and other levels under subsection (c) shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as aggregates and other levels contained in this resolution.

SEC. 202. RESERVE FUND FOR AGRICULTURE.

(a) ADJUSTMENT.—If legislation is reported by the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry that provides risk management and income assistance for agriculture producers, the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of budget authority and outlays to that Committee by an amount that does not exceed—

(1) $6,500,000,000 in budget authority and in outlays for fiscal year 2000;

(2) $36,000,000,000 in budget authority and $35,165,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004; and

(3) $36,000,000,000 in budget authority and in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2009.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Senator.

I say to Senator KENNEDY, before I use a couple minutes and yield for your couple minutes, I ask if Senator ENZI, who has been waiting patiently and has an amendment to be cleared right quick, if he could comment on it. We could adopt it, and then we will, just before our 11:50 time to offer all the amendments, be completed.

Mr. ENZI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Will the Senator from Wyoming permit the Chair to appoint conferees on the supplemental?

Mr. ENZI. The Senator will.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the order of March 18, 1999, the Senate having received H.R. 1141, the House companion bill to S. 544, the provisions of the unanimous consent agreement are executed.

The provisions of the unanimous consent agreement are as follows:

Ordered, That when the Senate receives the House companion bill to S. 544, a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions for recovery from natural disasters, and foreign assistance, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, the Chair automatically strike all after the enacting clause; that the text of S. 544 as amended be inserted; that the House bill be advanced to third reading; and that the bill be passed, all without intervening action or debate.

Ordered further, That the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

Ordered further, That the bill, S. 544, remain at the desk.

The bill (H.R. 1141), as amended, was passed.

Pursuant to the order, the Chair appointed: Mr. STEVENS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. BOND, Mr. GORTON, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. BURNS, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. GREGG, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CRAIG, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. KYL, Mr. BYRD, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. HARKIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. REID, Mr. KOHL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DORGAN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN and Mr. DURBIN conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thanks the Senator from Wyoming.

The Senator is recognized.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000

The Senate continued with the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

AMENDMENT NO. 154

(Purpose: Expressing the Sense of the Senate that agricultural risk management programs should include livestock producers)

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to lay the pending amendment aside to call up amendment No. 154.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ENZI] for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. THOMAS and Mr. CONRAD proposes an amendment numbered 154.

Mr. ENZI. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT AGRICULTURAL RISK MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS SHOULD BENEFIT LIVESTOCK PRODUCERS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) extremes in weather-related and natural conditions have a profound impact on the economic viability of producers;

(2) these extremes, such as drought, excessive rain and snow, flood, wind, insect infestation are certainly beyond the control of livestock producers;

(3) these extremes do not impact livestock producers within a state, region or the nation in the same manner or during the same time frame or for the same duration of time;

(4) the livestock producers have few effective risk management tools at their disposal to adequately manage the short- and long-term impacts of weather-related or natural disaster situations; and

(5) ad hoc natural disaster assistance programs, while providing some relief, are not sufficient to meet livestock producers' needs for rational risk management planning.

(b) It is the sense of the Senate that any consideration of reform of federal crop insurance and risk management programs should include the needs of livestock producers.

Mr. ENZI. I also ask unanimous consent that Senator CONRAD be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. This amendment, offered by myself, Senator GRASSLEY, Senator THOMAS, and now Senator CONRAD, is a sense of the Senate that resolves that any consideration of reform of Federal crop insurance and risk management programs should include the needs of livestock producers as well.

The livestock industry has very few risk management tools available to manage the short- and long-term impacts of weather-related and natural disaster situations. They do not have an insurance program to help guard against losses. In fact, livestock producers are prohibited by law from participating in USDA's Crop Insurance Program. That prohibition must be removed.

We must devote our resources to finding a rational approach to risk management that will eliminate the need for ranchers and farmers to ask Congress each year for disaster assistance. Any program offered to the agricultural producers should cover them in the event of any crop or livestock losses due to excessive rain and snow, wind, drought, and even insect infestation. We need a program that is actuarially sound.

The livestock industry is comprised of smart, hardworking businessmen who constantly operate at the whims of Mother Nature. They are not looking for a Government handout. They simply want to be given the opportunity to better manage the risks they face in trying to get their cattle and sheep to market. We promised our ranchers help, but we have not delivered. This amendment is a good first step.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back any time that I have.

Mr. CONRAD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, very briefly, let me just say I hope our colleagues will support the amendment which my colleague from Wyoming has offered, along with a number of others of us who are very concerned about what has happened in the livestock industry.

In American agriculture now, we face the lowest prices in 52 years. We have been through an absolute price collapse in many sectors of the livestock industry. In the hog industry alone, prices have dropped to 8.5 cents a pound.

Mr. President, it takes 40 cents a pound to break even in the livestock industry. And 8.5 cents a pound is absolutely ridiculous. We anticipate losing as many as three-quarters of the hog producers in our State if something is not done.

This amendment, offered by Senator ENZI, cosponsored by others of us, we think is one way to help livestock producers manage risk through a program of risk management. I hope very much our colleagues will support it.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Enzi, Grassley, Thomas, Conrad amendment. Livestock producers have few viable risk management tools available to deal with drought, excessive rain and snow, flood, or disease. Dismal profits for cattlemen and the collapse of hog market in the Fall of 1998 are two of the predominate factors which have spurred a renewed interest in livestock insurance. I feel it is important that any consideration of reform for federal crop insurance and/or federal risk management programs should include the needs of livestock producers.

Since the introduction of revenue insurance programs in 1996 farmers raising crops have been provided risk management tools which better mediate the unavoidable risks farmers experience. Programs such as Crop Revenue Coverage (CRC), Income Protection (IP), and Revenue Assurance (RA) are available for crops, but currently a statutory prohibition bans the development of federally supported livestock insurance.

It is my opinion that we have a responsibility to provide risk management tools to all farmers, whether they raise crops or livestock. Iowa State University's Center for Agricultural and Rural Development (CARD) has studied the possible benefits of Whole-Farm Revenue Insurance for crop and livestock producers. The center has developed data which lends credibility to those who advocate adding a livestock net revenue guarantee to existing whole-farm crop revenue guarantees.

CARD determined Whole-Farm Revenue insurance programs could supplement existing risk management tools offered through the Chicago Mercantile Exchange and the Chicago Board of Trade for livestock. CARD also ascertained that the addition of livestock to whole-farm revenue guarantees could dramatically reduce both insurance rates and insurance premiums. Lower rates could lead to expanded coverage and less risk exposure for farmers.

Mr. President, risk management tools are necessary for the success of the agriculture community. Congress must work together and focus on expanded risk management to better mediate the unavoidable risks farmers experience. It's time for Congress to take an active role in providing these tools to all farmers.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support livestock producers by supporting the Enzi, Grassley, Thomas, Conrad amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. We have no objection on our side. I think it has been cleared on the Democrat side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 154) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 177

Mr. DOMENICI. I think our next Senator with an amendment has arrived. We have agreed your amendment would be next, I say to Senator GORTON. But we have to finish the Kennedy amendment in just a minute here.

Just give me a moment, I say to the Senator.

First, as I indicated earlier this morning, something very significant happened, and I am sure it will be adopted when we vote later on. That is the introduction of a bipartisan amendment to this budget resolution whereby the chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator ROTH, joined by Senator FRIST, on our side, and two very distinguished Democrats, Senator KERREY of Nebraska and Senator BREAUX of Louisiana, indicated in an official way, for the first time, that the Senate is going to be asked, because of their amendment, to proceed in a bipartisan manner to reform and fix Medicare so that it will be effective for our senior citizens for decades to come.

I must say that when we vote on that—and I believe it will be agreed to—we will have started down a path. But it will not be a long path; it will be a very short path. That path is going to lead, before the year is up, to a resolution in the Senate of the Medicare program for our senior citizens and for our children and for the taxpayers, all of whom have a very big stake in making sure this Medicare program is reformed and fixed.

So I once again congratulate those four Senators. They have permitted me to join them, so I am the fifth man on the team. I hope, before the day is out, many others will join. But I am certain by our vote we will indicate that that is precisely the path we want to take.

Some will get up and say it is very specific and precise. But ultimately, it lays down some markers. It says to the Finance Committee, let's get on with it; let's quit talking about it; let's fix it.

It is interesting that as soon as that amendment got debated, a kind of a furor occurred, and it was not on our side of the aisle, it was on the other side of the aisle. That is because that was a significant amendment that people in this country are going to understand. It is not politics; it is not talking; it is a commitment to fix Medicare for our senior citizens.

If there are new ideas beyond what the Commission—there are two commissions that are recalled in that amendment—if there are ideas beyond

it, it is going to come out of that bipartisan committee, who are so committed to repairing and fixing and modifying that program.

Having said that, the commotion got quick, and the Senator from Massachusetts arrived on the floor. Let me suggest, I have great respect for the distinguished Senator. I do know—I do know—that I am as concerned about Medicare people in America—our people, our friends, our neighbors, our relatives—as he is. I am just as compassionate and just as concerned. But I do believe—I do believe—we have to talk a little bit about reality.

Let me tell you the first reality. When the vote starts and the Senator is through with his charts, I would like very much for the rule to be applied and they be taken down, because they are only supposed to be up for a little while. Frankly, whatever little while, they should not have been up at all, because those charts are not true. Those charts state things that are not true.

Let me just tell you, ''Republican Plan Would Slash Medicare'' —there is no Republican plan. We are waiting for the Finance Committee to produce a plan. We have given them latitude in the budget resolution, but there is none. It is a bipartisan plan. So he might have said that up there, ''The Bipartisan Plan,'' if it is that plan that he does not like.

The chart says that cuts under the Democratic plan are zero. What does that mean? What in the world does that mean? There will be no reform that saves any money, that changes anything in Medicare under a Democratic plan—can't be, can't be. Everybody that is for fixing Medicare is going to have something in that column because they will repair it so it is more efficient. Some will legitimately call that a cut.

The next column in the chart is really preposterous, ''Cuts under Republican plan, 1999–2020.'' We have not even been talking about the year 2020 on the floor. There is no budget resolution for 2020 and there is no Republican plan. How can it be that we have $686 billion in cuts by the year 2020? Perhaps that number is if you leave the program alone for 20 years, it needs $686 billion worth of resources—that might be the number.

What does that have to do with our Republican plan, what we are talking about on the floor? Is the Senator suggesting we ought to put $686 billion into Medicare out of general taxes to America? It will never happen. That will not happen. Everybody knows that.

We have debated this issue. I should stop debating it because I have done it three times, but every time they bring up an amendment I have to get up because they get up. I don't want anybody out there listening to this debate to think that is accurate because that is not accurate.

We can put up charts and claim whatever we want, but that chart is not accurate. It does not adequately describe nor appropriately describe anything with reference to where we are.

Having said that, we debated and voted an amendment very similar to this amendment. The only thing is it was subject to a point of order. Perhaps Senator KENNEDY has doctored this up so it is not subject to a point of order. The Senate rejected by a majority a plan of Senator CONRAD's which is very similar, except for one thing. It is a little better in terms of trying to protect Medicare than this one. It establishes a point of order of some kind which makes it difficult to spend this extra money that is sitting around, or this surplus that is sitting around. The Kennedy amendment does not even do that.

I need no more time. I have used about 5 minutes; the Senator has used 2½ minutes. I hope we get on with the rest of this and let other Senators have a chance to debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, Senator LAUTENBERG is to be recognized for the purpose of presenting amendments.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, since a challenge was put down by the chairman of the committee on the information presented by the Senator from Massachusetts, that the Senator from Massachusetts be allowed 5 minutes to respond.

Mr. KENNEDY. I appreciate the courtesy.

Mr. DOMENICI. He has 2½ minutes.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the 2½ minutes be made available before we send our amendments to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this $686 billion is the amount that we would like and the President would like to have out of the surplus to fund the Medicare trust system so that it will be financially stable to the year 2020. That is what it represents.

Under the budget proposal of the majority, if you are not going to allocate this 15 percent of the surplus for the Medicare system, you are going to have to have $686 billion in cuts or premium increases.

That is not what I am saying; that is what the Medicare trustees have said.

To conclude, basically what we are saying, let us go ahead, prior to the tax cut, take the 10-year budget, take $320 billion of what the Republicans are intending to use for a tax cut, and use it to put the Medicare system on a sound financial system. That is it. Put the protection of Medicare first, prior to a tax cut. That is what this vote is about.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD statements from the AARP and virtually every senior citizen organization, including the National Council of Senior Citizens, the National Committee to Preserve Social Security, the OWL organization, Families USA, Gray Panthers, all of the organizations that are in strong support of using the 15 percent to make Medicare financially sound so we will have the opportunity to bring about reforms, and do that prior to the time we have tax breaks. That makes sense to protect working families in this country.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF SENIOR CITIZENS,
Silver Spring, MD, March 24, 1999.

Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY. In behalf of the members and officers of the National Council of Senior Citizens and our nationwide network of clubs and councils, I write in strong support of your efforts to amend the Senate budget resolution to assure the utilization of 15 percent of the budget surplus to extend the solvency of the Medicare program.

We also support your work to include in the final resolution a straight-forward reserve fund to create a Medicare pharmaceutical benefit with no ambiguity in regard to the use of reserve fund resources. The Snowe Amendment to the resolution falls to deliver on this point. It will not create a viable reserve fund for the Medicare prescription benefit. It would set up hurdles before the Congress could access the fund for the benefit. The overriding issue is the need of millions of seniors for a comprehensive Medicare drug benefit now.

The Senate and the Congress must not lose this historic opportunity to make a significant investment in the future health needs of both older persons and Baby Boomers as they reach Medicare eligibility. By this action, the Congress will provide for sufficient time to consider a large range of options both to strengthen Medicare and assure long-term solvency.

We applaud your efforts and those of your colleagues.

Sincerely,

STEVE PROTULIS,
Executive Director.

STATEMENT ON MEDICARE FUNDING

(By Max Rightman, Executive Vice-President, The National Committee To Preserve Social Security and Medicare, March 18, 1999)

The measure proposed for Medicare by the Budget Committee is inadequate and short-sighted.

The President's request to devote 15 percent of the surplus to Medicare is a critical element in saving Medicare. The Budget Committees' plan falls far short of that.

What the congressional measure do, quite frankly, is shortchanged today's seniors—the seniors here with this morning—and short-change millions of baby-boomers who in just a few short years will be retiring and relying on Medicare to be there for them.

America has a long-standing commitment to all of our retirees of adequate and affordable health care—it's a commitment called Medicare.

Devoting fifteen percent of the surplus for Medicare will extend solvency for a number of additional, critical years. It also will reassure today's baby boomer that this Congress will keep its commitment to them when they retire.

The National Committee urges Congress to adopt the President's 15-percent Medicare proposal. Thank you.

THE VOICE OF MIDLIFE AND OLDER WOMEN,
Washington, DC, March 24, 1999.

Hon. THOMAS DASCHLE,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DASCHLE: OWL, the only national membership organization to address issues unique to women as they age, urges the Congress to set aside 15 percent of the projected federal budget surplus to extend the solvency of the Medicare Trust Fund for an additional decade. We need a more complete public discussion of thoughtful reform and its implications on all Americans.

Medicare is a women's issue. Any effort to strengthen and modernize the system must be viewed for its impact on women. Women are 58 percent of the Medicare population at age 65 and that number rises to 71 percent at age 85. Women's health care needs differ from men's needs. They have more chronic illness, often more than one chronic illness at a time. As a result, women must have access to specialists, leading-edge medications, and technology. Chronic illness means that women interface with the Medicare system more frequently and, appropriately managed, their care can remain cost effective and they remain independent longer. Inappropriately managed, their poorer, frailer health can lead to expensive acute care episodes or long-term stays in nursing facilities. Medicare reform, to be successful, must address her needs.

As you know, Senator Daschle, women are also poorer in retirement than men. She has almost less than half of the income that her male counterpart has in retirement and she lives an average of six years longer. She spends more out-of-pocket for health care needs covered by Medicare. She averages 22 percent of her lower income in out-of-pocket expenses compared to 17 percent by men. Thus, efforts to change Medicare that would increase out-of-pocket costs for the Medicare population would have a disparate impact on the majority of the Medicare population who are women.

You know, too, Senator that Medicare and Social Security are inextricably linked in women's retirement security. We must examine the impact on each as we move forward to resolve the longterm issues facing these important programs. We cannot move in haste. We must engage the American public in this important process. Therefore, we urge Congress to set aside 15 percent of the projected surplus. Bolstering the Trust Fund will remove Medicare from the critical list and give both the public and policymakers the necessary breathing room to consider a range of options. It means that we can and will develop a program to strengthen Medicare that will work for all Americans.

Sincerely,

DEBORAH BRICELAND-BETTS,
Executive Director.

FAMILIES USA FOUNDATION,
Washington, DC, March 24, 1999.

Hon. TOM DASCHLE,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DASCHLE: Protecting the Medicare program's effectiveness and solvency is of utmost concern to America's seniors and people with disabilities—and their families as well. It should be a top priority in this Congress.

To protect the Medicare program, Families USA strongly supports committing 15 percent of the federal budget surplus to extending the Medicare trust fund. We do not believe that any credible reform of the program can be achieved without including significant new resources for the program. As the recently disbanded Medicare Commission has demonstrated, even so-called ''reforms'' that reduce seniors' benefit packages, increase beneficiary out-of-pocket costs, and cause younger seniors to lose health insurance coverage fail to secure the long-term solvency of the program. Hence, the commitment of 15 percent of the federal budget surplus is a very constructive and helpful first step in strengthening the fiscal integrity of the program.

Medicare is a program that works well for millions of older Americans and people with disabilities. By extending the life of the Medicare Part A trust fund to the year 2020, the proposed transfer of surplus funds will help to ensure that the program remains effective and viable in the years ahead.

Sincerely,

RON POLLACK,
Executive Director.

GRAY PANTHERS,
Washington, DC, March 24, 1999.

Hon. THOMAS A. DASCHLE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DASCHLE: I am writing you this letter on behalf of Gray Panthers across the country regarding the improvements we see necessary for the Medicare Program. For almost thirty years, Gray Panthers have represented older Americans and families across the country. Today, our fifty chapters and over 20,000 members across the United States, include members who are patients, caregivers, providers, business owners, association members, and active voters. All of our members have a vested interest in the Medicare program. Our members are extremely active on the Medicare issue and demand the Congress Protect, Improve, and Modernize Medicare.

As a first step then, in protecting the program, Gray Panthers urges members of Congress to vote in favor of setting aside 15% of the non-Social Security budget surplus specifically for Medicare. We understand that this will guarantee the financial integrity of the program for at least the next decade. Gray Panthers also recommends lifting the cap on Social Security in order to expand that budget as well as build fiscal integrity for the program.

We thank you for your time and consideration of this matter.

Yours truly,

PATRICIA A. RIZZO,
National Deputy Director.

ASSOCIATION OF JEWISH AGING SERVICES,
Washington, DC, March 23, 1999.

Hon. THOMAS A. DASCHLE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DASCHLE: On behalf of the membership of the Association of Jewish Aging Services and the over 150,000 elderly served in communities across the nation we urge you to protect at least 15% of the projected budget surplus to extend Medicare solvency.

Shoring up Social Security, not privatization, and improving the quality and accessibility of health care deserve the highest Congressional priority. To do otherwise, is an abdication of leadership responsibility and abandonment of our country's fundamental responsibilities to its aging citizenry.

Sincerely,

LAWRENCE M. ZIPPIN,
President.

NCOA APPLAUDS PRESIDENT'S SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE PROPOSALS

(By James Firman, President & CEO, The National Council on the Aging, January 20, 1999)

President Clinton's proposal to fortify Social Security and Medicare for the years ahead deserves the support of all Americans. His proposals would pay dividends in the form of a higher quality of life for us all—not only the chronically ill, the disabled and the frail elderly but also their families. The National Council on the Aging strongly supports investing the budget surplus to protect and strengthen Social Security and Medicare rather than squandering it on a one-time tax break.

Setting aside additional money today is the only way to prepare for the great demographic changes that our economy and our culture will face as the massive baby boom generation enters its later years. President Clinton's proposals would provide much-needed relief to today's older Americans and their families—and it would also help ensure a more secure and fulfilling old age for the baby boomers who are today's wage earners and tomorrow's Senior Boom.

By extending the solvency of these essential programs without privatizing them, cutting benefits or slashing eligibility, the Clinton plan benefits all Americans—those who are in need of assistance today, and those who will be tomorrow. The National Council on the Aging, on behalf of older Americans and those who care about them, strongly supports using the surplus for this purpose.

The President's recognition of the need to ease the poverty of older women—particularly widows—is also welcome and long overdue. For far too long, our nation has looked the other way as aging women sink deeper and deeper into poverty. We all know women live longer than men, on average, and that they tend to earn less over the course of their lifetimes. Too often, these factors doom them to a sparse and barren subsistence in their later years. In our individual lives, we would not willingly abandon our wives and mothers to spend their final years in poverty. Yet for too long, we as a nation have denied women their right to a safe and financially secure retirement.

We likewise applaud and will support the President's proposals to provide a $1,000 long-term care tax credit, to make home-care and caregiver services more available to those who need them, to increase the minimum wage and to raise additional revenues from the tobacco industry and use some of the proceeds to support the Medicare program.

We would also call on Congress to increase funding and to reauthorize the Older Americans Act, which provides for so many services—congregate and home-delivered meals, the older worker employment program, senior centers and other home and community-based activities—that are crucial to older Americans.

We look forward to working with the President and the Congress to win passage of these crucial measures, which will—sooner rather than later—touch the lives of each of us.

STATEMENT BY AARP EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HORACE DEETS ON THE PRESIDENT'S STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

We are pleased that the President has offered creative ideas to strengthen Social Security and Medicare—issues of primary concern to AARP and the American people. We eagerly await the details.

The President has offered some very intriguing ideas and we are anxious to learn more about them and how they would affect the American people. AARP has long advocated that any discussion of Social Security needs to be in the broader context of retirement income. These ideas should be measured against American's family budgets, as well as against the federal budget.

AARP's goal for Social Security reform remains steadfast a program that will guarantee benefits for future generations, that

cannot be jeopardized by misfortune, eroded by inflation, or depleted by a long life. Following a year of dialogue, AARP believes it is now time to move forward with purpose and conviction and begin to carefully examine and debate specific proposals on these and other retirement issues.

The President's plan to bolster, along with Social Security, Medicare's Hospital Insurance Trust Fund with funds from the federal budget surplus adknowledges what most Americans have long understood—that health security and economic security in retirement go hand-in-hand.

AARP has long supported the addition of a prescription drug benefit to Medicare and we applaud the President's support of one. AARP believes Medicare should remain an earned guarantee of specified health-care benefits for all older Americans and those with disabilities.

One piece of unfinished business from the last Congress that should be addressed quickly is consumer protections in managed health care. AARP continues to be deeply committed to assuring quality and consumer protection in health care, and we urge the Congress to enact legislation that will ensure such basic safeguards for all consumers as a fair and meaningful external appeals process, understandable health plan information, and access to specialty care.

The President's proposal to provide a tax credit to Americans who need long-term health care is long-overdue recognition to the many American families who are assuming the enormous burden of providing high quality care to a family member. The tax credit builds on the similar proposal put forward previously by House Republicans. AARP believes it is but one of a number of steps that can be taken to solve the nation's long-term care.

We are pleased that the President and the Republicans through their legislative agenda have given high priority to these issues. AARP encourages bipartisan Congressional action this year.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask unanimous consent to have 1 minute to respond.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Senator KENNEDY, I don't know if you were paying attention, but I did say to you that I compliment you on your compassion and your concern in this area. All I indicated was that you in your Irish way are compassionate; I, in my Italian way, am just as compassionate and I compliment you for trying to save Medicare.

I now know where the $686 billion came from. So everyone will know—I was wondering where the figure came from—it came from the President's budget, the dollar number that he is going to transfer to the Medicare fund and take back IOUs.

Let me tell Members what that is, I finally understand it. It is like postdating a check for all these billions and then saying to the American people, ''You are going to wake up one day when we have to pay them, but we are telling you now in advance you will pay them,'' and the only thing that can happen is we will pay a huge amount of new taxes, or we will have to cut the Medicare program dramatically.

I don't think that is how we ought to do business. That is what the number represents.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I will make a unanimous consent request just to take 1 minute to parallel my friend and chairman of the Budget Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, the President of the United States has a plan to extend Medicare's solvency to 2020. I heard the impassioned and always eloquent appeal by the chairman of the Budget Committee that this was a bipartisan effort. It is true that there are a couple of Democrats that are supporters of the amendment under discussion, but this is by no means to be judged in this moment to be a bipartisan effort.

Each of us is going to look at it as we see it. The Republicans do not have anything in the plan to extend the solvency.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 183 THROUGH 205, EN BLOC

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, under the provisions of the consent agreement of yesterday, I send a package of amendments to the desk and ask they be considered and offered individually, set aside en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 183

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate that Congress should enact legislation to modernize America's schools)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON MODERNIZING AMERICA'S SCHOOLS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) The General Accounting Office has performed a comprehensive survey of the Nation's public elementary and secondary school facilities and has found severe levels of disrepair in all areas of the United States.

(2) The General Accounting Office has concluded that more than 14,000,000 children attend schools in need of extensive repair or replacement; 7,000,000 children attend schools with life safety code violations; and 12,000,000 children attend schools with leaky roofs.

(3) The General Accounting Office has found that the problem of crumbling schools transcends demographic and geographic boundaries. At 38 percent of urban schools, 30 percent of rural schools, and 29 percent of suburban schools, at least 1 building is in need of extensive repair or should be completely replaced.

(4) The condition of school facilities has a direct effect on the safety of students and teachers and on the ability of students to learn. Academic research has provided a direct correlation between the condition of school facilities and student achievement. At Georgetown University, researchers have found the test scores of students assigned to schools in poor condition can be expected to fall 10.9 percentage points below the test scores of students in buildings in excellent condition. Similar studies have demonstrated up to a 20 percent improvement in test scores when students were moved from a poor facility to a new facility.

(5) The General Accounting Office has found most schools are not prepared to incorporate modern technology in the classroom. 46 percent of schools lack adequate electrical wiring to support the full-scale use of technology. More than a third of schools lack the requisite electrical power. 56 percent of schools have insufficient phone lines for modems.

(6) The Department of Education has reported that elementary and secondary school enrollment, already at a record high level, will continue to grow over the next 10 years, and that in order to accommodate this growth, the United States will need to build an additional 6,000 schools.

(7) The General Accounting Office has determined that the cost of bringing schools up to good, overall condition to be $112,000,000,000, not including the cost of modernizing schools to accommodate technology, or the cost of building additional facilities needed to meet record enrollment levels.

(8) Schools run by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) for Native American children are also in dire need of repair and renovation. The General Accounting Office has reported that the cost of total inventory repairs needed for BIA facilities is $754,000,000. The December 1997 report by the Comptroller General of the United States states that, ''Compared with other schools nationally, BIA schools are generally in poorer physical condition, have more unsatisfactory environmental factors, more often lack key facilities requirements for education reform, and are less able to support computer and communications technology.

(9) State and local financing mechanisms have proven inadequate to meet the challenges facing today's aging school facilities. Large numbers of local educational agencies have difficulties securing financing for school facility improvement.

(10) The Federal Government has provided resources for school construction in the past. For example, between 1933 and 1939, the Federal Government assisted in 70 percent of all new school construction.

(11) The Federal Government can support elementary and secondary school facilities without interfering in issues of local control, and should help communities leverage additional funds for the improvement of elementary and secondary school facilities.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the budgetary levels in this budget resolution assume that Congress will enact measures to assist school districts in modernizing their facilities, including—

(1) legislation to allow States and school districts to issue at least $24,800,000,000 worth of zero-interest bonds to rebuild and modernize our Nation's schools, and to provide Federal income tax credits to the purchasers of those bonds in lieu of interest payments; and

(2) appropriate funding for the Education Infrastructure Act of 1994 during the period 2000 through 2004, which would provide grants to local school districts for the repair, renovation and construction of public school facilities.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues—Senator LAUTENBERG and Senator ROBB in sponsoring this important amendment which calls on Congress to pass legislation to fix our Nation's crumbling schools.

The condition of our Nation's schools is well known—they are in deplorable condition. Last year, the American Society of Civil Engineers issued a report card on the condition of America's infrastructure. The report made it clear that the physical infrastructure in this

country is in dire need. However, the only area that warranted a failing grade was education. The group was concerned about the condition of things like our roads, bridges, and wastewater systems. But the only area that was deemed inadequate is education. It is clear we must place repair of our nation's schools at the top of our Nation's priority list.

There are 14 million children—almost 5 times the number of people in all of Iowa—that are attending classes in buildings that are literally falling down around them. The General Accounting Office tells us that we need $112 billion to modernize our Nation's schools to bring them to good overall condition. The Civil Engineers also say we need $60 billion in new construction to accommodate increasing enrollments.

This is a serious problem, and one that is not getting better. As a matter of fact, every day we delay, it gets worse and will cost more money to address.

Iowa State University conducted a comprehensive survey on the condition of schools in Iowa. In 1995 the estimated cost over the next 10 years was $3.4 billion. Two years later it was $4 billion and I would guess that if the study were updated for 1999 we would find that the cost has increased even more.

There are many that say this is a local problem and federal support is unwarranted and unwise. All across this country school districts are struggling to repair and upgrade their facilities because the cost is enormous.

It is simply unacceptable that we tolerate this situation. It is unconscionable that children in this country go to school in buildings where the plumbing doesn't work, the windows are broken, and the roofs leak.

This amendment calls on Congress to enact legislation to provide a comprehensive strategy to modernize our Nation's schools. First, we must pass legislation to provide funding for the Education Infrastructure Act. This is an existing federal program which has been on the books since 1994.

During each of the last two years, the Senate has passed legislation which included my proposal to appropriate $100 million for this program. Unfortunately, we have been unable to hold the funds in conference with the House.

We must redouble our efforts to provide funding for this grant program to assist needy school districts and the resolution calls on our to make this investment.

Second, the amendment calls on Congress to pass legislation to provide at least $24.8 billion in tax credits to holders of school construction bonds. These tax credits will make it possible for school districts to build and renovate school facilities at a reduced cost because the holder of the bond would receive a federal tax credit in lieu of interest.

Mr. President, We have high expectations for our children. We want them to be the best in the world—to reach the highest academic standards. But then we ask them to attend class in buildings that just don't make the grade—in buildings that are not equipped to provide a quality 21st century education.

We must enact legislation now to remedy this situation and I urge my colleagues to support our amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 184

(Purpose: To establish a budget-neutral reserve fund for environmental and natural resources)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . BUDGET-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AND NATURAL RESOURCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, revenue and spending aggregates and other appropriate budgetary levels and limits may be adjusted and allocations may be revised for legislation to improve the quality of our nation's air, water, land, and natural resources, provided that, to the extent that this concurrent resolution on the budget does not include the costs of that legislation, the enactment of the legislation will not (by virtue of either contemporaneous or previously-passed reinstatement or modification of expired excise or environmental taxes) increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for—

(1) fiscal year 2000;

(2) the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004; or

(3) the period of fiscal years 2005 through 2009.

(b) REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—

(1) ADJUSTMENTS FOR LEGISLATION.—Upon the consideration of legislation pursuant to subsection (a), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may file with the Senate appropriately-revised allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this section. These revised allocations, functional levels, and aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(2) ADJUSTMENTS FOR AMENDMENTS.—If the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate submits an adjustment under this section for legislation in furtherance of the purpose described in subsection (a), upon the offering of an amendment to that legislation that would necessitate such submission, the Chairman shall submit to the Senate appropriately-revised allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this section. These revised allocations, functional levels, and aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) REPORTING REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—The appropriate committees shall report appropriately-revised allocations pursuant to section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this section.

AMENDMENT NO. 185

(Purpose: To provide a substitute for section 205 regarding the emergency designation point of order)

On page 47, strike section 205 and insert the following:

SEC. 205. EMERGENCY DESIGNATION POINT OF ORDER.

(a) DESIGNATIONS.—

(1) GUIDANCE.—In making a designation of a provision of legislation as an emergency requirement under section 251(b)(2)(A) or 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall analyze whether a proposed emergency requirement meets all the criteria in paragraph (2).

(2) CRITERIA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The criteria to be considered in determining whether a proposed expenditure or tax change is an emergency requirement are whether it is—

(i) necessary, essential, or vital (not merely useful or beneficial);

(ii) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time;

(iii) an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(iv) subject to subparagraph (B), unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

(v) not permanent, temporary in nature.

(B) UNFORESEEN.—An emergency that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance, is not unforeseen.

(3) JUSTIFICATION FOR FAILURE TO MEET CRITERIA.—If the proposed emergency requirement does not meet all the criteria set forth in paragraph (2), the committee report or the statement of managers, as the case may be, shall provide a written justification of why the requirement should be accorded emergency status.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—When the Senate is considering a bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report, upon a point of order being made by a Senator against any provision in that measure designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) or 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and the Presiding Officer sustains that point of order, that provision along with the language making the designation shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(2) GENERAL POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under this subsection may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(3) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—If a point of order is sustained under this subsection against a conference report the report shall be disposed of as provided in section 313(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

AMENDMENT NO. 186

(Purpose: to express the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that it is the policy of the United States to provide as soon as is technologically possible an education for every American child that will enable each child to effectively meet the challenges of the 21st century)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE PROVISIONS OF THIS RESOLUTION ASSUME THAT IT IS THE POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES TO PROVIDE AS SOON AS IT TECHNOLOGICALLY POSSIBLE AN EDUCATION FOR EVERY AMERICAN CHILD THAT WILL ENABLE EACH CHILD TO EFFECTIVELY MEET THE CHALLENGES OF THE 21ST CENTURY

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) Pell Grants require an increase of $5 billion per year to fund the maximum award established in the Higher Education Act Amendments of 1998;

(2) IDEA needs at least $13 billion more per year to fund the federal commitment to fund 40% of the excess costs for special education services;

(3) Title I needs at least $4 billion more per year to serve all eligible children;

(4) over $11 billion over the next six years will be required to hire 100,000 teachers to reduce class size to an average of 18 in grades 1–3;

(5) according to the General Accounting Office, it will cost $112 billion just to bring existing school buildings up to good overall condition. According to GAO, one-third of schools serving 14 million children require extensive repair or replacement of one or more of their buildings. GAO also found that almost half of all schools lack even the basic electrical wiring needed to support full-scale use of computers;

(6) the federal share of education spending has declined from 11.9% in 1980 to 7.6% in 1998;

(7) federal spending for education has declined from 2.5% of all federal spending in FY 1980 to 2.0% in FY 1999:

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the Sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that it is the policy of the United States to provide as soon as is technologically possible an education for every American child that will enable each child to effectively meet the challenges of the 21st century.

AMENDMENT NO. 187

(Purpose: To finance disability programs designed to allow individuals with disabilities to become employed and remain independent)

At the end of Title II, insert the following:

"SEC. . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO FOSTER THE EMPLOYMENT AND INDEPENDENCE OF INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, revenue and spending aggregates and other appropriate budgetary levels and limits may be adjusted and allocations may be revised for legislation that finances disability programs designed to allow individuals with disabilities to become employed and remain independent, provided, that, to the extent that this concurrent resolution on the budget does not include the costs of that legislation, the enactment of that legislation will not increase (by virtue of either contemporaneous or previously-passed reduction) the deficit in this resolution for—

(1) fiscal year 2000;

(2) the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004; or

(3) the period of fiscal years 2005 through 2009.

(b) REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—

(1) ADJUSTMENTS FOR LEGISLATION.—Upon the consideration of legislation pursuant to subsection (a), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may file with the Senate appropriately-revised allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this section. These revised allocations, functional levels, and aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(2) ADJUSTMENTS FOR AMENDMENTS. If the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate submits an adjustment under this section for legislation in furtherance of the purpose described in subsection (a), upon the offering of an amendment to that legislation that would necessitate such submission, the Chairman shall submit to the Senate appropriately-revised allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this section. These revised allocations, functional levels, and aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) REPORTING REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—The appropriate committees shall report appropriately-revised allocations pursuant to section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this section.''

AMENDMENT NO. 188

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate that agricultural commodities and products, medicines, and medical products should be exempted from unilateral economic sanctions)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING EXEMPTION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES AND PRODUCTS, MEDICINES, AND MEDICAL PRODUCTS FROM UNILATERAL ECONOMIC SANCTIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) prohibiting or otherwise restricting the donation or sale of agricultural commodities or products, medicines, or medical products in order to unilaterally sanction a foreign government for actions or policies that the United States finds objectionable unnecessarily harms innocent populations in the targeted country and rarely causes the sanctioned government to alter its actions or policies;

(2) for the United States as a matter of policy to deny access to agricultural commodities or products, medicines, or medical products by innocent men, women, and children in other countries weakens the international leadership and moral authority of the United States; and

(3) unilateral sanctions on the sale or donation of agricultural commodities or products, medicines, or medical products needlessly harm agricultural producers and workers employed in the agricultural or medical sectors in the United States by foreclosing markets for the commodities, products, or medicines.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution and legislation enacted pursuant to this resolution assume that the President should—

(1) subject to paragraph (2), exempt agricultural commodities and products, medicines, and medical products from any unilateral economic sanction imposed on a foreign government; and

(2) apply the sanction to the commodities, products, or medicines if the application is necessary—

(A) for health or safety reasons; or

(B) due to a domestic shortage of the commodities, products, or medicines.

AMENDMENT NO. 189

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding capital gains tax fairness for family farmers)

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING CAPITAL GAINS TAX FAIRNESS FOR FAMILY FARMERS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) one of the most popular provisions included in the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 permits many families to exclude from Federal income taxes up to $500,000 of gain from the sale of their principal residences;

(2) under current law, family farmers are not able to take full advantage of this $500,000 capital gains exclusion that families living in urban or suburban areas enjoy on the sale of their homes;

(3) for most urban and suburban residents, their homes are their major financial asset and as a result such families, who have owned their homes through many years of appreciation, can often benefit from a large portion of this new $500,000 capital gains exclusion;

(4) most family farmers plow any profits they make back into the whole farm rather than into the house which holds little or no value;

(5) unfortunately, farm families receive little benefit from this capital gains exclusion because the Internal Revenue Service separates the value of their homes from the value of the land the homes sit on;

(6) we should recognize in our tax laws the unique character and role of our farm families and their important contributions to our economy, and allow them to benefit more fully from the capital gains tax exclusion that urban and suburban homeowners already enjoy; and

(7) we should expand the $500,000 capital gains tax exclusion to cover sales of the farmhouse and the surrounding farmland over their lifetimes.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that if we pass tax relief measures in accordance with the assumptions in the budget resolution, we should ensure that such legislation removes the disparity between farm families and their urban and suburban counterparts with respect to the new $500,000 capital gains tax exclusion for principal residence sales by expanding it to cover gains from the sale of farmland along with the sale of the farmhouse.

AMENDMENT NO. 190

(Purpose: To provide for a 1-year delay in a portion of certain tax provisions necessary to avoid future budget deficits)

At the end of title II, insert the following:

SEC. ___. 1-YEAR DELAY OF PORTION OF CERTAIN TAX PROVISIONS NECESSARY TO AVOID FUTURE BUDGET DEFICITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate shall provide in any reconciliation legislation provided pursuant to sections 104 and 105—

(1) a provision requiring the Congressional Budget Office to report to Congress on June 30 of each year (beginning in 2000) on the estimated Federal budget revenue impact over the next 1, 5, and 10-fiscal year period of that portion of any tax provision included in such reconciliation legislation which has not gone into effect in the taxable year in which such report is made, and

(2) in any tax provision to be included in such reconciliation legislation a provision delaying for 1 additional taxable year that portion of such provision which did not go into effect before a trigger year.

(b) TRIGGER YEAR.—For purposes of subsection (a)(2), the term ''trigger year'' means the 1st fiscal year in which the projected Federal on-budget surplus for the 1, 5, or 10-fiscal year period, as determined by the report under subsection (a)(1), is exceeded by the amount of the aggregate reduction in revenues for such period resulting from the enactment of all of the tax provisions in the reconciliation legislation described in subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 191

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate that the Urban Parks and Recreation Recovery (UPARR) program should be fully funded)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING FUNDING FOR THE URBAN PARKS AND RECREATION RECOVERY (UPARR) PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) every analysis of national recreation issues in the last 3 decades has identified the importance of close-to-home recreation opportunities, particularly for residents in densely-populated urban areas;

(2) the Land and Water Conservation Fund grants program under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 460*l*–4 et seq.) was established partly to address the pressing needs of urban areas;

(3) the National Urban Recreation Study of 1978 and the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors of 1987 revealed that critical urban recreation resources were not being addressed;

(4) older city park structures and infrastructures worth billions of dollars are at risk because government incentives favored the development of new areas over the revitalization of existing resources, ranging from downtown parks established in the 19th century to neighborhood playgrounds and sports centers built from the 1920's to the 1950's;

(5) the Urban Parks and Recreation Recovery (UPARR) program, established under the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.), authorized $725,000,000 to provide matching grants and technical assistance to economically distressed urban communities;

(6) the purposes of the UPARR program is to provide direct Federal assistance to urban localities for rehabilitation of critically needed recreation facilities, and to encourage local planning and a commitment to continuing operation and maintenance of recreation programs, sites, and facilities; and

(7) funding for UPARR is supported by a wide range of organizations, including the National Association of Police Athletic Leagues, the Sporting Goods Manufacturers Association, the Conference of Mayors, and Major League Baseball.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution and legislation enacted pursuant to this resolution assume that Congress considers the UPARR program to be a high priority, and should appropriate such amounts as are necessary to carry out the Urban Parks and Recreation Recovery (UPARR) program established under the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.).

Mr. TORRICELL. Mr. President, I thank the Chairman and Ranking Member for accepting this amendment that I have offered expressing the Sense of the Senate and the Urban Parks Recreation and Recovery Program (UPARR) should be a high Congressional budget. Community recreation services and green open spaces are an invaluable investment in our urban areas. Few things can make as big a difference for improving the quality of life and improving community morale in inner cities as a simple investment in parks. However, many facilities are old, overused, and called upon to perform years beyond their original life spans.

Established in 1978 by Public Law 95–625, the UPARR program was authorized at a level of $725 million to provide (70% federal and 30% local) grants and technical assistance to economically distressed urban communities. Prior to the elimination of funding for UPARR in 1995, the program experienced great success. UPARR funds have returned more than 1500 facilities to functional use in 400 local jurisdictions in 42 states. In the last round of applications when UPARR money was available, over 200 communities sought grants. Grants of only a few hundred thousand dollars have been enough to provide the spark to turn abandoned industrial facilities and armories into green open spaces and neighborhood recreational facilities.

By providing safe recreation opportunities these grants will improve our city's quality of life and help address the needs of at-risk youth. Violent crime arrests grew 94% between 1980–1995 for youth under age 15. FBI analysis of 1991–93 data indicate violent crimes committed by juveniles occurs with the greatest frequency after school. While federal financial assistance cannot rebuild all urban parks or solve all urban recreation problems, the program's original mission of providing seed money for local investments is one that is still valuable to make as we prepare to enter a new millennium.

Funding for UPARR is supported by a wide range of organizations—from the National Association of Police Athletic Leagues and the Sporting Goods Manufacturers Association, to the Conference of Mayors and Mayor League Baseball. They know the results of studies of studies that show that when students have an activity available after school hours, crime rates and juvenile arrests decrease. A study of the Big Brothers/Big Sisters mentoring program demonstrated that young people with adult supervision were only after half as likely to begin illegal drug use as those who had no mentor. Research at Columbia University has shown that Boys and Girls Clubs have been effective in reducing drug activities and juvenile crime in public housing and that participants do better in school and are less attracted to gangs as non-participants.

Again, I thank my colleagues for their support and look forward to working to ensure sufficient funding for this important program.

AMENDMENT NO. 192

(Purpose: To fully fund the Class Size Initiative and the Individuals with Disabilities Act with mandatory funds, the amendment reduces the resolution's tax cut by one fifth, frees up $43 billion in discretionary spending within Function 500 (in 2001–2009) for other important education programs, and leaves adequate room in the revenue reconciliation instructions for targeted tax cuts that help those in need and tax breaks for communities to modernize and rebuild crumbling schools)

On page 3, strike beginning with line 5 through page 5, line 14, and insert the following:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution—

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,401,979,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,436,108,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,467,563,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,548,594,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,604,382,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,668,856,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,703,047,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,756,420,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,826,649,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $1,890,274,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $0.
Fiscal year 2001: −$6,539,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: −$40,713,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: −$14,724,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: −$29,767,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: −$42,040,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: −$87,666,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: −$114,980,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: −$129,560,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: −$155,436,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,426,931,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,474,165,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,506,259,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,580,072,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,633,179,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,688,032,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,717,635,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,773,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,835,769,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $1,896,955,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,408,292,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,436,108,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,467,563,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,548,594,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,601,483,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,659,025,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,688,217,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,736,657,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,801,829,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $1,862,458,000,000.

On page 23, strike beginning with line 14 through page 25, line 3, and insert the following:

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $67,373,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,994,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $84,420,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,249,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $86,077,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $78,442,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $92,893,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $86,110,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $78,948,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $91,867,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $99,653,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $96,488,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $98,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $98,798,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $106,245,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $98,893,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $102,174,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $100,241,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $103,037,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $100,818,000,000.

On page 42, strike lines 1 through 5 and insert the following:

(1) to reduce revenues by not more than $0 in fiscal year 2000, $91,744,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004, and $621,426,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2009; and

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, at first glance, the pending budget appears to place a high priority on education. The resolution invests more money than proposed by President Clinton and highlights increases for elementary and secondary education.

This stands in sharp contrast to previous Republican budgets that slashed

funding for vital discretionary education programs, cut college loans and called for elimination of the Department of Education. In some respects, this budget is a welcome change.

To highlight elementary and secondary education, the resolution takes the unusual step of providing so-called ''sub-function'' allocations to prominently display the proposed increases for K–12 education. In addition, the resolution calls for an investment of $2.5 billion in special education over the next five years. That sounds pretty good.

Unfortunately, a closer examination of the budget exposes serious flaws. On the one hand, the budget touts increases for K–12 schools but plays down the sobering fact that the only way to accomplish that objective is to cut other important education and training programs.

Cuts, or in the best case scenario, freezes college grants.

Denies 100,000 children Head Start services.

Eliminates 73,000 young people from the summer jobs program.

Makes it impossible for 102,000 dislocated workers to get the training they need to get new jobs.

Unlike previous GOP budgets that launched a frontal assault on education, this budget is a stealth attack. The rhetoric touts education, but the details will spell disaster.

That is why we are offering this amendment to fully fund two critically important education programs—special education and the class size reduction act. The amendment will enable us to meet two important goals.

First, we will make sure there is full funding for these two initiatives. IDEA will be fully funded for the first time ever and we will meet our national goal of hiring 100,000 new teachers to reduce class size.

Second, by providing this mandatory stream of funding, the amendment will free up precious discretionary funds that could be invested in other important national priorities such as college grants, Head Start, Title I, education technology and job training.

The amendment is fully offset by reducing the tax breaks by 20%. That still leaves plenty of room for tax cuts for working families.

We must renew the bipartisan effort we began last fall to reduce class size. Research has shown that smaller class sizes make a difference. Teachers are able to provide more personalized attention for students and have to spend less time on discipline. As a result, students do better and learn more.

We got off to a good start last fall by enacting legislation as part of the omnibus appropriations bill for the first year of the seven year class size initiative. This amendment would enable us to finish the job and fully fund the initiative.

The amendment also invests in IDEA. In the early seventies, two landmark federal district court cases—PARC versus Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and Mills versus Board of Education of the District Court of Columbia—established that children with disabilities have a constitutional right to a free appropriate public education.

In 1975, in response to these cases, the Congress enacted PL 94–142, the precursor to IDEA, to help states meet their constitutional obligations.

When we enacted PL 94–142, the Congress authorized the maximum state award as the number of children served under the special education law times 40% of the national average per pupil expenditure.

Congress has fallen far short of this goal. Indeed, in fiscal year 1999, Congress appropriated only 11.7% of the national average per pupil expenditure for Part B of IDEA. Congress needs to do much more to help and this amendment would fully fund this program for the first time.

As an editorial in the March 15 edition of the New York Times explained, ''Educating disabled youngsters is a national responsibility. The expense should be borne on the nation as a whole, not imposed haphazardly on stated or financially strapped districts that happen to serve a large number of disabled students.''

As the ranking member on the education appropriations subcommittee, I am acutely aware of all the things we are unable to do because we do not have sufficient resources to invest. An added benefit of this amendment is to provide $43 billion for education and training programs over the next 10 years.

Mr. President, this amendment will place education at the top of the national priority list and I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 193

(Purpose: To allocate a portion of the surplus for legislation that promotes early educational development and well-being of children)

On page 43, strike beginning with line 13 through line page 44, line 10, and insert the following:

for fiscal year 2000 or increases in the surplus for any of the outyears, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make the adjustments as provided in subsection (c).

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall take a portion of the amount of increases in the on-budget surplus for fiscal years 2000 through 2004 estimated in the report submitted pursuant to subsection (a) and—

(1) increase the allocation by these amounts to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions only for legislation that promotes early educational development and well-being of children for fiscal years 2000 through 2004; and

(2) provide for or increase the on-budget surplus levels used for determining compliance with the pay-as-you-go requirements of section 202 of H. Con. Res. 67 (104th Congress) by those amounts for fiscal year 2000 through 2004.

AMENDMENT NO. 194

(Purpose: To fully fund the Class Size Initiative and the Individuals with Disabilities Act with mandatory funds, the amendment reduces the resolution's tax cut by one-fifth, frees up $43 billion in discretionary spending within Function 500 (in 2001–2009) for other important education programs, and leaves adequate room in the revenue reconciliation instructions for targeted tax cuts that help those in need and tax breaks for communities to modernize and rebuild crumbling schools)

On page 3, strike beginning with line 5 through page 5, line 14, and insert the following:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution—

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,401,979,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,436,108,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,467,563,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,548,594,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,604,382,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,668,856,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,703,047,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,756,420,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,826,649,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $1,890,274,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: −$0.
Fiscal year 2001: −$6,539,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: −$40,713,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: −$14,724,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: −$29,767,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: −$42,040,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: −$87,666,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: −$114,980,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: −$129,560,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: −$155,436,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,426,931,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,474,165,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,506,259,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,580,072,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,633,179,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,688,032,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,717,635,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,773,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,835,769,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $1,896,955,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,408,292,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,436,108,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,467,563,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,548,594,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,601,483,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,659,025,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,688,217,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,736,657,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,801,829,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $1,862,458,000,000.

On page 23, strike beginning with line 14 through page 25, line 3, and insert the following:

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $67,373,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,994,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $84,420,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,249,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $86,077,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $78,442,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $92,893,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $86,170,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, $78,948,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $91,867,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $99,653,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $96,488,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $98,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $98,798,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $100,245,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $98,893,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $102,174,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $100,241,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $103,037,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $100,818,000,000.

On page 42, strike lines 1 through 5 and insert the following:

(1) to reduce revenues by not more than $0 in fiscal year 2000, $91,744,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004, and $621,426,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2009; and

AMENDMENT NO. 195

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate concerning an increase in the minimum wage)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING AN INCREASE IN THE MINIMUM WAGE.

It is the sense of the Senate that the minimum hourly wage under section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206) should be increased by 50 cents on September 1, 1999, and again on September 1, 2000, to bring the minimum hourly wage to $6.15 an hour, and that such section should apply to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

AMENDMENT NO. 196

(Purpose: To create a reserve fund for medicare prescription drug benefits)

At the end of title II, insert the following:

SEC. ___. RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFITS.

(a) ADJUSTMENT.—If legislation is considered that modernizes and strengthens the medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) and includes a benefit under such title providing affordable prescription drug coverage for all medicare beneficiaries, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget may change committee allocations, revenue aggregates, and spending aggregates if such legislation will not cause an on-budget deficit for—

(1) fiscal year 2000;

(2) the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004; or

(3) the period of fiscal years 2005 through 2009.

(b) BUDGETARY ENFORCEMENT.—The revision of allocations and aggregates made under this section shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

AMENDMENT NO. 197

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding asset-building for the working poor)

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF SENATE REGARDING ASSET-BUILDING FOR THE WORKING POOR.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) 33 percent of all American households and 60 percent of African American households have no or negative financial assets.

(2) 46.9 percent of all children in America live in households with no financial assets, including 40 percent of Caucasian children and 75 percent of African American children.

(3) In order to provide low-income families with more tools for empowerment , incentives which encourage asset-building should be established.

(4) Across the Nation, numerous small public, private, and public-private asset-building incentives, including individual development accounts, are demonstrating success at empowering low-income workers.

(5) Middle and upper income Americans currently benefit from tax incentives for building assets.

(6) The Federal Government should utilize the Federal tax code to provide low-income Americans with incentives to work and build assets in order to escape poverty permanently.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that Congress should modify the Federal tax law to include provisions which encourage low-income workers and their families to save for buying a first home, starting a business, obtaining an education, or taking other measures to prepare for the future.

AMENDMENT NO. 198

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding the need for increased funding for the State Criminal Alien Assistance program in fiscal year 2000)

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON SCAAP FUNDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) The Federal Government has the responsibility for ensuring that our Nation's borders are safe and secure.

(2) States and localities, particularly in high immigrant States, face disproportionate costs in implementing our Nation's immigration policies, particularly in the case of incarcerating criminal illegal aliens.

(3) Federal reimbursements have continually failed to cover the actual costs borne by States and localities in incarcerating criminal illegal aliens. In fiscal year 1999, the costs to States and localities for incarcerating criminal aliens reached over $1,700,000,000, but the Federal Government reimbursed States only $585,000,000.

(4) In fiscal year 1998, the State of California spent approximately $577,000,000 for the incarceration and parole supervision of criminal alien felons, but received just $244,000,000 in reimbursements. The State of Texas spent $133,000,000, but the Federal Government provided only a $53,000,000 reimbursement. The State of Arizona incurred $38,000,000 in costs, but only received $15,000,000 in reimbursements. The State of New Mexico incurred $3,000,000 in cost, but only received $1,000,000 in reimbursements.

(5) The current Administration request of $500,000,000 is significantly below last year's Federal appropriation, despite the fact that more aliens are now being detained in State and local jails.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that the State Criminal Alien Assistance program budget proposal should increase to $970,000,000 and that the budget resolution appropriately reflects sufficient funds to achieve this objective.

AMENDMENT 199

(Purpose: To help ensure the long-term national security of the United States by budgeting for a robust Defense Science and Technology Program)

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

"SEC. . BUDGETING FOR THE DEFENSE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM.

''It is the sense of the Senate that the budgetary levels for National Defense (function 050) for fiscal years 2000 through 2008 assume funding for the Defense Science and Technology program that is consistent with Section 214 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999, which expresses a sense of the Congress that for each of those fiscal years it should be an objective of the Secretary of Defense to increase the budget request for the Defense Science and Technology program by at least 2 percent over inflation.''.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I'm very pleased to be joined by Senators from both sides of the aisle in offering this amendment regarding the Defense Science and Technology program. Senators DEWINE, KENNEDY, HUTCHISON, GRAHAM, SANTORUM, SCHUMER, CHAFEE, MOYNIHAN, and LIEBERMAN are all cosponsors, and I thank them for their valuable support.

This sense of the Senate amendment reemphasizes Congressional support for modest but needed increases in the Defense Science and Technology program budget. It reinforces that the Senate, honoring its responsibility for maintaining the long-term strength of our national defense, intends to see that the DoD places a greater priority on this high payoff investment in our national security.

A little background is in order. Technological superiority, coupled with outstanding training, remains a keystone of our military strategy and might. Undergirding that superiority has been the patient, long-term investment we have made in the Defense Science and Technology program—often known around here as ''S&T'' or ''6.1, 6.2, and 6.3'' funding. That investment gave us things like stealth and the advanced information systems that allowed us to totally dominate the battlespace during Desert Storm. It's sometimes said that the S&T of the 60's and 70's was used to fight and win the Gulf War of the 90's, at a relatively low cost of American lives. And, it's worth remembering that each time you use the Internet, you're using the results of Defense S&T.

Yet, despite the widely acknowledged and proven value of Defense S&T, despite the fact that new technology will help us counter the new threats we see emerging, despite the fact that overall Defense spending will significantly increase, the DoD plans to cut and continue cutting S&T. The fiscal 1999 S&T funding is $7.8 billion, whereas the budget request for fiscal 2000 is $7.4 billion, down around 15% in real terms since 1995. Moreover, that request includes the lowest level of S&T by the military services in 22 years. Worse yet, S&T is slated to decline to around $7 billion in constant dollars in the outyears—$1 billion less than the level recommended just last summer by the independent Defense Science Board. To my mind, that is just not consistent with maintaining the long term technological edge of our military.

Now, both Houses of Congress have recognized this problem. Last year, we included in the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act a sense of the Congress provision, Section 214, calling on the Secretary of Defense to increase the S&T budget request by at least 2% a year over inflation during fiscal 2000 through 2008.

That provision was designed to be a flexible way of urging the DoD to place a higher priority on S&T. It contemplated they would plan sensible, gradual increases in S&T, which would reach the Defense Science Board target in real terms by fiscal 2005 or so.

Unfortunately, the DoD may be falling into a classic trap that can catch the best of managers, that of focusing so hard on the short term problems that they shortchange the future. This year's plans continue to show declines for S&T in the outyears, and are largely unchanged from last year's plans.

That's where we come in. The Senate is perhaps uniquely suited to take the long term view, to look after those things that require patience, yet lie at the very foundation of our national security—like Defense S&T. We have the luxury of not being subject to the day to day pressures of DoD managers, but we have the responsibility to make sure they don't shortchange the future.

Hence, this amendment says that within the budgetary levels for National Defense, function 050, we assume the DoD will increase the S&T budget as called for in last year's Defense authorization act. This assumption, in turn, signals that we continue to be very serious about our long term investment in S&T, and will not just let the issue slide. Over time, I believe the DoD will hear our message and begin placing a higher priority on S&T and fix this problem.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to join the ten of us and support this amendment.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, in the early seventies, two landmark federal district court cases—*PARC* v. *Commonwealth of Pennsylvania,* and *Mills* v. *Board of Education of the District Court of Columbia*—established that children with disabilities have a constitutional right to a free appropriate public education.

In 1975, in response to these cases, the Congress enacted PL 94–142, the precursor to IDEA, to help states meet their constitutional obligations.

When we enacted PL 94–142, the Congress authorized the maximum state award as the number of children served under the special education law times 40% of the national average per pupil expenditure.

Congress has fallen far short of this goal. Indeed, in fiscal year 1999, Congress appropriated only 11.7% of the national average per pupil expenditure for Part B of IDEA.

Congress needs to do much more to help school districts meet their constitutional obligations. Indeed, whenever I go home to Iowa, I am besieged by requests for additional federal funding for special education.

These requests increased in intensity following the Supreme Court decision in *Cedar Rapids Community School District* v. *Garrett F.* That decision reaffirmed the court's longstanding interpretation that schools must provide those health-related services necessary to allow a child with a disability to remain in school.

This is a terribly important decision, which reaffirms that all children with disabilities have the right to a meaningful education. As Justice Stevens wrote, ''under the statute, [Supreme Court] precedent, and the purpose of the IDEA, the District must fund such ''related services'' in order to help guarantee that students like Garrett are integrated into the public schools.''

The child in this case, Garrett Frey, happens to come from Iowa. He is friendly bright, articulate young man, who is also quadriplegic and ventilator-dependent. Twenty years ago, he probably would have been shunted off to an institution, at a terrible cost to taxpayers. Instead, he is thriving as a high school student, and will most likely go off to college and become a hard-working, tax paying citizen.

An editorial in USA Today summed up the situation well.

> We've learned a lot about the costs of special education over the past 24 years. In addition to the savings realized when children can live at home with their families, we also know there are astronomical costs associated with not educating students with disabilities. Research shows that individuals who did not benefit from IDEA are almost twice as likely to not complete high school, not attend college and not get a job. The bottom line: Providing appropriate special education and related services to children saves government hundreds of thousands of dollars in dependency costs.

The Garrett Frey decision, also underscores the need for Congress to help school districts with the financial costs of educating children with disabilities. While the excess costs of educating some children with disabilities is minimal, the excess costs of educating other children with disabilities, like Garrett, is great.

The pending amendment, of which I am pleased to cosponsor, would take two important steps. First, it would fully fund IDEA at the 40% goals. Secondly, the amendment would provide a mandatory stream of funding for this important program. Finally, the amendment is paid for by taking a portion of the funds set-aside for tax breaks and instead invest those funds in IDEA. Mr. President, my amendment would provide real money to help school districts meet their constitutional obligations. Local school districts should not have to bear the full costs of educating children with disabilities.

Again, the USA Today editorial said it well.

> Let's be clear: The job of educating all our children is no small feat. But kids in special education and kids in ''gifted and talented'' programs are not to blame for tight resources. We, as a nation, must increase our commitment to a system of public education that has the capacity to meet the needs of all children, including children with disabilities.

Of course, in providing increased funding for IDEA, we must make sure we do not do so at the expense of other equally important education programs.

We need to fully fund Head Start so that all children start school ready to learn.

We need to fully fund Title I so that all children get the extra help they need in reading and math.

We need to fully fund Pell Grants so that all students have a chance to go to college.

There are many other important education initiatives, such as reducing class size, improving teacher training, and modernizing our crumbling schools, that will also help children with disabilities.

Finally, I'd like to point out that when we reauthorized IDEA in 1997, we made clear that the cost of serving students with disabilities should fall not just on school districts, but should be shared by all responsive state agencies, including state Medicaid agencies and state health departments. While Garrett does not qualify for any state programs, many children in his situation do, and the school districts can and should avail themselves of that money.

Mr. President, this amendment is about setting rational national priorities. We must make education our nation's top priority since the real threat to our national security is an inability to compete in the global marketplace. We must have the best-educated, most-skilled, healthiest workers in the world to secure our nation's future. Investments in education are essential if we are to reach that goal.

The amendment targets one important area—special education—and fully funds this important program. As an editorial in the March 15 edition of the New York Times explained, ''Educating disabled youngsters is a national responsibility. The expense should be borne on the nation as a whole, not imposed haphazardly on states or financially strapped districts that happen to serve a large number of disabled students.''

By providing these additional resources for special education, we would free up funds both here and in local school districts for other important education priorities. I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment to fully fund IDEA by reducing tax breaks in the budget.

AMENDMENT NO. 200

(Purpose: To allow increased tobacco tax revenues to be used as an offset for the Medicare prescription drug benefit provided for in section 209)

On page 53, line 4, after ''may change committee allocations'' insert '', revenue aggregates for legislation that increases taxes on tobacco or tobacco products (only),''.

AMENDMENT NO. 201

(Purpose: To fund a 40 percent Federal share for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the amendment reduces the resolution's tax cut by nearly one fifth, frees up $43 billion in discretionary spending within Function 500 (in 2001–2009) for other important education programs, and leaves adequate room in the revenue reconciliation instructions for targeted tax cuts that help those in need and tax breaks for communities to modernize and rebuild crumbling schools)

On page 3, strike beginning with line 5 through page 5, line 14, and insert the following:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution—

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,401,979,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,436,033,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,466,653,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,547,102,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,602,574,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,666,629,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,700,594,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,755,630,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,826,369,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $1,890,274,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $0.
Fiscal year 2001: −$6,614,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: −$41,623,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: −$16,216,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: −$31,574,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: −$44,267,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: −$90,119,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: −$115,770,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: −$129,840,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: −$155,436,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,426,931,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,472,665,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,504,559,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,578,337,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,630,879,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,685,232,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,717,635,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,773,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,835,769,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $1,896,955,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,408,292,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,436,033,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,466,653,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,547,102,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,599,675,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,656,798,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,685,764,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,735,867,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,801,549,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $1,862,458,000,000.

On page 23, strike beginning with line 14 through page 25, line 3, and insert the following:

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $67,373,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,994,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $82,920,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,174,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $84,377,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $77,532,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $91,158,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $84,618,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $95,249,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $90,059,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $96,853,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $94,261,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $98,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $96,345,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $100,245,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $98,103,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $102,174,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $99,961,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $103,037,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $100,818,000,000.

On page 42, strike lines 1 through 5 and insert the following:

(1) to reduce revenues by not more than $0 in fiscal year 2000, $96,028,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004, and $631,461,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2009; and

AMENDMENT NO. 202

(Purpose: To express the Sense of the Senate regarding funding for embassy security)

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON IMPORTANCE OF FUNDING FOR EMBASSY SECURITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) Enhancing security at U.S. diplomatic missions overseas is essential to protect U.S. government personnel serving on the front lines of our national defense;

(2) 80 percent of U.S. diplomatic missions do not meet current security standards;

(3) the Accountability Review Boards on the Embassy Bombings in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam recommended that the Department of State spend $1.4 billion annually on embassy security over each of the next ten years;

(4) the amount of spending recommended for embassy security by the Accountability Review Boards is approximately 36 percent of the operating budget requested for the Department of State in Fiscal Year 2000; and

(5) the funding requirements necessary to improve security for United States diplomatic missions and personnel abroad cannot be borne within the current budgetary resources of the Department of State;

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the Sense of the Senate that the budgetary levels in this budget resolution assume that as the Congress contemplates changes in the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to reflect projected on-budget surpluses, provisions similar to those set forth in Section 314(b) of that Act should be considered to ensure adequate funding for enhancements to the security of U.S. diplomatic missions.

AMENDMENT NO. 203

(Purpose: To allow for the creation of a mandatory fund for medical research under the authority of the National Institutes of Health fully funded through a tax provision providing that certain funds provided by tobacco companies to states or local governments in connection with tobacco litigation or settlement shall not be deductible)

Page 3, line 9: reduce the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 3, line 10: reduce the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 3, line 11: reduce the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 3, line 12: reduce the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 3, line 13: reduce the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 3, line 14: reduce the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 3, line 15: reduce the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 3, line 16: reduce the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 3, line 17: reduce the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 3, line 18: reduce the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 4, line 4: change the figure to read −$1,400,000,000.
Page 4, line 5: reduce the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 4, line 6: reduce the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 4, line 7: reduce the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 4, line 8: reduce the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 4, line 9: reduce the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 4, line 10: reduce the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 4, line 11: reduce the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 4, line 12: reduce the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 4, line 13: reduce the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 4, line 17: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 4, line 18: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 4, line 19: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 4, line 20: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 4, line 21: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 4, line 22: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 4, line 23: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 4, line 24: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 4, line 25: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 5, line 1: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 5, line 5: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 5, line 6: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 5, line 7: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 5, line 8: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 5, line 9: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 5, line 10: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 5, line 11: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 5, line 12: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 5, line 13: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 5, line 14: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 25, line 7: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 25, line 8: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 25, line 11: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 25, line 12: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 25, line 15: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 25, line 16: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 25, line 19: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 25, line 20: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 25, line 23: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.
Page 25, line 24: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 26, line 2: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 26, line 3: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 26, line 6: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 26, line 7: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 26, line 10: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 26, line 11: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 26, line 14: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 26, line 15: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 26, line 18: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 26, line 19: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 204

(Purpose: To extend the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund)

At the end of title II, insert the following:

SEC. ___. EXTENSION OF VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION TRUST FUND.

(a) DISCRETIONARY LIMITS.—In the Senate, in this section, and for the purposes of allocations made for the discretionary category pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974—

(1) with respect to fiscal year 2001—

(A) the Chairman of the Budget Committee shall make the necessary adjustments in the discretionary spending limits to reflect the changes in (B); and

(B) for the violent crime reduction category: $6,025,000,000 in new budget authority and $5,718,000,000 in outlays;

(2) with respect to fiscal year 2002—

(A) the Chairman of the Budget Committee shall make the necessary adjustments in the discretionary spending limits to reflect the changes in (B); and

(B) for the violent crime reduction category: $6,169,000,000 in new budget authority and $6,020,000,000 in outlays; and

(3) with respect to fiscal year 2003—

(A) the Chairman of the Budget Committee shall make the necessary adjustments in the discretionary spending limits to reflect the changes in (B); and

(B) for the violent crime reduction category: $6,316,000,000 in new budget authority and $6,161,000,000 in outlays;

(4) with respect to fiscal year 2004—

(A) the Chairman of the Budget Committee shall make the necessary adjustments in the discretionary spending limits to reflect the changes in (B); and

(B) for the violent crime reduction category: $6,458,000 in new budget authority and $6,303,000,000 in outlays; and

(5) with respect to fiscal year 2005—

(A) the Chairman of the Budget Committee shall make the necessary adjustments in the discretionary spending limits to reflect the changes in (B); and

(B) for the violent crime reduction category: $6,616,000 in new budget authority and $6,452,000,000 in outlays;

as adjusted in strict conformance with section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and section 314 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(b) POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider—

(A) a revision of this resolution or any concurrent resolution on the budget for any of the fiscal years 2000 through 2005 (or amendment, motion, or conference report on such a resolution) that provides discretionary spending in excess of the discretionary spending limit or limits for such fiscal year; or

(B) any bill or resolution (or amendment, motion, or conference report on such bill or resolution) for any of the fiscal years 2000 through 2005 that would cause any of the limits in this section (or suballocations of the discretionary limits made pursuant to section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) to be exceeded.

(2) EXCEPTION.—This section shall not apply if a declaration of war by Congress is in effect or if a joint resolution pursuant to section 258 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 has been enacted.

(c) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(d) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this section shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the concurrent resolution, bill, or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(e) DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, new entitlement authority, revenues, and deficits for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

AMENDMENT NO. 205

(Purpose: to allow for a tax cut for working families that could be provided immediately, before enactment of Social Security reform would make on-budget surpluses available as an offset)

On page 46, after line 10, add a new subsection (c) that reads as follows:

(c) LIMITATION.—This reserve fund will only be available for the following types of tax relief:

(1) Tax relief to help working families afford child care, including assistance for families with a parent staying out of the workforce in order to care for young children;

(2) Tax relief to help individuals and their families afford the expense of long-term health care;

(3) Tax relief to ease the tax code's marriage penalties on working families;

(4) Any other individual tax relief targeted exclusively for families in the bottom 90 percent of the family income distribution;

(5) The extension of the Research and Experimentation tax credit, the Work Opportunity tax credit, and other expiring tax provisions, a number of which are important to help American businesses compete in the modern international economy and to help bring the benefits of a strong economy to disadvantaged individuals and communities; and,

(6) Tax incentives to help small businesses offer pension plans to their employees, and other proposals to increase pension access, portability, and security.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I rise to offer an amendment to strike section 204 of the budget resolution, as well as the reconciliation instructions to cut taxes by $778 billion over the next 10 years without offsetting their costs.

I move to eliminate these provisions because they strike at the very heart of the fiscal discipline that has brought about the first unified balanced budget in 30 years.

In 1993, in President Clinton's first budget, we introduced a new pay-as-you-go rule in the Senate. This rule provided for a 60-vote point of order in the Senate against legislation that would increase the deficit over 10 years. That has served to keep the Senate and the Congress on a course of fiscal responsibility by requiring Congress to pay for any changes in revenues or direct spending.

The budget resolution before us, however, abandons the pay-go rule and allows Congress to spend the projected onbudget surpluses without offsetting their costs.

While supporters of this language promote this as a simple clarification of existing principles, arguing the pay-go rules were not to apply in times of onbudget surpluses, the Congressional Budget Office disagrees.

In my judgment, it would be irresponsible to abandon the very pay-go rules that brought us to this point when we still face a $3.7 trillion debt held by the public, and a total debt of over $5.5 trillion.

But, Mr. President, regardless of one's views on whether these rules were meant to apply in our current fiscal circumstances, I believe it is in our interest not to abandon the pay-go rules at this time. They have been instrumental in imposing fiscal discipline on this body, something that has been sorely lacking in previous years.

Paying for new spending or new tax cuts forces legislators to make tough choices. If we abandon this rule, we are saying, in effect, we don't have to make tough choices anymore. And that is particularly troubling when we make long-term decisions based only on projections, as we do today.

Mr. President, those who support this change are using it to pass a tax cut that would otherwise be subject to a point of order under the current pay-go rules. But I want to ask our colleagues, which is the more fiscally conservative position? Supporters of this new language may think of themselves as fiscal conservatives. In my view, the fiscally conservative position demands paying for other priorities and using the total surplus, not just the off-budget surplus, to pay down the publicly held debt.

By ridding ourselves of this debt, we dramatically increase our flexibility to solve some of our long-term funding challenges in Social Security and Medicare.

The budget resolution before us is short shrift to Social Security and Medicare by abandoning the pay-go rules and using the onbudget surplus for tax cuts. Once again, it puts short-term political interests ahead of long-term planning. As long as the only window we are looking through faces the next election rather than our economic strength in the next century, we will continue to put our focus on feel-good tax cuts at the expense of preparing for the future of Social Security and Medicare.

Bottom line, Mr. President, the responsible position is to maintain the

current budget rules and pay down the debt, and that is the proposition that Americans support.

We have a responsibility to the next generation to reduce the debt that clouds our Nation's future prosperity, and the way to remove that debt is to stick to the pay-go rules that have served us so well.

With this amendment, cosponsored by Senator GRAHAM of Florida, we will keep the pay-go rules, we will pay off the debt, and we will ensure that any tax cut doesn't threaten to plunge us back into the large deficits from which we have so recently been delivered.

With that, Mr. President, I yield back any time remaining. I thank the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

Mr. DOMENICI. Is it in order for the Senator to submit the Republican amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is in order.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 206 THROUGH 243, EN BLOC

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I want to inform the Senate that the timeline runs out on the resolution—because votes count and everything now—at 7 o'clock. Here are 36 amendments that Republicans have asked me to send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They will be received at the desk.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 206

(Purpose: To provide the Sense of the Senate regarding support for Federal, State and local law enforcement, and for the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

"SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING SUPPORT FOR FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AND FOR THE VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION TRUST FUND.

''(a) FINDINGS.—the Senate finds that:—

''(1) Our Federal, State and local law enforcement officers provide essential services that preserve and protect our freedom and safety, and with the support of federal assistance such as the Local Law Enforcement Block Grant Program, the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant Program, the COPS Program, and the Byrne Grant Program, state and local law enforcement officers have succeeded in reducing the national scourge of violent crime, illustrated by a violent crime rate that has dropped in each of the past four years;

''(2) Assistance, such as the Violent Offender Incarceration/Truth in Sentencing Incentive Grants, provided to State corrections systems to encourage truth in sentencing laws for violent offenders has resulted in longer time served by violent criminals and safer streets for law abiding people across the Nation;

''(3) Through a comprehensive effort by state and local law enforcement to attack violence against women, in concert with the efforts of dedicated volunteers and professionals who provide victim services, shelter, counseling and advocacy to battered women and their children, important strides have been made against the national scourge of violence against women.

''(4) Despite recent gains, the violent crime rate remains high by historical standards;

''(5) Federal efforts to investigate and prosecute international terrorism and complex interstate and international crime are vital aspects of a National anticrime strategy, and should be maintained;

''(6) The recent gains by Federal, State and local law enforcement in the fight against violent crime and violence against women are fragile, and continued financial commitment from the Federal Government for funding and financial assistance is required to sustain and build upon these gains; and

''(7) The Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund, enacted as a part of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, funds the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996, without adding to the federal budget deficit.

''(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the Sense of the Senate that the provisions and the functional totals underlying this resolution assume that the Federal Government's commitment to fund Federal law enforcement programs and programs to assist State and local efforts to combat violent crime, such as the Local Law Enforcement Block Grant Program, the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant Program, the Violent Offender Incarceration/Truth in Sentencing Incentive Grants Program, the Violence Against Women Act, the COPS Program, and the Byrne Grant Program, shall be maintained, and that funding for the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund shall continue to at least fiscal year 2005.''

AMENDMENT NO. 207

(Purpose: To ensure a rational adjustment to merger notification thresholds for small business and to ensure adequate funding for Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice)

At the appropriate place, insert the following new section:

"SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON MERGER ENFORCEMENT BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

''(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

''(1) the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice is charged with the civil and criminal enforcement of the antitrust laws, including review of corporate mergers likely to reduce competition in particular markets, with a goal to promote and protect the competitive process;

''(2) the Antitrust Division requests a 16 percent increase in funding for fiscal year 2000;

''(3) justification for such an increase is based, in part, on increasingly numerous and complex merger filings pursuant to the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976;

''(4) the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 sets value thresholds which trigger the requirement for filing premerger notification;

''(5) the number of merger filings under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976, which the Department, in conjunction with the Federal Trade Commission, is required to review, increased by 38 percent in fiscal year 1998;

''(6) the Department expects the number of merger filings to increase in fiscal years 1999 and 2000;

''(7) the value thresholds, which relate to both the size of the companies involved and the size of the transaction, under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 have not been adjusted since passage of that Act.

''(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the Sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that the Antitrust Division will have adequate resources to enable it to meet its statutory requirements, including those related to reviewing and investigating increasingly numerous and complex mergers, but that Congress should make modest, budget neutral, adjustments to the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 to account for inflation in the value thresholds of the Act, and in so doing, ensure that the Antitrust Division's resources are focused on matters and transactions most deserving of the Division's attention.

AMENDMENT NO. 208

(Purpose: To express the Sense of the Senate that the Marriage Penalty should be eliminated and the marginal income tax rates should be uniformly reduced)

At the appropriate place, insert:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ELIMINATING THE MARRIAGE PENALTY AND ACROSS THE BOARD INCOME TAX RATE CUTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) The institution of marriage is the cornerstone of the family and civil society;

(2) Strengthening of the marriage commitment and the family is an indispensable step in the renewal of America's culture;

(3) The Federal income tax punishes marriage by imposing a greater tax burden on married couples than on their single counterparts:

(4) America's tax code should give each married couple the choice to be treated as one economic unit, regardless of which spouse earns the income; and

(5) All American taxpayers are responsible for any budget surplus and deserve broad-based tax relief after the Social Security Trust fund has been protected.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that—

(1) Congress should eliminate the marriage penalty in a manner that treats all married couples equally, regardless of which spouse earns the income; and

(2) Congress should implement an equal, across the board reduction in each of the current federal income tax rates as soon as there is a non-Social Security surplus.

AMENDMENT NO. 209

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate that the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 needs comprehensive reform)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING REFORM OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (referred to in this section as the ''tax code'') is unnecessarily complex and burdensome, consisting of 2,000 pages of tax code, and resulting in 12,000 pages of regulations and 200,000 pages of court proceedings;

(2) the complexity of the tax code results in taxpayers spending approximately 5,400,000,000 hours and $200,000,000,000 on tax compliance each year;

(3) the impact of the complexity of the tax code is inherently inequitable, rewarding taxpayers which hire professional tax preparers and penalizing taxpayers which seek to comply with the tax code without professional assistance;

(4) the percentage of the income of an average family of four that is paid for taxes has grown significantly, comprising nearly 40 percent of the family's earnings, a percentage which represents more than a family spends in the aggregate on food, clothing, and housing;

(5) the total amount of Federal, State, and local tax collections in 1998 increased approximately 5.7 percent over such collections in 1997;

(6) the tax code penalizes saving and investment by imposing tax on these important activities twice while promoting consumption by only taxing income used for consumption once;

(7) the tax code stifles economic growth by discouraging work and capital formation through high tax rates;

(8) Congress and the President have found it necessary on several occasions to enact laws to protect taxpayers from abusive actions and procedures of the Internal Revenue Service in enforcement of the tax code; and

(9) the complexity of the tax code is largely responsible for the growth in size of the Internal Revenue Service.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that —

(1) the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 needs comprehensive reform; and

(2) Congress should move expeditiously to consider comprehensive proposals to reform the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

AMENDMENT NO. 210

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate that the additional tax incentives should be provided for education savings)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING TAX INCENTIVES FOR EDUCATION SAVINGS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) families in the United States have accrued more college debt in the 1990s than during the previous 3 decades combined; and

(2) families should have every resource available to them to meet the rising cost of higher education.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution and legislation enacted pursuant to this resolution assume that additional tax incentives should be provided for education savings, including—

(1) excluding from gross income distributions from qualified State tuition plans; and

(2) providing a tax deferral for private prepaid tuition plans in years 2000 through 2003 and excluding from gross income distributions from such plans in years 2004 and after.

AMENDMENT NO. 211

(Purpose: expressing the Sense of the Senate regarding the Davis-Bacon Act)

At the appropriate place, insert:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING DAVIS-BACON.

It is the Sense of the Senate that in carrying out the assumptions in this budget resolution, the Senate will consider reform of the Davis-Bacon Act as an alternative to repeal.

AMENDMENT NO. 212

(Purpose: expressing the Sense of the Senate regarding reauthorization of the Farmland Protection Program)

At the appropriate place, insert:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE 106TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION SHOULD REAUTHORIZE FUNDS FOR THE FARMLAND PROTECTION PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings—

(1) Nineteen states and dozens of localities have spent nearly $1 billion to protect over 600,000 acres of important farmland;

(2) The Farmland Protection Program has provided cost-sharing for nineteen states and dozens of localities to protect over 123,000 acres on 432 farms since 1996;

(3) The Farmland Protection Program has generated new interest in saving farmland in communities around the country;

(4) The Farmland Protection Program represents an innovative and voluntary partnership, rewards local ingenuity, and supports local priorities;

(5) The Farmland Protection Program is a matching grant program that is completely voluntary in which the federal government does not acquire the land or easement;

(6) Funds authorized for the Farmland Protection Program were expended at the end of Fiscal Year 1998, and no funds were appropriated in Fiscal Year 1999;

(7) The United States is losing two acres of our best farmland to development every minute of every day;

(8) These lands produce three quarters of the fruits and vegetables and over one half of the dairy in the United States;

(b) SENATE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals contained in this resolution assume that the 106th Congress, 1st Session will reauthorize funds for the Farmland Protection Program.

AMENDMENT NO. 213

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding support for State and local law enforcement)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING SUPPORT FOR STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the President's budget request for fiscal year 2000 proposes significant reductions in Federal support for State and local law enforcement efforts to combat crime by eliminating more than $1,000,000,000 from State and local law enforcement programs that directly support the Nation's communities, including—

(A) zero funding for Local Law Enforcement Block Grants, for which $523,000,000 was made available for fiscal year 1999;

(B) a reduction from the amount made available for fiscal year 1999 of $645,000,000 for State prison grants (including Violent Offender Incarceration Grants and Truth-in-Sentencing Incentive Grants);

(C) a reduction from the amount made available for fiscal year 1999 of more than $85,000,000 from the State Criminal Alien Incarceration Program, which reimburses States for the incarceration of illegal aliens;

(D) a reduction in funding for the popular Byrne grant program under part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968; and

(E) elimination of funding for Juvenile Accountability Block Grants, which have provided $500,000,000 over the last 2 years to communities attempting to control the plague of youth violence;

(2) as national crime rates are beginning to fall as a result of State and local efforts, with Federal support, it is unwise to ignore the responsibility of the Federal Government to communities still overwhelmed by crime;

(3) Federal support is crucial to the provision of critical crime fighting services and the effective administration of justice in the States, such as the approximately 600 qualified State and local crime laboratories and medical examiners' offices, which deliver over 90 percent of the forensic services in the United States;

(4) dramatic increases in crime rates over the last decade have generally exceeded the capacity of State and local crime laboratories to process their forensic examinations, resulting in tremendous backlogs that prevent the swift administration of justice and impede fundamental individual rights, such as the right to a speedy trial and to exculpatory evidence;

(5) last year, Congress passed the Crime Identification Technology Act of 1998, which authorizes $250,000,000 each year for 5 years to assist State and local law enforcement agencies in integrating their anticrime technology systems into national databases, and in upgrading their forensic laboratories and information and communications infrastructures upon which these crime fighting systems rely; and

(6) the Federal Government must continue efforts to significantly reduce crime by at least maintaining Federal funding for State and local law enforcement, and wisely targeting these resources.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that—

(1) the amounts made available for fiscal year 2000 to assist State and local law enforcement efforts will be—

(A) greater than the amounts proposed in the President's budget request for fiscal year 2000; and

(B) comparable to amounts made available for that purpose for fiscal year 1999;

(2) the amounts made available for fiscal year 2000 for crime technology programs should be used to further the purposes of the program under section 102 of the Crime Identification Technology Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 14601); and

(3) Congress should consider legislation that specifically addresses the backlogs in State and local crime laboratories and medical examiners' offices.

AMENDMENT NO. 214

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate that funding for Federal drug control activities should be at a level higher than that proposed in the President's budget request for fiscal year 2000)

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING FUNDING FOR COUNTER-NARCOTICS INITIATIVES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) from 1985–1992, the Federal Government's drug control budget was balanced among education, treatment, law enforcement, and international supply reduction activities and this resulted in a 13-percent reduction in total drug use from 1988 to 1991;

(2) since 1992, overall drug use among teens aged 12 to 17 rose by 70 percent, cocaine and marijuana use by high school seniors rose 80 percent, and heroin use by high school seniors rose 100 percent;

(3) during this same period, the Federal investment in reducing the flow of drugs outside our borders declined both in real dollars and as a proportion of the Federal drug control budget;

(4) while the Federal Government works with State and local governments and numerous private organizations to reduce the demand for illegal drugs, seize drugs, and break down drug trafficking organizations within our borders, only the Federal Government can seize and destroy drugs outside of our borders;

(5) in an effort to restore Federal international eradication and interdiction efforts, in 1998, Congress passed the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act which authorized an additional $2,600,000,000 over 3 years for international interdiction, eradication, and alternative development activities;

(6) Congress appropriated over $800,000,000 in fiscal year 1999 for anti-drug activities authorized in the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act;

(7) the President's Budget Request for fiscal year 2000 would invest $100,000,000 less than what Congress appropriated in fiscal year 1999;

(8) the President's Budget Request for fiscal year 2000 contains no funding for the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act's top 5 priorities, namely, including funds for an enhanced United States Customs Service

air interdiction program, counter-drug intelligence programs, security enhancements for our United States-Mexico border, and a promising eradication program against coca, opium, poppy, and marijuana; and

(9) the proposed Drug Free Century Act would build upon many of the initiatives authorized in the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act, including additional funding for the Department of Defense for counter-drug intelligence and related activities.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that—

(1) funding for Federal drug control activities should be at a level higher than that proposed in the President's budget request for fiscal year 2000; and

(2) funding for Federal drug control activities should allow for investments in programs authorized in the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act and in the proposed Drug Free Century Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 215

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate concerning resources for autism research through the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING AUTISM.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Infantile autism and autism spectrum disorders are biologically-based neurodevelopmental diseases that cause severe impairments in language and communication and generally manifest in young children sometime during the first two years of life.

(2) Best estimates indicate that 1 in 500 children born today will be diagnosed with an autism spectrum disorder and that 400,000 Americans have autism or an autism spectrum disorder.

(3) There is little information on the prevalence of autism and other pervasive developmental disabilities in the United States. There have never been any national prevalence studies in the United States, and the two studies that were conducted in the 1980s examined only selected areas of the country. Recent studies in Canada, Europe, and Japan suggest that the prevalence of classic autism alone may be 300 percent to 400 percent higher than previously estimated.

(4) Three quarters of those with infantile autism spend their adult lives in institutions or group homes, and usually enter institutions by the age of 13.

(5) The cost of caring for individuals with autism and autism spectrum disorder is great, and is estimated to be $13.3 billion per year solely for direct costs.

(6) The rapid advancements in biomedical science suggest that effective treatments and a cure for autism are attainable if—

(A) there is appropriate coordination of the efforts of the various agencies of the Federal Government involved in biomedical research on autism and autism spectrum disorders;

(B) there is an increased understanding of autism and autism spectrum disorders by the scientific and medical communities involved in autism research and treatment; and

(C) sufficient funds are allocated to research.

(7) The discovery of effective treatments and a cure for autism will be greatly enhanced when scientists and epidemiologists have an accurate understanding of the prevalence and incidence of autism.

(8) Recent research suggests that environmental factors may contribute to autism. As a result, contributing causes of autism, if identified, may be preventable.

(9) Finding the answers to the causes of autism and related developmental disabilities may help researchers to understand other disorders, ranging from learning problems, to hyperactivity, to communications deficits that affect millions of Americans.

(10) Specifically, more knowledge is needed concerning—

(A) the underlying causes of autism and autism spectrum disorders, how to treat the underlying abnormality or abnormalities causing the severe symptoms of autism, and how to prevent these abnormalities from occurring in the future;

(B) the epidemiology of, and the identification of risk factors for, infantile autism and autism spectrum disorders;

(C) the development of methods for early medical diagnosis and functional assessment of individuals with autism and autism spectrum disorders, including identification and assessment of the subtypes within the autism spectrum disorders, for the purpose of monitoring the course of the disease and developing medically sound strategies for improving the outcomes of such individuals;

(D) existing biomedical and diagnostic data that are relevant to autism and autism spectrum disorders for dissemination to medical personnel, particularly pediatricians, to aid in the early diagnosis and treatment of this disease; and

(E) the costs incurred in educating and caring for individuals with autism and autism spectrum disorders.

(11) In 1998, the National Institutes of Health announced a program of research on autism and autism spectrum disorders. A sufficient level of funding should be made available for carrying out the program.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying this resolution assume that additional resources will be targeted towards autism research through the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

AMENDMENT NO. 216

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding the potential impact of the amendments to the medicare program contained in the Balanced Budget Act on access to items and services under such program)

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING ACCESS TO ITEMS AND SERVICES UNDER MEDICARE PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) Total hospital operating margins with respect to items and services provided to medicare beneficiaries are expected to decline from 4.3 percent in fiscal year 1997 to 0.1 percent in fiscal year 1999.

(2) Total operating margins for small rural hospitals are expected to decline from 4.2 percent in fiscal year 1998 to negative 5.6 percent in fiscal year 2002, a 233 percent decline.

(3) The Congressional Budget Office recently has estimated that the amount of savings to the medicare program in fiscal years 1998 through 2002 by reason of the amendments to that program contained in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 is $88,500,000 more than the amount of savings to the program by reason of those amendments that the Congressional Budget Office estimated for those fiscal years immediately prior to the enactment of that Act.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions contained in this budget resolution assume that the Senate should—

(1) consider whether the amendments to the medicare program contained in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 have had an adverse impact on access to items and services under that program; and

(2) if it is determined that additional resources are available, additional budget authority and outlays shall be allocated to address the unintended consequences of change in medicare program policy made by the Balanced Budget Act, including inpatient and outpatient hospital services, to ensure fair and equitable access to al items and services under the program.

AMENDMENT NO. 217

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate that the budget process should require truth-in-budgeting with respect to the on-budget trust funds)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. ___. HONEST REPORTING OF THE DEFICIT.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume the following:

(1) IN GENERAL.—Effective for fiscal year 2001, the President's budget and the budget report of CBO required under section 202(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the concurrent resolution on the budget should include—

(A) the receipts and disbursements totals of the on-budget trust funds, including the projected levels for at least the next 5 fiscal years; and

(B) the deficit or surplus excluding the on-budget trust funds, including the projected levels for at least the next 5 fiscal years.

(2) ITEMIZATION.—Effective for fiscal year 2001, the President's budget and the budget report of CBO required under section 202(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 should include an itemization of the on-budget trust funds for the budget year, including receipts, outlays, and balances.

AMENDMENT NO. 218

(Purpose: Relating to the international affairs budget)

At the appropriate place in the concurrent resolution, insert the following:

SEC. ___. INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS BUDGET.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The Administration has attacked the Senate budget resolution which stays within the caps set in the Balanced Budget Agreement reached with the President in 1997. The Administration accuses the Senate of taking a ''meat axe'' to American leadership, and placing a ''foreign policy straitjacket'' on the United States. In fact, the fiscal year 2000 budget continues to fund programs and projects that advance United States interests, while eliminating funding for wasteful or duplicative programs and activities.

(2) The Administration claims that the Senate resolution would cut funds for international affairs in fiscal year 2000 by 15.3 percent. The reality is that the reduction is a five percent decrease from spending in fiscal year 1999. Much of the decrease is a result of savings from reductions assumed by the President in his budget: the President assumes savings from ''one time costs'' in the fiscal year 1999 budget, as well as fiscal year 2000 budget reductions for OPIC, P.L. 480 Programs, and historic levels of foreign assistance to Israel and Egypt . When adjusted for arrearages, the Senate Resolution is only a decrease of $.9 billion in budget authority and $.02 billion in outlays from the fiscal year 1999 levels.

(3) The Administration threatens the budget will hinder consular services and abandon our citizens who travel abroad and leave them to fend for themselves. The reality is that most consular services today are supplemented heavily by machine readable visa, expedited passport, and other fees. The State Department is able to retain these fees due

to congressional authorization for the retention of these fees rather then returning them to the general fund of the Treasury. Due to this authority, in fiscal year 2000, the State Department expects to have at least $374,000,000 to expend from fee collections. These funds are in addition to the budget authority provided by the Senate budget resolution.

(4) The Administration argues that this budget will pull the plug on U.S. contributions to UNICEF and Child Survival. In fact, the United States provided more than $122,000,000 or 27 percent of all UNICEF funding in 1997, according to the State Department's most recent statistics (of course, this does not include private donations of United States citizens). At the same time, the United States Agency for International Development is requesting a funding increase of $119,000,000 for development assistance and $15,000,000 for operating expenses even as the General Accounting Office reports that the Agency for International Development cannot explain how its programs are performing or whether they are achieving their intended goals.

(5) The Administration argues that this budget will reduce the United States commitment to the war on drugs. In fiscal year 1999, Congress appropriated funds for drug interdiction programs far exceeding the Administration's request; moreover, the comprehensive Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act enacted in October 1998 authorizes nearly $1,000,000,000 in new funds, equipment, and technology to correct the dangerous imbalance in the Administration's anti-drug strategy that has underfunded and continues to underfund interdiction programs. (The President's fiscal year 2000 budget continues to short-change anti-drug activities by the Customs Service and the Coast Guard.)

(6) The Administration argues that this budget will erode support for peace in the Middle East, Bosnia, and Northern Ireland. However, funding for peacekeeping continues to skyrocket. However, the cost of peacekeeping has become a burden on the 050 defense budget rather than the 150 foreign affairs budget since the failure of the United Nations mission in Bosnia. Last year, the United States expended $4,277,500,000 on peacekeeping and related activities in Bosnia, Iraq, other Middle East peacekeeping, and in Africa. This amount does not include funds for humanitarian and development activities.

(7) The Administration argues that this budget will force the United States to close its embassies and turn its back on American interests. The budget will instead force the Executive branch to take on greater cost-based decisionmaking. According to the General Accounting Office, ''more needs to be done to create a well-tuned platform for conducting foreign affairs. Achieving this goal will require the State Department to make a strong commitment to management improvement, modernization, and 'cost-based' decisionmaking.'' The General Accounting Office reports that ''one of State's long-standing shortcomings has been the absence of an effective financial management system that can assist managers in making 'cost-based' decisions.''

(8) Prior to the start of fiscal year 2000, the United States Information Agency and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency will be integrated into the State Department. In addition the Secretary of State will have more direct oversight over the Agency for International Development, and certain functions of that agency will be merged into the State Department. To date, no savings have been identified as a result of this merger. The General Accounting Office identifies potential areas for reduction of duplication as a result of integration in the areas of legal affairs, congressional liaison, press and public affairs, and management. In addition the General Accounting Office notes that in the State Department strategic plan, it has not adequately reviewed overlapping issues performed by State Department functional bureaus and other United States agencies.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the budget levels of this resolution assume that enactment of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 provides a unique opportunity for the State Department to achieve management improvements and cost reductions, and that:

(1) The Senate believes that savings can be achieved by simply eliminating wasteful and duplicative programs, not the programs cited by the Administration, which generally receive broad bipartisan support. Just a few abuses that could be eliminated to achieve reductions include the following:

(A) $25,000,000 for UNFPA while UNFPA works hand-in-glove with the brutal Communist Chinese dictators to abuse women and children under the coercive one-child-per-family population control policy.

(B) $35,000,000 for the Inter-American Foundation, which funded groups in Ecuador clearly identified by the State Department as terrorist organizations that kidnaped Americans and threatened their lives, as well as the lives and safety of other United States citizens, while extorting money from them.

(C) $105,000,000 proposed for Haiti, which has abandoned democracy in favor of dictatorship and where United States taxpayer funds have been used, according to the International Planned Parenthood Federation's annual report, for ''a campaign to reach voodoo followers with sexual and reproductive health information..by performing short song-prayers about STDs [sexually transmitted diseases] and the benefits of family planning during voodoo ceremonies''.

(D) $60,000,000 over ten years to the American Center for International Labor Solidarity (ACILS), which is AFL-CIOs international nongovernment division. 100% of ACILS's funding is from taxpayers while AFL-CIO contributed $40,956,828 exclusively to Democratic candidates in the 1998 Federal election cycle.

(E) In fiscal year 1999, $200,000 in foreign aid to Canada to underwrite seminars on gender sensitivity for peacekeepers.

(F) In fiscal year 1999, the United States provided the International Labor Organization with $54,774,408. Work produced by that organization included a report advocating recognition of the sex trade as a flourishing economic enterprise and called for recognition of the trade in official statistics.

(G) According to the General Accounting Office, ''USAID has spent, by its own account, $92,000,000 to develop and maintain the NMS [new management system], the system does not work as intended and has created problems in mission operations and morale.''

(H) In fiscal year 1999, the State Department is attempting to send $28,000,000 to fund the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Organization, which is an organization established by a treaty the United States has not ratified.

(I) Despite sensitive deadlines in the Middle East Peace Process looming, the United Nations is calling for a conference under the auspices of the Fourth Geneva Convention. No conference has been held under that Convention since its inception in 1947. The topic for discussion is Israeli Settlements in the West Bank and Gaza. The United States opposes this conference yet contributes 25 percent of the United Nations budget.

(J) The United States has spent more than $3,000,000,000 to ''restore democracy in Haiti.'' The reality is that there has been no Prime Minister or Cabinet in Haiti for 19 months; the Parliament has been effectively dissolved; local officials serve at the whim of President Preval; the privatization process is stalled; political murders remain unsolved; drug trafficking is rampant. In short, billions of dollars in foreign aid have bought us no leverage with the Haitians.

(K) As a result of consolidation of United States foreign affairs agencies, 1,943 personnel will be transferred into the State Department prior to the start of fiscal year 2000. The fiscal year 2000 budget does not identify a reduction in a single staff position.

(2) Additional funds that may become available from elimination of some foreign assistance programs, management efficiencies as a result of reorganization of the foreign affairs agencies, and new estimates on the size of the budget surplus should be designated for United States embassy upgrades.

AMENDMENT NO. 219

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate that $50 million will be provided in fiscal year 2000 to conduct intensive firearms prosecution projects to combat violence in the twenty-five American cities with the highest crime rates)

At the appropriate place insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING FUNDING FOR INTENSIVE FIREARMS PROSECUTION PROGRAMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) gun violence in America, while declining somewhat in recent years, is still unacceptably high;

(2) keeping firearms out of the hands of criminals can dramatically reduce gun violence in America;

(3) States and localities often do not have the investigative or prosecutorial resources to locate and convict individuals who violate their firearms laws. Even when they do win convictions, states and localities often lack the jail space to hold such convicts for their full terms;

(4) there are a number of federal laws on the books which are designed to keep firearms out of the hands of criminals. These laws impose mandatory minimum sentences upon individuals who use firearms to commit crimes of violence and convicted felons caught in possession of a firearm;

(5) the federal government does have the resources to investigate and prosecute violations of these federal firearms laws. The federal government also has enough jail space to hold individuals for the length of their mandatory minimum sentences;

(6) an effort to aggressively and consistently apply these federal firearms laws in Richmond, Virginia, has cut violent crime in that city. This program, called Project Exile, has produced 288 indictments during its first two years of operation and has been credited with contributing to a 15% decrease in violent crimes in Richmond during the same period. In the first three-quarters of 1998, homicides with a firearm in Richmond were down 55% compared to 1997;

(7) the Fiscal Year 1999 Commerce-State-Justice Appropriations Act provided $1.5 million to hire additional federal prosecutors and investigators to enforce federal firearms laws in Philadelphia. The Philadelphia project—called Operation Cease Fire—started on January 1, 1999. Since it began, the project has resulted in 31 indictments of 52 defendants on firearms violations. The project has benefited from help from the Philadelphia Police Department and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms which was not paid for out of the $1.5 million grant;

(8) Senator Hatch has introduced legislation to authorize Project CUFF, a federal firearms prosecution program;

(9) the Administration has requested $5 million to conduct intensive firearms prosecution projects on a national level;

(10) given that at least $1.5 million is needed to run an effective program in one American city—Philadelphia—$5 million is far from enough funding to conduct such programs nationally.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that Function 750 in the budget resolution assumes that $50,000,000 will be provided in fiscal year 2000 to conduct intensive firearms prosecution projects to combat violence in the twenty-five American cities with the highest crime rates.

AMENDMENT NO. 221

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate concerning fostering the employment and independence of individuals with disabilities)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING FOSTERING THE EMPLOYMENT AND INDEPENDENCE OF INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) Health care is important to all Americans.

(2) Health care is particularly important to individuals with disabilities and special health care needs who often cannot afford the insurance available to them through the private market, are uninsurable by the plans available in the private sector, or are at great risk of incurring very high and economically devastating health care costs.

(3) Americans with significant disabilities often are unable to obtain health care insurance that provides coverage of the services and supports that enable them to live independently and enter or rejoin the workforce. Coverage for personal assistance services, prescription drugs, durable medical equipment, and basic health care are powerful and proven tools for individuals with significant disabilities to obtain and retain employment.

(4) For individuals with disabilities, the fear of losing health care and related services is one of the greatest barriers keeping the individuals from maximizing their employment, earning potential, and independence.

(5) Individuals with disabilities who are beneficiaries under title II or XVI of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq., 1381 et seq.) risk losing medicare or medicaid coverage that is linked to their cash benefits, a risk that is an equal, or greater, work disincentive than the loss of cash benefits associated with working.

(6) Currently, less than ½ of 1 percent of social security disability insurance (SSDI) and supplemental security income (SSI) beneficiaries cease to receive benefits as a result of employment.

(7) Beneficiaries have cited the lack of adequate employment training and placement services as an additional barrier to employment.

(8) If an additional ½ of 1 percent of the current social security disability insurance (SSDI) and supplemental security income (SSI) recipients were to cease receiving benefits as a result of employment, the savings to the Social Security Trust Funds in cash assistance would total $3,500,000,000 over the worklife of the individuals.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that the Work Incentives Improvement Act of 1999 (S. 331, 106th Congress) will be passed by the Senate and enacted early this year, and thereby provide individuals with disabilities with the health care and employment preparation and placement services that will enable those individuals to reduce their dependency on cash benefit programs.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, the amendment that I offer with my colleagues Senators KENNEDY, ROTH, MOYNIHAN, and CHAFEE, states that the Senate budget resolution assumes that the Work Incentives Improvement Act of 1999, S. 331, will pass the Senate and be enacted early this year.

S. 331 helps people with disabilities remain or become taxpayers. It has 70 co-sponsors. It gives people with disabilities, who are on the Social Security rolls, a reason to work.

If they work and forego cash payments, they will have access to health care. They will contribute to the cost of that health care. Right now the federal government disburses $1.21 billion each week in cash payments—a real budget buster that S. 331 would fix.

Mr. President, we have one broad, bipartisan initiative on health care reform, that we should take up and enact quickly. Along with my colleagues Senators KENNEDY, ROTH and MOYNIHAN, I have introduced S. 331, legislation that would help individuals with disabilities go to work without being forced to sacrifice vital health care benefits. 70 Senators have joined us as co-sponsors of the Work Incentives Improvement Act of 1999, S. 331.

I have heard many compelling stories from individuals with disabilities. Some sit at home waiting for S. 331 to become law, so they can go to work. Some work part time being careful not to exceed the $500 per month threshold which would trigger cut off of their health care. Yesterday I received a letter from a young man, Don, 30-years of age, who told me he has mild mental retardation, mild cerebral palsy, a seizure disorder, and a visual impairment. Don works, but only part time.

At the end of his letter he wrote,

> The Work Incentives Improvement Act will help my friends become independent too. Then they can pay taxes too. But most of all they will have a life in the community. We are adults. We want to work. We don't need a hand out . . . we just need a hand up.

Well, we want to help people such as Don have a hand up. Not just for him, but out of self-interest as well. The hard facts make a compelling case for enacting S. 331 quickly.

The rate in growth in these programs between 1989 and 1997 was 64 percent. Thus, it is not surprising that SSI and SSDI disbursements went from $34.4 billion in 1989 to $62.9 billion in 1997. For 1997, GAO estimated weekly disbursements to be $1.21 billion.

Surplus or no surplus, we cannot afford these escalating costs. By adopting our resolution, the Senate sends an important message, we want individuals with disabilities to have an opportunity to contribute—to their own well-being, to that of their families, and to that of their communities. The 57,000 beneficiaries in Vermont are waiting for S. 331. A vote in favor of our Sense of the Senate amendment will send these beneficiaries and those in every State a clear, concrete signal. S. 331 will be enacted this year, and soon.

AMENDMENT NO. 222

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate with respect to maintaining at least current expenditures (including emergency funding) for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) for FY 2000)

At the appropriate place, insert the following new section:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON LIHEAP.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that:

(1) Home energy assistance for working and low-income families with children, the elderly on fixed incomes, the disabled, and others who need such aid is a critical part of the social safety net in cold-weather areas during the winter, and a source of necessary cooling aid during the summer;

(2) LIHEAP is a highly targeted, cost-effective way to help millions of low-income Americans pay their home energy bills. More than two-thirds of LIHEAP-eligible households have annual incomes of less than $8,000, approximately one-half have annual incomes below $6,000; and

(3) LIHEAP funding has been substantially reduced in recent years, and cannot sustain further spending cuts if the program is to remain a viable means of meeting the home heating and other energy-related needs of low-income families, especially those in cold-weather states.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—The assumptions underlying this budget resolution assume that it is the sense of the Senate that the funds made available for LIHEAP in Fiscal Year 2000 will not be less than the current services for LIHEAP in Fiscal Year 1999.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, there is strong bipartisan support for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program. Last year, Congress unanimously passed a five-year reauthorization of LIHEAP. In addition, 52 Senators signed a letter in support of $1.2 billion in funding for LIHEAP. This year, the Northeast-Midwest Senate Coalition is circulating a similar letter, which has already garnered the support of 30 Senators.

Support has not waned for the LIHEAP program since the May 1996 Sense of the Senate on LIHEAP. Eighty-eight Senators voted to maintain current expenditure levels for LIHEAP. Nevertheless, it appears time to re-confirm the Senate's commitment to LIHEAP. Last year, there was a failed attempt to zero out funding for LIHEAP. The threat looms again this year.

I, along with my colleagues from the Northeast-Midwest Senate Coalition, offer this Sense of the Senate to demonstrate the broad, bipartisan support for the LIHEAP program. The amendment is simple. It maintains LIHEAP funding at a minimum of current levels, which is $1.1 billion. This is still 50% lower than LIHEAP funding was in 1985.

I recognize that these are difficult budgetary times; however, LIHEAP is an effective tool for maintaining the basic needs of low-income households.

It promotes self-sufficiency, something our welfare-to-work laws advocate; and it ensures that our nation's children, elderly and disabled never go to sleep in a freezing cold farmhouse or a stifling hot apartment.

Some would argue that energy costs are low and winter temperatures have been milder. My response is that the need for LIHEAP has never been greater. The eligible population has grown; eligibility has been restricted; benefit levels have been reduced; and welfare rolls have been shrinking. LIHEAP provides a critical safety net to the working poor, the elderly and families with children.

The statistics demonstrate the need for LIHEAP best. More than two-thirds of LIHEAP-eligible households have annual incomes of less than $8000, approximately one-half have annual incomes below $6000. It has been estimated that low-income households typically spend four times what middle-income households spend on utility services. Middle-income households spend about 4 percent of their income for energy purposes, whereas low-income households spend between 14% and 16%, and in many instances up to 25% for utility costs.

The other argument I hear against LIHEAP is that only cold weather states reap its benefits. Wrong again. In 1998, eleven southern states received $150 million in emergency LIHEAP funding alone. I have seen news articles from Oregon, Georgia, Tennessee, and Kansas discussing the importance of LIHEAP. This is an important national program.

AMENDMENT NO. 223

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate that the Congress should provide the maximum funding envisioned in law for Southwest Border law enforcement programs to stop the flow of drugs into the United States)

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON SOUTHWEST BORDER LAW ENFORCEMENT FUNDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—

(1) The Federal Government has not effectively secured the Southwest Border of the United States. According to the Drug Enforcement Administration, 50 to 70 percent of illegal drugs enter the United States through Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California. According to the State Department's 1999 International Narcotics Strategy Report, 60 percent of the Columbian cocaine sold in the United States passes through Mexico before entering the United States.

(2) General Barry McCaffrey, Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, has stated that 20,000 Border Patrol agents are needed to secure the United States' southern and northern borders. Currently, the Border Patrol has approximately 8,000 agents.

(3) The Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996, requires the Attorney General to increase by not less than 1,000 the number of positions for full-time, active duty Border Patrol agents in fiscal years 1997, 1998, 2000, and 2001. The Administration's fiscal year 2000 budget provides no funding to hire additional full-time Border Patrol agents.

(4) The U.S. Customs Service plays an integral role in the detection, deterrence, disruption and seizure of illegal drugs as well as the facilitation of trade across the Southwest Border of the United States. Customs requested 506 additional inspectors in its fiscal year 2000 budget submission to the Office of Management and Budget. In their fiscal year 2000 budget request to Congress, however, the Administration provides no funding to hire additional, full-time Customs Service inspectors.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the budgetary levels in this budget resolution assume full funding for the Immigration and Naturalization Service to hire 1,000 full-time, active-duty Border Patrol agents in fiscal year 2000, as authorized by the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996. Further, it is the sense of the Senate that the budgetary levels in this budget resolution assume funding for the Customs Service to hire necessary staff and purchase equipment for drug interdiction and traffic facilitation at United States land border crossings, including 506 full-time, active-duty Customs inspectors.

AMENDMENT NO. 224

(Purpose: to express the sense of Congress that South Korea must abide by its international trade commitments on pork and beef)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING SOUTH KOREA'S INTERNATIONAL TRADE PRACTICES ON PORK AND BEEF.

FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that:

Asia is the largest regional export market for America's farmers and ranchers, traditionally purchasing approximately 40 percent of all U.S. agricultural exports;

The Department of Agriculture forecasts that over the next year American agricultural exports to Asian countries will decline by several billion dollars due to the Asian financial crisis;

The United States is the producer of the safest agricultural products from farm to table, customizing goods to meet the needs of customers worldwide, and has established the image and reputation as the world's best provider of agricultural products;

American farmers and ranchers, and more specifically, American pork and beef producers, are dependent on secure, open, and competitive Asian export markets for their product;

United States pork and beef producers not only have faced the adverse effects of depreciated and unstable currencies and lowered demand due to the Asian financial crisis, but also have been confronted with South Korea's pork subsidies and its failure to keep commitments on market access for beef;

It is the policy of the United States to prohibit South Korea from using United States and International Monetary Fund assistance to subsidize targeted industries and compete unfairly for market share against U.S. products;

The South Korea Government has been subsidizing its pork exports to Japan, resulting in a 973 percent increase in its exports to Japan since 1992, and a 71 percent increase in the last year;

Pork already comprises 70 percent of South Korea's agriculture exports to Japan, yet the South Korean Government has announced plans to invest 100,000,000,000 won in its agricultural sector in order to flood the Japanese market with even more South Korean pork;

The South Korean Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries reportedly has earmarked 25,000,000,000 won for loans to Korea's pork processors in order for them to purchase more Korean pork and to increase exports to Japan;

Any export subsidies on pork, including those on exports from South Korea to Japan, would violate South Korea's international trade agreements and may be actionable under the World Trade Organization;

South Korea's subsidies are hindering U.S. pork and beef producers from capturing their full potential in the Japanese market, which is the largest export market for U.S. pork and beef, importing nearly $700,000,000 of U.S. pork and over $1,500,000,000 of U.S. beef last year alone;

Under the United States-Korea 1993 Record of Understanding on Market Access for Beef, which was negotiated pursuant to a 1989 GATT Panel decision against Korea, South Korea was allowed to delay full liberation of its beef market (in an exception to WTO rules) if it would agree to import increasing minimum quantities of beef each year until the year 2001;

South Korea fell woefully short of its beef market access commitment for 1998; and,

United States pork and beef producers are not able to compete fairly with Korean livestock producers, who have a high cost of production, because South Korea has violated trade agreements and implemented protectionist policies: Now, therefore, be it

It is the sense of the Congress that Congress:

(1) Believes strongly that while a stable global marketplace is in the best interest of America's farmers and ranchers, the United States should seek a mutually beneficial relationship without hindering the competitiveness of American agriculture;

(2) Calls on South Korea to abide by its trade commitments;

(3) Calls on the Secretary of the Treasury to instruct the United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund to promote vigorously policies that encourage the opening of markets for beef and pork products by requiring South Korea to abide by its existing international trade commitments and to reduce trade barriers, tariffs, and export subsidies;

(4) Calls on the President and the Secretaries of Treasury and Agriculture to monitor and report to Congress that resources will not be used to stabilize the South Korean market at the expense of U.S. agricultural goods or services; and

(5) Requests the United States Trade Representative and the U.S. Department of Agriculture to pursue the settlement of disputes with the Government of South Korea on its failure to abide by its international trade commitments on beef market access, to consider whether Korea's reported plans for subsidizing its pork industry would violate any of its international trade commitments, and to determine what impact Korea's subsidy plans would have on U.S. agricultural interests, especially in Japan.

AMENDMENT NO. 225

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate that no additional firewalls should be enacted for transportation activities)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON TRANSPORTATION FIREWALLS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) domestic firewalls greatly limit funding flexibility as Congress manages budget priorities in a fiscally constrained budget;

(2) domestic firewalls inhibit congressional oversight of programs and organizations under such artificial protections;

(3) domestic firewalls mask mandatory spending under the guise of discretionary spending, thereby presenting a distorted picture of overall discretionary spending;

(4) domestic firewalls impede the ability of Congress to react to changing circumstances or to fund other equally important programs;

(5) the Congress implemented ''domestic discretionary budget firewalls'' for approximately 70 percent of function 400 spending in the 105th Congress;

(6) if the aviation firewall proposal circulating in the House of Representatives were to be enacted, over 100 percent of function 400 spending would be firewalled; and

(7) if the aviation firewall proposal circulating in the House of Representatives were to be enacted, drug interdiction activities by the Coast Guard, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration activities, rail safety inspections, Federal support for Amtrak, all National Transportation Safety Board activities, Pipeline and Hazardous materials safety programs, and Coast Guard search and rescue activities would be drastically cut or eliminated from function 400.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that no additional firewalls should be enacted for function 400 transportation activities.

AMENDMENT NO. 226

(Purpose: To express the Sense of the Senate that new public health programs should not be established to the detriment of funding for existing, effective programs, such as the Preventive Health and Health Services Block Grant)

At the appropriate place, insert:

SEC. 316. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON FUNDING EXISTING, EFFECTIVE PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAMS BEFORE CREATING NEW PROGRAMS.

(a) FUNDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the establishment of new categorical funding programs has led to proposed cuts in the Preventive Health and Health Services Block Grant to states for broad, public health missions;

(2) Preventive Health and Health Services Block Grant dollars fill gaps in the otherwise-categorical funding states and localities receive, funding such major public health threats as cardiovascular disease, injuries, emergency medical services and poor diet, for which there is often no other source of funding;

(3) in 1981, Congress consolidated a number of programs, including certain public health programs, into block grants for the purpose of best advancing the health, economics and well-being of communities across the country;

(4) The Preventive Health and Health Services Block Grant can be used for programs for screening, outreach, health education and laboratory services.

(5) The Preventive Health and Health Services Block Grant gives states the flexibility to determine how funding available for this purpose can be used to meet each state's preventive health priorities;

(6) The establishment of new public health programs that compete for funding with the Preventive Health and Health Services Block Grant could result in the elimination of effective, localized public health programs in every state.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—it is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution and legislation enacted pursuant to this resolution assume that there shall be a continuation of the level of funding support for existing public health programs, specifically the Prevention Block Grant, prior to the funding of new public health programs.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise today to offer an amendment to the budget resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that we should continue to support our successful existing public health programs, before diverting limited dollars to the creation of new programs.

The President's budget proposed a $30 million cut to the Preventive Health and Health Services Block Grant, which is funded through the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. That's a 20 percent cut. For Wyoming, that means the loss of an entire public health program. How can I ask them to decide between the heart disease prevention program and emergency medical services? I sure know that I can't tell my constituents we were able to find funding for new, narrowly focused categorical programs that they may or may not be eligible for.

Mr. President, I believe we all share the same goal of getting the most out of money in the interest of public health. That was exactly Congress' thinking when they consolidated a variety of programs and established instead block grants to states. The intent was clear. States and localities need the flexibility to determine the best way to meet the public health needs of their residents. I believe we can address national health priorities without discarding the needs of local communities.

Congress has already drawn the correct conclusion. A significant portion of the public health battle is wages on the front lines back in the states. In the name of advancing public health, we should not be proposing cuts to our front line infrastructure.

Mr. President, I ask for my colleagues support for this amendment and request its immediate adoption.

AMENDMENT NO. 227

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE PRESIDENT'S FY 2000 BUDGET PROPOSAL TO TAX ASSOCIATION INVESTMENT INCOME.

(a) The Congress finds that—

(1) The President's fiscal year 2000 federal budget proposal to impose a tax on the interest, dividends, capital gains, rents, and royalties in excess of $10,000 of trade associations and professional societies exempt under sec. 501(c)(6) of the IRC of 1986 represents an unjust and unnecessary penalty on legitimate association activities.

(2) At a time when the government is projecting on-budget surpluses of more than $800,000,000,000 over the next ten years, the President proposes to increase the tax burden on trade and professional association by $1,440,000,000 over the next five years.

(3) The Presidents association tax increase proposal will impose a tremendous burden on thousands of small and mid-sized trade associations and professional societies.

(4) Under the President's association tax increase proposal, most associations with annual operating budgets of as low $200,000 or more will be taxed on investment income and as many as 70,000 associations nationwide could be affected by this proposal.

(5) Associations rely on this targeted investment income to carry out tax-exempt status related activities, such as training individuals to adapt to the changing workplace, improving industry safety, providing statistical data, and providing community services.

(6) Keeping investment income free from tax encourages associations to maintain modest surplus funds that cushion against economic and fiscal downturns.

(7) Corporations can increase prices to cover increased costs, while small and medium sized local, regional, and State-based associations do not have such an option, and thus increased costs imposed by the President's association tax increase would reduce resources available for the important standard setting, educational training, and professionalism training performed by association.

(b) It is the sense of Congress that the functional totals in this concurrent resolution on the budget assume that Congress shall reject the President's proposed tax increase on investment income of associations as defined under section 501(c)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I am joined today by Senators CRAPO, SANTORUM, HAGEL, INHOFE and COLLINS in introducing a sense of the Senate amendment to the budget resolution rejecting the President's proposed tax, as part of his fiscal year 2000 budget proposal, on the investment income earned by nonprofit trade associations and professional societies.

This proposal would tax any income in excess of $10,000 earned through the non-competitive activities of nonprofit associations, such as interest, dividends, capital gains, rents and royalties, posing a tremendous burden on an estimated 70,000 registered trade associations and professional societies.

Mostly operating on a state and local level, these organizations depend on this income to perform such vital community services as education, training, standard setting, industry safety, and community outreach. Faced with an additional increase in taxes of $1.4 billion over the next five years, many associations will be forced to cut back or eliminate these important services, forcing the government to step in, increasing expenditures and creating additional programs.

During a time when the government is projecting on-budget surpluses of more than $800 billion over the next 10 years, it is unconscionable that we would allow the administration to levy a new tax on these nonprofit organizations.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the resolution be printed in the RECORD immediately following my statement.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my good friend, Senator ABRAHAM of Michigan, in offering this amendment.

This amendment is being offered in reaction to a provision in the President's FY 2000 budget that would impose a new tax on the investment income of nonprofit trade and professional associations. These trade and professional associations are currently exempt from taxes under section 501(c)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code.

The administration's proposal would tax the investment income—interest,

dividends, capital gains, rents, and royalties—of 501(c)(6) associations. Associations currently rely on this investment income to carry out exempt-status related activities such as education, training, standard-setting, research, and community outreach.

Under the President's proposal, the first $10,000 an association earns from investments would not be taxed. However, all income earned over $10,000 would be subject to the unrelated business income tax under the Internal Revenue Code. It is estimated that this new tax, which can be as high as 35 percent, will increase the tax burden on the nation's nonprofit trade and professional associations by $1.4 billion over the next 5 years.

Contrary to assertions made by the administration, this proposal will affect thousands of small and mid-sized trade associations and professional societies. According to the American Society of Association Executives' Operating Ratio Report, most associations with annual operating budgets as low as $200,000 would be subject to a new tax under this proposal.

As many as 70,000 associations nationwide could be affected by this new tax, including the American Youth Soccer Organization, American Nurses Association, the National Education Association, National Association of State Departments of Agriculture, and many others. Important trade associations in my home state that could be affected by the new tax include the Idaho Association of School Administrators, Idaho Credit Union League, Idaho Mining Association, the Idaho Cattle Association and others.

This amendment is supported by the American Society of Association Executives (ASAE), the trade organization that represents our Nation's trade and professional associations.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to oppose this new tax and support the amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 228

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. XX. FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS FOR NEEDLE EXCHANGE PROGRAMS.

(a) The Congress finds that—

(1) Deaths from drug overdoses have increased over five times since 1988.

(2) A Montreal study published in the American Journal of Epidemiology, found that IV addicts who used a needle exchange program were over twice as likely to become infected with HIV as those who did not.

(3) A Vancouver study published in the Journal of AIDS, showed a stunning increase in HIV in drug addicts, from 1 to 2 percent to 23 percent, since that city's needle exchange program was begun in 1988. Deaths from drug overdoses have increased over five times since 1988 and Vancouver now has the highest death rate from heroin in North America.

(4) In November of 1995 the Manhattan Lower East Side Community Board #3 passed a resolution to terminate their needle exchange program due to the fact that ''the community has been inundated with drug dealers. . . . Law-abiding businesses are being abandoned; and much needed law enforcement is being withheld by the police.''

(5) The New York Times Magazine in 1997 reported that one New York City needle exchange program gave out 60 syringes to a single person, little pans to ''cook'' the heroin, instructions on how to inject the drug and a card exempting the user from arrest for possession of drug paraphernalia.

(6) Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Weekly reports that heroin use by American teenagers has doubled in the last five years.

(b) It is the sense of Congress that the functional totals in this concurrent resolution on the budget assume that Congress shall continue the statutory ban on the use of federal funds to implement or support any needle exchange program for drug addicts.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I am joined today by Senators COVERDELL, ASHCROFT, and HUTCHINSON in introducing a sense of the Senate amendment to the budget resolution rejecting the use of federal funds for needle exchange programs.

Deaths resulting from drug overdoses have increased five times since 1988. According to Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Weekly, the number of American teenagers using heroin, once considered a drug used primarily by hard-core drug addicts, has doubled in the past five years.

Last year, the Clinton administration attempted to lift the ongoing ban on federal funds for needle exchange programs as a solution to reducing the rate HIV infection among intravenous (IV) drug use without increasing the use of drugs like heroin. Needle exchange programs are not the answer—giving an addict a clean needle is equivalent to giving an alcoholic a clean glass—both do a more sanitary job of delivering the poison that is killing our kids.

A Montreal study published in the American Journal of Epidemiology, found that IV addicts who used a needle exchange program were over twice as likely to become infected with HIV as those who did not. The New York Times magazine reported that one New York City needle program gave a single individual 60 syringes, little pans to ''cook'' the heroin, instructions for usage, and a card amounting to a ''get out of jail free'' pass for possession of drug paraphernalia.

At a time when heroin use is skyrocketing among our youth, the last thing we need is for Washington to send the message that drug use is okay, and that we are not serious about the war on drugs. Join with us in finding that Congress shall continue the statutory ban on the use of federal funds to implement or support any needle exchange program for drug addicts.

AMENDMENT NO. 229

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate concerning funding for special education)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING FUNDING FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) In the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.) (referred to in this resolution as the ''Act''), Congress found that improving educational results for children with disabilities is an essential element of our national policy of ensuring equality of opportunity, full participation, independent living, and economic self-sufficiency for individuals with disabilities.

(2) In the Act, the Secretary of Education is instructed to make grants to States to assist them in providing special education and related services to children with disabilities.

(3) The Act represents a commitment by the Federal Government to fund 40 percent of the average per-pupil expenditure in public elementary and secondary schools in the United States.

(4) The budget submitted by the President for fiscal year 2000 ignores the commitment by the Federal Government under the Act to fund special education and instead proposes the creation of new programs that limit the manner in which States may spend the limited Federal education dollars received.

(5) The budget submitted by the President for fiscal year 2000 fails to increase funding for special education, and leaves States and localities with an enormous unfunded mandate to pay for growing special education costs.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the budgetary levels in this resolution assume that part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.) should be fully funded at the originally promised level before any funds are appropriated for new education programs.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleague from Maine, Senator COLLINS, in offering this important amendment to express the Sense of the Senate that funding for need-based student financial aid programs should be increased.

The Republican budget proposal provides some welcome news when compared with past Republican budget proposals because it at least includes increased funding for elementary and secondary education. Indeed, it can be called much improved in contrast with past Republican proposals to eliminate the Department of Education.

However, I am deeply concerned that this funding increase may be financed by cutting critical programs like Head Start, Summer Jobs for Youth, and job training by up to 10% in FY2000, and 20% in the following years.

Moreover, this budget proposal assumes an increase for elementary and secondary education programs of $2.6 billion over a freeze. However, it only assumes a $2.4 billion overall increase for all education programs in fiscal year 2000, which means other vital education programs, like student financial aid programs, would have to be deeply cut or frozen in order to meet these assumptions.

It would be a shame to limit our ability to realize the reforms we just recently enacted as part of the Higher Education Act Amendments of 1998 to enhance federal assistance to college students. That is why I have joined Senator COLLINS and others in offering this amendment.

Mr. President, this amendment simply urges increases in funding for need-based student financial aid programs. These programs include Pell Grants, the Federal Work Study Program, the Leveraging Educational Assistance Partnership (LEAP) program, and TRIO.

I strongly support a greater investment in all of these important programs than is provided by the budget resolution. And, in particular, I have long been a champion of more robust funding for the LEAP program, a federal-state partnership that is essential to our efforts to help needy students attend and graduate from college.

I worked closely with Senator COLLINS on a successful amendment two years ago to save LEAP from elimination and on legislation to reform this program, which was included in the Higher Education Act Amendments of 1998. These reforms seek to encourage states to increase their commitments to need-based student grant aid in exchange for increased flexibility to provide a broader array of higher education assistance to needy students.

We are currently working together to secure $75 million for LEAP in the Fiscal Year 2000 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations bill to trigger these reforms, and I urge my colleagues to join us in this important effort.

LEAP and the rest of the federal financial aid programs are critical to helping students achieve their higher education goals.

All higher education and student groups endorse the effort to increase funding for need-based student financial aid programs, and I strongly urge my colleagues to support our amendment in order to meet the commitment to higher education that we reaffirmed last fall by passing the Higher Education Act Amendments of 1998.

AMENDMENT NO. 230

(Purpose: To provide an exception for emergency defense spending)

At the end of section 205 of the resolution, add the following:

(f) EXCEPTION FOR DEFENSE SPENDING.—This section shall not apply to a provision making discretionary appropriations in the defense category.''.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this amendment modifies section 205 of the resolution, which creates a 60 vote point of order against emergency appropriations. The modification establishes an exception from the 60 vote point of order for national security emergency appropriations. Given the on-going operations in the Balkans, the need for this exception is clear.

Much like the vote to authorize the Persian Gulf war, where only 52 members of the Senate voted in support of that action, the current military operations in Kosovo and Serbia gained the support of only 58 Senators. I opposed that resolution. That doesn't change the fact that the men and women of the Armed Forces mut be properly supplied, equipped and supported when they are sent to combat. That is our job, irrespective of whether each of us agrees with the specific policy that led to the deployment of U.S. forces.

Earlier this month, the Governmental Affairs Committee reported S. 93, which established new procedures for the consideration of emergency appropriations. That bill creates a point of order that requires 51 votes to waive. That bill has been referred to the Budget Committee, and will probably come before the Senate after the Easter recess. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 231

(Purpose: Sense of the Senate on providing tax relief to all Americans by returning the non-Social Security surplus to taxpayers)

At the appropriate place, insert:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF SENATE ON PROVIDING TAX RELIEF TO ALL AMERICANS BY RETURNING NON-SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUS TO TAXPAYERS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) Every cent of Social Security surplus should be reserved to pay Social Security benefits, for Social Security reform, or to pay down the debt held by the public and not be used for other purposes.

(2) Medicare should be fully funded.

(3) Even after safeguarding Social Security and Medicare, a recent Congressional Research Service study found that an average American family will pay $5,307 more in taxes over the next 10 years than the government needs to operate.

(4) The Administration's budget returns none of the excess surplus back to the taxpayers and instead increases net taxes and fees by $96,000,000,000 over 10 years.

(5) The burden of the Administration's tax increases falls disproportionately on low- and middle-income taxpayers. A recent Tax Foundation study found that individuals with incomes of less than $25,000 would bear 38.5 percent of the increased tax burden, while taxpayers with incomes between $25,000 and $50,000 would pay 22.4 percent of the new taxes.

(6) The budget resolution returns most of the non-Social Security surplus to those who worked so hard to produce it by providing $142,000,000,000 in real tax relief over 5 years and almost $800,000,000,000 in tax relief over 10 years.

(7) The budget resolution builds on the following tax relief that Republicans have provided since 1995:

(A) In 1995, Republicans proposed the Balanced Budget Act of 1995 which included tax relief for families, savings and investment incentives, health care-related tax relief, and relief for small business—tax relief that was vetoed by President Clinton.

(B) In 1996, Republicans provided, and the President signed, tax relief for small business and health care-related tax relief.

(C) In 1997, Republicans once again pushed for tax relief in the context of a balanced budget, and this time President Clinton signed into law a $500 per child tax credit, expanded individual retirement accounts and the new Roth IRA, a cut in the capital gains tax rate, education tax relief, and estate tax relief.

(D) In 1998, Republicans (initially opposed by the Administration) pushed for reform of the Internal Revenue Service, and provided tax relief for America's farmers.

(8) Americans deserve further tax relief because they are still overpaying. They deserve a refund. Federal taxes currently consume nearly 21 percent of national income, the highest percentage since World War II. Families are paying more in Federal, State, and local taxes than for food, clothing, and shelter combined.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the levels in this resolution assume that the Senate not only puts a priority on protecting Social Security and Medicare and reducing the Federal debt, but also on middle-class tax relief by returning some of the non-Social Security surplus to those from whom it was taken; and

(2) such middle-class tax relief could include broad-based tax relief, marriage penalty relief, retirement savings incentives, death tax relief, savings and investment incentives, health care-related tax relief, education-related tax relief, and tax simplification proposals.

AMENDMENT NO. 232

(Purpose: To allow increased tobacco tax revenues to be used as an offset for the Medicare prescription drug benefit provided for in section 209)

On page 53, line 4, after ''may change committee allocations'' insert '', revenue aggregates for legislation that increases taxes on tobacco or tobacco products (only).''.

AMENDMENT NO. 233

(Purpose: To protect taxpayers from retroactive income and estate tax rate increases by creating a point of order)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. ___. RESTRICTION ON RETROACTIVE INCOME AND ESTATE TAX RATE INCREASES.

(a) PURPOSE.—The Senate declares that it is essential to ensure taxpayers are protected against retroactive income and estate tax rate increases.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report, that includes a retroactive Federal income tax rate increase.

(2) DEFINITION.—In this section—

(A) the term ''Federal income tax rate increase'' means any amendment to subsection (a), (b), (c), (d), or (e) of section 1, or to section 11(b) or 55(b), of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, that imposes a new percentage as a rate of tax and thereby increases the amount of tax imposed by any such section; and

(B) a Federal income tax rate increase is retroactive if it applies to a period beginning prior to the enactment of the provision.

(c) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER.—

(1) WAIVER.—The point of order in subsection (b) may be waived or suspended only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEALS.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (b).

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section takes effect on January 1, 1999.

AMENDMENT NO. 234

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regardng the need for incentives for low- and middle-income savers and investors and the need for such incentives to be accompanied by an expansion of the lowest personal income tax bracket)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. _____. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING INCENTIVES FOR SMALL SAVERS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) in general, the Federal budget will accumulate nearly $800,000,000,000 in non-Social Security surpluses through 2009;

(2) such a level of surplus affords Congress the opportunity to return a portion to the taxpayers in the form of tax relief;

(3) the Federal tax burden is at its highest level in over 50 years;

(4) personal bankruptcy filings reached a record high in 1998 with $40,000,000,000 in debts discharged;

(5) the personal savings rate is at record lows not seen since the Great Depression;

(6) the personal savings rate was 9 percent of income in 1982;

(7) the personal savings rate was 5.7 percent of income in 1992;

(8) the personal savings rate plummeted to 0.5 percent in 1998;

(9) the personal savings rate could plummet to as low as negative 4.5 percent if current trends do not change;

(10) personal saving is important as a means for the American people to prepare for crisis, such as a job loss, health emergency, or some other personal tragedy, or to prepare for retirement;

(11) President Clinton recently acknowledged the low rate of personal savings as a concern;

(12) raising the starting point for the 28 percent personal income tax bracket by $10,000 over 5 years would move 7,000,000 middle-income taxpayers into the lowest income tax bracket;

(13) excluding the first $500 from interest and dividends income, or $250 for singles, would enable 30,000,000 low- and middle-income taxpayers to save tax-free and would translate into approximately $1,000,000,000,000 in savings;

(14) exempting the first $5,000 in capital gains income from capital gains taxation would mean 10,000,000 low- and middle-income taxpayers would no longer pay capital gains tax;

(15) raising the deductible limit for Individual Retirement Account contributions from $2,000 to $3,000, would mean over 5,000,000 taxpayers will be better equipped for retirement; and

(16) tax relief measures to encourage savings and investments for low- and middle-income savers would mean tax relief for nearly 112,000,000 individual taxpayers by—

(A) raising the starting point for the 28 percent personal income tax bracket by $10,000 over 5 years;

(B) excluding from income the first $500 in interest and dividend income ($250 for singles);

(C) exempting from capital gains taxation the first $5,000 in capital gains taxes; and

(D) raising the deductible limit for Individual Retirement Account contributions from $2,000 to $3,000.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this budget resolution and legislation enacted pursuant to this resolution assume that—

(1) Congress will adopt tax relief that provides incentives for savings and investment for low- and middle-income working families that assist in preparing for unexpected emergencies and retirement, such as—

(A) raising the starting point for the 28 percent personal income tax bracket by $10,000 over 5 years;

(B) excluding from income the first $500 in interest and dividend income ($250 for singles);

(C) exempting from capital gains taxation the first $5,000 in capital gains taxes; and

(D) raising the deductible limit for Individual Retirement Account contributions from $2,000 to $3,000; and

(2) tax relief as described in this subsection is fully achievable within the parameters set forth under this budget resolution.

AMENDMENT NO. 235

(Purpose: To reduce the size of the tax cut)

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $3,717,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $26,559,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $16,152,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $24,590,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $31,319,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $54,638,000,000.

On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by $67,877,000,000.

On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by $75,346,000,000.

On page 3, line 18, increase the amount by $88,598,000,000.

On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by $3,717,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by $26,559,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by $16,152,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by $24,590,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, increase the amount by $31,319,000,000.

On page 4, line 10, increase the amount by $54,638,000,000.

On page 4, line 11, increase the amount by $67,877,000,000.

On page 4, line 12, increase the amount by $75,346,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by $88,598,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, decrease the amount by $83,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, decrease the amount by $783,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, decrease the amount by $1,946,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, decrease the amount by $3,057,000,000.

On page 4, line 22, decrease the amount by $4,616,000,000.

On page 4, line 23, decrease the amount by $6,966,000,000.

On page 4, line 24, decrease the amount by $10,401,000,000.

On page 4, line 25, decrease the amount by $14,557,000,000.

On page 5, line 1, decrease the amount by $19,436,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, decrease the amount by $83,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, decrease the amount by $783,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, decrease the amount by $1,946,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by $3,057,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $4,616,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $6,966,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $10,401,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $14,557,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $19,436,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $3,800,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $27,342,000,000.

On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $18,098,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $27,647,000,000.

On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $35,935,000,000.

On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by $61,604,000,000.

On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by $78,278,000,000.

On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by $89,903,000,000.

On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by $108,034,000,000.

On page 6, line 6, decrease the amount by $3,800,000,000.

On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $31,142,000,000.

On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $49,240,000,000.

On page 6, line 9, decrease the amount by $76,887,000,000.

On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $112,822,000,000.

On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by $174,426,000,000.

On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by $252,704,000,000.

On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by $342,607,000,000.

On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $450,641,000,000.

On page 6, line 18, decrease the amount by $3,800,000,000.

On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by $31,142,000,000.

On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $49,240,000,000.

On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $76,887,000,000.

On page 6, line 22, decrease the amount by $112,822,000,000.

On page 6, line 23, decrease the amount by $174,426,000,000.

On page 6, line 24, decrease the amount by $252,704,000,000.

On page 6, line 25, decrease the amount by $342,607,000,000.

On page 7, line 1, decrease the amount by $450,641,000,000.

On page 37, line 2, decrease the amount by $83,000,000.

On page 37, line 3, decrease the amount by $83,000,000.

On page 37, line 6, decrease the amount by $783,000,000.

On page 37, line 7, decrease the amount by $783,000,000.

On page 37, line 10, decrease the amount by $1,946,000,000.

On page 37, line 11, decrease the amount by $1,946,000,000.

On page 37, line 14, decrease the amount by $3,057,000,000.

On page 37, line 15, decrease the amount by $3,057,000,000.

On page 37, line 18, decrease the amount by $4,616,000,000.

On page 37, line 19, decrease the amount by $4,616,000,000.

On page 37, line 22, decrease the amount by $6,966,000,000.

On page 37, line 23, decrease the amount by $6,966,000,000.

On page 38, line 2, decrease the amount by $10,401,000,000.

On page 38, line 3, decrease the amount by $10,401,000,000.

On page 38, line 6, decrease the amount by $14,557,000,000.

On page 38, line 7, decrease the amount by $14,557,000,000.

On page 38, line 10, decrease the amount by $19,436,000,000.

On page 38, line 11, decrease the amount by $19,436,000,000.

On page 42, line 2, strike the amount and insert ''$71,016,000,000''.

On page 42, line 4, strike the amount and insert ''$388,791,000,000''.

On page 42, line 16, strike the amount and insert ''$71,016,000,000''.

On page 42, line 18, strike the amount and insert ''$388,791,000,000''.

AMENDMENT NO. 236

(Purpose: To strike section 201)

Strike section 201.

AMENDMENT NO. 237

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate on the importance of social security for individuals who become disabled)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE IMPORTANCE OF SOCIAL SECURITY FOR INDIVIDUALS WHO BECOME DISABLED.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) in addition to providing retirement income, Social Security also protects individuals from the loss of income due to disability;

(2) according to the most recent report from the Social Security Board of Trustees nearly 1 in 7 Social Security beneficiaries, 6,000,000 individuals in total, were receiving benefits as a result of disability;

(3) more than 60 percent of workers have no long-term disability insurance protection other than that provided by Social Security;

(4) according to statistics from the Society of Actuaries, the odds of a long-term disability versus death are 2.7 to 1 at age 27, 3.5 to 1 at age 42, and 2.2 to 1 at age 52; and

(5) in 1998, the average monthly benefit for a disabled worker was $722.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that levels in the resolution assume that—

(1) Social Security plays a vital role in providing adequate income for individuals who become disabled;

(2) individuals who become disabled face circumstances much different than those who rely on Social Security for retirement income;

(3) Social Security reform proposals that focus too heavily on retirement income may adversely affect the income protection provided to individuals with disabilities; and

(4) Congress and the President should take these factors into account when considering proposals to reform the Social Security program.

AMENDMENT NO. 238

(Purpose: To provide $200,000,000 for the State-side program of the land and water conservation fund)

On page 15, line 8, increase the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 15, line 9, increase the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 18, line 15, decrease the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 18, line 16, decrease the amount by $200,000,000.

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING FUNDING FOR THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) amounts in the land and water conservation fund finance the primary Federal program for acquiring land for conservation and recreation and for supporting State and local efforts for conservation and recreation;

(2) Congress has appropriated only $10,000,000,000 out of the more than $21,000,000,000 covered into the fund from revenues payable to the United States under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.); and

(3) 38 Senators cosigned 2 letters to the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on the Budget urging that the land and water conservation fund be fully funded.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution and legislation enacted pursuant to this resolution assume that Congress should appropriate $200,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 to provide financial assistance to the States under section 6 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C 460*l*–8), in addition to such amounts as are made available for Federal land acquisition under that Act for fiscal year 2000.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I rise today to offer an amendment to restore funding to a program that has been dormant for too long, a program that could provide vital funding to assist small municipalities in conserving their resources. I rise today to offer an amendment to provide $200 million for funding the State-side program of the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF). I am pleased to be joined by Senators BOB SMITH, FEINGOLD, LEAHY, JEFFORDS, MOYNIHAN, ROTH, ALLARD, COLLINS, and SNOWE in sponsoring this amendment.

The LWCF was started in 1964 to provide funds for land and water conservation through two programs: Federal land acquisitions, and Federal cost-sharing of State conservation and recreation projects. Moneys for the LWCF are derived from revenues obtained through oil and gas drilling in the Outer Continental Shelf. These revenues amount to $4 billion to $5 billion annually, which go into the General Treasury. Of this amount, $900 million is authorized to go specifically to LWCF. However, in recent years, only about $300 million to $350 million has been appropriated for LWCF, and since 1995, funding for the State-side program has been entirely eliminated.

The principle behind the LWCF is a simple but noble one: to reinvest the revenues earned from the depletion of offshore oil and gas resources to the conservation of other natural resources. Unfortunately, the promise of the LWCF has never been fully realized because of sporadic funding. Many opportunities to conserve precious lands and to work with our State and local partners have been lost.

People across the country are realizing that they cannot afford to lose more opportunities to protect the lands they consider important. The elections of November 1998 underscored the groundswell of support for these efforts. Voters approved more than 200 State and local ballot initiatives—70 percent of the total initiatives offered—to commit $7 billion for conservation and related activities.

Congress should play a role in supporting these efforts, and the LWCF was created 35 years ago precisely for this purpose. The two components of the Fund—Federal acquisitions and State-side conservation—provide a perfect complement to one another in a comprehensive package. Just two weeks ago, I spearheaded efforts to encourage 37 of my Senate colleagues to cosign a letter to the Budget Committee supporting full funding for the LWCF.

The State-side program, however, deserves specific attention. It is a grants program, that requires States to contribute 50 percent of the total cost of projects they wish to fund. The Federal Government matches the other 50 percent. States must prepare a comprehensive plan in order to be eligible for the funding, and they receive funds through an allocation formula. In short, the State-side program is a cost-sharing grants program, based on sound planning, with an apolitical distribution formula. What could be better? And yet Congress has not funded it since 1995.

One reason it has not been funded has been a question of priorities among a long list of conservation needs. Federal land acquisition; operations and maintenance of Federal lands; and assistance to States are all important. Indeed, Mr. President, the Budget Committee explicitly recognizes this in its report for S. Con. Res. 20. However, the State-side program has suffered too long by being completely without funds. It is high time we restore some funding to this program, while recognizing that other needs still exist. My amendment does just that.

In order to increase the LWCF by $200 million, of course, we need to find an offset with equivalent budget authority and outlays. This is never an easy task, but my amendment takes the funds from Function 370, relating to Commerce and Housing Credit. I believe that there are several programs within that function that can be cut to provide $200 million for LWCF.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I support the CHAFEE amendment that assumes funding of $200 million specifically for the stateside program of the Land and Water Conservation Fund to come out of Function 370. It is my understanding that no specific program in Function 370 has been designated as an offset for the Chafee amendment, nor do I believe that programs such as the Advanced Technology Program be considered as an offset. The ultimate funding decision of course rests with the appropriators, but I wanted to take this opportunity to cast my support for funds for the LWCF stateside program, which has not received any funding since 1995.

Up until 1995, LWCF stateside program funds were used in my state to assist communities for planning, acquiring and developing outdoor recreation facilities that would not otherwise have been affordable, especially in the smaller communities in Maine.

The LWCF stateside program has funded such local projects in Maine as the community playground in Durham, the Mt. Apatite trails in Auburn, the Dionne Park Playground in Madawaska, the East-West Aroostook Valley trail in Caribou, the Williams Wading Pool in Augusta, multi-purpose fields in St. George, Hampden, Buxton, Calais, and Bradford, the skating rink in Bucksport, and wharf rehabilitation in Greenville.

By leveraging state dollars with critical LWCF stateside funds, Maine's communities have been able to enjoy recreational facilities such as neighborhood parks, swimming pools, and ball fields, and also have had the opportunity to conserve certain highly valued lands that the citizens of the state wish to save for outdoor recreational activities for themselves and for generations to come.

AMENDMENT NO. 239

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate that the Social Security Trust Fund shall be managed in the best interest of current and future beneficiaries)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND SHALL BE MANAGED IN THE BEST INTEREST OF CURRENT AND FUTURE BENEFICIARIES.

It is the sense of the Senate that the Social Security Trust Fund surplus shall be invested in interest-bearing obligations of the United States in a manner consistent with the best interest of, and payment of benefits to, current and future Social Security beneficiaries.

AMENDMENT NO. 240

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate concerning Federal tax relief)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING FEDERAL TAX RELIEF.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The Congressional Budget Office has reported that payroll taxes will exceed income taxes for 74 percent of all taxpayers in 1999.

(2) The Federal Government will collect nearly $50 billion in income taxes this year through its practice of taxing the income Americans sacrifice to the government in the form of Social Security payroll taxes.

(3) American taxpayers are currently shouldering the heaviest tax burden since 1944.

(4) According to the non-partisan Tax Foundation, the median dual-income family sacrificed a record 37.6 percent of its income to the government in 1997.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional totals in this resolution assume that a significant portion of the tax relief will be devoted to working families who are double-taxed by—

(1) Providing taxpayers with an above-the-line income tax deduction for the Social Security payroll taxes they pay so that they no longer pay income taxes on such payroll taxes, and/or

(2) gradually reducing the lowest marginal income tax rate from 15 percent to 10 percent, and/or

(3) other tax reductions that do not reduce the tax revenue devoted to the Social Security Trust Fund.

AMENDMENT NO. 241

At the appropriate place, insert:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE CLOSURE OF HOWARD AIR FORCE BASE AND REPOSITIONING OF ASSETS AND OPERATIONAL CAPABILITIES IN FORWARD OPERATING LOCATIONS.

(A) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following—

(1) at noon on the last day of 1999, the Panama Canal and its adjacent lands will revert from U.S. control to that of the government of Panama, as prescribed by the Carter-Torrijos treaties concluded in 1978.

(2) with this act, nearly ninety years of American presence in the Central American isthmus will come to an end.

(3) on September 25, 1998, the United States and Panama announced that talks aimed at establishing a Multinational counter-narcotics Center (MCC) were ended through mutual agreement. The two countries had been engaged in discussions for two years.

(4) plans to meet the deadline are going forward and the U.S. is withdrawing all forces and proceeding with the return of all military installations to Panamanian control.

(5) Howard Air Force Base is scheduled to return to Panamanian control by May 1, 1999. Howard AFB provides a secure staging for detection, monitoring and intelligence collecting assets on counter-narcotics drug trafficking. Howard Air Force Base was the proposed location for the Multinational Counter-narcotics Center.

(6) AWACS (E–3) aircraft used for counter-drug surveillance is scheduled for relocation from Howard AFB to MacDill AFB in April. The E3's are scheduled to resume this mission in May from MacDill.

(7) USSOUTHCOM and the Department of State have been examining the potential for alternative forward operating locations (FOLs). A potential location would require the operational capacity to house E–3 AWACS KC–135 tankers, Night Hawk F–16s/F–15s, Navy P–3s, U.S. Customs P–3s and Citations, Army Airborne Reconnaissance Low, and Senior Scout C–130s. No agreement has been reached regarding the number of FOLs required, cost of relocating these assets, time to build ensuing facilities, or plans for housing these assets for long-term stays.

(B) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that—

(1) the United States is obligated to protect its citizens from the threats posed by illegal drugs crossing our borders. Interdiction in the transit and arrival zones disrupt the drug flow, increases risk to traffickers, drives them to less efficient routes and methods, and prevents significant amounts of drugs from reaching the United States.

(2) there has been an inordinate delay in identifying and securing appropriate alternate sites.

(3) the Senate must pursue every effort to explore, urge the President to arrange long-term agreements with countries that support reducing the flow of drugs, and fully fund forward operating locations so that we continue our balanced strategy of attacking drug smugglers before their deadly cargos reach our borders.

AMENDMENT NO. 242

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate that increased funding for elementary and secondary education should be directed to States and local school districts)

On page 73, after line 10, insert the following:

(c) ADDITIONAL FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Children should be the primary beneficiaries of education spending, not bureaucrats.

(2) Parents have the primary responsibility for their children's education. Parents are the first and best educators of their children. Our Nation trusts parents along with teachers and State and local school officials to make the best decisions about the education of our Nation's children.

(3) Congress supports the goal of ensuring that the maximum amount of Federal education dollars are spent directly in the classrooms.

(4) Education initiatives should boost academic achievement for all students. Excellence in American classrooms means having high expectations for all students, teachers, and administrators, and holding schools accountable to the children and parents served by such schools.

(5) Successful schools and school systems are characterized by parental involvement in the education of their children, local control, emphasis on basic academics, emphasis on fundamental skills, and exceptional teachers in the classroom.

(6) Congress rejects a one-size-fits-all approach to education which often creates barriers to innovation and reform initiatives at the local level. America's rural schools face challenges quite different from their urban counterparts. Parents, teachers, and State and local school officials should have the freedom to tailor their education plans and reforms according to the unique educational needs of their children.

(7) The funding levels in this resolution assume that Congress will provide an additional $2,800,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and an additional $33,000,000,000 for the period beginning with fiscal year 2000 and ending with fiscal year 2005 for elementary and secondary education.

(d) ADDITIONAL SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that—

(1) increased Federal funding for elementary and secondary education should be directed to States and local school districts; and

(2) decisionmaking authority should be placed in the hands of States, localities, and families to implement innovative solutions to local educational challenges and to increase the performance of all students, unencumbered by unnecessary Federal rules and regulations.

AMENDMENT NO. 243

(Purpose: Sense of the Senate to create a task force to pursue the creation of a natural disaster reserve fund)

At the appropriate place, insert:

It is the sense of the senate that a task force be created for the purpose of creating a reserve fund for natural disasters. The task force should be composed of three Senators appointed by the majority lender, and two Senators appointed by the minority leader. The task force should also be composed of three members appointed by the speaker of the House, and two members appointed by minority leader in the House. It is the sense of the Senate that the task force make a report to the appropriate committees in Congress within 90 days of being convened. The report should be available for the purposes of consideration during comprehensive overhaul of budget procedures.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I now yield to Senator ROBB from Virginia so that he may offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

AMENDMENT NO. 182

(Purpose: To ensure fiscal discipline by requiring that any tax relief be offset in accordance with current budget rules and practices, and that any surpluses be used for debt reduction, until Congress saves Social Security and strengthens Medicare and pays off the publicly held debt)

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk and I ask that the clerk report the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBB], for himself and Mr. GRAHAM of Florida, proposes an amendment numbered 182.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 46, strike section 204.

On page 42, strike lines 1 through 5, and strike lines 15 through 19. Insert at the appropriate place the following:

''SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that the savings from this amendment shall be used to reduce publicly held debt and to strengthen and extend the solvency of the Medicare program.

AMENDMENT NO. 178, AS MODIFIED

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I send a modification to amendment No. 178 to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modification will be accepted.

The amendment (No. 178), as modified, follows:

On page 43, strike beginning with line 3 through line 6, page 45, and insert the following:

SEC. 201. RESERVE FUND FOR AN UPDATED BUDGET FORECAST.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE UPDATED BUDGET FORECAST FOR FISCAL YEARS 2000–2004.—Pursuant to section 202(e)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Congressional Budget Office shall update its economic and budget forecast for fiscal years 1999 through 2009 by July 15, 1999.

(b) REPORTING A SURPLUS.—If the report provided pursuant to subsection (a) estimates an on-budget surplus for fiscal year 2000 or results in additional surpluses beyond those assumed in this resolution in following fiscal years, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make the appropriate adjustments to revenue and spending as provided in subsection (c).

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall take the amount of the additional on-budget surplus for fiscal years 2000 through 2009 estimated in the report submitted pursuant to subsection (a) and in the following order in each of the fiscal years 2000 through 2009—

(1) increase the allocation to the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry by $6,000,000,000 in budget authority and outlays in each of the fiscal years 2000 through 2004;

(2) reduce the on-budget revenue aggregate by any remaining amounts for fiscal years 2000;

(3) provide for or increase the on-budget surplus levels used for determining compliance with the pay-as-you-go requirements of section 202 of H. Con. Res. 67 (104th Congress) by those amounts for fiscal year 2000 and all subsequent years; and

(4) adjust the instruction in sections 104(1) and 105(1) of this resolution to—

(A) reduce revenues by amounts in section (c)(2) for fiscal year 2000; and

(B) increase the reduction in revenues for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004 and for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2009 by that amount.

(d) BUDGETARY ENFORCEMENT.—Revised aggregates and other levels under subsection (c) shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as aggregates and other levels contained in this resolution.

SEC. 202. RESERVE FUND FOR AGRICULTURE.

(a) ADJUSTMENT.—If legislation is reported by the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry that provides risk management and income assistance for agriculture producers, the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of budget authority and outlays to that Committee by an amount that does not exceed—

(1) $6,500,000,000 in budget authority and in outlays for fiscal year 2000;

(2) $36,000,000,000 in budget authority and $35,165,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004; and

(3) $36,000,000,000 in budget authority and in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2009.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the next amendment will be an amendment offered by Senator ASHCROFT on education. Frankly, I am wondering, with such a short period of time before the vote must occur, whether we should just go ahead and ask him to delay and start with that amendment after the vote.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I would be pleased to operate in a way consistent with your wishes. I will begin debate now, or we can defer it until after the vote.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote occur on the first of the stacked amendments, and that the first vote be a 20-minute vote instead of 15, thus making up for the 5 minutes we might have misled people on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 157

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BUNNING addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, the pending amendment, No. 157, offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania, Senator SPECTER, proposes to create a new entitlement for the NIH funded with increased taxes. This language is not germane to the budget resolution before us; therefore, I raise a point of order under section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

MOTION TO WAIVE THE BUDGET ACT

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, Senator SPECTER is not here. I know he would move to waive the point of order. So in his behalf, I move to waive the point of order and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR), is absent because of a death in family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. FITZGERALD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 64 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Abraham	Feinstein	Moynihan
Akaka	Graham	Murray
Bayh	Harkin	Reed
Biden	Inouye	Reid
Bingaman	Jeffords	Rockefeller
Boxer	Johnson	Santorum
Bryan	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Byrd	Kerrey	Schumer
Cleland	Kerry	Smith Gordon H
Collins	Kohl	Snowe
Daschle	Lautenberg	Specter
DeWine	Leahy	Thurmond
Dodd	Levin	Torricelli
Dorgan	Lieberman	Wellstone
Durbin	Mack	Wyden
Feingold	Mikulski	

NAYS—52

Allard	Enzi	Lott
Ashcroft	Fitzgerald	McCain
Baucus	Frist	McConnell
Bennett	Gorton	Murkowski
Bond	Gramm	Nickles
Breaux	Grams	Robb
Brownback	Grassley	Roberts
Bunning	Gregg	Roth
Burns	Hagel	Sessions
Campbell	Hatch	Shelby
Chafee	Helms	Smith Bob
Cochran	Hollings	Stevens
Conrad	Hutchinson	Thomas
Coverdell	Hutchison	Thompson
Craig	Inhofe	Voinovich
Crapo	Kyl	Warner
Domenici	Landrieu	
Edwards	Lincoln	

NOT VOTING—1

Lugar

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 46, the nays are 53. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The point of order is sustained and the amendment falls.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, before you call up the vote, I remind Senators that vote was supposed to be over 15 minutes ago. It is almost 30 minutes. This one is supposed to be 10 minutes under the unanimous consent agreement. I am going to work very hard to see that we stick to 10. The next one right after it is 10 minutes. If we are here in 10, we will get two of them done in 20 minutes. So if we call the regular order, don't be surprised if you miss a vote.

AMENDMENT NO. 176, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 2 minutes equally divided. Who yields time?

Mr. DOMENICI. Senator ROTH has 1 minute and the other side has 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, this amendment does not endorse any one course of action. It calls upon the Finance Committee to develop bipartisan legislation to reform the Medicare program. Congress should work in a bipartisan fashion to extend the solvency of

the Medicare program and to ensure that benefits under that program will be available to beneficiaries in the future. Congress should move expeditiously to consider the bipartisan recommendations of the chairman of the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare. It urges the President to work with the Congress in fixing the problems in the Medicare program.

I thank my colleagues Senator BREAUX, Senator FRIST, Senator KERREY, Senator DOMENICI, Senator THOMPSON, Senator Bob GRAHAM, Senator ABRAHAM as well as Senators PHIL GRAMM, NICKLES, GRASSLEY, MURKOWSKI, and ASHCROFT for cosponsoring this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. May we have order, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I will use my minute in response to simply say this is not a ''bipartisan'' Commission. The Finance Committee may very well take it up. But people, before they praise what the Bipartisan Commission has done, should understand the sick and disabled are going to have to pay the most. Mr. President, 71 percent of all counties in this country have no HMOs whatsoever. The costs of beneficiaries are going to go up. Medicare prescription drugs are not in any way, shape, or form universal.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, can we have order? We cannot hear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. Senators will take their conferences off the floor. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I will continue by saying rural seniors and urban seniors are going to be hurt in this process because there will be fewer physicians who are trained because the training of doctors is completely removed from Medicare. It was turned over to the appropriators. I think you will see a diminution of personnel.

The numbers of uninsured seniors are going to be increased, some estimate by 1.4 million. Medicare was begun because the private sector was not able to handle the insurance, was not willing to handle it. I hope Members will vote against this nonbipartisan Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) is absent because of a death in the family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 65 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Abraham	Fitzgerald	McConnell
Allard	Frist	Murkowski
Ashcroft	Gorton	Nickles
Bennett	Gramm	Roberts
Bond	Grams	Roth
Breaux	Grassley	Santorum
Brownback	Gregg	Sessions
Bunning	Hagel	Shelby
Burns	Hatch	Smith (NH)
Campbell	Helms	Smith (OR)
Chafee	Hutchinson	Snowe
Cochran	Hutchison	Specter
Collins	Inhofe	Stevens
Coverdell	Jeffords	Thomas
Craig	Kerrey	Thompson
Crapo	Kyl	Thurmond
DeWine	Lott	Voinovich
Domenici	Mack	Warner
Enzi	McCain	

NAYS—43

Akaka	Feingold	Lincoln
Baucus	Feinstein	Mikulski
Bayh	Graham	Moynihan
Biden	Harkin	Murray
Bingaman	Hollings	Reed
Boxer	Inouye	Reid
Bryan	Johnson	Robb
Byrd	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Cleland	Kerry	Sarbanes
Conrad	Kohl	Schumer
Daschle	Landrieu	Torricelli
Dodd	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Dorgan	Leahy	Wyden
Durbin	Levin	
Edwards	Lieberman	

NOT VOTING—1

Lugar

The amendment (No. 176), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. ROTH. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 177

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 2 minutes on the Kennedy amendment, equally divided.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask unanimous consent that Senator ASHCROFT be made a cosponsor of the Abraham amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, over the course of the past 2 days of debate, we have seen that there really are no additional funds in this budget proposal before the Senate for the preservation of the financial security of Medicare. But there are proposals for a tax cut of $778 billion over the period of the next 10 years.

This amendment says we will take $320 billion of the amount that is reserved for the tax cut and use it for the financial security of Medicare. Effectively, we are saying, with the surplus, which represents the pay-ins by hard-working Americans—hard-working Americans—that we are going to use that money for the preservation of Medicare, and then we can move ahead and really reform Medicare, and give that a priority over tax cuts which are currently in the budget.

It is a simple question. Are we going to favor financial stability and security of Medicare or are we going to favor tax cuts? I say we can do both, but let us do the financial security of the Medicare system first. That is what this amendment is all about.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, first, this is an anti-tax-relief amendment. Secondly, compared to the resolution, we increase taxes $320 billion. And there is absolutely no relationship between this amendment and Medicare, no matter how much the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts wants to say that there is. There is no relationship. This money sits around, can be spent. It is applied to the debt. We already apply more of the surplus to the debt than the President did with the Kennedy amendment. And last, we have already voted on it. We voted on Conrad. It is almost identical.

Having said that, I move to table and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR), is absent because of a death in the family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 66 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Abraham	Fitzgerald	McConnell
Allard	Frist	Murkowski
Ashcroft	Gorton	Nickles
Bennett	Gramm	Roberts
Bond	Grams	Roth
Brownback	Grassley	Santorum
Bunning	Gregg	Sessions
Burns	Hagel	Shelby
Campbell	Hatch	Smith (NH)
Chafee	Helms	Smith (OR)
Cochran	Hutchinson	Snowe
Collins	Hutchison	Stevens
Coverdell	Inhofe	Thomas
Craig	Jeffords	Thompson
Crapo	Kyl	Thurmond
DeWine	Lott	Voinovich
Domenici	Mack	Warner
Enzi	McCain	

NAYS—46

Akaka	Feingold	Lincoln
Baucus	Feinstein	Mikulski
Bayh	Graham	Moynihan
Biden	Harkin	Murray
Bingaman	Hollings	Reed
Boxer	Inouye	Reid
Breaux	Johnson	Robb
Bryan	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Byrd	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Cleland	Kerry	Schumer
Conrad	Kohl	Specter
Daschle	Landrieu	Torricelli
Dodd	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Dorgan	Leahy	Wyden
Durbin	Levin	
Edwards	Lieberman	

NOT VOTING—1

Lugar

The motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 177) was agreed to.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that full floor privileges be granted to the following staff persons for the duration of the budget resolution debate: Mark Prater, Brig Pari, Tom Roesser, Bill Sweetnam, Jeff Kupfer, Ed McClellan, Alec Vachon, Kathy Means, DeDe Spitznagel, Monica Tencate, Marc Hahn, and Jennifer Baxendell.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 242

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I believe it is now in order to consider an amendment previously offered by the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. ASHCROFT], for himself, and Mr. GORTON, proposes an amendment numbered 242, as previously offered.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, this amendment relates to the education funding included in this budget proposal. I have joined with other Republican Senators in calling for an increase in Federal spending for education and urging that those additional dollars go directly to the classroom. This is a proposed sense-of-the-Senate amendment, and I am offering this measure with Senator GORTON. It is a measure which already is at the desk.

Mr. President, as I mentioned earlier, this budget is very generous in terms of education, providing additional resources for the purpose of enhancing the capacity of our students to perform.

This budget provides, for instance, for my own State—I think if the money were to be divided equally between the States, Missouri would get $56 million next year, more than it gets now. Over the next 5 years, it would get about $660 million more. So that is a substantial increase in the resource.

I have joined with Senator GORTON of Washington to say that when we have that kind of resource flowing to the States, it is important for us that this increased resource in Federal education dollars be directed to the States and local schools out of the Federal budget and not to the Federal bureaucracy.

You see, our intention with this resource is to elevate the capacity of students to perform, not to elevate the capacity or the propensity of the bureaucracy to intermeddle in directing, and sometimes misdirecting, the resources that would otherwise be best directed at the local level.

Our hope is that this additional resource will give States and local communities, will give teachers and principals, and will give people at the classroom level—places where decisions can be made effectively about allocation of the resources—the maximum flexibility to design and run education programs that will literally elevate performance of our students.

One of our Nation's highest priorities is that every child would have the opportunity to receive the kind of challenging, rigorous education that would prepare them for not only success personally, but would also prepare them as team members of Team U.S.A. to keep America where it ought to be—leading the world.

Congress should develop and support Federal policy that will best promote education practices that succeed in our States and schools. Sometimes those practices are different in one State than they would be in other States. So we really want to invite the States, the school boards, the parents, and the teachers, those whose children are in the schools, to participate in developing the right deployment of these resources—spending the money wisely in ways that will help the students.

Successful school systems are characterized by parental involvement, where parents really care, where parents get involved with the school system, where they energize their children, where they assign a high value to achievement in education. That is where our children soar. We should have Federal policy that gives the parents, the schools, the school boards, the school districts, the local governments, and the States the right to tailor the expenditure of resources so as to meet the needs of our children. Successful schools are also characterized by fundamental skills, excellent teachers, dollars spent in the classroom, and not dollars wasted in the bureaucracy. So many of our current Federal educational resources are misspent. They drive a demand for paperwork. They don't drive a demand for performance. They don't contain elements that further our goal of giving our children a world-class education. A number of our Federal education programs contain these mountainous paperwork burdens—regulations and restrictions that hinder States' and local schools' ability to design programs.

Here are a couple of examples about the bureaucracy. Listen to these numbers. They are almost mind staggering.

In Florida, 374 employees administer $8 billion in State funds. So it takes 374 to administer the $8 billion in State funds. However, there are 297 State employees needed to oversee only $1 billion in Federal funds, six times as many employees, six times as much bureaucracy, six times as much administration per dollar of funds spent in Federal dollars as there are for State dollars.

I think if we want to avoid that kind of overlay of inefficiency, if we want to avoid the weight of paper that is weighing down the educational system that keeps teachers writing reports to bureaucrats instead of teaching our students, we ought to be working for this amendment which says that resources should go to State and local efforts; they should be tailored to meet the needs of the schools and to elevate student performance. The enhanced resources in this bill should not be devoted to the Federal bureaucracy where we have that 6-to-1 ratio demonstrated in the Florida experience where there are six times as many administrators for federal dollars as there are for State dollars.

The Federal Department of Education requires over 48.6 million hours of paperwork each year just to receive the Federal dollars. That translates into the equivalent of 25,000 full-time employees every year just doing the paperwork. This bureaucratic maze for Federal education bureaucracy takes up to 35 percent of Federal education dollars.

If I were to hand my son $1 and before it got from my hand to his it changed from $1 to 65 cents, I would hear about it. I would hear about it with justification—''You say you are giving me a dollar. You are only giving me 65 cents.'' That is what has been happening with Federal education dollars.

The Governors of the country know about it. That is why they were so adamant in unanimously supporting the Ed-Flex bill which we passed in the Senate. Flexibility is important. That is what we would be providing to support student achievement if we are able to support this amendment.

A recent example of inflexible Federal funding is the $1.2 billion earmarked exclusively for classroom size reduction for early elementary grades. It may have been a noble aspiration, but it may not be what some schools need.

Listen to what Gov. Gray Davis, a Democratic Governor of California, recently said. He said it this way. His State had already achieved smaller classroom sizes in the early grades and needed to use the new Federal funds for reducing class size in 10th grade math and English classes. But no. The Federal bureaucrats and we, in conjunction with them, said no; this is only to be used in another specific arena.

Let's give the flexibility to a school district, to the Governors, to teachers, to principals, to people at the local level. Let's give them the flexibility to meet student needs instead of to satisfy the bureaucratic demand. Why should we handcuff States and local schools from using money in the way they best see fit?

According to the 1998 National Assessment of Educational Progress Reading Report Card, nearly 40 percent of our fourth grade students cannot even read at a basic level. United States 12th graders outperformed only 2 out of 21 nations in mathematics on a recent Third International Math and Science Study Test.

The Brookings Institution has reported that public institutions of higher education have to spend $1 billion each year on remedial education for students who want to go to college. They have to have remedial work because it didn't happen at the elementary and secondary level.

Let's not continue to spend money, Federal funds, in the old way of running it through the bureaucracy, first shrinking it and then allowing it to go from the bureaucracy forward in ways that aren't serving students. We should direct any new and existing Federal education resources to States and local schools to design and implement education programs that work, and that they know can work, because they are working with the program. And they also know what programs they need for their students.

When Governor Gray Davis said he didn't need the money for smaller class sizes in early grades, he wasn't saying the program wouldn't work. He is just saying we already did that; we need to use the resource for something else.

We cannot afford to keep spending our dollars in the same way that we have been doing for years. A profound friend of mine said, ''Your system is perfectly designed to give you what you are getting. If you do not like what you are getting, you had better change your system.''

We can't do it the same way. It has been giving us the wrong results. Let's let States and local communities decide how to spend dollars to improve performance—not give us the same result but give us an elevated outcome.

I think we should give States and local schools the kind of flexibility they need to spend Federal dollars on programs that are needed at the local level rather than programs that are mandated from the bureaucracy. I think we need programs that boost student achievement, and that somehow foster academic excellence, giving local individuals the right to deploy the resources to do that.

Under this approach, schools will be able to deploy resources to hire new teachers and to raise teachers' salaries. They could buy textbooks, or new computers, enhance the library, or even build—do all kinds of things, whatever they believe is most important in order to achieve that fundamental goal that we will all agree we want to pursue: that is, elevated student performance.

That is what education is for—not for the bureaucracy in Washington. It is not really even for the bureaucracies at the State level, or the school boards, or even for the teachers. Our education effort is designed to elevate the performance and capacity to build the future of the United States by enhancing the future of individual students.

In conclusion, parents, teachers, school boards, and administrators are in the best position to say what is needed. You wouldn't think of going to a doctor who is 1,000 miles away who is prescribing only one thing for all the people in the country regardless of their symptoms. We would say that is the most foolish thing of all. Yet we go to the bureaucracy in Washington, have them prescribe what we are going to do with our educational resources, no matter what the situation is in the State, or the school, or the local school area, or in the classroom. We need the capacity to say, here is what is wrong. Let's make the diagnosis at the local level, and then let's get at the problem at the local level.

We can provide those resources. The resources in this budget should be devoted to that. Senator GORTON of Washington has been a champion of this idea. Several years ago, really in a breakthrough in the Senate, we voted for this concept, and it was on his motion that we did so. I am pleased to join with him in this sense-of-the-Senate resolution.

I ask unanimous consent to add Senator SESSIONS as a cosponsor of this amendment. There may be others as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I am pleased to have the opportunity to join my colleague from Washington State, SLADE GORTON, in making sure that we give the Senate an opportunity to express itself clearly in favor of the kind of funding for schools that boosts student achievement.

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, it is almost 35 years since Congress passed the first Elementary and Secondary Education Act. That marked a fundamental change in the relationship between the Federal Government and local school districts in the management of education policy. That act in 1965 was 30 pages long. Today the Elementary and Secondary Education Act takes up 400 pages of our statute books. The regulations passed pursuant to that act and other education acts literally occupy thousands of pages of the Federal regulations.

For a third of a century, Washington, DC—often Congress but most particularly the people who work in the Department of Education—has been dominated by the thought that centralized decisions and centralized control exercised here in Washington, DC, was the best way to solve problems relating to the education of our young people.

Mr. President, 35 years of that experience has been demonstrably shown not to work. Test scores have not improved anything like the degree that centralized control has been imposed from Washington, DC. In addition, of course, the Congress has not really kept its promise with respect to education. Only 7 or 8 percent of the money that our schools spend comes from appropriations from the Congress of the United States, but a good 50 percent of the rules and regulations do. A failed experiment should be abandoned, and we should try something else.

To focus on a particular incident in my own State of Washington, a team of researchers at the University of Washington found that it wasn't more money that improved test scores in 26 elementary schools in Seattle. It was better people and more freedom. The schools that showed the greatest improvements had principals who motivated teachers to work together, parents who cared and were involved, and the flexibility to do things differently among these various schools. Those principals had more control over the moneys that their schools spent, and it allowed them to custom build programs tailored to their particular school's needs.

The idea has caught on in my State to the point at which our Governor has proposed the creation of ''opportunity schools,'' school districts that would choose to send their funding directly to the schoolhouse and thus free themselves from many regulations at the State level.

This amendment, this sense-of-the-Senate resolution, suggests that we here in Washington, DC, abandon the failed pattern of more and more Federal rules and regulations and repose more trust in parents, in teachers, in principals, and in elected school board members all across the United States.

My friend, the Senator from Missouri, dramatically illustrated how much more money goes into administration when you deal with Federal dollars than is the case with State dollars. He talked about the thousands of school employees throughout the United States who must occupy their time filling out Federal forms. We believe that we should provide more in the way of dollars to our students across the United States, and in fact, this budget resolution is far more generous than the budget proposed by the President of the United States, but we believe that we should impose far fewer controls with those dollars and impose more trust in those people who spend their full time caring about the education of our children.

In the Presiding Officer's State of Ohio and in mine, Washington State, and the State represented by the Senator from Missouri, the electors who were wise enough to elect us to this position are certainly wise enough to elect school board members who care passionately about the kids in their school districts and about the success of their education.

Later in this year, we will deal with the renewal of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Then our voices and our votes will carry even more weight because we will be voting on real policies. In this budget resolution, however, we are making a promise of more resources for our schools and for our schoolchildren, and we should accompany that promise with the promise to trust our parents and teachers and principals and school board members to spend that money wisely.

The Senator from Missouri was very complimentary with respect to my efforts in this regard. Twice in the last 2 years the Senate has voted to move in exactly that direction. We have not yet been successful. We have not gotten this all the way through Congress and past the President of the United States. In fact, the President's budget underfunds the programs that we have already established without removing the regulations that accompany those programs and establishes a whole new series of categorical programs in which we tell the schools what their priorities ought to be and how they ought to spend their money.

What does that do in the real world? The Seattle Times recently reported remarks by the superintendent of the Snoqualmie Valley School District, Rich McCullough, who said:

> It's a little discouraging, but I think there is a lack of trust implicit in almost all Federal funding programs we deal with. They don't trust us to spend the money right, so they force us to do whatever they think is best. It's not always best for every school.

I think that Mr. McCullough knows more about what the students in the Snoqualmie Valley School District in Washington need and how the money he has should be spent on their education than does any Member of Congress, myself included, or any bureaucrat in the Department of Education in downtown Washington, DC.

Dwayne Slate, the executive director of the Washington State School Board, made a similar point in a recent letter that he wrote to me:

> At some point elected officials in Washington, DC simply must trust local education officials to do what's in the best interests of kids in their communities. We all have their best interests at heart.

Mr. President, this sense-of-the-Senate resolution will follow that advice and will allow these superintendents, these teachers, these parents, more in the way of decisionmaking authority as to the kids to whom they are devoting their lives and their careers.

I have every hope that the Senate will accept this amendment.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, how much time do we have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 30 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Thirty minutes.

Mr. President, I yield myself 7 minutes.

As has been pointed out by our friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the importance of providing resources and help and assistance to local communities and then having a degree of flexibility within those communities is basically a concept which this body has gone on record supporting as long as we have some accountability for those funds. That is incorporated in the amendments which I cosponsored with Senator Hatfield in 1994, providing States with flexibility, and now we see that legislation is in conference with the House of Representatives.

We did not have the resolution of our friends until just a few moments ago, but after a quick look at the sense-of-the-Senate, I urge our colleagues on this side to support it. The point that I think is always well worth understanding is that education is basically a local responsibility as has been pointed out by the two speakers on the other side of the aisle. Only about 5 to 6 cents out of every dollar that is spent locally comes from the Federal Government. The rest is raised locally and by the States. So whatever success or failure we have out there in local communities obviously is attributable to the local communities.

We have had some success. We have other challenges. What I think the American people want today is a partnership between the local community and the State and the Feds to try to enhance academic achievement. What we have heard from those schoolteachers and what we have heard from parents and what we have heard from students is a series of recommendations. They had talked about smaller class size, better trained teachers, afterschool programs. They talked about technology in the classroom and some other recommendations—literacy programs as well. That is what they have been telling us, and we have developed legislative proposals to respond to those ideas.

I point out for the benefit of the RECORD that currently, according to the Department of Education—and I will include their study in the RECORD—95 cents of every dollar is actually appropriated for local schools, 95.5 percent of the Federal funds actually go to local districts; a half of 1 percent stays at the Federal level, 4 percent stays at the State level.

So, this is a pretty good indication that whatever we do—and it is very modest when you look at the Nation—it is getting to the community. We can always do better with what we are providing there, but we are, at least with regard to getting the funds into the local communities, doing pretty well, I think. It is certainly better than the kind of bureaucracy that exists at the State level.

Having said that, we will have an opportunity this afternoon to do something which I consider to be very significant in the area of education—a real choice. The proposal we have today indicates the importance of supporting local desires and local interest in the community, and I am certainly going to recommend we all support that. But, later on this afternoon, we will have a measure which the Senator from Connecticut and I will send to the desk, and which we will vote on, which will say: Let's really do something, provide some additional resources to help assist those local communities.

It is all nice and well to agree to a resolution that, as this resolution does, encourages further flexibility at the local level. We are going to embrace and support that. But we will have an opportunity this afternoon to say the following: Before we have the tax breaks for the wealthiest individuals, let us go ahead and fully fund the IDEA program at 40 percent.

We heard a great deal of debate about that in the earlier debate on education. Now, this afternoon, we will have an opportunity to fully fund, at 40 percent, the IDEA program—the special needs programs of help and assistance for the local communities that have special needs children—and meet for the first time our responsibility of funding it at 40 percent, prior to the time we have tax breaks for the wealthy. That will be the significance of the vote on our amendment this afternoon. We will say that we will support a program for smaller class size from K–3, we will support the afterschool programs, we will as a result of this particular amendment see an expansion of the Pell grants and an expansion of the work/study programs, and we will see an expansion of the Head Start programs.

We are effectively saying, instead of $778 billion in tax breaks, we are going to take $156 billion of that over the next 10 years and put it where it will make a difference for children in our country at the local level, in the local community—in smaller class sizes, in helping and assisting in modernizing buildings, in upgrading the skills of our teachers, in effective afterschool programs, in additional technology, in helping and assisting in bringing the Pell Program up to date in a more effective way, and in work/study programs which in many instances are used to expand literacy training and fund the literacy program.

It will be very easy later on this afternoon when we vote on this; the choice will be very clear. After all the pronouncements, all the speeches, all the declarations, all the press releases, this afternoon this Senate will have an opportunity to say we are, over the next 10 years, going to have the most serious support for local improvement, raising the standards of education, that we will have had in the last 35 years. That will be before the Senate this afternoon in our amendment.

There still will be ample resources, over $500 billion, that will be available for the tax breaks.

So I hope when the time comes we will have the support of those who have been speaking in support of local schools and districts involving parents, involving local decisions. I hope we are going to have their help and their support. Do they want to really put their vote where their voice has been and where their press releases have been in

supporting education? Or are they going to vote and say: We will do that at another day, but I am going to vote for tax breaks for wealthy individuals? That is the choice. That will be the choice when the Senate considers the amendment that Senator DODD and I will introduce at the first available opportunity.

Mr. DODD addressed the Chair.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, they are not here on the floor at this moment, but let me say to my colleagues from Missouri and Washington, that I appreciate the sense-of-the-Senate resolution in which they called for increased Federal funding for elementary and secondary education to be directed to the States and local school districts, granting decisionmaking authority in the hands of the States. I have no difficulty with that assertion. But, as my colleague from Massachusetts has just pointed out, there is not a single dime that flows to the States as a result of this amendment.

I commend the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator DOMENICI, and the members of the committee, both Democrats and Republicans, for earmarking additional funds for education. This was a long overdue but welcome addition to the budget process. But, as the Senator from Massachusetts has pointed out, there are some significant differences in what we should do with those dollars because we are competing within the educational function, in effect, on some very critical needs.

Many times Members stand on the floor of the Senate and tell you what message the American public may be sending. Two Senators can get up on the same subject matter, take entirely different positions, and tell you they are speaking on behalf of the American people. On education, Mr. President, we hear one message. We hear, I think, very loudly and very clearly, regardless of geography, economics, ethnicity, gender, or age, that education is a major concern of the American people. There has been a deep and abiding appreciation throughout the long history of our Nation for the importance of education, the fundamental understanding that the subtleties of our democracy and our Constitution can only be perpetuated in time because each succeeding generation is an educated generation. We prosper economically, we grow culturally and intellectually, because we are an educated people. That has been ingrained from the founding days of this Republic.

Earlier today I heard our new colleague from Indiana give his maiden speech on the floor of the Senate. It was a fine speech in which he talked about this being the last budget of the 20th century. I would like to take that in a different direction, in a sense, and remind our colleagues, that this is the first budget of the 21st century. What we are adopting here today, tonight, or tomorrow by noon will be the first budget that will apply to the first year of the coming millennium.

I suppose historians looking back, as they are apt to, will want to know what we were saying about our society as we left the 20th century and began this new millennium. Where were our priorities? What was our agenda? What did we want to see envisioned for our country? Again, I think the voice of the American public is pretty loud and clear and pretty uniform on the issue that education ought to be paramount on our agenda.

For those reasons, the Senator from Massachusetts and I will offer an amendment later today—we will not be able to debate it so we are doing it now—which will say that 80 percent of the tax cut that we are talking debating today will stay in place, if, in fact, that is the will of the majority. Twenty percent of that proposed tax cut we would like to take and deal with the educational needs of America over the next 10 years.

We would like to do something about the commitment we made almost a generation ago, when it came to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. I do not know of a mayor, Mr. President, or a Governor, I say to the Presiding Officer, who knows what I am talking about, in my State or across the country, who has not begged me to do something about us living up to that 40-percent level that we said we would fulfill when it came to the educational needs of special needs children.

We have gone from 8 to about 11 percent of special education funding. I offered an amendment 5 or 6 years ago, Mr. President, in the Budget Committee, which I lost on a tie vote on the IDEA budget that would have increased our commitment to special education.

What Senator KENNEDY and I are offering this afternoon is an opportunity for us to do that over the next 10 years and fulfill that commitment by merely saying, let's slightly modify the tax cut proposal. We are also proposing to take some of those funds, and apply them to deal with the issue of class size—again, a subject matter that I think all Americans agree is important—to have an additional 100,000 teachers, to reduce the ratio of student to teachers in our classrooms; thus, obviously, as I think we all appreciate, increasing the opportunity for learning. Those are the two things we do in this amendment we plan to offer.

There are other questions, obviously, including both school construction and student loans. The Senator from Massachusetts made reference to Pell grants. Does anyone doubt in the 21st century that there is going to be an increasing cost in higher education for families? What a signal to send on the first budget of the 21st century that we recognize that need and that growing cost, and we are going to commit some resources to provide for the higher educational cost needs of average American working families.

School construction: Again, it is incredible to me that in the most affluent nation in the world, we have school buildings that are falling down within blocks of this building. Within blocks of where we are speaking today, there are school buildings that were built in the early part of the 20th century, facilities in which we are training and educating young people who will be the leaders of the 21st century. We somehow have not yet been able to find the resources to make sure those schools are going to be well constructed, are going to be wired with the technology that they need.

The problem with the budget resolution that our good friend from New Mexico and others have crafted is that while it increases spending for education, it does so at the expense of the very programs I have just identified, and others.

It says, in order to do that, we are going to take it from Head Start and higher education, and we are going to take it from other areas. Further, it says we are not going to do something about special education costs at the local community level.

So on the one hand, I commend my colleagues for raising the ante, if you will, on education. Simultaneously, they are squeezing the other programs that are absolutely critical, so that we can attempt to provide for the educational needs of the Americans of the 21st century.

We have a way of paying for this. Again, I think our colleagues earlier today talked about a balance in this budget. There is a need for tax cuts. I am looking forward to supporting some good tax cut proposals—child care, the marriage penalty tax, investment in small business, innovation and technology, housing. I can think of a dozen areas where good, strong tax cuts make sense.

But that is not the only need in this country. There is a need to do something about the educational improvement of American schools. There is something valuable in assisting our communities and local governments with the cost of special education. What we will offer in our amendment will do that.

New school construction, classroom size, special education: why not also provide for that and simultaneously provide the resources for some of the tax cuts people are proposing?

The resolution before us, the sense of the Senate which says we ought to do more about elementary and secondary education, if Senators vote for that, and I hope they will, then they are going to get a chance momentarily, right after that, to fulfill that commitment. Rarely do we get to do that. We make a promise with one resolution, and within minutes we will be given a

chance to actually fulfill that commitment and that promise with the amendment that we will offer.

We hope, Mr. President, that our colleagues will support the resolution by the Senator from Missouri. In doing so, we also hope that when the amendment is offered by the Senator from Massachusetts and myself, to fulfill our commitment on IDEA and do something about classroom size by reducing marginally the tax cut proposal, that we will also put real dollars and real meaning behind the commitments made in the resolution before us.

Mr. President, with that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, how much time is available?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The sponsor of the amendment has 10 minutes 5 seconds, and the opponents, 11½ minutes.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I will take the remaining 10 minutes.

First of all, I ask unanimous consent that at 4 p.m. today, all remaining debate time on the budget resolution be considered yielded back and, further, that the Senate proceed to a stacked series of votes on the remaining pending amendments.

I further ask that the first vote be 15 minutes in length, with the remaining votes in the sequence limited to 10 minutes in length, with 2 minutes equally divided between each vote for brief explanations of the amendments.

Finally, I ask that the votes alternate between Republican and Democrat amendments.

Mr. KERRY. Reserving the right to object, I want to make sure I understood that correctly, Mr. President. Was that request, again, as of 4 to begin the process of serial votes?

Ms. SNOWE. That is correct.

Mr. DODD. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. President—

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Maine.

Ms. SNOWE. Thank you, Mr. President.

I wanted to make a few comments on an amendment that the Senator from Oregon and I have introduced already. It has already been brought up.

I wanted to offer a few words of explanation, because we think this is a very important amendment that would expand the reserve fund in the budget resolution for Medicare and the prescription drug benefit program. Specifically, our amendment would allow for new tobacco taxes to be used as an offset for the new Medicare prescription drug benefit that this reserve fund would create.

As I stated on the floor yesterday, I believe that one of the most critical items included in this year's Senate budget resolution is the reserve fund for Medicare and prescription drugs. This reserve fund received support from virtually all the members of the committee, both Democrats and most Republicans, which would address the prescription drug benefit program by allowing the use of onbudget surpluses.

We know that the Bipartisan Commission did not report out a majority report, but we do know that the Senate Finance Committee will be considering the Commission's recommendations nevertheless. So in this proposal, in the bipartisan resolution, it does include, in the reserve fund in the budget resolution, language that in the event that the Senate Finance Committee reports out a reform package of the Medicare program that extends the solvency of the program, then we would also include a prescription drug benefit program.

To the credit of the chairman of the Budget Committee, he proposed, when we were trying to work out exactly how this would be funded, whether or not to use tobacco taxes or other sources of revenue, we decided that the onbudget surplus was one means of supporting a prescription drug benefit program. But we also know that could also be tenuous depending on the surpluses that develop over the next 5 to 10 years. We want to provide certainty to the funding of this prescription drug benefit program.

So the Senator from Oregon and I have proposed an amendment that would provide an additional means of funding for this prescription drug benefit program so that we provide the continuity and the stability for funding by raising tobacco taxes in order to fund the program.

In fact, the President includes a 55-cent tax increase in his own budget for a tobacco tax increase. He talks about a prescription drug benefit program but does not provide a plan nor does he provide any sources for funding. We think this is an important step forward.

I appreciate being able to work with the Senator from Oregon in a bipartisan fashion to address this most critical issue, critical problem that is facing our Nation's senior citizens. Twelve percent of our Nation's elderly account for more than a third of the drug expenditures that occur in this country. Clearly, it is a real problem for seniors. It certainly is the black hole in the Medicare program because of the absence of support for a drug benefit program.

We want to provide the means by which it can happen and can happen this year. So the reserve fund in the budget resolution, contrary to what has been said, does provide the means for a prescription drug benefit program. If that reserve fund and that line item was not in the budget resolution, we would have a 60-vote hurdle to bring it to the floor.

So it guarantees the prospects of having a prescription drug benefit program with use of onbudget surpluses. We are just adding another option to the funding of that program because we think it is so important.

HCFA will say 65 percent of the Nation's elderly who are on Medicare have support of prescription drug benefits through other insurance policies. Well, not exactly. When you start to look at the Medigap policies, the cost of the deductibles and the caps, it is a very expensive proposition, and very few seniors have the option of using it in a way that can help them given the enormous costs that prescription drugs represent to their families.

So we realize this is a necessity. That is why we wanted to develop this bipartisan approach on funding, and ultimately the Senator from Oregon and I are going to develop bipartisan legislation to move this process forward.

I want to yield to the Senator from Oregon, because I know there is very little time left, to be able to address this issue as well. I think it is important. It makes sense to use tobacco taxes. The Columbia University did a study on this issue.

And there is no question that tobacco-related illnesses has cost the Medicare program to a tremendous extent, in fact, more than $34 billion. And 80 percent of the $32 billion in total substance abuse costs in 1994 were as a result of tobacco-related illnesses, as this chart will illustrate right here. So $25 billion alone in 1994.

So Mr. President, there is no question that it makes sense to link a tobacco tax increase to financing a prescription drug program when you consider the costs and the impact of tobacco-related illnesses on the Medicare program. And that is only going to get worse in the future.

Now I would like to yield to the Senator from Oregon for any comments he would like to make on our amendment.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank my colleague from Maine. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, whose time is being used now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senators have submitted an amendment, they have 30 minutes as proponents on the amendment. The Chair has accepted the proposition that an amendment has been accepted.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, parliamentary point of inquiry. Which amendment is, in fact, the amendment that is currently under controlled time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are more than 80 amendments.

Mr. KERRY. No. It is my understanding, Mr. President, that the Ashcroft amendment is the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That was the last amendment that was proposed.

Mr. KERRY. The Ashcroft amendment is being debated under controlled time; is that correct? There is a unanimous consent request as to the order of amendments. Excuse me. There is a unanimous consent order that has set up the order of amendments now. So the order is the Ashcroft amendment.

Subsequent to the Ashcroft amendment, there is an additional Daschle amendment, and then it is going back and forth. So we are on the Ashcroft amendment. If debate on that is finished, under the consent order, we would move to a separate order. This amendment, if it is separate, would not be in order at this time.

Mr. DOMENICI. That is correct.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. If you will give me a moment, I have an inquiry. I ask the Parliamentarian, is there a UC now that lists amendments in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No, there is not.

Mr. DOMENICI. We did not get a UC.

Mr. KENNEDY. Point of inquiry. Can I try to clarify this issue? If I could have the attention of the Parliamentarian. As I understood, we had the Ashcroft amendment. And then we had 12 minutes left on our side; 12 minutes on the other side. And as someone who was interested in our side, the Democratic side, I thought the Senator from Maine asked to take the 10 minutes—it was on the other side—to talk about an amendment that was going to come up, just as we talked about an amendment we hoped would be considered later in the afternoon. I do not remember a consent request that we set that aside. I have been sitting here, Senator DODD has been sitting here, ready to debate the Ashcroft amendment.

Mr. KERRY. Further inquiry, Mr. President. Last night I stood here in this very chair when the distinguished manager——

Mr. DOMENICI. I was not here.

Mr. REID. I was here.

Mr. KERRY. Senator REID. And we propounded a unanimous consent request at that time which the Chair, in fact, did rule on, saying there would be six amendments, three on each side; and the three on our side were specifically listed at that point in time. And I think the distinguished minority whip will confirm what I am saying.

Mr. REID. There was an order entered last night with names of Senators on this side mentioned. Senator DOMENICI indicated he would fill in the names of the Republican Senators, for the three amendments to be offered on their side.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President and Senators, I was not here, but I do not challenge what anybody has said. Somebody else was here in my stead. I think it was—no. Was I here?

Mr. REID. You were here.

Mr. DOMENICI. OK. My recollection is getting weaker by the hour here.

Mr. DODD. Join the club.

Mr. DOMENICI. But if you let me try to fix it, just give me a moment.

How much time is left on the amendment that is known as the Ashcroft-Gorton?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 10 minutes to the sponsors and 11½ minutes to the opponents——

Mr. DOMENICI. What is the argument?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the Ashcroft amendment. So we are still on Ashcroft.

Mr. DOMENICI. They are supposed to have that time. Why not give them that time? What is wrong with that?

Mr. KERRY. The Snowe amendment is a separate amendment, and not in order.

Mr. DOMENICI. Could you clarify, what is the status of Senator SNOWE's amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There have been submitted in excess of 80 amendments. Under the Senate's precedents, each of those amendments can be brought up on the call of the regular order.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, again——

Mr. DOMENICI. She did not ask for regular order. Her amendment isn't pending. Is it pending or not?

Mr. WYDEN. Parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is what we are trying to get to right now.

Mr. DOMENICI. Could we ask Senator SNOWE, what do you desire to do? Do you want to talk about your amendment?

Ms. SNOWE. That is correct. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I want to talk about my amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. How long would you like to talk about your amendment?

Ms. SNOWE. Not too much longer, perhaps another 10 minutes. The Senator from Oregon could finish up his remarks and then any concluding remarks.

Mr. DOMENICI. Ten minutes between the two Senators?

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I think we can be finished with this in probably 15 minutes.

The Senator from Maine and I, as well as our colleague from Massachusetts, have been here for the last few hours. If I had 10 minutes and Senator SNOWE could wrap up briefly, we could be done.

Mr. DOMENICI. We will make time for you.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I am absolutely confident that we can work this out appropriately with the help of the distinguished manager. I make it clear that no call for regular order was made. We were in the middle of the process of debating the Ashcroft amendment which is under controlled time. In the course of that debate of controlled time, the Senator from Maine—and I have no objection to this—stood up to speak on a separate amendment without calling for regular order.

So that is not the pending business before the Senate.

Now, I am delighted to have the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Oregon be able to debate their amendment, but there is, in fact, an order setting up a line of amendments here.

I am happy to enter into a new unanimous consent agreement that adequately protects those people in line and the time of the Senator from Maine's, and then we can proceed. I would be willing to lift my objection to having the serial votes follow at that point in time. I do think we ought to follow the procedures of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators SNOWE and WYDEN be permitted to speak without calling up their amendment for 15 minutes, after which time the regular order will be the Ashcroft amendment, which will then vest in the respective Senators the remaining time under the hour that they had. As soon as that is over, we will proceed with the Daschle-Dorgan amendment, and they will have 1 hour equally divided, after which we will move to a Republican amendment for Grams-Roth, which will be one half-hour equally divided. Then we will have Senator JOHN KERRY of Massachusetts to follow that with one half-hour equally divided.

We can stay on that path for just a while and then we will do something else.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Who yields time on the pending Ashcroft amendment?

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I have the time.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, we just entered into a unanimous consent agreement. What do we need the Parliamentarian for? He can sit there. Senators SNOWE and WYDEN are to proceed under the UC now for 15 minutes, and we just stated what is to follow.

You don't have to ask the Parliamentarian anything; just call on Senator SNOWE.

You are the Parliamentarian; you run the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that we will have 15 minutes divided between the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Oregon.

The Senator from Maine.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, first let me thank my colleague from Maine and say that the reason we have come to the floor at this time is there would be an opportunity today for the Senate, after all of the frustrations surrounding the Medicare Commission, to take a major step forward in the cause of Medicare reform, and finance it in a responsible way.

What the Senator from Maine and I have done, both in the Budget Committee and with this amendment, is sought to ensure that the Senate would have an opportunity in this bipartisan amendment to ensure for the first time in this session the Senate could make a significant addition to the Medicare program: Start covering prescription drugs for vulnerable older people and pay for it in a responsible fashion.

More than 20 percent of the Nation's elderly spend over $1,000 a year out of pocket on their prescription medicine. These are older folks who are walking on an economic tightrope. They balance their food bills against their medical bills, their medical bills

against their housing expenses, and many of these older people end up with a prescription that would involve their taking three pills a day which they cannot afford. So they end up taking two pills at the beginning and then maybe they take one. They get sicker. As a result, this country's inability to finance prescription drug coverage for older people under Medicare, this results in a lot of those older folks having to face hospitalizations, unnecessary surgeries, institutional health care.

The reason Senator SNOWE and I have acted as we have: First, to ensure that part of the onbudget surplus could be used for this additional benefit; and, second, to raise the opportunity for additional revenue through new tobacco taxes. We believe that a significant portion of Medicare expenses are due to tobacco-related illnesses. In fact, the evidence shows that perhaps 15 percent of all Medicare costs are tobacco related.

In this amendment we have provided a two-step process for ensuring that we will have the opportunity to finance a decent pharmaceutical benefit for low-income older people. The first is the proposition that many Democrats have felt strongly about, and that is to ensure that a portion of the onbudget surplus could be used for this benefit. Second, we have felt that it may take additional funds, which is why we are saying that the Senate Finance Committee would have the opportunity, should they choose to do so, to add to the reserve fund money that would come from a new tobacco tax.

I believe, having seen the frustrations of the Medicare Commission and their inability to come up with a bipartisan agreement, the Snowe-Wyden amendment, the amendment that we will vote on today, is a major step forward.

When we talk with our older constituents, they tell us that the great gap today in Medicare is prescription drugs. More than 37 percent of older people are responsible for their prescription drug bill. On average, they pay twice as much as those without coverage. The AARP has estimated that fee-for-service beneficiaries with annual incomes below $10,000 are estimated to be spending about 10 percent of their entire income on prescription drugs.

I am very pleased to have a chance, after some of the bickering that has surrounded this Medicare issue, to come to the floor of the Senate today and say that with the Snowe-Wyden amendment we are in a position to add coverage for the vulnerable older people of this country and to pay for it in a responsible way.

Many of our colleagues know that Medicare offers very little in the way of preventive benefits. We have finally been able to add some mammography coverage, some coverage for those with diabetes. But the fact of the matter is, this drug coverage benefit is perhaps the next best step we can take in terms of preventive health care.

What we are seeing with these new drugs and new therapies, they are absolutely key to keeping older people out of the hospital, to making sure we are avoiding unnecessary surgeries. I submit that this legislation, which meets an enormous need in our country, is also a major step forward in terms of preventive health services.

I know that there are going to be some on the Republican side and some on the Democratic side who will say that this is not perfection in terms of Medicare reform. Well, I would agree with that. But I also say that the opportunity to take a major step now to helping those 20 percent of the Nation's senior citizens who pay more than $1,000 out of pocket for their prescription drugs is certainly an opportunity that the Senate should move to take advantage of.

It isn't a perfect amendment. The Senate Finance Committee is going to have an opportunity to make refinements in it. But for the vulnerable older people, 37 percent of the Nation's elderly that are responsible for their prescription drug bill, this is going to mean that some of those folks are actually going to be able to pay for three pills a day when the doctor tells them that is needed.

I want to wrap up by thanking my colleague from Maine. She, like myself, has worked on this issue for many years—really, since our House days. I am so pleased that now we can, after there have been the frustrations surrounding the Medicare Commission, come to the floor of the Senate with a significant Medicare reform that is responsibly financed. We got a 21–1 vote in the Senate Budget Committee, and the addition that we have made today, with the opportunity for additional revenue to be generated for this program with any new tobacco tax, is another step forward.

I thank my colleague from Maine for this time. I know she would like to wrap up, and I tell her I very much appreciate the opportunity to, with her, address Medicare reform now in a bipartisan fashion and to meet the needs of some of the Nation's most vulnerable citizens, our elderly. I thank her for this time to speak.

Ms. SNOWE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I want to commend my colleague, Senator WYDEN, for his leadership on this issue, not only here in the Senate, but as he referred to, during our days in the House of Representatives. I know he has worked considerably on the issues of senior citizens in this country, and in his service on the Aging Committee as well in the House of Representatives.

I want to also commend the chairman of the Budget Committee because at a time when I was discussing the idea of creating a reserve fund for the prescription drug benefit program, Senator DOMENICI came up with the idea of including onbudget surpluses of which there is probably more than $132 billion estimated over the next 5 years, and that that could be a potential source for funding for the prescription drug management program.

So this amendment is to build on that leadership, to ensure that there will be continuity and funding in the event that those surpluses do not materialize. Also, this is a carrot-and-stick approach because the reserve fund in the budget resolution includes a prescription drug benefit program contingent on a reform package being passed out by the Senate Finance Committee that extends the solvency of the Medicare program.

We think that is important, but we don't want to overlook the significance of providing this benefit to senior citizens because it has constituted a crisis in this country for our Nation's elderly, without a doubt. As Senator WYDEN has indicated, it has consumed most of their income when it comes to the cost of prescription drugs. We think it is an appropriate linkage between a tobacco tax increase and the impact on the Medicare program. Again, if you look at this chart, $25 billion is the cost to the Medicare program in 1995 as a result of tobacco-related illnesses. Well, if you take that even further, it represents 14 percent of Medicare costs in that year alone. That is all going to grow exponentially. It will get worse. It could be more than a $400 billion problem over the next 10 to 15 years.

So that is why it is important, I think, to look at the source of revenue through a tobacco tax increase, in the event the surpluses don't materialize, but that we have a permanency in terms of coverage. That is what we are attempting to do in this amendment. That is why we think it is so important because to do otherwise is failing to acknowledge the reality of the impact of not having this kind of benefit program currently in the Medicare system.

Finally, I should say, Mr. President, that in the reserve fund in the budget resolution we prohibit any transfer of IOUs to the Medicare program. We do not artificially address the Medicare program. We are doing it in a real way, and that is also the case with the prescription drug benefit program.

I might also just mention, in talking about Medicare, as one quote that came out of the President's book—the OMB fiscal year 2000 budget—what it said with respect to the President's Medicare proposal is:

> Trust fund balances are available to finance future benefit payments and other trust fund expenditures—but only in a bookkeeping sense. . . . They do not consist of real economic assets that can be drawn down in the future to fund benefits. Instead, they are claims on the Treasury that, when redeemed, will have to be financed by raising taxes, borrowing from the public, or reducing benefits or other expenditures. The existence of large trust fund balances, therefore, does not, by itself, have any impact on the Government's ability to pay benefits.

What that means, in a nutshell, is that the President's proposal, contrary to what is suggested on the floor, isn't putting a penny of real money into these programs, and the same is true for the prescription drug benefit program. They talk about the State of the Union Address, but did not propose a plan, did not provide one penny for a prescription drug benefit program. The budget resolution, on a bipartisan basis—21–1—supported the reserve fund I offered with the onbudget surpluses to pay for it. That is a step in the right direction that is going to ensure that the Nation's senior citizens have that benefit. In addition, on this amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon and myself, I should also mention that Senator SMITH from Oregon is a cosponsor.

Mr. WYDEN. Will the Senator yield?

Ms. SNOWE. Yes.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank my colleague for yielding. I want to come back to how bipartisan this amendment has been——

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WYDEN. In a moment, I will. In the Budget Committee, this received a 21–1 vote. Suffice it to say, for an issue that has been this controversial, which generated so much discussion in the Medicare Commission, to be able to come to the Senate today with a 21–1 vote from the Senate Budget Committee and then to take the additional step that the Senator from Maine and I and many of our other colleagues have taken, like Senator KENNEDY who has fought this battle valiantly for so many years—we have now taken the additional step of saying that any new tobacco tax money could be used for this program, and that strikes me as the kind of bipartisan work that the Senate ought to be doing. It would be one thing if this was a narrowly fought battle in the Senate Budget Committee. Instead, we got a 21–1 vote.

Now we come to the Senate floor and say that onbudget surpluses could be used to finance this program for the vulnerable, No. 1. The second is to say that any new tobacco tax revenue could be generated for this program. That is the kind of bipartisan approach we ought to be taking. I thank my colleague from Maine. I know my friend from Massachusetts wants to speak.

Mr. KENNEDY. May I ask a question, please? On this trust fund, the reserve fund, on page 90, which describes the fund, there are also the words that the committee report would not allow the reserve to be funded by the intergovernmental transfers. That would be the part that the President talked about—any of the funding from the surpluses. And then, on page 90, it indicates that you can't have the funds from other revenues, as it talks about being adjusted for legislation that extends the solvency of the fund.

How are we going to extend the solvency without additional funds in order to trigger this program? You have the solvency mentioned, and 9 years and 12 years. We don't want to create a program that says we are going to do something on prescription drugs and then, on the other hand, which says we are only going to do it if we extend solvency, and then we don't have additional funds to extend solvency. I am interested in what kind of a commitment or promise this is really going to be.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, the answer to the Senator's question is, that is occurring through the Part A program of Medicare. The prescription drug benefit will be in Part B of the program.

Mr. KENNEDY. The provision here talks about now allowing transfer of new subsidies from the general fund. That is not applicable to Part B. It says right here on page 90. That is prohibited without the use of transfers of new subsidies from the general fund. And it also talks about prohibition of intergovernmental transfers.

Can the Senator tell us how she foresees the solvency being worked out, if it isn't going to be higher premiums, or reduced benefits?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time that has been allocated to the Senator has expired.

Mr. KENNEDY. May I ask for a minute so the Senator can respond?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, if I may respond, I would be glad to respond. We are not proposing any reforms to solvency. That will be determined by the Senate Finance Committee with respect to Part A. With respect to the prescription drug benefit program, that would come under Part B. And that is why we will be using onbudget surpluses, plus the tobacco tax increase, if it is necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. First, Mr. President, to the Parliamentarian, I apologize for my statements a while ago. I guess I have been here too long.

Anyhow, let me see who is under the order. Is not the Daschle amendment up? We understand there is time remaining on other amendments. That is bothering you. So why don't we just say whatever time remains on amendments that have been set aside, or otherwise are not disturbed, by unanimous consent will not be changed or altered by setting them aside, reserving that time, and going to the Daschle amendment as ordered a few moments ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Daschle-Dorgan. There was a unanimous consent on three amendments that are going to be made, and this is the beginning of that with the Daschle amendment. The clerk will report that amendment.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Parliamentary inquiry: After the amendments are called up, are you going to ask unanimous consent that they be entered?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I have just been back here now distracted. Are we going to just finish up now the amendment? We have been here with Senator DODD all during the lunch hour since 1 o'clock, which I am glad to do to accommodate others. And the chairman has been enormously accommodating. But I thought we would have Senator DODD next. Senator MURRAY is here and wanted to speak. Senators HARKIN and DODD wanted to speak on it and to do the last 10 minutes. The chairman has been extremely courteous in accommodating everyone's interest. Both of them are here. What I would like to do is to have some idea.

Mr. DOMENICI. What amendments are they speaking to?

Mr. KENNEDY. Ashcroft. We have 10 minutes remaining on the Ashcroft amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair's recollection is that there was a unanimous consent ordered to give the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Oregon 15 minutes, and then we would proceed under an order in regard to specific amendments.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Regular order is the Ashcroft amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Ashcroft is pending.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. That is the pending amendment. I think the Parliamentarian will agree.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, if there is any confusion, might I modify the previous unanimous consent request and say that there are 10 minutes remaining on each side on the Ashcroft amendment, 10 under the control of Senator KENNEDY, 10 under the control of Senator ASHCROFT, and that we proceed to do that now, and then follow the sequence that we just agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. We will proceed. There being no objection, the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, before the body at this time is an amendment on education. We have heard from this floor many times over the course of this Congress that education is a priority. And that is a fact; it is a priority here in the Senate. I am delighted to say that. It is certainly a priority for thousands of families across the country who have children in school who want them to get a good education. But it is also a priority for many businesses who want to make sure that we are educating young people today in order to give them the skills they need to be able to hire them. It is a priority for our police officers and the community leaders, because they know that investing in education and making sure that young people get what they need in our

schools means the safety, the health, and the viability of our country for many years to come.

The pending amendment talks about education. But talking about education is not what our constituents are asking for. They are asking for us to invest in education. We can all talk about quality, but unless we provide the resources for those schools out there, we will not be providing them with the kind of education they have to have in order for our country to be strong in the future. The amendment that my colleagues, Senator KENNEDY and Senator DODD, have introduced offers us a way to do that.

Too often on this floor we have set up challenges between different funding. We can either support IDEA funding for special education, or we can support teacher quality, or class size. The amendment that Senator KENNEDY will offer at a later time provides us with the alternative to make sure that we do provide the funds for special education under IDEA and complete the promise we have made to young students and teachers and communities to reduce class size. It simply says that this is an investment we are going to make.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. It will make a difference in our classrooms across this country.

Mr. President, too often we are told that we are providing a tax cut and returning money to the people. I can think of no better way to return money to our constituents than by investing it in education so that our young people get the skills they need, so they can get jobs and become a viable part of our economy in the future. A budget is not just about putting dollars out there today, it is making good investment so that our budgets will be strong in the future.

That is why I am going to support the Kennedy amendment, which gives actual real resources to our students, and not just another empty promise and another way of moving bureaucratic paper around.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield my time back to the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. President, I want to just mention to the Members again what we are basically talking about is funding, meeting our responsibility under IDEA, which this Nation is committed to offer the next 10 years, and also funding the smaller class program and providing a significant increase in the Head Start Program, the Pell grants, the work/study programs, afterschool programs, school dropout programs.

These are the groups that support our program: American Association of School Administrators, the National Education Association, Parent-Teachers, Council of Greater City Schools, Chief of State School Offices, Federation of Teachers, Committee on Education Funding, the National Parent Network on Disabilities, the Disability Rights Education Fund, Easter Seals, Consortium of Citizens with Disabilities, National Federation of Children with Special Needs.

Virtually every children's group and every education group understands that this is our best opportunity in this Congress to really make a downpayment in terms of the partnership among local, State, and Federal in terms of enhancing academic achievement and accomplishment in the schools across our country.

We have a chance now to fulfill our commitments that we have all made in statements and speeches and press releases to do something now. That is what this vote is about. It says we will fund these programs before we go for tax breaks for wealthy individuals. That is the choice. It is as clear as can be. That is what the issue is. We are hopeful that we will get strong support for that program.

Mr. President, I yield what time remains to my colleague and cosponsor, Senator DODD.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, this is a letter that I think the Presiding Officer will be very familiar with. This is a letter from the National Governors' Association.

Let me quote this letter, if I may. So my colleagues will be aware, this is signed by Michael Leavitt, Republican Governor of Utah; Mike Huckabee, Republican Governor of Arkansas; Tom Carper, Democratic Governor of Delaware; and Jim Hunt, Democratic Governor of North Carolina. They say in their letter to us, to the chairman of the Budget Committee, ''Governors urge Congress to live up to the agreements already made to meet current funding commitments'' regarding education before adopting ''new initiatives or tax cuts in the Federal budget.''

It goes on in the letter to say that they are already cutting existing funds locally to provide for special needs students. They are asking unanimously, Democratic and Republican Governors across this country, to do exactly what Senator KENNEDY and I will be asking our colleagues to do in the amendment when we vote on it, and that is to place the special education needs of children ahead of a tax cuts. Our commitment to special education ought to come before tax cuts. There will still be plenty of room financially for the tax cuts. But here is Mike Leavitt, Mike Huckabee, Tom Carper, and Jim Hunt speaking on behalf of the National Governors' Association telling us to fund IDEA before enact tax cuts. What clearer message could we have?

I hope our colleagues today, after they vote on the Ashcroft amendment and say that we ought to provide more for education, and then quickly thereafter have a chance to vote on the Kennedy-Dodd amendment, will remind themselves—and I will see that each Member gets a copy of the NGA letter regarding IDEA funding—to live up to the commitment in the Ashcroft amendment by fulfilling the request of the National Governors' Association to support this program as crafted by this amendment.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Three minutes 5 seconds to the opponents and 10 minutes to the proponents.

Who yields time?

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I do not know if there are—Senator HARKIN of Iowa wanted to be heard, but I don't see him in the Chamber at this time. I don't know, are there any further requests for time on this side?

We reserve the remainder of our time, unless the distinguished chairman of the committee wants to be heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. I am going to argue for 2 minutes and yield back the remainder of my time so we can get going. If Senator HARKIN isn't here, I hope Senators will cooperate with me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I am very pleased that a Governor occupies the Chair while I make this statement.

Those Governors are friends of ours. The Republicans have been increasing the funding for special education. We do not need a lecture from the Governors about it. What we need is help from the Democrats who have resisted it every time. The President didn't even put an increase in his budget last year. We put the whole increase in. I don't remember if he did much this year, but it is mighty small. It is Senator JUDD GREGG and others who have been leading the parade around here on IDEA.

Now, frankly, we would like to ask those Governors who signed that letter, would you like us to cut the extra $3 billion in this budget that we put in and the extra $27 billion that we put in here? If you would like that cut, we will make room for more IDEA money for you. That is an increase in education, and it is left up to the committees to do what they would like, except we would like to make a sense-of-the-Senate resolution binding, adopted by us, that says, let's reform the Federal program and let's make sure that they are more responsive by focusing them in at the local level with local control.

Now, we ought to pass that, because it is time we reform it. There is no IDEA issue in this amendment. They are going to raise IDEA in a later amendment. They are going to raise something on special education.

So with that, I wish their amendment well when they bring it up. It is high time that they are for significantly increasing funding under special education, but for now we have raised it and we ask that the local control be attached to that with one of the qualities being that it be accountable, that there be accountability in those laws.

I yield back the remainder of time so we can move on.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, may we have 30 seconds?

Mr. DODD. We have more time remaining.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the Ashcroft amendment is a sense-of-the-Senate. Our amendment is real dollars, real dollars. We are saying fund the education programs before the tax cut. That is what the issue is. I am interested in what the Governors say, but I care most about those parents who are supporting this program. Every child group, every education group supports it.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, in response to my good friend from New Mexico, I served on the Budget Committee for a number of years. Back in 1992 or 1993, I offered the IDEA amendment. I lost on a tie vote. I must say, the majority leader, TRENT LOTT, a member of the Budget Committee, voted with me. That was the only vote I got on the other side, so I lost on the tie vote. The amendment failed. I commend the chairman and others who have wanted to increase this. We have funded IDEA at about $500 million a year. I think there is $500 million this year, I say to the chairman of the committee, on the IDEA funding. They deserve credit for doing that.

What we are saying here is that we have all tried different ways over the last number of years. I don't think you necessarily want to turn around and say to Head Start or to Pell grants or to school construction, fine, you can do IDEA but we are going to cut your budget.

We are not saying that. We are saying, look, with an $800 billion tax cut, that is a big tax cut, keep 80 to 85 percent of the tax cut; how about 10 or 15 percent of that to do what the Governors have asked us to do here? That is specifically what we have said. Do this before you do the tax cut.

All we are suggesting is their request is well founded. When Republican and Democratic Governors ask the Congress to set some priorities so they can have the resources to do the job, I think we in this body ought to take note of it. That is the reason I offer the argument.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the National Governors' Association be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL GOVERNORS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, March 9, 1999.

Hon. PETE V. DOMENICI,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you prepare the budget resolution for the coming fiscal year, the nation's Governors urge Congress to live up to agreements already made to meet current funding commitments to states before funding new initiatives or tax cuts in the federal budget.

The federal government committed to fully fund—defined as 40 percent of the costs—the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) when the law, formerly known as Education of the Handicapped Act, was passed in 1975. Currently, the federal government's contribution amounts to only 11 percent, and states are funding the balance to assist school districts in providing special education and related services. Although we strongly support providing the necessary services and support to help all students succeed, the costs associated with implementing IDEA are placing an increased burden on states.

We are currently reallocating existing state funds from other programs or committing new funds to ensure that students with disabilities are provided a ''fee and appropriate public education.'' In some cases, we are taking funds from existing education programs to pay for the costs of educating our students with disabilities because we believe that all students deserve an equal opportunity to learn. Therefore, Governors urge Congress to honor its original commitment and fully fund 40 percent of Part B services as authorized by IDEA so the goals of the act can be achieved.

This is such a high priority for Governors, that at the recent National Governors' Association Winter Meeting, it was a topic of discussion with the President as well as the subject of an adopted, revised policy attached. Many thanks for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

GOV. THOMAS R. CARPER.
GOV. JAMES B. HUNT, Jr.,
Chair, Committee on Human Resources.
GOV. MICHAEL O. LEAVITT.
GOV. MIKE HUCKABEE,
Vice Chair, Committee on Human Resources.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I will be glad to yield back the remainder of our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

AMENDMENT NO. 178, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time on the Daschle amendment?

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, it is my understanding that we have 1 hour equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DORGAN. That amendment is an amendment that I have introduced with a number of my colleagues, including Mr. DASCHLE. So let me begin by describing the amendment and the reason that we are here. I will then call on my colleague from North Dakota, Senator CONRAD, Senator DASCHLE, and others.

Mr. President, first, let me tell you that I am offering an amendment for my colleagues to try to strengthen rural America, and to try to provide some better price supports for family farmers.

I want to tell you about a 90-year-old woman I talked to this morning. Her name is Margaret Hansen. A few weeks ago, Margaret, age 90, got in her car in the rural part of North Dakota and got stuck in a snow bank. This 90-year-old lady got out of her car and began to walk. She walked a mile and a half when her legs gave out. Then this 90-year-old woman began to crawl on this gravel road. She crawled for a half mile, and then she couldn't crawl any longer. She laid there huddled on that road apparently for about 8 hours before someone came along in a pickup truck and stopped to wonder what was lying on the road. He found this 90-year-old woman. She wasn't dead. They took her to a hospital.

I am happy to report that Margaret is doing quite well. She said to me, yeah, I am doing fine, but my legs aren't so good. She was remarkably upbeat.

Why would it take 7 or 8 hours before a 90-year-old woman is found lying on a gravel road in the middle of winter? That's because there aren't many people living in rural America anymore.

I want to show you a chart. This chart shows, blocked out in red, the counties in this country that are losing population. If you look at the farm belt in the Great Plains, up and down the middle part of America, you will see a part of our country that is being depopulated. And some of these counties have lost half their population in a relatively short period of time.

Now, why is that? The overriding reason is we have a farm program that doesn't work. We have a farm program that doesn't allow family farmers to stay on the land and work the land. We have a miserable farm program that pulls the rug out from under family farmers.

Let me show you a chart that shows what has happened to the price of wheat. The price of wheat has dropped 53 percent since the passage of the farm law. It was $5.75 a bushel. Last, month prices received by farmers nationwide average $2.72. Now, ask yourself, if instead of the price of wheat it were your salary or your profit, your wages, your minimum wage, your Social Security check, were cut in half? If this was your income, how do you think you would be doing?

We have folks in the Senate who said some years ago within budget debate that we are going to change the farm program. In making those changes, in essence they told rural America that they were going to pull the rug out from underneath family farmers. They were going to have farmers operate in the marketplace and, when prices collapse, the nation won't care. If farmers go out of business, they wouldn't care. They basically said they don't care whether there are family farmers in this country's future. Boy, you talk about a wrongheaded public policy for America. That was it.

What my colleagues and I are suggesting today is that it is time to decide that family farmers matter in this country. It is time to provide the resources to get some price protection so that when commodity prices collapse, those folks operating out on America's farms have the underpinnings so that

they are going to be able to get across those price valleys. That way, they will be able to continue working the land, continue a rural lifestyle. Other countries do it. But, our country has decided that, gee, if things are fine on Wall Street, they are fine everywhere.

That is not true. This country has a very strong economy. Things are going well in this country. But our family farmers face a very serious crisis. This is a serious emergency on the family farm, and we must do something to respond to it.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask my friend if he will yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. DORGAN. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. DOMENICI. I might say to Senators, we have been working on this for a long time. We will see if we can't put ourselves in a position where we might finish a little earlier, perhaps even tonight. I am not sure. This has been worked out by the majority leader, minority leader, and those of us on the floor. I assume there has been consultation elsewhere.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, on behalf of the leader I ask unanimous consent that following the previously allotted debate times, the following debate times be in order: Hollings amendment on debt reduction; Craig amendment No. 146; Durbin amendment, emergencies; Crapo amendment No. 163; Boxer amendment No. 175; Sessions amendment No. 210—I ask each of the above-listed amendments be limited to 7½ minutes equally divided in the usual form. I ask unanimous consent that, following the conclusion of those debates, I be recognized in order to yield back all remaining debate time on the budget resolution.

Therefore, the Senate will then proceed to a stacked series of votes on the remaining pending amendments. I further ask that the first vote be 15 minutes in length, with remaining votes in sequence limited to 10 minutes each, with 2 minutes equally divided between each vote for brief explanations of the amendments.

Finally, I ask the votes alternate between Republicans and Democrat amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank all Senators.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, how much time have I consumed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 4 minutes 11 seconds.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, let me continue briefly and then call on my colleague from North Dakota, Senator CONRAD, and I believe the Democratic leader, Senator DASCHLE, will be here as well.

Imagine for a moment that corporate profits were cut by 50 percent, or 75 percent, or 90 percent, as farm income was cut one year recently in my State. Imagine what would happen in this country if that were the case, and corporate profits were slashed. We would have an apoplectic seizure here in Congress trying to figure out what happened and what can we do about it.

The question is what do we do about the economic all-stars, the families out there on our family farms that produce, raise crops, and take the risks? What about when their income collapses? Again, we have people here who say that doesn't matter and that corporations can farm America from the California coast to Maine. It doesn't matter, they say. I cannot describe how wrong they are. So we come to the floor to say we propose this amendment to add $6 billion a year, which would provide the opportunity for real, significant price support increases when commodity prices collapse for family farmers. Is that a lot to ask?

We hear folks come to the floor and say defense needs more. So, we stick in money for defense. We want to build a missile system. You put $1 billion in for a missile system last fall that the Defense Department said it did not want and could not use. Money for tax cuts? There's plenty of money for that. But what about money for mom and pop out there on the family farm who are ravaged by collapsed prices? No, they say, we are out of money.

I would say this. This Congress is out of ideas when it comes to family farming, if it believes the current farm program is the road to prosperity for these producers who are this country's real economic all-stars. We need to backtrack just a bit and decide that family farmers matter to this country's future. We need to say to them that we are going to reconnect a reasonable price protection program. So, when prices collapse our country will say to farmers that we will give them a chance to make it across those price valleys.

I started by talking about Margaret Hansen, the 90-year-old woman from North Dakota. We are a sparsely populated State. Half of our economy is agriculture. But that is also true with respect to a major part of this farm belt. This Congress should understand that America's economy is never going to be doing well in the long term if the middle part of its farm belt is being depopulated. Food production is important to this country's future and the health of family farming is important in producing America's food.

Let me call on my colleague from North Dakota and allocate 7 minutes to my colleague, Senator CONRAD.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I thank Senator DORGAN and I thank our colleagues. This is a matter of sheer survival. I want to say to my colleagues, we are on the brink of a depression in farm country in this Nation. If you come to North Dakota today and go with me to community farms, what you find people want to talk about is the collapse of farm income because it is threatening the survival of literally tens of thousands of family farmers just in our State of North Dakota. In fact, this year, unless something happens and happens quickly, we anticipate we will lose one-third of all the farmers in the State.

The reason that is occurring is really very simple. This chart shows what happened from 1996 to 1997, as farm income was washed away: In 1 year, a 98 percent reduction in farm income in our State. The reason we have seen this collapsing income is really three factors: Bad prices, bad weather, and bad policy.

The bad prices are stunning. This shows what has happened to farm prices over a 52-year period. We now have the lowest prices for our major commodities in 52 years. We have wheat selling for $2.60 a bushel. Mr. President, $2.60 a bushel. That is 5 cents a pound. There is no way anybody can make it at those prices. The cost of production is about double that. So what we have is a hemorrhaging, a loss of income, and farmers' livelihoods being threatened. That is what we are faced with.

When I talk about bad policy, when we passed the last farm bill—which is, frankly, a disaster itself—the support for farmers was cut in half. Under the previous legislation we averaged $10 billion a year. Under the new legislation, $5 billion a year. This makes it virtually impossible to write any kind of decent farm legislation. The current farm legislation cuts support for farmers each and every year and cuts it sharply, without regard to what happens to prices. In previous legislation we used to make an adjustment. When prices fell there was more assistance.

But look what our major competitors are doing. It is very interesting, because if we look at what they are doing we see that they are spending almost 10 times as much as we are to support their producers. In Europe, they are spending nearly $50 billion a year to support their farmers. We are spending $5 billion. This is not a fair fight. This is unilateral disarmament in a trade confrontation. We would never do it in a military confrontation. Why ever are we doing it in a trade confrontation? This says to our farmers: You go out there and compete against the French farmer and the German farmer. And, oh, while you are at it, you take on the French Government and the German Government as well. That is not a fair fight. You have to say to our farmers it is pretty amazing you are able to survive in a circumstance like this one, when our major competitors are spending 10 times as much to support them.

When we look at what they are doing for support of exports, it is even more dramatic. Instead of a factor of 10 to 1, they are outspending us by a factor of more than 100 to 1. In fact, it is about 130-to-1 to support their farm exports versus what we are doing. Then some say just leave it to the market. That is not what our competitors are doing. If that is what we do, we are going to

consign our farmers to a life of economic hardship and economic collapse. That is what is happening in farm country today. That is why it is absolutely critical that an amendment like this one pass to help farmers through this period of collapsed commodity values. If we do not do it, we will see literally thousands of farm families forced off the land. The stakes are high. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, before I start, I ask unanimous consent that Jodi Niehoff, who works in my office, be granted the privilege of the floor during the duration of this debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I make this appeal to my colleagues as a Senator from Minnesota: First of all, please get this disaster relief bill through, at least get the agricultural part of it through.

If we don't get that, our FSA offices run out of loan money. They will have to let people go, and we will not be able to provide people with the loan money that they need and they are going to go under. Please make that happen. We should not go home without that happening.

Second of all, I rise to support this amendment. Time is not neutral. It rushes on. It is not on the side of family farmers in our States. I have never seen it this bad in all the years we have lived in Minnesota. People are in real economic pain.

It was the wheat farmers in the northwest. Now it is the other grain farmers. It is the dairy farmers in southern Minnesota. The hog producers are facing extinction while the packers are in hog heaven. We have to get the price up. We have to get farm income up.

I think this amendment, which speaks to taking the cap off the loan rate, is the right thing to do. Price, price, price. Get farm income up and get it up now.

This is a critically important crisis amendment. If Senators are on the side of family farmers and a family farm structure of agriculture, which is good for farmers and rural America and consumers, they will vote for this amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas,

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mrs. LINCOLN. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. President, I appreciate my colleagues being on the floor today to talk about this important issue. I am pleased to be here in support, and I am pleased to see these Senators helping to educate our other colleagues in this body about the importance of this issue.

It is not just to educate. It is also to impress upon them the urgency of this issue. I come from a seventh-generation Arkansas farm family. We are in dire straits. All farmers across this Nation are in dire straits. It is so very important for us to act in this body and in this Congress in a timely fashion.

I believe my colleagues have expressed it, but it is so absolutely critical. Our farmers have been in dire straits for the past year, with bad weather, bad prices, and bad markets. This is the last straw. It is absolutely essential that we do something before we go home for this recess.

Our farmers right now are looking at the equivalent of 1970 prices. What industry could make it with the increase in production costs, the increase of keeping the business going, surviving on what people were making in the 1970s? It is absolutely impossible to survive in today's agriculture economic climate.

We produce the safest, most abundant, and most affordable food supply in the world. It is not going to be there for the future of this Nation and for the world if we do not support our farmers at this critical time. It is simply a desperate time.

I spent the last recess looking at the worry on the faces of Arkansas farmers as they have talked about this crisis. These farmers are ready to throw in the towel; many of them already have. I applaud Senator DORGAN's efforts and hope my colleagues will join him in addressing the needs of our agricultural community.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Iowa, Mr. HARKIN.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Senator for yielding me this time. I thank him for his leadership on this amendment, and I thank our Democratic leader also for his leadership.

Mr. President, last Saturday was National Agriculture Day. Each year on the first day of spring, we celebrate the success and the accomplishment of American agriculture. U.S. consumers today spend less than any country in the world, as a percent of their disposable income, on food. Nine cents out of a dollar, that is all. Think about this, the productivity of American farmers, what it has done for us. In the 1960s, one farmer in America supplied food for 25 people. Now they supply food for over 130 people. Tremendous.

Isn't it a cruel irony that we set aside the first day of spring every year to recognize agriculture and the American farmer, yet tens of thousands of American farm families are going under right now? They are on the verge of losing their livelihoods and their life savings. It is devastation in the agricultural sector.

What this amendment basically says is that with the expected budget surplus for fiscal year 2000 and greater surpluses in years to follow, we will apply $6 billion of that extra surplus to putting a safety net underneath agriculture. In other words, if we have extra money in the years 2000 to 2004, that money will be made available to agriculture. Of course, if the farm economy improved, then it wouldn't be needed.

This chart here kind of tells it all. People say, why do you need $6 billion? Here is last year, 1998. This is all of the farm income; that is, the crop receipts, their AMTA payments, their aid, their loan deficiency payments—$69.5 billion. Expected this year, $64 billion. That is about a $5 billion, $5.5 to $6 billion decrease. But last year this was 17 percent lower than the average 5 years before. This year it is expected to be 27 percent less in income for farmers. That is why this amendment is sorely needed. Those who have much in our society, to whom the Republicans want to give these tax breaks, they are doing well. They are doing well on Wall Street. They are doing well in Palm Beach. They are doing well on Rodeo Drive in Beverly Hills. In the farm sector of America, our families are struggling to survive. All we are asking for is a decent safety net. That is why this amendment is sorely needed.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Democratic leader, Senator DASCHLE.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I thank my friend from North Dakota for his leadership on this matter.

Let me say, you can't say it better than what the ranking member of our committee, Senator HARKIN, has just said. The fact is that you can look at virtually any commodity in agriculture today, and the situation continues to worsen. Whether it is in livestock or in grain, the commodity doesn't matter.

The fact is, our circumstances are so dire that in spite of all the help we have attempted to provide through disaster assistance over the last 6 months, we are still going to lose millions of farmers and millions of rural Americans in the next couple of years. That is fact.

All we are simply saying is this: If we are going to be of any assistance as we go through this extraordinary transition, we need to recreate the safety net that we once had. We need to recognize that farmers and ranchers cannot do it alone. We need to recognize that if there is going to be a surplus, one of the single best investments we can make is to ensure that those farmers and ranchers can survive with what meager tools they are going to have to manage their risks more effectively.

That is what the Senator from North Dakota is saying. We are not going to specify and delineate each and every tool today. We will work that out. But we have got to set the parameters. We have got to send the message. We have to ensure that the priority is there.

I have to say, Mr. President, this is a very important amendment. I applaud

the Senator from North Dakota for his willingness to take the leadership in ensuring that we are at this point. I am hopeful that we can get a broad bipartisan consensus in passing it. It sends as clear a message as we can send out to agriculture across this country: We hear you. We are as concerned as you are, and we want to do something about it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I send a modification to my amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, may we have a copy, please?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask that the time be charged to me for the next 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FITZGERALD.) Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise with great empathy and sympathy and heartfelt concern about the farmers of the United States. That is why in the budget before you we put $6 billion of new money for crop insurance and other things which was, indeed, modified in the committee so as to accommodate farm Senators by even making sure it was available this coming year.

Now, I guess there is an adage around that it is harder to manage the surplus than it was a deficit. I agree with that statement without a question. And here today it is very, very interesting. My wonderful friends on the other side of the aisle, I am sure joined by some on my side of the aisle, are here on the floor about 2½ months after the President of the United States sends his budget to us, and they are lamenting the terrible state of economics for the farmers of America.

I did not ask any of them, as they spoke—and I do not know that I will—but frankly, the President of the United States knew about all this. Isn't it interesting he asked for not one red cent for the farmers—zero. Typical. Typical. There is a crisis prevailing. If there is one, the President ought to know about it. He puts nothing in the budget. We put $6 billion in thinking we are being helpful. The President claims he lives within the caps, he isn't breaking any budget. Of course he is not. He did not even provide the $6 billion we did in our budget resolution.

Now, $6 billion isn't enough. Hold on, everybody. This is $6 billion a year. This is $30 billion. When is enough enough? So $30 billion of new money on top of the $6 billion we put in is $36 billion in 5 years in new money for agriculture.

Frankly, I am fully aware that there is a problem. There are some other sectors of America with problems, big problems—steel, oil and gas. All kinds of pieces of the American economy are having trouble because of the world economy. We are doing a little bit here and there, but we cannot go in and make everybody whole everywhere in America when we are having a downturn that adversely affects their business.

If the Senators proposing this want to spend more money because they want a new agriculture program, then I submit they ought to go to the Agriculture Committee and get a new agriculture program written into the laws of this land. I believe they would not get it done. I believe that is why they did not do it.

So each year they come along and add a few more billions, and while saying we still have a law around they, little by little, destroy it. If that is what they want, they ought to say it. If they think this amendment is repealing the law we have on the books, let them say it, so then we can at least add this as an amendment to repeal the competitive agricultural reforms that we put in place not too many years ago.

Frankly, it will be difficult for some not to vote for $30 billion more in support money for farmers when there is already $6 billion in the bill and when the President of the United States asks for none—zero—zip. No. It is kind of interesting. When is enough enough? It seems to me that this amendment is an indication that for some it does not matter what you put in a budget resolution because it will not be enough.

I believe $6 billion in new money for agriculture, addressing the most significant issue they have, crop insurance, is sufficient at this point. Maybe we have an emergency, maybe the President should have looked at the emergency before he sends us a budget with nothing in it for farmers so we have to come along and put it in, cut other programs in our arsenal, or in this case reduce the tax cuts that we planned for the American people.

I just do not think that is right. I would hope some would listen today. I am not sure how many. Normally I try to accommodate, but I don't think, as one trying to write budgets, that I can accommodate today. Either they win or my position prevails. If I could find another way, I would try it. I just do not think there is one.

Either we decide that in an era of surpluses the American taxpayer does not matter a bit—you remember what some of us said, why it would be difficult to manage a surplus. You remember? Because we will spend it all; we will spend it all. Why did the Senator from New Mexico say, ''Yes, you can claim you put it all on the surplus and it's sitting there to get rid of the debt.'' Why did I say, I do not choose that method. I choose it for all the Social Security money, but I do not choose it for everything. I said, ''Because you know what, we'll spend it. Then we'll have bigger Government, the public will be paying for bigger Government, and they'll be paying more and more taxes.'' And that isn't the right kind of America.

So, Mr. President, I have some additional time, and depending upon what is said in the remaining 5 minutes that they have on the other side, that the proponents have, I may yield back the remainder of my time. But for now I reserve it.

Mr. DORGAN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from South Dakota, Senator JOHNSON.

Mr. JOHNSON. I thank the Senator from North Dakota. I thank my colleague from South Dakota, Senator DASCHLE, for his great work on this amendment.

What we have here is a very fundamental priority decision that this Congress needs to make. The question is not whether we will have tax relief or not. Certainly we will have tax relief. The question is whether we have a commonsense kind of budget that also allows for some key investments, in this case in agriculture. Are we going to preserve the strongest agricultural system in the world that provides the highest quality, most affordable food in the world or not?

To say that we have an $800 billion tax relief package and there is no room for $6 billion of investment in our ag sector simply makes no sense. The American people see through the budget resolution on the floor. They know that they want some tax relief, especially if it is targeted to middle-class and working families. But they also know that we need to make some key strategic investments in important sectors of our economy. Nothing is more important than agriculture as we craft ways to get a better price out of the market, as we craft ways to keep a fine meshed system of family farms and ranches all across America. But as things are going right now, we are headed for a catastrophic train wreck in agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 1 minute.

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield such time as I have back to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Would the Presiding Officer notify me when I have 1 minute remaining?

Mr. President, this is about priorities. We just heard my colleague say: ''Well, this isn't a priority. We don't have resources for this.'' Gosh, we have resources for some very large tax cuts. If that is their priority, then there is money for that. Or, what about the $1 billion for national missile defense which the Department of Defense says it does not want, does not need, and cannot spend. They have money for that. And, then there is $110 billion or so for readiness in defense. They have money for that.

The question is, What is a priority? We do have a surplus of empathy and sympathy. I do not disagree with that. Everybody empathizes and sympathizes.

The fact is, we have farmers going broke in record numbers.

How would you feel I would ask if any of you listening or watching or participating had your income cut by 98 percent? All of a sudden you have 98 percent less income. Would that be a catastrophe? I think it would. That is what happened to our farmers. I had a fellow at a forum, a big, husky guy with a beard. He said, ''My dad farmed, my granddad farmed on the same place. I farmed for 23 years.'' Then he got tears in his eyes and his chin began to quiver. He said, ''I am quitting, I can't continue. I am being forced off the farm.''

That is what this amendment is about. We need to consider the human toll of farm failures all across this country. What will be left when only the corporate agrifactories are producing America's food. Some people think that would be great because they love big corporations—the bigger the better. Of course, there will be no yardlights lighting farmsteads. There will be nobody living in the country, because all the farmers who risked their money will have found that the auction block served as the final resting place for their dreams and their hopes.

We can do something about that if we decide it is a priority.

I say to my colleague from New Mexico, this is where the current farm bill started in 1995. It started right here in the budget. It is where it ought to stop. It is where we ought to make the modifications and changes. It is where we, as a Congress, ought to say this is a priority, and that family farmers are a priority. But, it is not just about farm families. It is also about Main Streets and small towns. It is about the economic and social fabric in a part of our country that is now being depopulated.

Let me again refer to this chart. The red on the chart shows the middle part of the country, which is full of rural counties that are losing population. This little place right here is where I grew up in Hettinger County, North Dakota. When I left, there were 5,000 people in that county. Today, there are 3,000 people. That county is symbolic of so much of the farm belt that is now being depopulated because we have a farm program that doesn't work.

There is a whole range of other programs that we must address. It is not enough to say that things will work out, or that this doesn't matter. This matters very much to a significant part of America. We have a right to be standing here on the floor of the Senate saying, this too is a priority. This is a priority for us, for our part of the country, and for family farmers.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, how much time do we have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has 21½ minutes and the sponsor has 3 minutes 24 seconds.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I think the Senator is right, that this is a question of priority.

The Senator mentioned missile defense. He said it will cost $1.5 billion. We don't need it; we shouldn't pay for it. What would be prioritizing would be if he would move to strike the missile defense system. The problem is, if he did that, he would find that not only the American people would say no, but 65 or 70 Senators would say no. He picked the wrong program, because most Americans think we have a missile defense system. They think if a rogue country or North Korea or China sent a missile to the United States that we could destroy it. The truth of the matter is, whoever thinks that is wrong. We don't.

Republicans have been saying, and now we are joined by Democrats, use every single technological achievable end to get a missile defense system started. That is a high priority, too.

I don't know what else the Senator mentioned, but whatever he mentioned, the truth of the matter is he could come to the floor and say farmers have a higher priority than this whole list of things in the Government. That is not what is being done; it is just making the Government bigger.

In fact, it is very interesting. It is a tax-and-spend proposal. It is increasing the taxes on the people of this country because we intend to give them back some to pay for more Government. I think Government is about as big as it ought to be. I remind everyone, the President put nothing in for the state of emergency. For a President who is worried about Main Street, and everything else alluded to on the floor, isn't that interesting?

We did what we thought was right and put in $6 billion. The first amendment that was sent to the desk would have cost $60 billion. I was in error—now it is $30, it has been modified. The price is cut in half in about 26 minutes. I laud the Senator for modifying it. I wish it were still at 60—we could argue about 60. That sounded like a good, round number.

Having said that, I reserve my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I prefer to close for a minute, but if the Senator wishes to keep it open I assume he will want to move along here and be able to get as much done as is possible.

Let me have the attention of the Senator from New Mexico. If I finish our time, would the Senator then yield back his time so we can proceed?

Mr. DOMENICI. I am pleased to do that.

Mr. DORGAN. Let me respond to a couple points.

First, let's talk about national missile defense. He makes an interesting argument, but the Senator misunderstood what I said. I talked about the $1 billion last fall that was stuck into the omnibus appropriations bill. No one asked for it and the Defense Department said they couldn't use it. Go track the money and find out what happened to it. They didn't want it, but Congress said, ''We demand you take it.'' My point is, if it is a priority, then the sky is the limit. It doesn't matter that it is not needed. That is the point I was making.

The tax-and-spend cliche is such an old argument it is calcified. I thought I heard the last of that some years ago. This debate is about what is important and what are our priorities.

I want to talk about the big print and the little print which got us to this mess. Some years ago, we had people in Congress who said we should change the farm program. In the big print in the 1996 farm law it says that we will provide a marketing loan and it will be at 85 percent of the Olympic average of the prices received by farmers in the previous five years. That was the big print. Then they put the little print in the bill. It said, by the way, although we promised you that marketing loan at 85 percent, we are going to cap it at $2.58 a bushel for wheat. What the big print giveth, the little print taketh away.

Does it matter? Does it cost? Of course. It matters in terms of the failure of hopes and dreams for family farmers who are bankrupted by these little print policies. These little print policies really say that family farming doesn't matter too much to this country anymore. It says that we would rather have big corporate agrifactories. It says we like corporate agriculture. and corporate farming. It says that mom and pop don't have to live out there so the yardlights don't have to be on. It says we can mechanically milk all the cows and have 3,000-head dairy herds. That is a very different version of America than I have and a different sense of priorities than I think should exist for this country.

That is what this debate is about. The Senator from New Mexico says this should go to the Agriculture Committee. This started in 1995 in the Budget Committee. That is where it started. The budget resolution prescribed the Freedom to Farm bill. If you can start the farm bill in 1995 in the Budget Committee, we can, it seems to me, debate it in 1999 as we debate the budget resolution.

Today, we face depression-era prices on the farm. Family farmers are going belly up on a wholesale basis out there in the country and this Congress must do something about it.

Did the President's budget address this? No. Does this budget resolution address it in an appropriate way? No. Do I appreciate that the Budget Committee put in $6 billion over 6 years or so for crop insurance? Of course I do. I appreciate that. But it is so far short of what is needed. We are about $5 billion

a year short of what we used to do to provide to fund price protection for family farmers.

Today we need to repair that by deciding our priority in this budget resolution is to stand up and help family farmers during this time of trouble.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield back any time I have.

AMENDMENT NO. 178, AS FURTHER MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Previously, the Senator sought modification.

The amendment is so modified.

The amendment (No. 178), as further modified, is as follows:

On page 43, strike beginning with line 3 through line 15, page 44, and insert the following:

SEC. 201. RESERVE FUND FOR AN UPDATED BUDGET FORECAST.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE UPDATED BUDGET FORECAST FOR FISCAL YEARS 2000–2004.—Pursuant to section 202(e)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Congressional Budget Office shall update its economic and budget forecast for fiscal years 1999 through 2009 by July 15, 1999.

(b) REPORTING A SURPLUS.—If the report provided pursuant to subsection (a) estimates an on-budget surplus for fiscal year 2000 or results in additional surpluses beyond those assumed in this resolution in following fiscal years, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make the appropriate adjustments to revenue and spending as provided in subsection (c).

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall take the amount of the additional on-budget surplus for fiscal years 2000 through 2009 estimated in the report submitted pursuant to subsection (a) and in the following order in each of the fiscal years 2000 through 2009—

(1) increase the allocation to the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry by $6,000,000,000 in budget authority and outlays in each of the fiscal years 2000 through 2004 for legislation that provides risk management and income assistance for agricultural producers;

(2) reduce the on-budget revenue aggregate by any remaining amounts for fiscal years 2000;

(3) provide for or increase the on-budget surplus levels used for determining compliance with the pay-as-you-go requirements of section 202 of H. Con. Res. 67 (104th Congress) by those amounts for fiscal year 2000, and all subsequent years; and

(4) adjust the instruction in sections 104(1) and 105(1) of this resolution to—

(A) reduce revenues by amounts in section (c)(2) for fiscal year 2000; and

(B) increase the reduction in revenues for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004 and for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2009 by that amount.

(d) BUDGETARY ENFORCEMENT.—Revised aggregates and other levels under subsection (c) shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as aggregates and other levels contained in this resolution.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 231

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Minnesota is to be recognized to speak on his amendment.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. GRAMS], for himself, Mr. ROTH, Mr. COVERDELL, and Mr. ABRAHAM proposes an amendment numbered 231, as previously offered.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I rise today to offer this sense-of-the-Senate amendment with Senators ROTH, COVERDELL and ABRAHAM.

I ask unanimous consent to add the names of Senators HAGEL, BURNS, MCCAIN and CRAIG as original cosponsors as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, again, what I am talking about is supporting the middle-income tax relief included in this budget resolution. This is a crucial amendment that we all should support.

This amendment says that the Senate Budget Resolution places a priority not only on protecting Social Security and Medicare and reducing the Federal debt, but also on middle-income tax relief by returning nearly $800 billion of the non-Social Security surplus to those from whom it was taken. It discusses options for middle-income tax relief such as broad-based tax relief, marriage penalty relief, retirement savings incentives, death tax relief, health care-related tax relief, and education-related tax relief.

This amendment does not put us on record as supporting any one form of tax relief, or any particular combination. That is the task of the Finance Committee under the able leadership of Senator ROTH.

While many of us will discuss our own preferences for the tax relief, our job today is to support the nearly $800 billion total, recognizing the need for tax relief, and then to ask the Finance Committee to come up with specific tax relief proposals.

Again, Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to assure the American people that we've made a commitment to major tax relief, and that there is room in this budget to fulfill this commitment while protecting Social Security and Medicare, providing debt relief and respecting some new spending priorities.

I just heard it said in the last debate on the farm issues, ''if there is something for a tax cut,'' or ''if that is a priority''—it should be a priority. There would not be a surplus if American taxpayers had not been overcharged and paid more in taxes than they should have. What they are doing is fighting over how can they spend those dollars, rather than trying to find a way to give those overcharges back to the people who paid them.

Mr. President, let me highlight a few points as to why we must provide a major tax relief this year.

Polls showed many Americans were skeptical about whether they would ever get meaningful tax relief this year. They have good reason to be skeptical about President Clinton's rhetoric on tax relief.

Despite a huge on-budget surplus over the next 10 years, President Clinton has failed to secure a single significant tax cut for working Americans. Instead, he has proposed to increase our taxes by at least $50 billion in his budget over the next five years and $90 billion over 10 years. He also spends $158 billion right out of the Social Security surplus he claims to protect. President Clinton talks about helping the American people build retirement security but to offset his new spending, he has proposed many new taxes including taxing life insurance products, which will hurt the retirement annuities of millions of Americans. The President talked about helping small business, but he has proposed to tax the income of non-profit trade associations and change the tax treatment for ESOPs, which will adversely affect millions of small businesses. These are just some of his new taxes that will hurt hard-working Americans.

Unlike President Clinton, our budget resolution has reserved nearly $800 billion of the non-Social Security budget surplus over the next 10 years for tax relief. This is in fact the largest tax relief since President Reagan's. This amendment has once again proved the Republican majority is committed to providing meaningful tax relief in 1999 as well as protecting Social Security, Medicare, reducing the debt, and funding important priorities.

Mr. President, with more middle-income workers being thrown into higher tax brackets, the ''middle class tax squeeze'' is devastating. There are over 20 million workers today with annual earnings between $20,000 and $50,000. Before 1993, they paid income tax at the 15 percent rate. But most of them have now been pushed into the 28 percent tax bracket due to inflation and economic growth. Worse still, they have to pay the 28 percent federal income tax rate on top of a 15.3 percent payroll tax. This adds up to a tax rate of 43 percent, without counting state, local tax, and other taxes. So any gains they made in wages have been taken by Washington. The bigger tax bite continues to eat up more of their wages.

Again, my point, Mr. President, is that this non-Social Security surplus is nothing but tax overpayments, and it should be returned to the taxpayers, not spent, as you are going to hear argued here on the floor day after day, hour after hour—''let's spend it.'' It should be given back to the taxpayers.

How to use the remaining surplus once we wall off Social Security has been the central focus of this year's budget debate. The Democrats want Washington to spend it because they don't believe the American people can be trusted to use it responsibly. We're heard it before, but let me remind you

what the President said about the surplus during a speech in Buffalo in January: ''We could give it all back to you and hope you spend it right, [but[if you don't * * *.'' You are smart enough to earn the money, but you are not quite smart enought to know how to spend it.

A top aide to the President, Paul Begala, said, ''We could squander the surplus by giving a tax cut.''

So, in other words, we have overcharged you and taken more money from you than we should have, or you have paid more in, but to give it back would be squandering it. Washington thinks they should spend it.

Republicans want to give the surplus back to working Americans—those who paid too much taxes in the first place.

We've recently heard some claims on the Senate floor that the American people today aren't interested in tax relief. That's not what I'm seeing and hearing. Those who don't care about tax relief are a minority, especially in my state. Tax relief continues to be a major interest of Minnesotans.

Mr. President, let me read to you letters from just three of the many Minnesotans who have taken time to contact me: Ken Ebensteiner from Audubon, Minnesota wrote: ''* * * please understand that the silent majority are sick and tired of all the taxes and regulations. We're just too busy working to voice our opinions.'' Taxpayers are working, and don't have the time to come to Washington. They can't afford to defend themselves because the government takes so much of their income. Washington's philosophy is apparently, ''Keep them poor, keep them quiet, keep them home.''

Rev. Craig Palach of Fergus Falls wrote: ''With four children—two soon to be in college, one beginning to think about college, and one in a parochial school—I could sure use some of the money that goes to taxes.'' But again, the President says Rev. Craig Palach wouldn't spend it right.

The third letter, this one by Alicia Jones of White Bear Lake, is right on target with the story she shared. She wrote:

> Last year, both my husband and I had graduated from college and had just begun working full time. I have never written a letter like this before, but after completing my taxes for 1998, I felt that this was my only option.
>
> I can't do anything about the amount of money my husband and I will have to pay to both the federal and state governments, but I hope that you can be active in making changes for next year.
>
> During 1998, my husband and I both worked full time in professional careers. We have no children and we are renting an apartment, saving to buy a house. Based on the fact that we both work, we are married, we have no children, and that we do not own a house—when we filed our taxes this year we owed approximately $700 more in federal income taxes, on top of the over $10,000 that we have already had taken out of our paychecks * * *.
>
> I am frustrated by this, I'm frustrated for the future—how do we get ahead, when each year we have to take money from our savings to pay more for our taxes. I hope that you will remember my concern.

But again, presidential aide Paul Begala says Alicia would ''squander'' any tax cut.

Working people have good reason to ask for a tax cut. Since 1993, Federal taxes have increased by 50 percent—50 percent. That is a tax increase of nearly $4,000 a year for a Alicia and her husband—50 percent; $4,000 more in the last 6 years. As a result, Americans today have the largest tax burden since World War II, and it is still growing.

Federal taxes consume now 21 percent of the total national income. A typical American family pays nearly 40 percent in total taxes. And that is more than it spends on food, clothing, and shelter combined.

People should go home and look at their pay stubs and find out exactly how much of their money is going to support Government, and how much they have left. And then figure out whether they should have a tax cut.

Mr. President, why should we continue taxing middle-class Americans at such a high rate? Who can rightfully argue that they don't need a tax cut? Who can argue that it is fair to take more than 40 percent of a person's income so Government can spend it?

That is why I, along with Senator ROTH and others, introduced bill No. S. 3, the Tax Cuts for All Americans Act. Our bill calls for a 10-percent across-the-board income tax for working Americans.

It is simple, fair, profamily, and progrowth. It will help millions of middle-income families to avoid the middle-income ''real income bracket creep'' that they have been subjected to since 1993.

Although I prefer broad-based tax relief, I understand this is just one of many tax relief proposals that are on the table. Again, there is nothing in this budget that endorses one proposal over the others. All we have done is to reserve some of the non-Social Security surplus for tax relief.

The Finance Committee will consider all tax relief proposals and decide how this reserved onbudget surplus should be distributed.

It is my hope that we can use the surplus to provide broad-based tax relief as well as other tax relief I support which would give families a break, and encourage savings, encourage investment, and provide incentives for higher education.

I remember vividly when I first proposed the $500-per-child tax credit back in 1993. The naysayers called it bad policy, even dangerous. Democrats accused us of cutting taxes for the rich. That sounds familiar, doesn't it? Every time it is a tax cut, it is for somebody else.

Some in Congress contended it was too costly, and others argued that we should balance the budget first. I argued then repeatedly that we could, and should, do both. And we did. As a result, we now have a balanced budget, and the largest non-Social Security surplus in U.S. history.

Cutting taxes, reducing the national debt, and reforming and protecting Social Security and Medicare at the same time are all possible. We can to it again. Mr. President, we must do it again.

That is what this budget is about, and that is what this amendment is about. I urge my colleagues to strongly support reserving this money for tax relief for working Americans.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, what is the time situation on this amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a total of a half hour equally divided. The sponsor has 3 minutes remaining. There are 15 minutes in opposition.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I stand here, and I request recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I was, obviously, very much interested—I will not say moved—by the discussion that I just heard on this amendment, because the drill is a familiar one. The drill is the people who earned it want it back; and, why not give it to them? Of course, we want to give it to them. But whether you give it to them in direct tax cuts or you shore up Social Security, you say that no matter when you retire, for the next 75 years, you will know that the retirement program is going to be there for you. Or you say, ''Well, we are going to take the Medicare fund, and we are going to increase its solvency from 2008 to 2020, 12 years more, during which time, or during this time, because we are looking at something 21 years away. We want to institute the reforms that are so often talked about so that health care can be provided in a reasonable fashion with longevity, with the solvency that is required.

I heard the distinguished Senator from Minnesota in our Budget Committee the other day presenting a poll in which he said 63 percent of the people—I think I have it accurately and fairly—polled wanted a tax cut. I read a newspaper story about that poll. Once the question was put as to whether you would rather have a tax cut, or pay down the debt, or make sure that Social Security is there for you, or make sure that Medicare is there when you need it, the numbers changed radically. The numbers that said pay down the debt, increase the longevity for Social Security, increase the longevity and solvency of Medicare, and, boy, they went the other way.

When I hear that the typical American family pays 40 percent in taxes—I

don't know what the income is for the typical American family, but I can tell you that almost 60 percent of the people are in the $38,000 or below income strata. They are not paying 40 percent taxes. Come on. Let's be reasonably direct and accurate about these things.

Look at what happened. If we use the GOP tax program as outlined by the distinguished Senator, the chairman of the Finance Committee, he says that if you are in the top 1 percent of the income, over $300,000 or more, an average of $800,000 a year, you get a $20,000 tax cut. But if you make $38,000, which is the bottom 60 percent of the people in this country, $38,000, you save $99. The guy on the top who gets a $20,000 refund could buy another car for that, or add a wing to his house. But the family that is earning $38,000 is not going to do a lot with 100 bucks—$99 to be precise.

I think we ought to be fairly clear when we have this debate. Yes, everyone is entitled to offer amendments they think are appropriate, but we ought not to color the facts such that we ignore the reality of what it is we are talking about.

Mr. President, I think that it is quite obvious that this gets back to the essential dispute between the parties with the Republicans wanting tax breaks primarily for the wealthy, ignoring the fact that they can improve the condition of Medicare.

We on this side want to have as our principal programs: save Social Security; extend the life of Medicare; make sure there are targeted tax breaks so that families who have an elderly parent can take care of that parent and get a tax deduction, a tax break for that responsibility; or who needs day care for their children, and get a tax break so that mama can work. That is what we are talking about. We are talking about things that pertain to the average American.

I am one of the people lucky enough to be in the top 1 percent. I was in business before I was here. I will tell you something. I am so happy every time I have the ability to earn that kind of money to pay my taxes, because I belong to the best club in the whole world, the club called ''America,'' where everything is available to you. Opportunity should be—education should be—everything should be available for those who want to climb the ladder and who are clever enough to do it.

That is what I am paying for when I send in my tax bill. I don't think it is being squandered by a bunch of bureaucrats. Some, maybe. That happens in corporate life. I ran a big corporation. I can tell you. What I want is a secure country. I want a country where people feel good about themselves and aren't looking at the guys on top and saying they are getting all the breaks. That is not a stable society. The stable society says, I want a chance to educate my children, I want a chance to have a roof over my head, and I want a chance to have a job. That is what I want. I want to know that when I am of retirement age that Social Security is going to be there for me. And I am happy to pay my dues. That is what it is—dues. We are so lucky to be here. People are willing to die, and are fleeing in inner tubes across the straits near Cuba, near Florida, to get to this country, and risk death coming out of ships' holds and things such as that to get to this country. We are not talking about squandering money and throwing away the citizens' dollars.

I think we ought to defeat this amendment.

Mr. GRAMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to Senator ROTH.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, as we turn our attention to the Budget Resolution, pondering the course government is going to take—the philosophy and policies that are going to lead us into a new millennium—I want my colleagues to consider that rather than a time for acrimony and partisan politics, this is a time of great opportunity.

In fact, few times in history have been so rich with the opportunities that are before us—opportunities to set a future where the needs of taxpayers, families, students, and communities come before the insatiable appetite of the federal government. Because of policies we began to implement in the early 1980s, we are the beneficiaries of the longest peacetime economic expansion in history.

Our efforts to support the home—to provide incentives to save and invest—as well as our work to encourage risk-taking businessmen and -women, researchers and developers, our agricultural and educational communities—these efforts have paid tremendous dividends.

Now the question, as we face the final hours of the 20th century, is simple: Do we move forward, embracing economic policies that are proven to increase prosperity and economic opportunity for all Americans, or do we abandon them for proposals that will raise taxes on the most vulnerable among us, proposals that will fill government coffers, swell federal programs, and risk shutting down the tremendous engine of growth that we have successfully created?

It seems that the answer to this question is clear, and therefore I rise today to support a Sense of the Senate amendment to the Budget Resolution—a Sense of the Senate amendment that is bipartisan in nature—one that makes it clear that in the choice between a tax cut, as authorized in the resolution, or a tax increase, as provided in the Administration's budget, we are resolved and choose to be consistent as to the direction we want to go.

Today the federal government is collecting more taxes than ever before. Because of our entrepreneurs, our farmers, laborers, and families preparing for the future, we are witnessing strong economic growth, and this has been very beneficial for the government's income. These individuals have been encouraged by our efforts to dramatically cut taxes in the 1980s, to create incentives for saving and investing in the 1990s, and by our work to reduce government interference in their lives.

Unfortunately, and despite the fact that government is collecting more revenue than ever, the Administration's budget reverses this important trend. It represents another in a series of large tax increases this Administration has tried to impose on Americans. In fact, this proposal is a net tax increase of $50 billion over five years and $90 billion over ten years. It is not a targeted tax cut as its proponents claim. Rather, it is a tax increase that dramatically hits lower-income Americans the hardest. For example, under the Administration's budget, taxpayers with incomes of $25,000 and under will bear almost 40 percent of the net tax increase. Taxpayers with incomes of $75,000 and under will bear over 75 percent of the burden.

One might ask, with all the talk about targeted tax breaks in the Administration's budget, how can it be a tax increase on America's most vulnerable. The simple answer is that the Administration's budget relies to a great degree on a 55 cents per pack cigarette tax increase. That tax increase, which largely goes for new spending, far outweighs any tax cutting provisions in the budget, and it hits lower-income Americans the hardest.

On the other hand, Mr. President, the budget resolution proposed by Senator DOMENICI does not unfairly penalize one group of Americans. In fact it does not penalize any group. Rather, it provides the Senate Finance Committee with the authority to cut taxes, not increase them. And it allows us to cut taxes in a way that will continue to energize the economic growth our nation is enjoying. This is what America needs as we look to the opportunities before us.

I reject any argument that tries to raise the old worn-out issue of class warfare—those who might try to suggest that this resolution will provide tax cuts for the rich. First, I reject it because this resolution does not actually cut taxes, but only authorizes the Finance Committee to proceed to cut taxes. And second, I reject it because the kind of across-the-board tax cuts that are being discussed are just that—fairly applied across-the-board tax cuts that go to everyone. They are just like the tax cuts that President Kennedy implemented in the 1960s and the tax cuts that President Reagan implemented in the 1980s. On both occasions these bipartisan tax cuts led to record-setting economic growth, so not only were they fairly applied, but they benefitted everyone.

Mr. President, I also reject the argument that the federal revenue windfall, or budget surplus, will be used by the Administration to retire the debt. For years, there were many among us who argued that tax increases were needed to reduce deficit spending and retire the debt. On occasion, they prevailed and taxes were raised, but then something interesting happened. Deficit spending did not stop, the debt was not retired. The increased taxes actually placed a damper on the economy, and the government spent more than $1.50 for every $1.00 it increased taxes. In other words, the government actually taxed itself into higher deficit spending. It wasn't until Congress insisted on holding the line on spending that the growing economy actually brought about a balanced budget.

According to a new study by the Joint Economic Committee, in the post-war period, sixty cents of every dollar of surplus taken into government coffers has been spent by government within a year. Does anyone doubt the taxpayer overpayments that are now contributing to surplus revenue will not be spent by future Congresses? Of course they will. The way to reduce the debt is to keep the economy growing—to keep an environment of opportunity available to all Americans. And the way to keep the economy growing is to cut taxes and minimize government interference in the lives of Americans. This is the message of the Grams Sense of the Senate amendment. It reaffirms support for the tax cut authorized under the resolution offered by Senator DOMENICI. The tax cut provided in that resolution is $142 billion over five years and $778 billion over ten.

This resolution will empower the Finance Committee, Republicans and Democrats, to work together and provide comprehensive tax relief. The Finance Committee can provide across-the-board tax relief, over the long-term—relief that is simple, fair, and meaningful to all taxpayers. With the authority given us by this resolution, the Finance Committee can provide tax relief in the short term for many good purposes—purposes supported by Republicans and Democrats alike.

For example, we could enhance retirement security. By this I mean improving small business pension plans, making IRAs more accessible, and simplifying employer 401(k) plans. Also, we should address the needs of women returning to the workforce. Every worker has a stake in a better retirement that these incentives could provide.

Second, we could enhance family tax relief. For instance, we could ensure that the $500 per child tax credit, dependent care tax credit, and education credits are available to middle income families by exempting these credits from the alternative minimum tax (''AMT''). If we do not provide these exemptions, millions of families could be adversely affected. In addition, the Budget Committee, on a bipartisan basis, has emphasized the importance of providing marriage penalty relief.

Third, we could do more to correct our abysmal national savings rate. Chairman Alan Greenspan says this is the number one economic problem confronting America. To this end, in addition to the retirement plan and IRA expansion mentioned above, we could do something for small savers. For instance, we could simplify the tax system by providing an exclusion for small savers of $200 for singles and $400 for married couples.

This bipartisan tax cut would benefit more than 60 million taxpayers. It would also allow up to 11 million Americans to file the 1040 EZ—which is the simpliest federal tax form there is.

Fourth, we could provide greater tax relief to improve educational opportunities for students and their families. We could provide incentives for families and students to seek higher education and avoid large debt burdens. For instance, nearly every state has a prepaid college tuition plan, and those plans could be made tax-free under a bipartisan proposal.

Fifth, we could address the expiring provisions in the current tax code, and we could look at real tax code simplification. The Finance Committee could eliminate needless complexity that results from income limits, phase-outs, and the alternative minimum tax. Again, these are bipartisan objectives.

And finally, Mr. President, we could continue to push for proper taxpayer protections. Reform of the IRS is in its infant stages. Elimination of unjust penalties and interest scores as revenue loss. In order to continue meaningful reform of the Internal Revenue Service, we must realize that our efforts will be scored as revenue losses and we must consequently address them in the context of tax cuts.

This Sense of the Senate amendment makes clear that without the authority provided in the budget resolution, the Finance Committee will not be able to provide significant tax relief—we will not be able to address these important bi-partisan issues and fix problems in the current code.

The resolution will allow us to move forward. And let me conclude by explaining how important it is that we move forward.

Working together, we have delivered on a bold promise to the American people—the promise of a balanced budget and a dynamic economy where jobs, opportunity, and growth are available to all. Since 1995, we have worked for tax relief for families, savings and investment incentives, health care-related tax relief, relief for small business, and tax simplification. As we moved forward in these areas, not everyone was supportive at first, but they were eventually adopted by Congress and signed into law by the President. Among the items enacted were tax deductible treatment for long-term care insurance and raising the deductible portion of health insurance for self-employed small businesses and farmers. In addition, pension plan reforms, especially for small business, were enacted.

In 1997, we pushed for tax relief in the context of a balanced budget. The President agreed to tax relief he had previously vetoed. Among the tax relief proposals enacted was a $500 per child tax credit that is now providing relief to millions of taxpaying families. We also expanded individual retirement accounts and created the new Roth IRA. Millions of taxpayers now have tax-favored savings vehicles open to them. We reduced the top capital gains rate from 28% to 20%. This provision helped unlock investment dollars for the economy and provided relief to farmers and small business.

Beyond this, Mr. President, we have worked together to offer education-related tax relief, including educational IRAs, prepaid college tuition plans, an extension of the tax-free treatment of employer-provided educational assistance, and a revival of the student loan interest deduction.

We have passed estate tax relief, including relief for small businesses and farmers. And we have succeeded with historic reform of the Internal Revenue Service, including new taxpayer protections regarding the collection activities of the IRS.

The Grams Sense of the Senate amendment makes clear that once again, we are at the crossroads on the question of tax relief or tax increases. The Sense of the Senate clarifies that the resolution continues Congress on the same tax relief path begun in 1995. It can be summarized into three points:

First, the Administration's budget, though described by its supporters as targeted tax cuts, is a tax increase.

Second, if you are serious about tax relief, it must be accommodated in the resolution. The Finance Committee must have the tools to provide meaningful relief. To oppose the tax cut in the resolution is to deny the Finance Committee the tools to do the job.

Third, a vote for the tax cut in the resolution is a vote for tax relief that is consistent with tax cuts that have been enacted over the past four years.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support the Grams Sense of the Senate amendment and I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD a copy of the Tax Foundation's analysis of the Administration's budget, as well as a copy of a revenue table, prepared by the Joint Committee on Taxation, which scores the Administration's budget.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Tax Foundation Special Report, March 1999]

THE PRESIDENT'S FISCAL YEAR 2000 BUDGET—LOW- AND MIDDLE-INCOME TAXPAYERS TO PAY LION'S SHARE OF NEW REVENUE DESPITE RECORD SURPLUS

(By Patrick Fleenor)

President Clinton's newly proposed budget plans on a steadily growing series of budget

surpluses over at least the next ten years. To ensure the surpluses, the Administration plans to hold the line on most types of federal spending while increasing the current record peace-time level of federal taxation.

Ostensibly to bolster the failing Social Security and Medicare programs, the Clinton plan would use more than three quarters of the projected surplus to reduce federal debt. Another 12 percent would be used to fund private savings accounts, and the balance would fund new spending initiatives.

Some programs would see an increase over the next five years, notably education and training programs as well as funding for roads and other transportation projects. The budget also calls for additional spending for more teachers, after-school programs, and Head Start. The Administration's plan to use surplus funds to pay down the national debt would significantly lower interest expenses while entitlement spending remains essentially unchanged under the plan.

On the revenue side of the ledger the Clinton plan contains a mix of tax and fee increases as well as a host of tax credits. These would, on net, boost federal revenues by $45.8 billion over the next five years. Revenue raisers include a 55-cent-per-pack hike in the federal cigarette tax and higher corporate income taxes. The revenue reducers are a myriad of tax credits that would subsidize activities ranging from long-term medical care to first-time home purchases in the District of Columbia.

WHICH INCOME GROUPS WILL PAY THE NEW TAXES

Figure 1 shows the net distributional effects of the Clinton plan. Individuals with adjusted gross incomes of less than $25,000 would bear 38.5 percent of the increased tax burden, or $17.7 billion. People in the $25,000–$50,000 range would pay 22.4 percent of the new revenue, or $10.2 billion. Taxpayers making $50,000–$75,000 would pay $6.7 billion in additional taxes, or approximately 14.6 percent of the total. In sum, then, over 75 percent of the President's new tax revenue would be paid by people whose tax returns report less than $75,000.

Upper-income taxpayers would not escape entirely, but as Figure 1 illustrates, their share of the increased tax burden is much smaller. Cumulatively, individuals in these three categories would bear only 24.5 percent of the increased tax burden. This regressive slant against low- and middle-income taxpayers results largely from the Administration's proposal to boost the federal cigarette tax. Probably the most regressive of all federal taxes, the cigarette tax would be the largest revenue raiser in the President's budget proposal.

THE BUDGET OUTLOOK

Figure 2 illustrates federal receipts and outlays as a percentage of GDP under the Clinton plan, given in historical context.

Federal receipts would grow 4.2 percent from $1,806.3 billion in 1999 to $1,883.0 billion in 2000. That is an uptick from 20.6 percent to 20.7 percent of GDP. By 2004, federal receipts would grow to $2,165.5 billion, or 20.0 percent of GDP. By 2009, federal receipts would rise to $2,707.7 billion, or 20.1 percent of GDP.

Only twice in American history—during the two closing years of World War II—did federal receipts ever exceed 20 percent of GDP. From this perspective, the Clinton proposal is truly historic in that it would fix federal receipts at this extraordinary level.

Federal outlays would rise from $1,727.1 billion in FY 1999 to $1,765.7 billion in FY 2000. They would rise to $1,992.0 billion in 2004. As a percentage of GDP, however, federal outlays would fall steadily from 19.4 percent in FY 2000 to 18.4 percent in 2004, then even further to around 17 percent in FY 2009.

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

The budget shares of the major categories of federal spending under the Clinton plan are illustrated by the five columns of Figure 3 corresponding with fiscal years 2000–2004. Historical data is provided for context. (See also Tables 1 and 2.)

Federal outlays are divided into two broad categories, discretionary and mandatory/net interest. Discretionary spending is determined by the annual appropriations process, while so-called mandatory outlays are predetermined by statute. To alter mandatory spending levels, the program's authorizing legislation must be amended.

*Illustrations not reproducible in the RECORD.

TABLE 1.—FEDERAL OUTLAYS BY TYPE

[Fiscal Years 1962–99; dollar amounts in billions]

Year	Total Outlays	Discretionary			Mandatory						Memo: GDP
		Total	Defense	Non-Defense	Total	Social Security	Medicare	Medicaid	Other	Net interest	
1962	$106.8	$72.1	$52.6	$19.5	$27.9	$14.0	$0.0	$0.1	$13.8	$6.9	$567.5
1963	111.3	75.3	53.7	21.5	28.3	15.5	0.0	0.2	12.6	7.7	598.3
1964	118.5	79.1	55.0	24.1	31.2	16.2	0.0	0.2	14.8	8.2	640.0
1965	118.2	77.8	51.0	26.8	31.8	17.1	0.0	0.3	14.4	8.6	686.7
1966	134.5	90.1	59.0	31.2	35.0	20.3	0.0	0.8	13.9	9.4	752.8
1967	157.5	106.4	72.0	34.4	40.7	21.3	2.5	1.2	15.7	10.3	811.9
1968	178.1	117.9	82.2	35.8	49.1	23.3	4.4	1.8	19.6	11.1	868.1
1969	183.6	117.3	82.7	34.6	53.7	26.7	5.4	2.3	19.3	12.7	947.9
1970	195.6	120.2	81.9	38.3	61.1	29.6	5.8	2.7	22.9	14.4	1,009.0
1971	210.2	122.5	79.0	43.5	72.9	35.1	6.2	3.4	28.2	14.8	1,077.7
1972	230.7	128.4	79.3	49.1	86.8	39.4	7.0	4.6	35.8	15.5	1,176.9
1973	245.7	130.2	77.1	53.1	98.1	48.2	7.6	4.6	37.7	17.3	1,306.8
1974	269.4	138.1	80.7	57.3	109.8	55.0	9.0	5.8	40.0	21.4	1,438.1
1975	332.3	157.8	87.6	70.2	151.3	63.6	12.2	6.8	68.6	23.2	1,554.5
1976	371.8	175.3	89.9	85.4	169.8	72.7	15.0	8.6	73.5	26.7	1,730.4
1977	409.2	196.8	97.5	99.3	182.5	83.7	18.6	9.9	70.3	29.9	1,971.4
1978	458.7	218.5	104.6	113.8	204.8	92.4	21.8	10.7	79.9	35.5	2,212.6
1979	504.0	239.7	116.8	122.9	221.7	102.6	25.5	12.4	81.2	42.6	2,495.9
1980	590.9	276.1	134.6	141.5	262.3	117.1	31.0	14.0	100.2	52.5	2,718.9
1981	678.2	307.8	158.0	149.7	301.7	137.9	37.9	16.8	109.0	68.8	3,049.1
1982	745.8	325.8	185.9	139.9	334.9	153.9	45.3	17.4	118.3	85.0	3,211.3
1983	808.4	353.1	209.9	143.3	365.4	168.5	51.2	19.0	126.7	89.8	3,421.9
1984	851.9	379.2	228.0	151.2	361.5	176.1	56.0	20.1	109.3	111.1	3,812.0
1985	946.4	415.7	253.1	162.6	401.3	186.4	64.1	22.7	128.2	129.5	4,102.1
1986	990.5	438.3	273.8	164.5	416.1	196.5	68.4	25.0	126.2	136.0	4,374.3
1987	1,004.1	444.0	282.5	161.4	421.5	205.1	73.4	27.4	115.6	138.7	4,605.1
1988	1,064.5	464.2	290.9	173.2	448.5	216.8	76.9	30.5	124.3	151.8	4,953.5
1989	1,143.7	488.6	304.0	184.5	485.9	230.4	82.7	34.6	138.2	169.3	5,351.8
1990	1,253.2	500.3	300.1	200.2	568.7	246.5	95.8	41.1	185.3	184.2	5,684.5
1991	1,324.4	533.0	319.7	213.3	596.8	266.8	102.0	52.5	175.4	194.5	5,858.8
1992	1,381.7	534.3	302.6	231.7	648.0	285.2	116.2	67.8	178.8	199.4	6,143.2
1993	1,409.4	540.7	292.4	248.3	669.9	302.0	127.9	75.8	164.2	198.8	6,475.1
1994	1,461.7	543.6	282.3	261.3	715.2	316.9	141.8	82.0	174.4	203.0	6,845.7
1995	1,515.7	545.4	273.6	271.8	738.2	333.3	156.9	89.1	158.9	232.2	7,197.7
1996	1,560.5	534.2	266.0	268.2	785.3	347.1	171.3	92.0	174.9	241.1	7,549.2
1997	1,601.2	548.6	271.7	276.9	808.6	362.3	187.4	95.6	163.3	244.0	7,996.5
1998	1,652.6	554.7	270.2	284.4	854.5	376.1	190.2	101.2	186.9	243.4	8,404.5
1999e	1,727.1	581.2	277.5	303.6	918.6	389.2	202.0	108.5	218.8	227.2	8,747.9

Source: Tax Foundation, Office of Management and Budget.

[From the Committee on Ways and Means, Mar. 22, 1999]

NEW STUDY: AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD WILL PAY $5,307 MORE IN TAXES THAN NEEDED—CRS ESTIMATES 10-YEAR TAX OVERPAYMENT FOR U.S. HOUSEHOLDS

WASHINGTON.—With no changes to current law, the average American household will pay $5,307 more in taxes than the government needs to operate over the next ten years, according to a new study by the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service (CRS) released today by Ways and Means Committee Chairman Bill Archer (R–TX). Of particular importance is that CRS calculated the tax overpayment using the non-Social Security budget surplus. *The CRS study follows this release.*

''After we reserve Social Security dollars for Social Security, Americans will still overpay their taxes. There are a lot of politicans in Washington who want to keep this money and spend it on more government programs, but I think Americans should keep it for themselves and their families. Five thousand dollars is a lot of money for hardworking taxpayers who deserve to keep more of what they earn,'' said Chairman Archer.

CRS calculated the annual overpayment per household based on the non-Social Security budget surplus as follows:

Fiscal year:

	Amount
2000	
2001	$42
2002	385
2003	331

	Amount
2004	432
2005	486
2006	758
2007	867
2008	941
2009	1,065
Total	5,307

[Memorandum from the Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, Mar. 16, 1999]

To: Committee on Ways and Means, Attention: Trent Duffy.

From: Gregg A. Esenwein, Specialist in Public Finance, Government and Finance.

Subject: Per household tax cut financed by the on-budget surplus.

The following table has been prepared in response to your recent request concerning the effects of a federal tax cut using only the non-social security budget surplus. It is intended to provide only a rough estimate of the per household in federal income taxes that could be funded using only the on-budget surplus.

The first column of the table shows fiscal years, the second column shows the baseline unified total budget surplus, the third column shows the on-budget deficit/surplus (the budget deficit/surplus excluding social security and the Postal Service), the fourth column shows the projected number of households for each year, and the fifth column is the dollar amount of tax cut per filing unit (column three divided by column four).

I hope this information meets your needs in this matter. If you have any questions or need further assistance, please let me know (7–7812).

AVERAGE FEDERAL INCOME TAX CUT PER HOUSEHOLD THAT COULD BE FUNDED USING ONLY THE ON-BUDGET SURPLUS

Fiscal year	Surplus/deficit in billions of dollars[1]		Projected number of households (millions)[2]	Average tax cut per household[3]
	Unified Budget	On-budget (excludes Social Security and the Postal Service)		
1999	$107	−$19	.....	.....
2000	131	−7	.....	.....
2001	151	6	142	$42
2002	209	55	143	385
2003	209	48	145	331
2004	234	63	146	432
2005	256	72	148	486
2006	306	113	149	758
2007	333	130	150	867
2008	355	143	152	941
2009	381	164	154	1,065

[1] Source: Congressional Budget Office. The Economic and Budget Outlook: Fiscal Years 2000–2009, January 1999. Page 33.
[2] Source: Joint Committee on Taxation.
[3] Column 3 divided by column 4.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask Senator LAUTENBERG if he would give me 2 minutes of his time.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I am pleased to do that.

Mr. DOMENICI. He said he will yield me 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Let me just say that I believe, after talking to Senator LAUTENBERG, the staffs can work together on this and that the sense-of-the-Senate part of this amendment, advocating the kind of tax cuts that were referred to by the Senator in his sense-of-the-Senate paragraph, might be acceptable to Senator LAUTENBERG, and we can then accept it without a vote. But I would just like to make an observation while we wait to see whether that will happen. I hope it doesn't make the Senator from New Jersey change his mind. I don't think it will.

Frankly, I said a while ago it is easier to manage a budget when we are not in surplus. I am almost prepared to say it is easier for the taxpayer to get a tax cut when we do not have a surplus than when we do.

Now, I haven't checked the history of the last six or seven tax cut bills, but obviously we were not in balance because we just got in balance. We gave tax cuts because we thought they were necessary, prudent. To the American people, our businesses, large and small, others—maybe those who have their businesses at home—ought to be able to deduct their health care like everyone else. We come around and say those things ought to be done.

Now we have a surplus, and I will be darned; it is tougher to get concurrence that we ought to give some of it back to the people than when we borrowed it to give it back to them. So I was thinking as the debate occurred, who has been forgotten by this Government? Who is looked upon as sort of a silent partner in all this but shouldn't be terribly worried about it? It seems to me it is the taxpayer.

Asked on our side, we would say reducing taxes, making sure Social Security is fixed—and we have done that. Everybody is now joining us on 100 percent of the surplus when held for that—Medicare; we have had a bipartisan approach here saying let's get it done—and that leaves the taxpayer. I kind of say, poor taxpayers. We ought to put them right up at the top, and that is sort of what the intention of my friend from Minnesota was. Whatever the language, laudatory or, as Senator NICKLES said the other day, precatory—if you want to look it up in the dictionary, it is pretty much like laudatory. And if you don't know what that means, I don't know what to tell you. But there is a lot of that. In any event, the sense of the Senate at the bottom says we recognize the taxpayers are very important and we ought to look at them just as we look at new programs. I certainly say it is important that we do that.

I yield back whatever of the 2 minutes I did not use.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I just heard, I think I will call it the chairman's lament, and that is here we have all this money and we can't give tax breaks. But I see the tax breaks as having a funny shape to them. They are big for the guy at the top and they are little for the people who need it most. But I would say this, that the only people who can add a new room to the house, get a child some special assistance with education, prepare retirement, ensure health care is available are those who have some surplus. That is when you do the good things. And the good things to me are not to take care of the guys at the top, who would get another 20 grand, to use the expression, on top of the $800,000 they make. I don't think they need help. But the person who is making $38,000, a family of four, they are struggling. They are struggling. They are trying to find a way to take care of all the needs as the kids grow, and it is a difficult, difficult problem.

So I do not object to appropriate tax breaks. I don't object to tax breaks for long-term health care. I don't object to tax breaks for child care so that mom can go to work and help dad support the family, or vice versa. I don't object to any of those things.

So with that I think we have probably heard each other enough. Can we yield back all the time?

Mr. DOMENICI. I don't think they have any time left.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. No. I have some time on my side, I think.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I feel benevolent, and I am going to yield back my time and we will try to resolve our problem so that we can accept the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota.

AMENDMENT NO. 231, AS MODIFIED

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I send a modification of the amendment to the desk. With a few changes, hopefully, it has been accepted on both sides. We submit this amendment and hope to get it approved.

Mr. DOMENICI. We have no objection and we have no time remaining.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. We are all set.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed modification? Without objection, the amendment is so modified.

The amendment (No. 231), as modified, is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF SENATE ON PROVIDING TAX RELIEF TO ALL AMERICANS BY RETURNING NON-SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUS TO TAXPAYERS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) Every cent of Social Security surplus should be reserved to pay Social Security benefits, for Social Security reform, or to pay down the debt held by the public and not be used for other purposes.

(2) Medicare should be fully funded.

(3) Even after safeguarding Social Security and Medicare, a recent Congressional Research Service study found that an average American family will pay $5,307 more in taxes over the next 10 years than the government needs to operate.

(4) The Administration's budget returns none of the excess surplus back to the taxpayers and instead increases net taxes and fees by $96,000,000,000 over 10 years.

(5) The burden of the Administration's tax increases falls disproportionately on low- and middle-income taxpayers. A recent Tax Foundation study found that individuals with incomes of less than $25,000 would bear 38.5 percent of the increased tax burden,

while taxpayers with incomes between $25,000 and $50,000 would pay 22.4 percent of the new taxes.

(6) The budget resolution returns most of the non-Social Security surplus to those who worked so hard to produce it by providing $142,000,000,000 in real tax relief over 5 years and almost $800,000,000,000 in tax relief over 10 years.

(7) The budget resolution builds on the following tax relief since 1995:

(B) In 1996, Congress provided, and the President signed, tax relief for small business and health care-related tax relief.

(C) In 1997, Congress once again pushed for tax relief in the context of a balanced budget, and President Clinton signed into law a $500 per child tax credit, expanded individual retirement accounts and the new Roth IRA, a cut in the capital gains tax rate, education tax relief, and estate tax relief.

(D) In 1998, Congress pushed for reform of the Internal Revenue Service, and provided tax relief for America's farmers.

(8) Americans deserve further tax relief because they are still overpaying. They deserve a refund. Federal taxes currently consume nearly 21 percent of national income, the highest percentage since World War II. Families are paying more in Federal, State, and local taxes than for food, clothing, and shelter combined.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the levels in this resolution assume that the Senate not only puts a priority on protecting Social Security and Medicare and reducing the Federal debt, but also on middle-class tax relief by returning some of the non-Social Security surplus to those from whom it was taken; and

(2) such middle-class tax relief could include broad-based tax relief, marriage penalty relief, retirement savings incentives, estate tax relief, savings and investment incentives, health care-related tax relief, education-related tax relief, and tax simplification proposals.

Mr. GRAMS. I thank the Chair. And approved?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. And it is accepted.

They can urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. There is no time left on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 231), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I believe the regular order is to proceed now to my amendment; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

AMENDMENT NO. 190

Mr. KERRY. I call up amendment No. 190.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is pending.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I add as original cosponsors Senator LAUTENBERG, Senator REED of Rhode Island, Senator JOHNSON, Senator HOLLINGS, Senator KERREY of Nebraska, and Senator CONRAD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, this is an amendment, really, of common sense and I think fiscal responsibility. It is a very simple amendment that I believe is a safeguard, an important safeguard, against our returning to an era of deficit spending. This amendment includes no new spending, no new programs, it does not touch the budget authority, it does not touch outlays as proposed in the budget resolution. Neither does it affect in any way whatsoever the Social Security trust funds.

Perhaps most important to many Members on the other side of the aisle, this amendment does not eliminate any of the tax relief that is provided in the budget resolution. Indeed, Congress can and Congress should consider sensible tax cuts which are targeted towards helping working families to meet their growing needs, whether it is health care or child care or buying a first home or any number of other things—saving to send a child to college—there are a number of tax cuts I think all of us can agree on. Those tax incentives will help Americans to plan and to save for retirement and to build the economy of the country.

My amendment simply directs that the tax cuts we authorize, that we pass today in the budget resolution, will not rely on deficit spending to fund them. That is it. It is a very simple proposition: We should not pass a tax cut that will rely on deficit spending in order to fund it.

In the Budget Committee's report accompanying this resolution, Chairman DOMENICI and his colleagues say the following, and I quote Chairman DOMENICI:

> The whole premise of this resolution is to ensure that the onbudget deficit is eliminated and to prohibit consideration of legislation resulting in an on-budget deficit in the future.

So the chairman and his colleagues who have voted for this budget have brought it to the floor of the Senate with the statement that it is their purpose to prevent a future onbudget deficit by having any legislation that would create that deficit. I applaud the chairman and his colleagues for that effort to maintain the course of fiscal discipline which we began in 1993 with the Deficit Reduction Act, which has put us on this path. To keep on that path is both progrowth and fiscally responsible. I am offering my amendment to ensure this year's tax provisions cannot and will not result in deficit spending.

Under my amendment, if the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office determines that the tax cut passed in this year's reconciliation bill would result in an onbudget deficit in the future, under the scoring periods we are currently applying for budget purposes, then all I would do is simply delay that tax cut for 1 year. We do not repeal it. We do not end it. We do not take it away. We simply delay it for the purposes of not being confronted with deficit spending in order to fund it.

The amendment itself would not affect the tax cuts once they become effective.

The budget we have before us sets aside the Social Security surplus for debt reduction, but, as every single one of my colleagues knows, the Social Security surplus is only one portion of the projected surplus over the next 10 years. The Congressional Budget Office projects an onbudget, obviously non-Social Security, surplus that will be more than $800 billion over the next 10 years. That is the projection.

If the Finance Committee reports out a tax bill later this year, those tax provisions will become law, and they become law not just for this year but they become law for the next year and the next year and the outyears. They will take effect regardless of what happens to the current projections on the economy. But most of them will not be effective until the year 2005.

All of us in this institution understand that our predictive capacities are not so honed that we are going to guarantee we have the revenues in the year 2005 in order to pay for the new tax breaks while still doing the other things the budget requires. So the last thing I think any of us would want to do is set up an equation where we put into law today $800 billion worth of projected surplus, therefore tax cuts, but, lo and behold, the surplus is not there but the tax cuts are still in law. The question then will be, How do we fund them?

It seems to me there ought to be precautions taken against this kind of fiscal irresponsibility. If the projected onbudget surplus suddenly disappears during the intervening years, we want to avoid the crisis that will occur when those tax provisions are in law. If we were to create an automatic push onto the next year, we would wind up in a situation where we have not promised a tax cut that cannot be delivered, we have not promised a tax cut that is going to force us into deficit spending or into other choices that are similarly unpalatable.

That is the simplicity of this budget amendment. Under this amendment, we can guarantee if the surplus actually materializes, tax cuts passed this year will not be affected, they will go into effect. But if the current economic projections change for the worse and the surplus turns out to be considerably smaller or nonexistent, we will delay the effect of the tax cuts and avoid the crisis of that moment. I think it is common sense. It is a sound way to budget. It is an appropriate way to make a determination instead of promising a tax cut that can either never materialize or that takes you into a position of fiscal irresponsibility.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, how much time does Senator KERRY have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seven minutes 49 seconds.

Mr. DOMENICI. And 15?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifteen minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I do not want to use very much time.

Mr. President, first of all, as I read the amendment, I wondered, I could not quite figure out what was going wrong. Essentially this amendment is subject to a point of order, because we do not have authority to tell the Finance Committee in a reconciliation instruction to do this. The law says what we can do in a reconciliation bill, and it does not include ordering them to trigger taxes. It says reduce taxes by a given amount over the period of time reflected in the reconciliation agreement. So it is subject to a point of order which I will raise when we come around to voting.

But aside from that, it seems to me if you write a tax law for the Nation, that any tax law you write is an ongoing tax law. Once you put it in, it is ongoing, at least the general tax provisions, unless you want to sunset it or the like. Frankly, I do not believe it would be appropriate to trigger a tax on and off depending upon what the onbudget surplus is.

In addition, I do not want to say too much about this, but our lockbox is a pretty good safeguard that we will not be spending Social Security surpluses in the future, because if you have to borrow any extra money, then you need a 60-vote point of order. So I think the Senator can rest assured if we vote for the lockbox as contemplated wherein the debt limit is going to be affected and you will have to raise it, I think it will be a pretty good indication we cannot go significantly in the red in future years, even with a tax cut that occurs in years prior to that. Something will have to be done.

I compliment the Senator for his concern about fiscal responsibility. I am sure inherent in this is his concurrence we ought to have some tax cuts. I am not sure which of the various amendments he has agreed to heretofore on how much. But I compliment him for being concerned, but I could not accept it and I do not think it would be valid if we did.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNNING). Who yields time?

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute and then I will yield to the distinguished ranking member.

Mr. President, let me say to my colleague who really understands budget well and understands fiscal matters well, this is not about Social Security. Indeed, the lockbox will protect Social Security. I am not here in this amendment worried about Social Security. I am talking about the onbudget surplus predicted today. That onbudget surplus could disappear. Indeed, the budget resolution claims to save $133 billion of the onbudget surplus over 10 years, but only $14 billion is saved in the first 5 years.

They are going to write in some $600 billion of tax cuts in the outyears without any capacity to predict that this country will have a surplus or have the capacity to support that.

What happens when that is in the law, the chairman sits down in 5 years, if he is still chairman, and he says, oh, we have these big tax cuts we have to fund, but we don't have the money for it? Where will it come from? That is when we are going to have a battle over every other program, or the tax cuts are phony.

I am not taking the tax cut away. I am simply saying, if CBO tells us in that year there is no money to fund it, you delay it a year. That seems to be the most fundamental common sense of how most Americans would decide to handle their budgets. If you cannot afford it, you don't do it. That is what we are trying to ask for, fiscal responsibility, not a flimflam show.

Mr. President, I yield 3½ minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I thank my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. President, I support Senator KERRY's amendment to delay new tax cuts if projected surpluses do not materialize. Medicare has a compelling need for revenues in the future that should not be jeopardized by tax cuts, especially knowing that these costs for tax cuts would explode substantially in the outyears.

I want to mention for my colleagues some history. The fiscal year 1982 budget projected surpluses were just around the corner. We all know what happened to those projected surpluses after the massive 1982 tax cut. We have also seen in recent years how wrong both CBO and OMB estimates have been as the economy has consistently outperformed all projections. Projecting long-term budget results is really an art, not a science.

This budget resolution relies heavily on estimates of surpluses going so far out as to adjust them during the summer. If such short-term estimates are being taken into account, we also ought to take into account the long-term realities. If the surpluses do not materialize, the tax cuts they are based on should be delayed until the surpluses are there.

We just heard the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee talk about tax cuts being permanently in law. We still do not fully understand why the commonly referred to ''revenue surprise'' has occurred, and we don't know honestly how long it is going to last.

My Republican colleagues often say, we are returning excess revenues to the taxpayers. I put it to them, if the tax revenues are not there in the future, should we drain away resources from Medicare to provide tax cuts?

Today we are phasing in tax cuts over long periods to obscure their revenue effects. If we implement tax breaks which create huge outyear revenue losses and the economy fails to perform as well as predicted, we could return to the world of deficits as far as the eye can see, just in time for the baby boomers to begin retiring.

Very simply, Mr. President, I think this is a sound amendment. It says, don't give it away unless you know very well that you are on target.

I think it is a reasonable position. I think it is fiscally sound. I hope that our colleagues will vote for the Kerry amendment.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I will use 1 minute and yield back my time so the Senator can have the rest of the time.

Frankly, many years ago I came to the floor—Senator Nunn helped me; he wasn't even on the Budget Committee—and I did something like this for entitlement programs.

I said, if the projections in the outyears are that it is going up so high that it creates a bigger deficit, then maybe we ought not spend the money, having programs that we spend money on automatic pilot. Maybe when we come around and say we are going to do that to taxes, we are going to do that to entitlements, we are going to do that to everything we spend on, we are going to trigger them all and, if we get a deficit, we cut them all so we are right back down to zero and incurring no debt.

Why should we do this to the taxpayer on the most important thing they can ask of their Government, and that is that they not be taxed too much? That is what they are looking up here asking us for. The big broad base that keeps America going and pays for all these programs, they would like some tax relief. We say, we will trigger you, we will give you some, but in case the deficit goes up, we will take it away from you, or at least it won't continue to grow, even though we passed it and it is in the law.

I think maybe that would be a great idea so we could stay in balance forever. Let's apply that to everything. Just think of that. We are in balance. Nothing could ever grow, if it puts us in the red again. Everything would get stopped that year. No entitlements could grow, nothing could. That would be treating everybody kind of fairly.

We would never do that. We shouldn't do that to the taxpayer.

Mr. President, I yield my time.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Three minutes 23 seconds.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, let me just say quickly to my colleague from New Mexico, he has been a real deficit hawk, and I admire the way in which he has fought it over the years he has been here. But he knows as well as I do that we have actually changed significantly our attitude and our approach towards entitlements. We have changed

significantly the entire budget structure from those years when he tried to do that with Senator Nunn.

The fact is, we now operate under very strict caps. I think for the last 10 or 12 years of the 15 I have been here, we have been cutting in most places, except a couple of areas where, in order to hold Social Security whole, we made some changes in the revenue stream.

The fact is, we have made significant reductions. All I am asking for here is—in 1993, we had the biggest turnaround of all. I remember my colleagues arguing that you had to have a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States. If you didn't do that, you couldn't change the economy of this country or our budgeting practice. Well, the fact is, we proved them wrong. In 1993, we changed the entire budgeting process and turned it around so that we now have the balanced budget and the surplus that we are talking about.

The American people would like us to apply the same discipline now going forward that we applied to get to this position. The fact is that Americans do not want us to create a deficit to give them a tax cut. Ask any American: Do you want me to add to the debt of the country so I can give you back some money today? They would say: That is absurd. Why would you add to the debt of the country in order to put a few dollars into my pocket?

Americans overwhelmingly want the surplus applied to debt reduction. That is what they say. All I am doing in this amendment is asking my colleagues to exercise the same responsibility about tax cuts that they have asked everybody to exercise about every other part of the budget.

This is about deficit spending to support a tax cut. The vast majority of Americans would say, don't be so crazy, don't promise me some great big tax cut that actually adds to the debt of the country and maybe even deprives my mother or father of Medicare payments and maybe even deprives my kid of a loan to go to college or a number of other things.

There is no way in that balance that that is the choice Americans would make. I ask my colleagues today to join in making a responsible vote on the issue of this budget. We should not fund a tax cut we can't afford down the road. Nothing in my amendment would deny us the ability to have a tax cut if the surplus is there. If you have a surplus, you will have a tax cut. That is about as decent and fiscally responsible an equation as you could ask for.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, has all time been yielded back on the Kerry amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator still has 14 seconds.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I yielded back my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 242

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, there was an amendment which was known as Ashcroft-Gorton, No. 242. We understand that it is acceptable on the other side. We do not think it ought to be held in the package here. No vote is needed.

I ask unanimous consent that it be in order that the amendment be accepted by the Senate without objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The yeas and nays are vitiated.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 242) was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank Senator LAUTENBERG for clearing the amendment.

Now we can proceed to the next amendment, Senator CRAIG's amendment.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, may I inquire, what are the time constraints in relation to the debate on this amendment?

Mr. DOMENICI. I say to Senator CRAIG, I made a mistake. Senator HOLLINGS was next. It is 3 and a half minutes. Would you let him proceed?

Mr. CRAIG. Yes, I will. I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. He was listed next.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. By unanimous consent, Mr. President, I ask that Senator HOLLINGS be given 5 minutes instead of 3 and a half to present his case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

AMENDMENT NO. 174

Mr. HOLLINGS. I call up amendment No. 174 offered by myself and the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, Senator KERREY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That amendment is pending.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, we just heard the word ''surplus.'' We have seen a lot of charts. But the truth of the matter is that we are spending $100 billion more than we are taking in this year. And the Congressional Budget Office projects that we will spend $89.9 billion or $90 billion more next year just under current policy, in the face of that current policy, taking care of inflation.

We hear all kinds of ''visions of sugar plums dancing in their heads'' on this floor. We have turned the Senate Chamber into a recording studio for campaign 2000. And everybody is saying, ''Well, $2 billion more for the veterans and $8 billion more for the farmers, and $15 billion more for the military pay, and so much more for education. And, by the way, we ought to have a tax cut. But remember, we have spending caps, and we have to stay within the caps.'' They know, of course, that we exceeded the caps last year by $12 billion and this year by $21 billion. So already we have exceeded the caps by $33 billion, plus the $18 billion that we voted for the military pay. We ought to be looking for $50 billion to make up for this, but we are adding on all of these fanciful figures.

So what we really ought to do is bring a note of reality, a note of what the situation actually is, to the debate and get a budget that we can vote on.

Here is the lead editorial of USA Today. And I quote it:

> If your member of Congress comes home this weekend bragging about having adopted a responsible federal budget for the coming year, don't you believe it.
>
> The $1.7 trillion spending and tax outlines being muscled through the House and Senate this week are little more than the budgetary equivalent of The Emperor's New Clothes [or the emperor had no clothes]: Behind the self-congratulatory hype there's a lot of nothing—and the real possibility of another political train wreck later in the year.

Mr. President, this amendment is offered in order to avoid that train wreck. And how do we do it? We do it as Alan Greenspan, the head of the Federal Reserve, said: ''Do nothing.''

I thought it was very interesting: in the Banking and Housing Committee we had the ranking member, Senator SARBANES of Maryland, in a discourse with Mr. Greenspan.

Quoting Senator SARBANES near the end of the questioning: ''So it seems to me for this whole host of reasons I agree with what I understand to be your position; that is, of all the alternatives the one you rate first and foremost by a significant margin would be to use the surplus to pay down the debt.''

Greenspan: ''That is correct, Senator.''

SARBANES: ''Yes, I—how do you save that surplus? You know, how do you keep it from getting spent, I guess is the question?''

Greenspan: ''What happens is that you do nothing.''

Namely, you freeze this budget with respect to the current policy. You take this year's budget for next year, you program it out, and you get to a real surplus in the year 2006. Thereupon, Mr. President, that is the real surplus; and thereupon, we will direct that surplus—if it materializes—to paying down the debt, and we will give everybody a real tax cut, because the interest rates will go down. And they will save all the mortgage homeowners—the automobile payments, the refrigerator payments, the washing machine payments. Everybody in credit-card America will get a real tax cut.

The point is that we have been playing the game of paying down the debt that is not understood really by the American people in that we have been using Social Security to pay down the debt for the last 15 years.

What we do is, we just take the Social Security credit card and look over

here to what they call public debt or the Wall Street credit card and pay off that debt to the payers with the credit from Social Security; and you just up the debt on Social Security. You still owe the same. It is like taking a Visa card and paying down your MasterCard; and, of course, your Visa card goes up. That gamesmanship, Mr. President, has been going on, to the point that we have fiscal cancer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 5 minutes have expired.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Could I get a few more minutes? Would you give me 2 more minutes?

Mr. GORTON. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for an additional 2½ minutes.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the distinguished Chair.

What has happened really is we have caused the debt in Social Security. This minute, Social Security is in the red $730 billion. Next year it will be in the red $867 billion. And by the year 2009, we will owe $2.6 trillion to Social Security.

Now, if we hold the line—staying the course; the economy is good; inflation is down; unemployment is down—if we stay the course, it is a responsible budget and we can maintain the good economy here in America.

I thank the distinguished Chair.

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina does have the virtue of consistency. He was one of three members of his party the night before last who voted against authorizing a war in Yugoslavia. And this budget resolution, among other things, does not raise the caps for national defense—a point that most Members feel is necessary after many years of short-changing it. It does not permit any tax relief, it does not permit any change in priorities for education, as does the budget that is before us at the present time.

In fact, it is based on the proposition that the country is unchanged from where it was when we voted on the budget a year ago. I believe the budget that we have here today is preferable to the one we had a year ago, partly because for the last year we have been very, very successful.

But, clearly, we are going to need the flexibility to pay for something that the distinguished Senator from South Carolina and the Presiding Officer and I voted against the other night which is going to have to be paid for at this point. And the only way to do so is to show the flexibility that this budget resolution does.

So I oppose the amendment of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

I yield back the remainder of our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CRAIG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho, Senator CRAIG.

AMENDMENT NO. 146

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, may I inquire as to the time limitations on each amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seven and one-half minutes equally divided.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Three and three-quarters.

Mr. CRAIG. I yield myself 1½ minutes.

My amendment would require that new mandatory spending programs be paid for with savings in existing mandatory programs, and it would establish a 60-vote point of order. We have known—since we have had limits on discretionary programs as the chart beside me demonstrates—a progressive reduction in the overall size of the discretionary spending within our budget.

My amendment does not affect any existing mandatory program. My amendment does not impact any current or future beneficiary of existing programs. What I am talking about is new mandatory, new direct spending programs, and it doesn't eliminate them, either. It simply requires that any Senator who brings that kind of program to the floor must experience the support of at least 60 of the Members of the Senate to be able to withstand this point of order.

My amendment will not prevent a tax increase and its use of debt and deficit reduction. That is simply not the case. It simply puts on equal footing new spending in mandatory areas, along with current discretionary spending.

My amendment institutes a milder version of the same spending restrictions that have applied to appropriated spending programs since 1990. I think it is easy to understand. Last year we received 54 votes. It is a bipartisan effort. Senator KERREY will speak to it. Senator ROBB and Senator BYRD have supported me in this effort, and have indicated their continued support in that area. It is that very effort that limits the kind of growth in our budget that we have always tried to do in creating balance.

Senator KERREY has arrived on the floor, and I yield him the remainder of our time.

Mr. KERREY. I am pleased to join the Senator from Idaho. This amendment would apply the same budgetary restrictions to mandatory programs that we have on discretionary programs. Mandatory programs are growing faster than the discretionary programs. We are converting our budget from one that used to be almost entirely discretionary, endowing our future, into a budget that is largely mandated by law.

This simply says if we are going to add a new mandatory program, you do as you would with the discretionary program: You need to have 60 votes to get the job done. It doesn't mean you can't; it just raises the bar as high as it is on discretionary programs.

I hope my colleagues see the wisdom of this and will support it.

Mr. CRAIG. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 33 seconds.

Mr. CRAIG. I reserve that time.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I oppose this amendment because it will prohibit using revenues to offset new mandatory spending and instead will require that all new mandatory spending be offset with other mandatory cuts. It is a major change in law. If there is a mandatory expenditure, commonly called entitlement, the fact of the matter is that we ought not be changing it by restricting funding. We ought to change the law. Change the law and you have taken care of the problem.

But I don't think this is an appropriate way to do it. Programs like Social Security and Medicare could be affected, and I think it is an inappropriate way to do it.

How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I am willing to yield back the reminder.

Mr. CRAIG. Let me conclude using my 30 seconds to say that it does not impact, as the Senator has just said, current programs. We are talking new creations, new ideas, new entitlement programs—not Social Security, not Medicare, not those kinds of critical programs that this Congress and this Senate attempt to strengthen and protect.

I am talking about the new ideas that come along. It doesn't limit them, either. It simply says that you have to gain the 60-vote majority here in the Senate; you have to find new revenue sources for them or pull revenue from existing mandatory areas.

As the Senator from Nebraska has so clearly spoken, it brings on balance in our budget new mandatory programs with current discretionary programs.

Here is the simple relationship: The red on the chart shows the progressive decline in discretionary spending since we have had pay-go enforcement there. This has been the kind of growth in mandatory when we had none of that budget authority, and, therefore, budget restriction.

That is the issue of this amendment. I encourage my colleagues here in the Senate to support it.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I don't think this amendment is germane and, therefore, I raise a point of order that the amendment violates section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask for a waiver of the Budget Act.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Are we ordering the yeas and nays now?

Mr. CRAIG. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. We neglected, when Senator HOLLINGS presented his

amendment No. 174, to ask for the yeas and nays. We ask for the yeas and nays on amendment No. 174.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from North Carolina be given 5 minutes to speak on another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I send to the desk for proper referral a bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

(The remarks of Mr. HELMS pertaining to the introduction of S. 720 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

AMENDMENT NO. 185

Mr. DURBIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it is my understanding, under the unanimous consent agreement, that it is my turn to speak for 3½ minutes in support of my amendment. I don't have the number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] proposes an amendment numbered 185, as previously offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this is a procedural change relating to the times when the Senate considers emergency spending. Examples are disaster aid, when an area has been hit by a flood, or the need for more money in the Department of Defense, for example. We may have emergency spending that is necessary because of the Kosovo military operation. I don't believe a single Member would stand in the way of providing all the resources necessary to bring our men and women home safely. Other emergency spending might be something as esoteric as the Y2K crisis—whether we are going to be able to respond quickly enough so the Government computers will be in line and not cause any problem to provide services. Those are examples of emergency spending, and the Senate can decide by a majority vote whether to change the basic caps or limits on spending because of an emergency.

Now there is a provision in this budget resolution which changes that dramatically and says that any emergency provision is going to require a supermajority vote from now on—60 votes. I oppose that. I don't believe that is good policy. I think that a majority of the Senators should be allowed to decide whether or not this Nation and this Senate face an emergency situation that requires a majority vote only to go forward and spend the necessary funds. Setting up a supermajority allows the minority in this body to become more or less the political brokers in an emergency situation.

I don't want to see that occur. We debated this in the Governmental Affairs Committee and reached a bipartisan agreement—involving Senators THOMPSON and DOMENICI on the Republican side, and involving Senator LIEBERMAN, myself, and others on the Democratic side—that we would stick with the majority vote. Then I was surprised to see that in the budget resolution our bipartisan agreement has been vitiated, and now we are dealing with another requirement for supermajority.

My amendment goes back to the simple majority requirement for emergency spending. It is supported by Senator LIEBERMAN from the Governmental Affairs Committee, the ranking Democrat, as well as Senator ROBERT BYRD, the ranking Democrat on the Senate Appropriations Committee.

At this point, I will retain the remainder of my time. I don't know if the rules require me to use it in all one fell swoop.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. The Senator can spread it around, if he has any time left.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, is there any time left of the 3½ minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, 1 minute 23 seconds.

Mr. DURBIN. I retain the remainder of my time. Somebody might wish to speak on the other side of this issue.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, the provision in this budget resolution that the distinguished Senator from Illinois seeks to strike is there for one quite simple reason, and that is that while we have created a discipline for ourselves through spending caps, and while within those spending caps we are able to determine appropriations on the basis of a simple majority vote, Members have discovered that all they need to do is declare an ''emergency,'' whether one exists or not, and they are free from the budget caps, from the very spending discipline that has been central to our economic success over the course of the last 3 or 4 years.

As a consequence, the requirement that in order to declare an emergency, in order to spend money that is outside of the caps, in order, essentially, in this fiscal year to invade the Social Security surplus will require a modest supermajority.

Now, under those circumstances, Mr. President, that seems to me to be eminently reasonable. If there is a true emergency, won't 60 votes be available? The Senator from Illinois refers to our members of our Armed Forces in Yugoslavia. Now, Mr. President, it beggars belief to feel that 60 votes will not be able to support our Armed Forces when they are engaged in conflict. The same thing is going to be true with respect to any other emergency. But to allow spending limitations that a majority of the Senate has put into effect, spending limitations that are so important to our success, to be frivolously overridden and ignored simply by a 51-vote majority is not responsible budgeting.

This provision is there because of our experience in the last couple of years with the declaration of emergencies for emergency spending purposes. Mr. President, I am sure that, along with the chairman of the Budget Committee, we feel the provision in this budget resolution is extremely sound, highly responsible, and should be retained.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I will yield all of my remaining time after making one comment. The Senator from Washington suggests that a majority vote is a ''simple thing.'' A majority vote is how we rule in the United States of America. It is the exception which requires a supermajority.

I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I support the amendment by the Senator from Illinois, and I point out that when we are talking about emergencies, we are talking about things like a volcanic eruption in the State of Washington, Mt. Saint Helens, or we are talking about an earthquake in California, or floods down the Mississippi, or storm damage in the Northeast. I don't know why it should take 60 votes to agree with maybe someone who has taken an unpopular political position earlier. I think we ought to let the majority rule. If we need changes in the emergency definition, I would certainly go along with that. Make sure that it is urgent. Make sure it is an emergency. But to suggest that simply because we don't have enough votes that the volcanic damage is worth cleaning up immediately, or some oil spill isn't worth dealing with immediately, frankly, I think is bad law. I think we ought to eliminate it from this budget resolution.

I hope that the vote on the amendment by the Senator from Illinois will prevail.

I yield the time.

I ask the Republican leader, is there another amendment to be discussed?

Mr. DOMENICI. On our side Senator CRAPO was next. He will be here in 3 minutes. We can go to Senator SESSIONS, and then Senator CRAPO will be last.

Is Senator SESSIONS ready? The Senator has 3½.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

AMENDMENT NO. 210

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I would like to rise in support and express my support for an amendment called the ''Class Act,'' a sense of the Senate.

The purpose of that Act is to deal with a growing problem in America. In the 1990s alone—we are not through the 1990s yet—we have accumulated more debt for college and higher education

than we have in the prior three decades, in the prior 30 years. We have an accelerating amount of debt to pay for college education. People are graduating with more debt than they have ever graduated with before. And it is a disruption to them and their families as they start to build their careers.

So what is the problem? How has this happened? I don't propose the ''Class Act'' amendment that I have worked to introduce along with Senator BOB GRAHAM of Florida will solve that problem, but at least it is a significant step in the right direction.

What we have been doing as a Government is subsidizing debt and taxing savings for college. That is the bottom line to it. If you save money for college, you pay taxes on it. But the Government will subsidize and give you interest rate breaks and delays if you will borrow money for your higher education.

Forty-two States will soon have prepaid college tuition plans. They are very popular. They are expanding. Middle-income people are the ones that are taking advantage of it. They are putting money in. They are locking in college tuition at the paid cost so inflation doesn't hurt them on the rising tuition, and then they put the money into those accounts. When it is taken out to pay for the tuition, they have to pay income tax on what it has accumulated. That is, to me, a shortsighted view. It encourages debt and discourages savings.

So our public policy is actually to tax, to hinder, and to punish people who wisely save, but to subsidize people who go further into debt.

It is a nice bill. We believe in it strongly. It has bipartisan support. It has the strong support in the House of Representatives. It will require, I believe, $197 million in cost; only that much through the first 5 years of the program; and $600 million or so over the 10 years. But it will as a result of that encourage huge amounts of savings because, frankly, it is not all that clear, according to a lot of money managers, that it is the wisest thing in the world to take advantage of these programs, if you have to pay taxes on the increase.

If we eliminate that tax on the increase funds, put in prepaid college tuition plans, it will be a clear winner. Every financial manager will urge their clients to take advantage of this program.

It will eliminate—which is not considered in the cost analysis of this bill—but, in my opinion, it will in fact reduce the amount of Government loans and maybe Pell grants that will have to be expended by the Government. It will be a good public policy move for our country.

I appreciate the chairman's support. I appreciate Senator BOB GRAHAM from Florida, who is on the Finance Committee, who is a cosponsor to this, and a number of other Senators.

We believe it is good public policy at a reasonable cost, and will help produce a significant amount of money for higher education.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SESSIONS. I am pleased to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Do I understand this is a sense of the Senate that we add to that list of tax changes that might be used by the Finance Committee when they set about to draw the bill, that this is just an additional one? There is nothing mandatory about it. It is merely suggesting that it is a good one that ought to be there, and they ought to look at it.

Is that it?

Mr. SESSIONS. The Senator is precisely correct. It will be a sense of the Senate that that be done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I think this is a good amendment. I congratulate the Senator from Alabama for offering it. Therefore, to my colleague in the management of the budget, I think we ought to go ahead.

Mr. DOMENICI. Can I be added as a cosponsor.

Mr. SESSIONS. I would be honored.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 210) was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I believe Senator CRAPO is here. He is ready with his amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 163

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO] proposes an amendment number 163, as previously reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to present this important amendment.

As we said yesterday when we discussed this amendment preliminarily, we have had an opportunity for the last 4 or 5 years to debate the concept of a lockbox in one context or another. Originally, in the House of Representatives when we presented this idea, it was to address deficits. We have had deficits for as long as most of us can remember. Yet the budget process did not seem to provide a mechanism by which we could lock aside spending that Congress decided to reduce in order to make sure that it was used to reduce the debt, or to reduce the deficit. Now we are in a surplus environment. We have just done some major work on this budget that was spearheaded by Senator ABRAHAM and Senator DOMENICI to create a lockbox for the Social Security surpluses, and to assure those surpluses are not spent by Congress. They are locked aside to be utilized to either pay down the public debt, or to be used to reform Social Security, both of which will strengthen and save a lot of the Social Security trust fund.

I commend our chairman for that tremendous effort and will support that effort. This amendment which Senator GRAMS from Minnesota and I have worked on would use the lockbox concept for another part of the surplus, that part of the surplus that deals with the potential for an increased surplus beyond that which we now have projected.

In July, we expect that new projections will show an increased surplus outside of the Social Security surplus that will be generated by taxpayer dollars. This part of the surplus will be a surplus that was not contemplated by Congress as we put together this budget. We are putting together this budget based on our current projections. And this budget will take care of the Social Security surplus. It will protect Medicare and education and other needed spending and will find room for tax relief. But, if in July the new projections show an enhanced surplus, this amendment would say that any new surplus must be locked away in a lockbox so that it can be used only for tax relief or retirement of the national debt.

It is critical that we take the tough steps, but the important steps to assure that as we now move into a surplus environment with our budget that we protect the taxpayer and we protect those of particularly our younger generations who face such monumental debt in our Federal Government.

This amendment says any new enhanced surplus that comes from better projections that is in excess of what we are projecting in this budget that we are working on now will not be used for other spending, but will be used to reduce the burden of taxes on Americans, or to reduce the national debt, which has been incurred over the last few decades.

I strongly encourage the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I reluctantly but strongly oppose the Crapo amendment. It would create a reserve fund, as I understand, to lock in any additional onbudget surplus in the outyears to be used only for tax breaks and debt reduction.

Mr. President, the Democrats welcome the opportunity to lock away a portion of the surplus for debt reduction. We have offered amendments that would do just that. But this amendment would limit the use of future surpluses to debt reduction or tax breaks exclusively—only. So I have to ask my friends on the other side of the aisle the following question. Why is it OK to set aside the surplus to create a new special interest tax loophole but not OK to use the surplus for an increase in military pay? Why is it OK to set aside

the surplus to give more tax breaks to the well off but not OK to use the surplus to hire more teachers and reduce class size?

Mr. President, this amendment is not about fiscal responsibility. It is not about saving Social Security or Medicare. But it is about setting aside the surplus to give tax breaks particularly to the wealthiest among us. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, could we have the yeas and nays on the amendment that was just proffered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I raise a point of order, Mr. President. The amendment is not germane, and I raise a point of order that the amendment violates section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act.

MOTION TO WAIVE THE BUDGET ACT

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to waive the Budget Act under the appropriate waiver provisions of the Budget Act, and I ask for the yeas and nays on the waiver.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chair.

I thank Senator LAUTENBERG.

Mr. President, we are getting close to what we have nicknamed around here votorama. The only thing is that sounds like a movie picture with a big screen where everybody can see everything. I am afraid it is going to be sort of the opposite because there is going to be 1 minute after a while on each amendment, and I don't know how many there is going to be yet. But unless and until we change our process, that is what we are going to go through for a while.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Pursuant to the previous consent agreement, I ask unanimous consent that the first vote in the voting sequence be on the adoption of S. Res. 57 regarding Cuba—that is extraneous to our Budget Act, but we are getting consent to take care of that very soon—with 10 minutes equally divided between Senator MACK and Senator DODD just prior to the vote. I further ask that pursuant to the previous agreement, the succeeding votes in the sequence begin with and continue as follows: Senator SANTORUM, amendment No. 212; Senator REED, amendment No. 162; Senator CRAIG, 146; BOXER, 175; Senator VOINOVICH, 161; KENNEDY, 192; CRAPO, 163; DODD, 160; ASHCROFT-GORTON, 242; DORGAN, 178, as modified; GRAMS-ROTH, 231; LAUTENBERG, 166; SNOWE, 232; KENNEDY 195.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Now, as we understand here, when we start with SANTORUM 212, this will mean Senator SANTORUM should be on the floor if he desires to speak to his amendment. And he will get 1 minute, and Senator LAUTENBERG or his designee on the other side, if they oppose it, will be given 1 minute, and so on down the line.

Now, we have already indicated previously that the first vote tonight will be a 15-minute vote, and the amendments after that will be 10 minutes each. I do not know what we are going to do about dinner, but perhaps we will reconsider dinner at 6:30 or 7 and see what we do. But in the meantime, we are going to proceed with that format, and I urge Senators to stay in the Chamber if they have amendments because if we want to get out of here at a reasonable time, we can't take 20 minutes on each rollcall. We just agreed it would be 10. That is very hard to do. We have timed it. Some people say, why don't you make it 7½? Remember last year. You cannot even get it done and get the Senators up to vote in 7½. Ten is the best we can do. But we have to work at it. We still don't know whether we can finish tonight, but we are working very hard to do it.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, if I can just add a note here, part of doing amendments is to fill the amendment tree. So I will say that now we want to shake the tree and see if we can drop some of those amendments that perhaps on reconsideration by the offeror, maybe there would be another time to achieve the goal he or she wants to attain. But I want to add this, Mr. President. I think it is an important observation. There could be as many as 50 votes.

Now, if we are exact on the enforcement of the time limit, which I would urge we agree to, that 10 minutes is 10 minutes, it is not 11, 12, 13, that means everybody has to pay attention. If we have a 10-minute vote and a 2-minute debate, that is 12 minutes. And if you have 50 of those, we are looking at 600 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Ten hours.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Ten hours. Senator DOMENICI and I will be here, perhaps with a glass of wine, at 3 o'clock in the morning or else we will have to go over to the next day.

Mr. DOMENICI. Right.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. So I will forgo the glass of wine, but what I hope is——

Mr. DOMENICI. I never was going to have one.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. No, we weren't going to have it. I was kidding. It is for my friends in California I said that. I hope that our colleagues will be paying attention to this because a delay by one person is a delay for 99 people and we ought not to treat that casually. We are going to be here a long time. This could be expedited substantially. We hope that any Senators who have an amendment review that which has already been discussed and accepted so that we are not being redundant. If it has been heard, I would ask colleagues to perhaps rethink whether or not they are going to offer their amendment. So I guess we can—I don't know what the terminology is for letting the vote roll—let the skaters begin, or something of that nature, or let the pitcher pitch.

Do we have our first?

Mr. DOMENICI. Let's see if we have our first Senator here. We are going to do Cuba and that Senator is here.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, with reference to the matter that is not part of our budget resolution, S. Res. 57 regarding Cuba, Senator DODD, is supposed to speak; CONNIE MACK on our side, Senator DODD on your side. Mr. President, we are going to wait just a little bit.

Before Senator MACK and Senator DODD begin their 10 minutes equally divided, might I repeat again, the first Senator up is Senator SANTORUM with amendment No. 212, Senator REED with No. 162. I have stated the rest of them. If anybody needs it, we have the list here. We need the Senators to be here and now they are going to have to just as well stay because there are going to be 15 or 16 votes in a row. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, may I inquire, just to be clear, the pending business is the resolution, is that correct?

HUMAN RIGHTS IN CUBA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 57) expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the human rights situation in Cuba.

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 5 minutes.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, have the proponents spoken on the resolution, I inquire of my colleague from Florida?

Mr. MACK. Not yet. We have not used our time yet.

Mr. DODD. How much time is there on the resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five minutes apiece.

Mr. DODD. Fine. Mr. President, if I may, let me, first of all, say I intend to support and vote for this resolution. But in doing so, I want to express some deep concerns. Many of my colleagues know we have what is now just about a 40-year-old problem that has not been even remotely close to resolution and that is, of course, United States-Cuban relations.

We know why we are going to be asked to consider this resolution this week, and I suspect it will be passed overwhelmingly. The real question is, does it do anything to influence the policies of the Cuban Government or garner the support of our allies? On that issue, I have to answer resoundingly no. It may make us feel good, it will express our views, but in terms of these resolutions having some influence on the very events which provoked the resolution, I think the answer has to be we can probably anticipate the same response as we have had

with a collective set of resolutions over the years.

I have criticized the recent crackdowns on dissidents, as many have here, including the sentencing of the ''Group of Four,'' which is terribly wrong and totally counterproductive and, in my view, a violation of human rights of these individuals. It is also very inconsistent with the Cuban Government's efforts in the past to gain the international respectability they have been trying to garner. For the life of me, from their standpoint, I don't see why this benefits them or assists them.

Our passing of these kinds of resolutions on Cuba, year after year, year after year, unfortunately, has not prevented the Cuban authorities from dealing harshly with dissidents. Depending upon the ebb and flow of the Cuban political dynamic, the human rights situation gets a little better or a little worse or a little better or a little worse, but nothing significant or permanent seems to happen or change.

We need to engage, in my view, the Cuban Government on this and other issues, as we have done with other nations with whom we have significant disagreements, if we are going to create any kind of environment for some change. That engagement, which we traditionally call diplomacy, has been totally absent in the conduct of relations between these two nations, the Cuban Government and our own. Perhaps that is why, I suggest, the record is so dismal. It is action-reaction, action-reaction, and a total absence of any diplomacy.

Let's not fool ourselves. This resolution is not going to help the people of Cuba. Is it not time to change our view of what should be the dynamics of United States-Cuban relations—to start a new conversation with Cuba, rather than simply act and react to unfolding events in Havana? I believe it is time to begin such a new conversation in this body and in the United States.

We in this country make the mistake, in my view, of overreacting to these ebbs and flows, rather than keeping to the steady and consistent policy to bring Cuba into the world community of democratic nations. All we do, by passing resolutions of this kind which are not accurate in all respects, is to fuel nationalist sentiments in Havana and elsewhere in this hemisphere and around the globe.

The resolution authoritatively cites human rights organizations as critical of human rights practices of Cuban authorities. However, it does not mention these very same organizations also criticize U.S. policies with respect to Cuba. The 1999 Human Rights Watch World Report states:

> The (U.S.) embargo had not only failed to bring about human rights improvements in Cuba but had become counterproductive.

It goes on to conclude that:

> The embargo continued to restrict the rights of freedom of expression and association and the freedom to travel between the United States and Cuba, thus violating Article 19 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, a treaty [I might add] ratified by [our Government.]

This resolution further, and our policy generally, allows all of Cuba's problems, and there are many, to be blamed on the United States in too many international circles. While we are not responsible for the state of the Cuban economy, the Cuban people are extremely nationalistic and will rally behind their government against foreign threats. This is true elsewhere in the hemisphere.

What we need to do, in my view, is to move forward to implement Pope John Paul II's call that Cuba open up to the world and the world open up to Cuba. More constructive measures such as the upcoming baseball game and concert are more effective ways of communicating U.S. values to the Cuban people, particularly as a part of a broader effort to pursue increasing contacts between the American and Cuban people.

Love of baseball and music are just two examples of the many things the American and the Cuban people have in common. We have much more in common than that. The best way to communicate that is by lifting restrictions on U.S. citizens' rights to travel to Cuba or anywhere else. Frankly, such restrictions, in my view, are un-American. We can travel to virtually any other nation in the world—North Korea, Iraq, Iran. The only restrictions are what those nations place on us. The only place I know of where we restrict Americans from going is a country 90 miles off our shore. If they want to place restrictions on our travel there, I would object. But we should not restrict Americans' travel.

We need to make other fundamental changes in our policy. Our guiding principle in doing that should be that these changes are in our, the Americans', best interests. With respect to Cuba, an island of 11 million people 90 miles off our shore, America's interest is that there be a peaceful transition to a post-Castro era, whenever that time comes.

Mr. President, I ask just for 1 additional minute, if I can, and I will give 1 additional minute to my colleague from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Smith of Oregon). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, it is not in America's interest to have an armed insurrection occurring in that country or to see living conditions become so onerous that everyone takes to the boats and finds themselves at sea, seeking safe harbor in this country or elsewhere.

With respect to policy, I suggest the lifting of restrictions on food and medicine. These restrictions border on immoral, in my view. I also recommend lifting restrictions on travel. Under certain circumstances, U.S. companies should also be permitted to invest in Cuba, provided American-style workplace conditions prevail in U.S.-owned investments. I also encourage contacts between United States and Cuban diplomats, including inviting Cuban diplomats to the United States, discussing issues of huge concern including regional terrorism, drug trafficking, and the preservation of the environment.

If we really want to see the peaceful transition to democracy in Cuba, then it is about time, after 40 years, the end of the cold war and the falling of the Berlin Wall, to break out of the policy straitjacket that has prevented meaningful change from taking place in Cuba-United States relationships. Passing resolutions of this kind, year after year, year after year, do nothing to help change what is a situation that demands, in my view, some new thinking, a new conversation.

With that, I thank my colleague for providing the additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I understand I have now 6 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 6 minutes.

Mr. MACK. It is my intention then to use 3 of those minutes and then to yield to my colleague, Senator GRAHAM, for the balance of the 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, let me, first of all, thank Senator DODD for his vote for this resolution. I respect immensely his viewpoint and what he has stated over all these years, but I respectfully disagree with him. Again, I will just point out, all we are suggesting here is that the least America can do is to say we ought to ask the United Nations to condemn Fidel Castro for his human rights violations. That is not an extreme position to take, to ask the world body to condemn Fidel Castro for human rights violations.

The reason we are doing this is because I think it is appropriate to respond to the impression that has been created over these last several months after the Pope visited Cuba. There has been this kind of love affair that Cuba has changed, that the world is now going to open up. The Senator said a moment ago, if Cuba would open up, if we would open up, we could come together.

Clearly, what has happened since the Pope's visit, Fidel Castro has arrested more dissidents than he has released following the Pope's visit. He has instituted new laws which restrict the freedom of speech, even more restrictive than in previous years. He arrested 15 people trying to celebrate the birthday of Martin Luther King this year, and just this month he arrested and sentenced four prominent activists for writing about the basic rights of the Cuban people.

Mr. President, it seems to me that this country, a country that has been willing to stand up in defense of human rights, basic human rights all over the globe, is doing the right thing. I ask my colleagues in the Senate to support this resolution.

I yield back my time and yield the floor to Senator GRAHAM.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I, too, appreciate the vote of the Senator from Connecticut in favor of this, I think, quite moderate but extremely important and timely resolution.

Today in Geneva the United Nations Human Rights Commission commenced its annual meetings. One of the issues that will be before the Commission will be whether a resolution condemning human rights in Cuba and appointing a special rapporteur to review those conditions should pass. Unfortunately, last year a similar resolution for the first time in many years failed to pass.

The question is, How has Cuba reacted to the fact that for 12 months it has not had the international condemnation of its human rights record, which has been the case for many of the years of the Castro regime? What in fact has happened is that we have seen a significant, almost inexplicable increase in the denial of fundamental rights, political rights, human rights, civil rights, to the people of Cuba and, as my colleague has just indicated, the examples of the loss of fundamental human dignity.

Why are we passing this resolution? We are passing this resolution not only to express our outrage at this condition but also to urge the international community to join us, the international community which has so recently been populated by new democracies, for those new democracies to step forward and express their condemnation for one of the few remaining dictatorial regimes in the world.

This recent crackdown by the Cuban Government has already drawn the condemnation of the international community, including some of Cuba's staunchest friends, such as Canada. A resolution is now being circulated in Geneva by several Eastern European states condemning the Cuban Government for its human rights record and calling for the appointment of a special rapporteur.

Mr. President, I think it is significant that these Eastern European states, which suffered under the tyranny of Nazi Germany and Stalinist Russia, are leading the effort to highlight the repression and terror that accompanies everyday life in Cuba.

This resolution calls on the U.S. Government to take all measures to support this resolution so that the international community, including the international community with the United States of America, can shine the light of freedom on Castro's brutal repressive regime.

I urge my colleagues to strongly support this resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, has all time expired on the Cuba resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DOMENICI. May I make a further announcement? A while ago I listed the amendments as we are going to consider them, starting with Senator SANTORUM, Senator REED. We had two Republican amendments listed, Ashcroft-Gorton 242. That is an error. We had already accepted that amendment. So what we would like to do is put, in lieu of Ashcroft-Gorton, which had been accepted, it was already adopted, Fitzgerald 217. Then if we go down on our list, Dorgan is next. Then Grams-Roth, we had also accepted that, and somebody on our staff put it on here. So we are going to substitute Ashcroft 240. So everybody should be on notice, including the proponents of those amendments, when they come up. I will try to announce the list just before the vote as to who is next, maybe two in advance, so everyone will know. I think we are prepared.

Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for a question, please; that is, how many votes do we have bracketed right now that we are certain of?

Mr. DOMENICI. Fifteen.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. So is it fair to say that 15 votes, 10 minutes apiece, 150 minutes, 2 minutes for debate, another 30 minutes, we are looking at a few hours, wouldn't you say?

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. But if we can get the cooperation of the Members, we can finish this tonight. If we can't, we will be here tomorrow. I think I speak for the chairman; we will find out immediately, when I say that I am willing to be here as late as it takes, if we can finish tonight.

Mr. DOMENICI. Senator, we are going to be as cooperative as we can and beyond this in agreeing to accept amendments. We are working with you to do the same, which means we can take many more later and accept them as we work our way through this part.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution (S. Res. 57).

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) is necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) is absent because of a death in the family.

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 67 Leg.]

YEAS—98

Abraham	Enzi	Lott
Akaka	Feingold	Mack
Allard	Feinstein	McConnell
Ashcroft	Fitzgerald	Mikulski
Baucus	Frist	Moynihan
Bayh	Gorton	Murkowski
Bennett	Graham	Murray
Biden	Gramm	Nickles
Bingaman	Grams	Reed
Bond	Grassley	Reid
Boxer	Gregg	Robb
Breaux	Hagel	Roberts
Brownback	Harkin	Rockefeller
Bryan	Hatch	Roth
Bunning	Helms	Santorum
Burns	Hollings	Sarbanes
Byrd	Hutchinson	Schumer
Campbell	Hutchison	Sessions
Chafee	Inhofe	Shelby
Cleland	Inouye	Smith (NH)
Cochran	Jeffords	Smith (OR)
Collins	Johnson	Snowe
Conrad	Kennedy	Specter
Coverdell	Kerrey	Stevens
Craig	Kerry	Thomas
Crapo	Kohl	Thompson
Daschle	Kyl	Thurmond
DeWine	Landrieu	Torricelli
Dodd	Lautenberg	Voinovich
Domenici	Leahy	Warner
Dorgan	Levin	Wellstone
Durbin	Lieberman	Wyden
Edwards	Lincoln	

NOT VOTING—2

Lugar	McCain

The Resolution was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 245

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendment No. 245 to the preamble is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 245) to the preamble was agreed to as follows:

On page 2 strike lines 9 on 10 and insert whereas such abuses violate internationally accepted norms of conduct enshrined by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution, with is preamble, as amended, reads as follows:

S. RES. 57

Whereas, the annual meeting of the United National Commission on Human Rights in Geneva, Switzerland, provides a forum for discussing human rights and expressing international support for improved human rights performance;

Whereas, according to the United States Department of State and international human rights organizations, the Government of Cuba continues to commit widespread and well documented human rights abuses in Cuba;

Whereas such abuses stem from a complete intolerance of dissent and the totalitarian nature of the regime controlled by Fidel Castro;

Whereas such abuses violate internationally accepted norms of conduct;

Whereas the Government of Cuba routinely restricts worker's rights, including the right to form independent unions, and employs forced labor, including that by children;

Whereas such abuses violate internationally accepted norms of conduct enshrined by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;

Whereas the Government of Cuba has detained scores of citizens associated with attempts to discuss human rights, advocate for free and fair elections, freedom of the press,

and others who petitioned the government to release those arbitrarily arrested;

Whereas the Government of Cuba has recently escalated efforts to extinguish expressions of protest or criticism by passing state measures criminalizing peaceful pro-democratic activities and independent journalism;

Whereas the recent trial of peaceful dissidents Vladimiro Roca, Marta Beatriz Roque, Felix Bonne, and Rene Gomez Manzano, charged with sedition for publishing a proposal for democratic reform, is indicative of the increased efforts by the Government of Cuba to detain citizens and extinguish expressions of support for the accused; and

Whereas these efforts underscore that the Government of Cuba has continued relentlessly its longstanding pattern of human rights abuses and demonstrate that it continues to systemically deny universally recognized human rights: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that at the 55th Session of the United Nations Human Rights Commission in Geneva, Switzerland, the United States should make all efforts necessary to pass a resolution, including introducing such a resolution, criticizing Cuba for its human rights abuses in Cuba, and to secure the appointment of a Special Rapporteur for Cuba.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. GRAMM. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

N O T I C E

Incomplete record of Senate proceedings. Today's Senate proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

LET US NOT SEND TROOPS TO KOSOVO

HON. STEPHEN HORN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1999

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, earlier today I expressed my views on why the American military should not be sent to Kosovo.

The conflict in Kosovo is taking place within a sovereign nation. If we are going to go to war with a sovereign nation, we ought to provide a declaration of war. That is what the Constitution of the United States would have us do. I think all of us in this chamber know that Serbian leader Milosevic is a war criminal that should be tried by an international tribunal. The issue here today is, by what criteria should Congress and the President of the United States judge whether American troops should go there?

When is the success known by American troops sent to Kosovo? The President repeatedly broke promises regarding the length of service in Bosnia before admitting our troops will be there indefinitely. Are they going to spend 50 years in the Balkans around Kosovo to bring peace as we have in Korea? Korea was where another Nation invaded South Korea.

This is the time to ask the President to face up to the tough questions and give us the answers to the questions that have been submitted to him. I would keep American troops out of Kosovo. I am opposed to any bombing of civilians. Any targets should be military in nature.

The President has failed to explain the urgent national interest which requires the introduction of U.S. forces into Kosovo. He has failed to even attempt a full explanation of this policy to Congress. The Constitution has given Congress a clear role to play which the President has ignored.

The Administration argues that if the House votes against authorizing its experiments in peacebuilding today, it will undercut ongoing negotiations and perhaps even lead to more bloodshed. This is insulting. It is the Administration's refusal to consult with Congress and its inability to form a strong policy against Serbian aggression that has led to the debate today. The Administration has rejected all attempts by Congress to assert its Constitutional role on every occasion it has put our forces in harm's way without a clear explanation of its mission or on what our forces were supposed to accomplish. The current objections by the White House are more of the same rhetoric from an Executive Branch derisive of consultation with Congress.

The conflict in Kosovo is taking place within a sovereign nation. Intervention in Kosovo, even following an agreement forced upon both sides, is the intervention in a civil war to mediate between two sides which we are trying to force into an agreement that will require our forces to uphold.

By what criteria would the President judge success in this mission whereby American troops could be recalled from Kosovo? The President repeatedly broke promises regarding the length of service in Bosnia before admitting that our troops will be there indefinitely. Once a peacekeeping force enters Kosovo to uphold a forced agreement, that force will serve indefinitely unless Congress acts to responsibly to restrict yet another open-ended commitment to achieve nebulous goals.

While the House debates the commitment of forces to Kosovo, we are also wrestling with the question of funding our armed forces, forces stretched thin by multiple commitments around the world. We are debating how to protect our nation from missile attack, perhaps from missiles improved with stolen American technology. How, then, will another open-ended commitment of American forces help American security. I have heard the arguments on why American forces must be present to make a peacekeeping force work, and while these arguments have merit, they also point out the failure of Europe to deal with issues in its own backyard.

Under the agreement being negotiated now, the peacekeeping force would attack Serbia if its forces or sympathizers violate the agreement, but what would happen if elements of the Kosovo Liberation Army violates the agreement? How would the United States with NATO punish Kosovar violations?

The United States presumably has a responsibility to end the bloodshed in Kosovo because it is the only nation left with the resources to do so. So why, then, is the Administration not seeking to put peacekeepers on the ground in Turkey, where thousands of innocent Kurds have been killed in Turkey's attempt to destroy the terrorists of the PKK? Why have American peacekeepers not been dispatched to Sierra Leone, where the killing continues? Why were international peacekeepers not part of the Irish or Basque peace agreement? What makes Kosovo different?

Let us keep American Troops out of Kosovo. If lives are to be in harm's way, let the European members of NATO handle regional conflicts in their own backyard.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN HONOR OF THE 35TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BARTON SENIOR CENTER

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1999

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Barton Senior Center for its 35-year record of enriching the quality of life for seniors in Lakewood, Ohio.

The Barton Center has been the inspiration for countless noteworthy projects and activities designed to benefit the Lakewood community. This non-profit, self-supporting organization offers a variety of social, educational, recreational and health related activities, classes, programs and services to the seniors of Lakewood. It is truly a multi-purpose senior center.

The inspiration for the Barton Center happened in 1963 when the first residents of the newly built Westerly senior apartment building realized their need for a common social area. With help from government loans, foundation gifts and individual donations, a full service senior center was built, complete with a spacious lounge and dining room, a fully equipped kitchen, a room for arts and crafts, a library, a pool and game room, a workshop and hobby room, and office space. A full-time director and activities coordinator was also hired.

Since its beginning, the Barton Center has continued to grow and expand. The center publishes a regular newsletter that has a circulation of over 1,500 people. Current programs and services such as the Driver Evaluation Program, Home Town Band Concerts, the Holiday Fair, the Dinner Theater, health and exercise programs and neighborhood transportation service are also immensely popular with the hundreds of members of the center.

My fellow colleagues, please join me in recognizing the 35th anniversary of the Barton Senior Center.

CELEBRATING ACHIEVEMENTS OF WOMEN OF COLOR DURING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1999

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Harriet Tubman and her lifelong dedication to social justice. We remember Harriet Tubman for her role in winning freedom for African-Americans. We remember her work on behalf of the Underground Railroad. We remember her courage in risking her life and freedom to help others to escape the tyranny of enslavement.

Harriet Tubman was born a slave in the early 1820s in Bucktown, Maryland, near Cambridge. At birth, she was named Araminta, but later adopted her mother's first name. In 1884, she married John Tubman, a freed slave. Starting life on a plantation, she grew up doing hard labor in the fields and suffering repeated beatings. Once, at age 13, an overseer struck her with a heavy weight and, for the rest of her life, she struggled with the serious effects of a fractured skull.

In 1849, after her owner died, she fled alone to Philadelphia on the underground railroad. Congress then passed the 1950 Fugitive Slave Act, a law that criminalized providing help to runaway slaves. Nevertheless, Harriet immediately dared to make her first return trip. Over the next decade, Tubman used the Underground Railroad to make 18 separate trips

to free slaves. In total, she helped more than 3,000 slaves escape and earned the nickname ''Moses'' for having led so many of her people to freedom.

It is said that she planned carefully, never repeated her route, and became an inspirational role model. Her success is measured by the reactions of slave owners, who placed a $40,000 bounty on her head, a fortune in today's dollars.

During the Civil War, she worked as a Union spy, scout, and nurse. In these roles, she helped even more slaves to escape. After the Civil War, she campaigned to raise funds for black schools. Later, she established the Harriet Tubman Home for Indigent Aged Negroes in her own home. Like many others who have dedicated their lives to social justice, Harriet lived her later years in poverty. A few years before her death, Congress finally awarded her a monthly pension. Today, I urge my colleagues to refresh our recognition of her life an and good works.

The date of Harriet Ross Tubman's birth is uncertain, but experts believe it is March 10, 1820. She died on March 10, 1913. It is, therefore, highly appropriate to honor this American hero during March's Women's History Month. At her death, Tubman was impoverished in economic terms, but her life was rich with great accomplishments, great works, and the knowledge that she had brought freedom to thousands of slaves. She is an inspiration to all of us.

''PROJECT 2000''—A NATIONAL MODEL FOR HUMANITARIAN SUPPORT

HON. HAROLD E. FORD, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1999

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a constituent, friend and esteemed member of the clergy from Tennessee's Ninth District, Reverend Bill Adkins.

On Wednesday, March 15, Reverend Adkins announced an ambitious project in Memphis that will bring together people of faith from across the city, from all dominations, to address our community's most pressing needs. Entitled ''Project 2000,'' the initiative would begin on Easter Sunday and continue throughout the year. Participating churches would set aside the receipt from one Sunday's collection for a special community project.

Reverend Adkins described this initiative best when he urged his fellow clergy to join him in his cause:

''We pray about poverty, housing, incarceration, illnesses and the lack of jobs, and we should. But what are the churches doing? Why can't we take one Sunday out of 52 and do something together for the betterment of the community? One hundred churches alone in Memphis could generate several million dollars.'' (Source: The Commercial Appeal, March 16, 1999)

''Project 2000'' exemplifies the American ideals of community and mutual responsibility. As Americans, we should not live as individuals in isolation, but as members of a community, working together to solve our common problems. In our labors, we should draw on the spiritual, moral, intellectual and financial strength of our church community. There is no limit to what we can accomplish when we marshal the good will and resources of the more than 150 million people of faith who attend weekly services in over 300,000 congregations in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to join me today in honoring Reverend Adkins and ''Project 2000.'' But more than that, Mr. Speaker, I believe the best tribute to Reverend Adkins and ''Project 2000'' would be for all of my colleagues in the House of Representatives to introduce this unique initiative to their constituents. I have included a copy of a recent news article describing this initiative and ask that it be included in the RECORD.

[From The Commercial Appeal, Mar. 16, 1999]

CHURCHES ASKED TO DONATE A SUNDAY

(By David Waters)

Monday, he was on the radio rallying citizens to do something positive for the oft-maligned neighborhood of Whitehaven.

Tuesday, he was at the City Council meeting, lobbying council members to do something to fix a voting plan he thinks is unfair.

Wednesday, he held a press conference and challenged his congregation and others to do something collectively to help the community.

''We pray about poverty, housing, incarceration, illness and the lack of jobs, and we should,'' Rev. Bill Adkins, pastor of Greater Imani Church, said as he presented his idea for Project 2000.

''But what are the churches doing?''

Adkins suggested that, starting next year, all local churches contribute one Sunday's receipts to a special community project.

The first Project 2000 Sunday could be Jan. 30, 2000, the fifth Sunday of that month.

''Most churches consider fifth Sundays as gravy,'' Adkins said.

''Why can't we take one Sunday out of 52 and do something together for the betterment of the community?''

Adkins would like to get representatives from each participating congregation to form a board to choose a Project 2000 recipient.

''One hundred churches alone in Memphis could generate several million dollars,'' he said.

''The church, especially the traditional black church, has the might to bring resurrection power to this community.''

Adkins said Project 2000 will begin on Easter Sunday.

Easter this year falls on April 4 for the first time since Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. was killed on that date in Memphis in 1968.

To commemorate that date, Adkins said Greater Imani will celebrate Easter at the Mid-South Coliseum this year. The service will begin at 9 a.m.

THE IRA CHARITABLE ROLLOVER INCENTIVE ACT OF 1999

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1999

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, today I am joined by my Ways and Means Committee colleague Mr. NEAL in introducing the IRA Charitable Rollover Incentive Act. This bill will allow Americans who have reached age 59½ to donate their IRA assets to a charity without incurring income tax on the distribution.

Under current law, distributions from IRA's are taken in as income to the account holder and taxed. This proposal will allow the assets in the IRA to pass directly to the charity without being taken in and taxed as income. However, the donor may not also claim a charitable contribution deduction as the IRA assets represent previously untaxed income.

The IRA Charitable Rollover Incentive Act has come about thanks to the valuable input from hundreds of charitable organizations across the country. I want to specifically thank Northwestern University President Henry Bienen for bringing to my attention the problems the current laws governing IRA's have created for donors who wish to transfer their assets to charities.

This bill has the potential for unlocking significant financial resources for charitable organizations. I urge my colleagues to join us in this effort by cosponsoring the IRA Charitable Rollover Incentive Act.

IN HONOR OF TOM AND PAUL CALAMARAS

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1999

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Tom and Paul Calamaras. They were honored on November 20, 1998, as ''Men of the Year'' by the Broadway-Astoria Merchants & Professionals Association at their 18th Annual Dinner Dance at the Crystal Palace.

Tom and Paul Calamaras, the owners of the Crystal Palace and Oyster Bay Catering Hall, have played an immensely significant role in New York City's Greek-American community.

The history of the Calamaras family is the story of the American Dream. Thomas, Paul, and their sister, Eleni, were born in Sparta to Despina and John Calamaras. When the children were still young, John came to the United States to support his family. He worked at the Oyster Bay Restaurant, first as a dishwasher and later as a chef. In 1944, John opened a small coffee shop on the Lower East Side.

John, who was not a citizen, was finally able to bring his family to the United States in the late 1940s. The Calamaras family ran the coffee shop, and when the restaurant next door became available, they expanded the restaurant into the Blue Sea Restaurant.

In 1957, Paul returned to Greece where he met and married Mary Stefanos Resiopoulos of Athens. They returned to the United States in 1958. Today, they live on the north shore of Long Island with their three sons, John, Stefanos, and Athanasios.

In 1959, Tom also returned to Greece where he met and married Aphrodite Christopoulos of Kalamata. They currently live on the Upper East Side of Manhattan.

In 1959, John, Paul and Tom purchased the Oyster Bay Restaurant, John's first place of employment in the United States. The Oyster Bay joined the Blue Sea Restaurant and many other diners and restaurants run by the Calamaras family. In 1961, John fulfilled another one of his dreams when he purchased the Broadway Movie Theater. The Calamaras family also established the Crystal Palace Caterers around this time.

Sadly, John passed away in 1973, but Tom and Paul are continuing his legacy. They still

own and operate their father's restaurant and they are also continuing his tradition of honoring their Greek roots.

In recognition of their continued support of causes that promote Hellenism in America, in February of this year Thomas and Paul Calamaras received the title of Archon Depoutatos by the Ecumenical Patriarch Dimitrios.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to bring to your attention these important men, Tom and Paul Calamaras, as they are honored as ''Men of the Year.'' I would also like to offer my sincere congratulations to the Broadway-Astoria Merchants & Professionals Association as it celebrates its 18th Annual Dinner Dance.

A TRIBUTE TO ED HASTEY

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1999

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention today the fine work and outstanding public service of my very good friend, Ed Hastey. Ed is looking forward to a full and productive retirement after serving the Bureau of Land Management, the State of California, and the nation for over 46 years.

A fourth generation Californian and native of Pacific Grove, Ed attended Fresno State College and Monterey Peninsula College, and following his service in the military, graduated from the University of Washington in 1957. He joined BLM in 1957 after several years in the Army Airborne. Over the years, he served as the BLM's national budget officer, assistant director for administration, and as associate director in Washington, DC. He also served two stints as BLM's California State Director, the last stretching from 1982 to the present.

During his tenure at the BLM, Ed spent most of his career directing the management of 16 million acres of public lands in California and Northern Nevada. In that time, he has worked under a dozen Secretaries of Interior. ''I once referred to Ed Hastey as 'the viceroy of California,' and I truly believe no single individual has had a more positive impact on California's landscapes than Ed,'' said Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt. ''He will be missed.''

Ed is widely credited with founding the California Biodiversity Council which draws together all Federal and State land management and environmental agencies with County Supervisors Associations from throughout the state to collaborate on ways to better manage California's diverse natural resources.

Ed is especially proud of the land exchange and acquisition program that he directed in cooperation with the State of California and several private land conservancies that has ensured protection of many unique California landscapes. Several examples include the King Range National Conservation Area on the north coast, the Carrizo Plain in central California, the Santa Rosa Mountains in Southern California, and Cosummes Preserve in Sacramento County, and numerous other areas throughout the state. Ed was also instrumental in the recent acquisition of the Headwaters Forest in Humboldt County which the BLM will manage in partnership with the state.

On a personal note, Ed has been a longtime friend and trusted advisor on important public land issues affecting my congressional district in southern California. We have, over the years, enjoyed many back country excursions together. I know that our friendship will continue and fully expect to spend many more days together exploring the vast and beautiful California wilderness.

Mr. Speaker, few people in public life ever make the type of contributions made by my very good friend, Ed Hastey. As he begins his well-deserved retirement, Ed leaves many admirers in and out of government who respect him for his work, his fundamental sense of decency, and most importantly, his integrity. All of us wish Ed, his wife of 45 years, Joyce, and his family much happiness in the coming years. It is only appropriate that the House pay tribute to Ed Hastey today.

HONORING COAHOMA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1999

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to stand before you today to honor an institution of higher learning that is currently enjoying its 50th year of academic excellence.

Coahoma Community College, nestled in Clarksdale, Mississippi, was established on June 8, 1949, by the Board of Trustees of Coahoma County agricultural High School. Back then, they got together to discuss adding a freshman year of college to the high school as provided by a special act of the state legislature. At the same time, they changed the name of the school to Coahoma Junior College and Agricultural High School which now stands as Coahoma Community College.

Coahoma Community College started out as a college where African-American students could pursue their dreams of obtaining a college education when no other opportunities were available to them. Today, they strive to meet the dreams of every student, adult and businessperson who has a desire to improve his or her place in life.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to add that Coahoma Community College is just that . . . a college for the community. It has definitely come a long way since 1949. With the additions of the Skill/Tech Industrial Training Center and other programs, Coahoma works with businesses and industrial plants offering start-up training, employee and skills enhancement training and health and safety training. Through its academic, vo-tech and skill/tech classes, the college offers a variety of non-credit courses designed to enhance the quality of life in the community as well as increase a person's skills in lifelong learning.

From a college that gave blacks an opportunity to attain a college education to providing the community with diverse centers for learning, Coahoma Community College continues to fulfill its original mission of providing opportunities for advancement for the people it serves.

THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF CORTEZ GROWERS

HON. GARY A. CONDIT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1999

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the 75th Anniversary of Cortez Growers.

Many of the original founders of the Cortez Growers Association first came to California in 1910. The farming cooperative takes it name from the small Santa Fe Railroad stop north of Livingston and southeast of Turlock in my district in California's great Central Valley.

Lured to the Valley by a popular Japanese-language newspaper, the immigrants, unable to speak English and ineligible to own land or become U.S. citizens doggedly pursued the American dream, eventually catching it, revolutionizing farming and transforming Merced County into a major agricultural center.

Immigrating in search of opportunity, they lived as sharecroppers and laborers while searching for the American dream in Berkeley, Watsonville, Salinas, Woodlands, Sacramento, San Francisco and nearly any other place where they found inexpensive farmland where they quickly found they could grow nearly anything.

With little money the immigrants faced incredible odds. Under the Alien Land Law of 1913, Asians couldn't own land because they couldn't become citizens. At the same time, many of the established farmers around Livingston didn't welcome the newcomers. Meeting the challenges steadfastly, the new residents of Cortez formed their grower's association on April 18, 1924.

They struggled with anti-Japanese sentiments during World War II, with many forced into internment camps. Though thousands of Japanese-Americans lost everything during the war, the crisis did not end the dreams of the Cortez members. By January, 1945, the tides of war had firmly turned in the Allied forces' favor, and the Western Defense Command had lifted military restrictions on Japanese-Americans. Following the war, the association began radical changes that would see it reach out to its neighbors and change the way we farm in California.

Cortez looks much different than it did 75 years ago. Instead of jackrabbits, there are cars, tractors and trucks. The sand has been replaced by lush greenery. Today there are 80 members; fewer than half claim Japanese roots. The average farm size is only 60 acres, but because of pooled resources, the association has the clout of a much larger organization.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent these farmers and ask that my colleagues in the House of Representatives rise and join me in honoring the Cortez Growers Association on their 75th anniversary.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR MEMBERS OF U.S. ARMED FORCES ENGAGED IN MILITARY OPERATIONS AGAINST FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA

SPEECH OF

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1999

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 130, a resolution expressing the support of the House of Representatives for our American troops engaged in military operations against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

Last year, I traveled to the Balkans as a representative of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. There, I was able to see firsthand the violence and destruction caused by a deep-seated hatred between ethnic groups, and more specifically, by the policies of Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic and his oppressive regime.

For the past 2 years, the world has watched as the ethnic Albanian people in Kosovo have been subjected to numerous killings, rapes, torture, and other forms of violence and human suffering. I strongly believe that something must be done to bring about a permanent end to the egregious human rights violations that are occurring against these people.

I support the President's decision to allow our troops to participate in NATO air strikes against Serbian forces within Yugoslavia. I am closely monitoring this situation and offer my hopes and prayers for all of our young men and women who are bravely serving their nation in the name of peace.

PEACE

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1999

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, today I rise and with gratitude to Edmund Burke and paraphrase words he first spoke 224 years ago this week. As it is presently true that to restore liberty and dignity to a nation so great and distracted as ours is indeed a significant undertaking. For, judging of what we are by what we ought to be, I have persuaded myself that this body might accept this reasonable proposition.

The proposition is peace. Not peace through the medium of war, not peace to be hunted through the labyrinth of intricate and endless negotiations; not peace to arise out of universal discord, fomented from principle, in all part of the earth; not peace to depend on juridical determination of perplexing questions, or the precise marking the shadowy boundaries of distant nations. It is simply peace, sought in its natural course and in it ordinary haunts.

Let other nations always keep the idea of their sovereign self-government associated with our Republic and they will befriend us, and no force under heaven will be of power to tear them from our allegiance. But let it be once understood that our government may be one thing and their sovereignty another, that these two things exist without mutual regard one for the other—and the affinity will be gone, the friendship loosened and the alliance hasten to decay and dissolution. As long as we have the wisdom to keep this country as the sanctuary of liberty, the sacred temple consecrated to our common faith, wherever mankind worships freedom they will turn their faces toward us. The more they multiply, the more friends we will have, the more ardently they love liberty, the more perfect will be our relations. Slavery they can find anywhere, as near to us as Cuba or as remote as China. But until we become lost to all feeling of our national interest and natural legacy, freedom and self-rule they can find in none but the American founding. These are precious commodities, and our nation alone was founded them. This is the true currency which binds to us the commerce of nations and through them secures the wealth of the world. But deny others of their national sovereignty and self-government, and you break that sole bond which originally made, and must still preserve, friendship among nations. Do not entertain so weak an imagination as that UN Charters and Security Councils, GATT and international laws, World Trade Organizations and General Assemblies, are what promote commerce and friendship. Do not dream that NATO and peacekeeping forces are the things that can hold nations together. It is the spirit of community that gives nations their lives and efficacy. And it is the spirit of the constitution of our founders that can invigorate every nation of the world, even down to the minutest of these.

For is it not the same virtue which would do the thing for us here in these United States? Do you imagine than that it is the Income Tax which pays our revenue? That it is the annual vote of the Ways and Means Committee, which provide us an army? Or that it is the Court Martial which inspires it with bravery and discipline? No! Surely, no! It is the private activity of citizens which gives government revenue, and it is the defense of our country that encourages young people to not only populate our army and navy but also has infused them with a patriotism without which our army will become a base rubble and our navy nothing but rotten timber.

All this, I know well enough, will sound wild and chimerical to the profane herd of those vulgar and mechanical politicians who have no place among us: a sort of people who think that nothing exists but what is gross and material, and who, therefore, far from begin qualified to be directors of the great movement of this nation, are not fit to turn a wheel in the machinery of our government. But to men truly initiated and rightly taught, these ruling and master principles, which in the opinion of such men as I have mentioned have no substantial existence, are in truth everything. Magnanimity in politics is often the truest wisdom, and a great nation and little minds go ill together. If we are conscious of our situation, and work zealously to fill our places as becomes the history of this great institution, we ought to auspiciate all our public proceedings on Kosovo with the old warning of the Church, *Sursum corda!* We ought to elevate our minds to the greatness of that trust to which the order of Providence has called us. By adverting to the dignity of this high calling, our forefathers turned a savage wilderness into a glorious nation, and have made the most extensive and the only honorable conquests, not by bombing and sabre-rattling, but by promoting the wealth, the liberty, and the peace of mankind. Let us gain our allies as we obtain our own liberty. Respect of self-government has made our nation all that it is, peace and neutrality alone will makes ours the Republic that it can yet still be.

HONORING DAVID E. SMITH

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1999

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today to recognize the accomplishments of a man who has made it his life's work to protect and defend human dignity, and to ensure the safety of our shores, for our citizens and our children. On April 23, friends and family will gather to honor the career of State Commander David E. Smith, for a lifetime of service, including more than 20 years as a member of the Disabled American Veterans.

A lifetime resident of Michigan, David Smith's introduction to the United States Armed Forces began with his grandfather, who served in World War I, and his father, Earl, who served in World War II. Upon completion of his tour of duty, the elder Mr. Smith moved his family to Christmas, Michigan, and later Mount Morris, in the Flint area. Mr. Smith enlisted in the United States Army on June 20, 1960, and served for six years, three of which were in Germany as a member of the 7th Army. He also served with the 1st Armored Division in Fort Hood, Texas, and the 1st Army at Fort Devens, Massachusetts. During this time, he rose to the rank of Sergeant.

In May of 1966, Sergeant Smith was medically discharged with service connected disability, however has continued to serve his country as he worked for the Department of the Army in Dover, New Jersey, before returning to Michigan in 1967. He began a career with general motors, which spaned three years before his disability prevented him from continuing. Showing determination to excel despite his disability, Mr. Smith and his family moved to Ann Arbor, Michigan, to be close to VA physicians. Mr. Smith began a new career, one that lasted five years until his disability rating was upgraded to 100% and he was ordered to cease working altogether.

In July of 1974, Mr. Smith joined the Disabled American Veterans as a like member. He began regularly attending DAV meetings in the fall of 1983. His regular attendance of Chapter Service Officer trainings prepared him for his future roles as Chapter Adjutant, Treasurer, and Service Officer. For three years, Mr. Smith served as Chapter Commander, and has held every statewide Vice-Commander positions, prior to his current position as State Commander. He has been honored as Chapter Service Officer of the Year on five separate occasions, and was recognized as Michigan Disabled Veteran of the Year in 1990.

Mr. Speaker, as we owe much to our nation's veterans, Commander David Smith has acknowledged the fact that his accomplishments would not have been possible without support from his wife Peggy, and his children, all of whom, are veterans as well. I ask my colleagues in the 106th Congress to join me in

congratulating him for this dedication and perseverance.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE HEART CENTER AT PARMA COMMUNITY GENERAL HOSPITAL

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1999

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the opening of the Heart Center at Parma Community General Hospital and the hospital's continued dedication to meeting the healthcare needs of the community.

Parma Community General Hospital, a not-for-profit, community-based hospital dedicated to bringing high quality health care services in a familiar, cost-effective setting, received numerous awards in 1998. According to a study by a national organization, Parma Hospital was rated first in quality of care in orthopedics of the 31 hospitals in its six-county region. In addition, Parma Hospital ranked in the top five in overall performance based on all services offered.

The nursing staff, a critical element in Parma Hospital's excellence, also received accolades for their commitment to quality. Mary Ann Hassing, R.N., in the Small Wonders Maternity Unit, was named Health Care Worker of the Year by the Ohio Association for Hospitals and Health Systems. In addition, Karen Krauth, R.N., certified Diabetes Educator and Renee Knapp, R.N. who works in the Emergency Department, were chosen by the Plain Dealer readers as the Best of the Best.

Last year, Parma also became the first hospital in the area to sign the pledge created by the National Healthcare Workers Safety Program and convert to needle safety blood drawing products and IV angiocatheters. Parma also provided care for a record number of patients in the Emergency Room in 1998.

My fellow colleagues, please join me in honoring the accomplishments of Parma Community General Hospital and the Sunday, March 28, 1999 opening of the Heart Center at Parma Community General Hospital.

CESAR CHAVEZ

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1999

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the organizing work of Cesar Chavez and to memorialize his lifelong struggle for justice, respect, and decent living conditions for America's farm workers.

Cesar Chavez was born on March 31, 1927, on a small farm in Arizona. When he died in 1993, at the age of 66, Cesar was President of the United Farm Workers of America. For most of his life, Cesar toiled on farms—both picking fruit and organizing workers—and dedicated himself to improving the plight of migrant workers.

Cesar grew up living as a migrant farm worker in the Southwest, and migrated with his family in their struggles to earn a living. His experiences taught him the importance of collective action and the importance of organizing to address America's economic and social inequity.

Cesar Chavez and his family were living in the East San Jose barrio of Sal Si Puedes, roughly translated this means Get Out If You Can, in 1952. That year, Cesar met Fred Ross Sr., an organizer for the Community Service Organization (C.S.O.), one of the first civic action groups in the Mexican-American communities of California and Arizona. Fred Ross became his mentor, and together they built 32 chapters of the C.S.O., organizing thousands of Mexican Americans to become active leaders of their communities. Cesar taught these leaders how to organize and win battles to end discrimination in education, housing, employment and health care. He led successful citizenship, voter registration, and get out the vote campaigns in both urban and rural communities throughout California. Because of his efforts, more than 500,000 new voters were added to America's rolls in the 1950's and early 1960's

Due to his determination and hard work, he rose from his humble origins to become the national director of CSO. He departed in 1962 to found the National Farm Workers Association. Against great odds, Cesar led a successful five year strike and boycott that rallied millions of supporters to the farm workers movement. He forged an international support coalition of unions, religious groups, students, minorities and fair minded consumers.

From the beginning, he adhered to the principles of non-violence practiced by Gandhi and Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. In 1968, Cesar fasted for 25 days to reaffirm the UFW's commitment to non-violence. The late Senator Robert F. Kennedy called Cesar ''one of the heroic figures of our time'' and joined him in Delano when he ended his fast.

Cesar's work has had a lasting impact on our nation. Seventeen million Americans honored the grape boycott, and thousands joined his non-violent struggle for justice in more active ways, through picket lines, civil disobedience, going to jail, and working as five dollar per week plus room and board volunteers, the same compensation that Cesar earned. My San Francisco District Director, Fred Ross Jr., son of Cesar's mentor, was one of these young people inspired by Cesar to join the cause and help migrant workers win the respect, dignity, and decent living conditions that they deserved.

On August 8, 1994, Cesar posthumously received the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the highest honor in the United States. Recently, the U.S. Department of Labor honored him by inducting him into its Hall of Fame.

I support House Joint Resolution 22, To Commemorate the Birthday of Cesar E. Chavez, which would declare March 31 a Federal holiday in his honor. Cesar dedicated his life to improving the living conditions of America's workers. I urge my colleagues to recognize his life's work.

TRIBUTE TO HAMILTON HIGH SCHOOL CHOIR

HON. HAROLD E. FORD, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1999

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to thirty extraordinarily gifted young men and women from Tennessee's Ninth Congressional District who are in Washington this week to display their talents before the nation.

Under the leadership of Mr. Reginald Gaston, the Hamilton High School Choir has become one of the best concert and gospel choirs in the State of Tennessee. Dedicated to the pursuit of excellence, the Hamilton Choir has earned national recognition for their superior ratings in the recent Mid-America Choral Festival in Orlando, Florida.

It gives me great honor, Mr. Speaker, to present the names of these thirty fine young representatives Tennessee's Ninth District: Marlon Mitchell, Mario Albright, Jason Mitchell, Jacinth Ragland, Jattir Ragland, Phillip Britteum, Jonathan Anderson, Burl Toler, Jared Bledsoe, Tre' Canady, Royry Walker, Rickeya Townes, Felecia Wiggins, Sally Ousley, Yamina Tunstall, Sekida Norwood, Tawanda Dean, Sukeeya Haley, April Johnson, Christian Kirk, Sharonda, Walker, Ranata Adams, Thais Polk, Jovannii Ayers, LaDaris Spearman, Paige Brown, Yolanda Bolton, Ashley Wheeler, Monique Joiner, Tinisha Daniels, and Ms. Adrianne Strong. The hard work of these young people defies the inaccurate notion of an ''uncommitted generation.'' The young people of this nation possess an overwhelming level of dedication and aptitude, and the students of the Hamilton High School Choir serve as a testimony to that.

We must continue to encourage the young people of this nation. We must continue to remind them of their potential. Moreover, we must congratulate them when they reach their goals and fulfill their potential. In that spirit, it gives me great pleasure to present this inspirational group of young men and women to official Washington, to my colleagues and to the hundreds of Americans who will be touring the people's capitol. May their voices ring from the steps of the capitol and echo the dedication and commitment of their generation.

THE CHARITABLE GIVING TAX RELIEF ACT

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1999

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, today I am joined by my Ways and Means Committee colleagues Messrs. COYNE and HERGER and Mrs. THURMAN in introducing the Charitable Giving Tax Relief Act.

Identical to a bill we introduced in the 105th Congress, the Charitable Giving Tax Relief Act will allow taxpayers who do not itemize their tax returns to deduct a portion of their charitable giving. Specifically, non-itemizers whose cumulative annual charitable donations exceed $500 will be able to deduct 50 percent of any charitable donations over that amount.

Under current law, non-itemizers receive a standard deduction while only taxpayers who itemize their deductions receive a direct tax benefit for giving to charity. Non-itemizers make up the vast majority of tax filers with two and a half times more returns than itemizers. Moreover, non-itemizers are typically middle to lower middle income level taxpayers who, despite their modest earnings, still give quite generously to charitable causes. In fact, non-itemizers earning less than $30,000 give the

highest percentage of their household income to charity. I believe these individuals deserve a tax break for their generosity.

This idea is not new. In the early 1980s, non-itemizers did enjoy the ability to deduct a portion of their charitable giving. In the last Congress, thanks to the support of the not-for-profit community, especially Independent Sector and its member organizations, 144 colleagues cosponsored my bill. I hope to build on that success and have this legislation included in any major tax bill that we might consider during this Congress.

As direct federal subsidies to non-profit organizations are being reduced, the private sector must fill the gap to provide the necessary resources. The Charitable Giving Tax Relief Act will help in that cause by rewarding those taxpayers standing in the gap. Independent Sector believes that this bill may even encourage more giving to charitable organizations. In fact, one study projects that giving could increase by $2.7 billion a year.

Americans have traditionally been the most generous people in the world. From churches to schools, the arts to social services, we fund and support all types of charitable causes. I believe altruism is the basis for that generosity. However, I realize that those who give can be sensitive to tax considerations. My ultimate goal is to remove the tax code as an obstacle to charitable giving.

I encourage my colleagues to join Mr. COYNE, Mr. HERGER, Mrs. THURMAN and me in our effort to reward and encourage the American tradition of philanthropy by agreeing to sponsor the Charitable Giving Relief Act.

IN HONOR OF THE 60TH DIAMOND WEDDING ANNIVERSARY OF PANTELIS AND DESPINA MARANGOS

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1999

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Pantelis and Despina Marangos as they celebrate their 60th Diamond Wedding Anniversary. They celebrated their joyous occasion on Sunday, November 8, 1998.

Pantelis, born in Kalavasos, Cyprus, the son of Mary and John Shakalisk, was known as ''Peter the Carpenters' son,'' thus the name Marangos. Despina was born in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, the daughter of Zaharias Kyriacou from Cyprus and Chrisanthy Protoulis from Greece.

At the age of 18, Pantelis arrived at Ellis Island at the height of the Great Depression with five dollars in his pocket. But he soon found work and within a few years as a skilled pastry chef. Despina came to New York as a child and attended P.S. 116 and Julia Richmond High School. During the Depression, she worked in the Garment District with her mother.

In 1938, Pantelis and Despina met, fell in love and married. In 1943, their first child, Mary Anna, was born, Their son, John Zaharias, was born in 1950.

During World War II, Pantelis served in the Navy as a Petty Officer on a mine sweeper and took part in the invasion of Anzio and St. Tropez while Despina served on the Home Front, working in defense plants.

Despina, who had the responsibility of caring for her parents in addition to her own family, found time to be a Den Mother and an Officer in both the Parents' Association and the Women's Auxiliary.

After his discharge from the Navy, Pantelis returned to the restaurant business where he was a manager, chef and proprietor of Michael's Restaurant until his retirement in 1975.

Despina worked at Macy's Department store during the 1959 Christmas season and retired after 30 years of dedicated service in 1989.

In 1966, Pantelis suffered a stroke and once again demonstrated the courage and bravery he showed when coming to this country alone. In the past two years he has become a living symbol for the handicapped.

The doctors told Despina that he would never function, yet today he is proving them wrong with a combination of therapies. The Chian Federation honored his courage in 1998. Despina and other Hellenic immigrants were also recognized at a ceremony on Ellis Island.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to bring to your attention this important milestone in the life of a remarkable couple. It is an honor to have them in my district.

A TRIBUTE TO PAUL THOMPSON

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1999

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention today the fine work and outstanding public service of my good friend, Paul Thompson. Paul is looking forward to a full and productive retirement after serving Congress and the nation as a professional staff member of the House Appropriations Committee for 29 years.

Paul first came to the Hill in 1970 as a detailee to the VA–HUD and Independent Agencies Subcommittee from the Department of Interior where he worked in the Bureau of Indian Affairs budget office. It was a VA–HUD that Paul found his home away from home and where he made himself over the years, quite literally, an invaluable part of the Appropriations process. With his knowledge of the legislative process, he became a technician's technician; he knew, better than most, how to put a bill together effectively from start to finish. Because Paul was never politically motivated, he has always been perceived by his colleagues, and more importantly, by Members of the House, as unfailingly fair and intellectually honest.

During his tenure as both professional staff and majority clerk of the subcommittee, Paul served under six subcommittee chairs including Chairmen WALSH, LEWIS, STOKES, TRAXLER, BOLAND and EVINS. Not surprisingly, during that time, Paul and his chairmen developed remarkable professional relationships as well as genuine lasting friendships that continue to prosper and endure.

There are, of course, a few things everyone should know about Paul. He loves a good laugh, maintains a work ethic from another era, and enjoys his Guinness in a coffee mug. When he's not working, you will find Paul on the water in his Ray Ban sunglasses with a cold drink in one hand while casting a line with the other. In fact, I expect many of Paul's friends will soon be receiving invitations to join him in his newly acquired fishing boat which he will tow behind the largest bright red pickup truck ever seen in the Rayburn garage.

Those who know Paul best have nothing but the finest things to say about him. ''A greater guy I have never worked with,'' said one longtime Appropriations staffer. Another, remembering how he single-handedly ate two dozen crabs while on a daytime cruise of the Chesapeake Bay, observed, ''Paul loves his crab but he's never crabby himself.''

Mr. Speaker, professional staff come and go in the People's House but few ever make the type of contribution made by my good friend, Paul Thompson. As he begins his well deserved retirement, Paul leaves an institution filled with many admirers who love and respect him for his work, his gentle heart, and his integrity. All of us wish Paul, his lovely bride, Geri and his three sons—Rick, Bill and John—much happiness in the coming years. Having said that, Mr. Speaker, it is only fitting that the House pay tribute to Paul Thompson today.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1999

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for rollcall votes 67–71 yesterday. Had I been present, I would have voted :''yea'' or ''aye'' on rollcall votes 68 and 71; I would have voted ''nay'' or ''no'' on rollcall votes 67, 69 and 70.

WELCOMING THE CLASS OF DODSON MIDDLE SCHOOL

HON. STEVEN T. KUYKENDALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1999

Mr. KUYKENDALL Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome fifty exceptional students from the Dodson Middle School's Gifted High Ability Magnet Program. These students are visiting the nation's capital to see first-hand how their government works. It is an interesting time to watch a democracy, as we struggle to decide how to strike the financial balance among many worthwhile government programs, and as we deploy American soldiers as part of ongoing NATO peacekeeping forces. I hope all of these students some day will appreciate the enormity of the decisions we make, and, at the same time, enjoy the experience.

I especially praise Stephanie Spychaj, who has been selected from her class to place the wreath on the Unknown' Soldier's gravesite. The other students are:

Craig Ackerman	Roy Lewis
Elizabeth Avila	Nicole Oberfoell
Ruben Becerra	Heather Peg
Beth Boechert	AileenPhillips
Kyle Brennan	Louis Pitre
Hazel Butler	Andrea Pynn
Jason Chaing	Daniel Sandri

Jeff Champion
Christina Cho
Jake Cummings
Daphne Detrano
Francesca Dolce
Jesse Flaunta
Alex Gellerman
Sarah Hargis
Rebecca Holtz
Marc Hull
Emily Ingram
Mathew Jackson
Cameron Jeans-Shaw
Zarina Jurlin
Tracy Kvanaugh
Jane Kim
Tiffany Kim
Kay Lalwani
Robin Lee
Patti Lester
Kathryn Mecija
Nicole Miller
Teri Miyahira
Jania Moretti
Devin Schopp
Elliott Shahian
Stephanie Sypchaj
Zia Suzuki
Akane Takei
Paola Terzoli
Jessica Thill
Brent Weber
Eric Williams
Jason Wilson
Ryan Zivalic

Chaperones:
Tom Schroeter
Claudia Dunn
Joyce Kimura
John Reynolds

HONORING THE PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY VALOR AWARD WINNERS

HON. THOMAS M. DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1999

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the 1999 Prince William Regional Chamber of Commerce and the Prince William County Greater Manassas Chamber of Commerce Valor Award Winners. The Valor Awards honor public service officers who have demonstrated extreme self-sacrifice, personal bravery, and ingenuity in the performance of their duty. Significantly, this year marks the thirteenth anniversary of the event honoring members of law enforcement and fire and rescue agencies historically servicing Prince William County, Dumfries, Haymarket, Manassas, Manassas Park, Occoquan, and Quantico. There are five categories: The Gold Medal of Valor, the Silver Medal of Valor, the Bronze Medal of Valor, the Certificate of Valor, and the Lifesaving Award.

The Silver Medal of Valor is the second highest award for bravery and heroism. Awarded in situations when a public safety official knowingly exposes himself/herself to great personal risk in the performance of an official act.

The Silver Medal of Valor Award Winners for 1999 are: Sergeant Barry D. Childress, Jr., USMC; Hospital Corpsman Third Class Eric Scott Parillo, USN

The Bronze Medal of Valor is awarded in situations where during the course of an emergency, a public safety official demonstrates judgment, ingenuity, or performance at a level that clearly exceeds that required and expected in the performance of his/her duties. May include the saving of a life that is threatened by medical or physical reasons.

The Bronze Medal of Valor Award Winners for 1999 are: Gunnery Sergeant Michael W. Todd, USMC; Captain Mark L. Doyle; Driver Operator David W. Luckett; Firefighter Roger D. Pinkston, USMC; Technicians II Shawn Crispin and John Sims, Prince William County Department of Fire and Rescue; Sergeant Darrell G. Steepleton and Firefighter Michael L. Skeele, Occoquan-Woodbridge-Lorton Volunteer Fire Department; Officer James E. Buchanan, Prince William County Police Department

The Certificate of Valor is awarded for acts that involve personal risk and/or demonstration of judgement, zeal, or ingenuity above what is normally expected in the performance of duties.

The Certificate of Valor Award Winners for 1999 are: Corporal Roberto Armendariz, USMC; Gunnery Sergeant Suzanne R. How, USMC; Troopers Douglas G. Brooks and Darrell D. Estess, and Special Agent Ron Paschal, Commonwealth of Virginia, Department of State Police; Sergeant Jesse A. Noriega, USMC; Sergeant David May, Corporal Douglas Songer, Officers Carl Larry and John Murray, Prince William-Manassas Regional Adult Detention Center;

The Lifesaving Award is awarded in recognition of acts taken in a life-threatening situation where an individual's life is in jeopardy, either medically or physically.

The Lifesaving Award Winners for 1999 are: Captain Matthew J. Noble, USMC; Emergency Medical Technician Michelle Dickison, Dumfries-Triangle Rescue Squad; Lance Corporal Matthew D. Hammond and Private First Class Jeremy A. Schenck, USMC; Officers Andrew Arnold and Pierre Costello, Prince William-Manassas Regional Adult Detention Center; Senior Police Officer Nathan S. Hill, Jr., Prince William County Police Department; Trooper Eric W. Berge, Commonwealth of Virginia, Department of State Police

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I would like to send my sincere gratitude and heartfelt appreciation to these distinguished public servants, who put their lives on the line everyday on behalf of their fellow Virginians.

ST. JOSEPH SCHOOL CELEBRATES 75TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DAVE CAMP

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1999

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate St. Joseph School in St. Johns, Mich., on 75 years of serving the community. It is an honor to have this extraordinary school in the 4th Congressional District of Michigan.

This remarkable school opened Sept. 8, 1924, with 61 students. Currently it draws 302 students from more than 200 area families, and serves kindergarten-6th students.

Much of the success of today's education system depends on strong leadership from school teachers, administrators and parents, and St. Joseph School serves as an outstanding example. Its parents have devoted their precious time to ensure a quality education for their children. The teachers and administration of St. Joseph have had a tremendous impact on the lives of many students. They have promoted and maintained a solid system of education for countless young people over the past 75 years.

I commend the staff, students and parents of St. Joseph School for their hard work in building an effective community for learning. Principal Tomi Ann Schultheiss' selfless commitment for the past seven years has helped prepare St. Joseph School for the 21st century. The focus on literacy and assurance that students obtain the essential skills needed for life are exemplary, and I am glad we have St. Joseph as an example for how we need to work to educate our children.

I am confident that future generations of families will be able to count on St. Joseph School for a healthy start and a head start for their children. I wish the St. Joseph School the best for the future.

PAUL CALLENS PROMOTES RACIAL UNITY WITH EVERY STEP

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1999

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the endeavor of my good friend Paul Callens.

Paul has gathered several of his friends to join him on a seven-month walk for national unity—an 11-state, 3,200-mile journey from Maryland's Eastern Shore to the city of San Francisco, to promote racial unity throughout the United States.

Along the way, the Unity Walkers will pass the birth place of abolitionist and former slave Harriet Tubman, stop at the site of last year's Middle East Peace Talks, and arrive in Washington, D.C. for a weekend celebration on the National Mall on Sunday, April 4 to commemorate the anniversary of the assassination of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

We would like to think that blatant racism is a thing of the past, but daily reports of police brutality, church burnings, hate crimes and acts of racially-motivated violence shatter the illusion that bigotry no longer exists in our country.

The goal of the walkers and their supporters is to build a national unity movement that celebrates the differences among Americans and promotes appreciation of the racial and cultural blend that makes up the population of the United States. They hope to interest community leaders and local government officials in celebrating a National Unity Day, to be observed on October 10.

In these next few months, Paul Callens will ask our communities to examine the attitudes we've inherited about race and to reevaluate our treatment of racial differences. Some who would promote intolerance and irrational prejudice have made an attempt to turn back the clock on the progress we've made in the fight for civil rights. Paul and his friends will spread the word that hostility based on racial or ethnic identity has no place in America.

Please join me in congratulating Paul and the Unity Walkers and wish them success in their effort to heal the wounds of racial intolerance in our country. We make progress one step at a tim

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate agreed to the Congressional Budget.

The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 68, Concurrent Budget Resolution.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S3309–S3383

Measures Introduced: Fifty bills and five resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 713–762, S.J. Res. 16–17, S. Con. Res. 23–24, and S. Res. 75.

(See next issue.)

Measures Passed:

Emergency Supplemental Appropriations: Pursuant to the order of March 18, 1999, Senate passed H.R. 1141, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, after striking all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the text of S. 544, Senate companion measure, as passed by the Senate on Tuesday, March 23, 1999. **Page S3327**

Senate insisted on its amendment, requested a conference with the House thereon, and the Chair, as authorized, appointed the following conferees on the part of the Senate: Senators Stevens, Cochran, Specter, Domenici, Bond, Gorton, McConnell, Burns, Shelby, Gregg, Bennett, Campbell, Craig, Hutchison, Kyl, Byrd, Inouye, Hollings, Leahy, Lautenberg, Harkin, Mikulski, Reid, Kohl, Murray, Dorgan, Feinstein, and Durbin. **Page S3327**

Subsequently, S. 544 was placed back on the Senate calendar. **(See next issue.)**

Adjournment Resolution: Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 23, providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and the House of Representatives. **(See next issue.)**

Cuban Human Rights: By a unanimous vote of 98 yeas (Vote No. 67), Senate agreed to S. Res. 57, expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the human rights situation in Cuba, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto:

Pages S3380–83

Graham/Mack Amendment No. 245, to state that where such abuses violate internationally accepted norms of conduct enshrined by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. **Pages S3382–83**

Congressional Budget: By 55 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. 81), Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 68, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 2000 through 2009, after striking all after the resolving clause and inserting in lieu thereof the text of S. Con. Res. 20, Senate companion measure, as amended, and after taking action on amendments proposed thereto, as follows: **Pages S3309–19, S3321–80**

Adopted:

Enzi Amendment No. 154, to express the sense of the Senate that agricultural risk management programs should include livestock producers.

Pages S3327–28

Dodd Amendment Modified No. 160, to increase the mandatory spending in the Child Care and Development Block Grant by $7.5 billion over five years, the amendment reduces the resolution's tax cut and leaves adequate room in the revenue instructions for targeted tax cuts that help families with the costs of caring for their children, and that such relief would assist all working families with employment related child care expenses, as well as families in which one parent stays home to care for an infant. (By yeas to nays (Vote No. 74), Senate failed to table the amendment.) **(See next issue.)**

Graham Modified Amendment No.164, to express the sense of the Senate that funds recovered from any Federal tobacco-related litigation should be set-aside for the purpose of first strengthening the medicare trust fund and second to fund a medicare prescription drug benefit. **(See next issue.)**

Graham Modified Amendment No. 165, to express the sense of the Senate that the Congress and the President should offset inappropriate emergency funding from fiscal year 1999 in fiscal year 1999.

(See next issue.)

Lautenberg (for Feinstein) Amendment No. 169, to express the sense of the Senate on the social promotion of elementary and secondary school students. **(See next issue.)**

Lautenberg (for Reid) Modified Amendment No. 170, to express the sense of the Senate regarding social security ''notch babies'', those individuals born between the years 1917 and 1926. **(See next issue.)**

Lautenberg (for Boxer) Amendment No. 171, to ensure that the President's after school initiative is fully funded for fiscal year 2000. **(See next issue.)**

Lautenberg (for Murray) Amendment No. 173, to express the sense of the Senate on women and Social Security reform. **(See next issue.)**

Lautenberg (for Boxer) Amendment No. 175, to ensure that the substantial majority of any income tax cuts go to middle and lower income taxpayers. **(See next issue.)**

By 56 yeas to 43 nays (Vote No. 65), Roth Modified Amendment No. 176, to express the sense of the Senate regarding the modernization and improvement of the medicare program. **Pages S3310–19, S3352–53**

Lautenberg Amendment No. 183, to express the sense of the Senate that Congress should enact legislation to modernize America's schools. **Pages S3331–32**

Lautenberg (for Durbin) Amendment No. 185, to provide a substitute for section 205 regarding the emergency designation point of order. **Pages S3332, S3378**

Lautenberg (for Durbin) Amendment No. 186, to express the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that it is the policy of the United States to provide as soon as it is technologically possible an education for every American child that will enable each child to effectively meet the challenges of the 21st century. **Pages S3332–33**

Lautenberg (for Durbin) Amendment No. 187, to finance disability programs designed to allow individuals with disabilities to become employed and remain independent. **Page S3333**

Lautenberg (for Dorgan) Amendment No. 188, to express the sense of the Senate that agricultural commodities and products, medicines, and medical products should be exempted from unilateral economic sanctions. **Page S3333**

Lautenberg (for Dorgan) Amendment No. 189, to express the sense of the Senate regarding capital gains tax fairness for family farmers. **Page S3333**

Lautenberg (for Torricelli) Amendment No. 191, to express the sense of the Senate that the Urban Parks and Recreation Recovery (UPARR) program should be fully funded. **Pages S3333–34**

Lautenberg (for Lieberman) Amendment No. 197, to express the sense of the Senate regarding asset-building for the working poor. **Page S3336**

Lautenberg (for Bingaman) Amendment No. 199, to help insure the long-term national security of the United States by budgeting for a robust Defense Science and Technology Program. **Pages S3336–37**

Lautenberg (for Biden) Amendment No. 202, to express the sense of the Senate on the importance of funding for embassy security. **Page S3338**

Lautenberg (for Landrieu) Modified Amendment No. 205, to allow for a tax cut for working families that could be provided immediately, before enactment of Social Security reform would make on-budget surpluses available as an offset. **Pages S3339–40**

Domenici (for Hatch) Modified Amendment No. 206, to provide the sense of the Senate regarding support for Federal, State and local law enforcement, and for the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund. **Page S3340**

Domenici (for Hatch) Modified Amendment No. 207, to ensure a rational adjustment to merger notification thresholds for small business and to ensure adequate funding for Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice. **Page S3340**

Domenici (for Enzi) Modified Amendment No. 208, to express the sense of the Senate that the Marriage Penalty should be eliminated and the marginal income tax rates should be uniformly reduced. **Page S3340**

Domenici (for Shelby) Amendment No. 209, to express the sense of the Senate that the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 needs comprehensive reform. **Pages S3340–41**

Domenici (for Sessions) Amendment No. 210, to express the sense of the Senate that the additional tax incentives should be provided for education savings. **Pages S3341, S3378–79**

Domenici (for Santorum) Amendment No. 211, to express the sense of the Senate regarding the Davis-Bacon Act. **Page S3341**

By 97 yeas to 1 nay (Vote No. 68), Domenici (for Santorum/Leahy) Amendment No. 212, to express the sense of the Senate that the 106th Congress, 1st Session should reauthorize funds for the Farmland Protection Program. **Page S3341**

Domenici (for DeWine/Coverdell) Modified Amendment No. 213, to express the sense of the Senate regarding support for State and local law enforcement. **Page S3341**

Domenici (for DeWine) Modified Amendment No. 214, to express the sense of the Senate that funding for Federal drug control activities should be at a level higher than that proposed in the President's budget request for fiscal year 2000. **Pages S3341–42**

Domenici (for Gorton) Amendment No. 215, to express the sense of the Senate concerning resources for autism research through the National Institutes

of Health and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. **Page S3342**

Domenici (for Roberts) Amendment No. 216, to express the sense of the Senate regarding the potential impact of the amendments to the medicare program contained in the Balanced Budget Act on access to items and services under such program. **Page S3342**

Domenici (for Fitzgerald) Amendment No. 217, to express the sense of the Senate that the budget process should require truth-in-budgeting with respect to the on-budget trust funds. **Page S3342**

Domenici (for Specter) Amendment No. 219, to express the sense of the Senate that $50 million will be provided in fiscal year 2000 to conduct intensive firearms prosecution projects to combat violence in the twenty-five American cities with the highest crime rates. **Pages S3343–44**

Subsequently, the amendment was modified. **(See next issue.)**

Domenici (for Specter) Amendment No. 220, to express the sense of the Senate on providing women direct access to physicians specializing in obstetrics and gynecological services.

Domenici (for Jeffords) Amendment No. 221, to express the sense of the Senate concerning fostering the employment and independence of individuals with disabilities. **Page S3344**

Domenici (for Jeffords) Amendment No. 222, to express the sense of the Senate with respect to maintaining at least current expenditures (including emergency funding) for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program for Fiscal Year 2000. **Pages S3344–45**

Domenici (for Ashcroft) Amendment No. 224, to express the sense of Congress that South Korea must abide by its international trade commitments on pork and beef. **Page S3345**

Domenici (for Shelby/Domenici) Modified Amendment No. 225, to express the sense of the Senate that no additional firewalls should be enacted for transportation activities. **Pages S3345–46**

Domenici (for Enzi) Amendment No. 226, to express the sense of the Senate that new public health programs should not be established to the detriment of funding for existing, effective programs, such as the Preventive Health and Health Services Block Grant. **Page S3346**

Domenici (for Abraham) Amendment No. 227, to provide for the continued viability of professional, educational, and trade associations. **Pages S3346–47**

Domenici (for Gregg/Collins) Amendment No. 229, to express the sense of the Senate concerning funding for special education. **Pages S3347–48**

Domenici (for Stevens/Warner) Amendment No. 230, to provide an exception for emergency defense spending. **Page S3348**

Domenici (for Grams) Modified Amendment No. 231, to express the sense of the Senate on providing tax relief to all Americans by returning the non-Social Security surplus to taxpayers. **Pages S3348,–S3368–74**

Domenici (for Chafee) Amendment No. 236, to strike section 201, Reserve Fund for a Fiscal Year 2000 Surplus, as provided for under Title II—Budgetary Restraints and Rulemaking. **Page S3349**

Domenici (for Chafee) Amendment No. 237, to express the sense of the Senate on the importance of social security for individuals who become disabled. **Pages S3349–50**

Domenici (for Chafee) Amendment No. 238, to provide $200,000,000 for the State-side program of the land and water conservation fund. **Page S3350**

Domenici (for Ashcroft) Amendment No. 240, to express the sense of the Senate concerning Federal tax relief. **Page S3351**

Domenici (for Ashcroft) Amendment No. 242, to express the sense of the Senate that increased funding for elementary and secondary education should be directed to States and local school districts. **Pages S3351, S3354–58, S3376**

Domenici (for Hutchison/Feinstein) Modified Amendment No. 243, to express the sense of the Senate that a task force be established to create a reserve fund for natural disasters. **Page S3351**

Lautenberg (for Moynihan) Amendment No. 244, to strike section 314, Sense of the Senate on Sale of Governors Island. **(See next issue.)**

Domenici (for Collins) Amendment No. 247, to express the sense of the Senate on need-based student financial aid programs. **(See next issue.)**

Rejected:

Kennedy Amendment No. 177, to reduce tax breaks for the wealthiest taxpayers and reserve the savings for Medicare. (By 53 yeas to 46 nays (Vote No. 66), Senate tabled the amendment.) **Pages S3321–31, S3353–54**

Voinovich Amendment No. 161, to use on-budget surplus to repay the debt instead of tax cuts. (By 67 yeas to 32 nays (Vote No. 71), Senate tabled the amendment.) **(See next issue.)**

Robb/Graham Amendment No. 182, to ensure fiscal discipline by requiring that any tax relief be offset in accordance with current budget rules and practices, and that any surpluses be used for debt reduction, until Congress saves Social Security and strengthens Medicare and pays off the publicly held debt. **Pages S3351–52**

Lautenberg (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 192, to fully fund the Class Size Initiative and the Individuals with Disabilities Act with mandatory funds, the amendment reduces the resolution's tax cut by one fifth, frees up $43 billion in discretionary spending within Function 500 (in 2001–2009) for other important education programs, and leaves adequate room in the revenue reconciliation instructions for targeted tax cuts that help those in need and tax breaks for communities to modernize and rebuild crumbling schools. (By 54 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 72), Senate tabled the amendment.) **Pages S3334–35**

Dorgan Modified Amendment No. 178, to provide for additional agricultural funding. (By 53 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 75), Senate tabled the amendment.) **Pages S3327, S3352, S3363–68**

By 24 yeas to 74 nays (Vote No. 78), Lautenberg (for Hollings) Amendment No. 174, to continue Federal spending at the current services baseline levels and pay down the Federal debt. **Pages S3376–77**

Lautenberg (for Rockefeller) Amendment No. 196, to create a reserve fund for medicare prescription drug benefits. (By 54 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 79), Senate tabled the amendment.) **Page S3336**

Withdrawn:

Lautenberg (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 193, to allocate a portion of the surplus for legislation that promotes early educational development and well-being of children. **Page S3335–36**

Domenici (for Helms) Amendment No. 218, relating to the international affairs budget. **Page S3342–43**

Domenici (for Coverdell) Amendment No. 234, to express the sense of the Senate regarding the need for incentives for low- and middle-income savers and investors and the need for such incentives to be accompanied by an expansion of the lowest personal income tax bracket. **Page S3348–49**

Domenici (for Chafee) Amendment No. 235, to reduce the size of the tax cut. **Page S3349**

Domenici (for Ashcroft) Amendment No. 239, to express the sense of the Senate that the Social Security Trust Fund shall be managed in the best interest of current and future beneficiaries. **Page S3351**

Domenici (for Grassley) Amendment No. 241, to express the sense of the Senate regarding the closure of Howard Air Force Base and repositioning of assets and operational capabilities in forward operating locations. **Page S3351**

Lautenberg Amendment No. 166, to express the sense of the Senate on saving Social Security and Medicare, reducing the public debt, and targeting tax relief to middle-income working families. **(See next issue.)**

Lautenberg (for Biden) Amendment No. 204, to extend the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund. **Page S3339**

Lautenberg (for Schumer) Amendment No. 167, to express the sense of the Senate that the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) Program should be reauthorized in order to provide continued Federal funding for the hiring, deployment, and retention of community law enforcement officers. **(See next issue.)**

Domenici (for Hutchison) Amendment No. 223, to express the sense of the Senate that the Congress should provide the maximum funding envisioned in law for Southwest Border law enforcement programs to stop the flow of drugs into the United States. **Page S3345**

Domenici (for Abraham/Coverdell) Amendment No. 228, to express the sense of Congress on the use of Federal funds for needle exchange programs for drug addicts. **Page S3347**

Lautenberg (for Wyden) Amendment No. 200, to allow increased tobacco tax revenues to be used as an offset for the medicare prescription drug benefit provided for in section 209 (Reserve Fund for Medicare and Prescription Drugs). **Page S3337**

Lautenberg (for Dodd) Amendment No. 201, to fund a 40 percent Federal share for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the amendment reduces the resolution's tax cut by nearly one fifth, frees up $43 billion in discretionary spending within Function 500 (in 2001–2009) for other important education programs, and leaves adequate room in the revenue reconciliation instructions for targeted tax cuts that help those in need and tax breaks for communities to modernize and rebuild crumbling schools. **Page S3338**

Lautenberg (for Harkin) Amendment No. 203, to allow for the creation of a mandatory fund for medical research under the authority of the National Institutes of Health fully funded through a tax provision providing that certain funds provided by tobacco companies to States or local governments in connection with tobacco litigation or settlement shall not be deductible. **Pages S3338–39**

Lautenberg (for Feinstein) Amendment No. 168, to express the sense of the Senate regarding school construction grants, and reducing school sizes and class sizes. **(See next issue.)**

Lautenberg (for Murray) Amendment No.172, to fully fund the Class Size Initiative, the amendment reduces the resolution's tax cut by ten billion dollars, leaving adequate room in the revenue reconciliation instructions for targeted tax cuts that help those in need and tax breaks for communities to modernize and rebuild crumbling schools. **(See next issue.)**

Lautenberg Amendment No. 184, to establish a budget-neutral reserve fund for environmental and natural resources. **Page S3332**

Lautenberg (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 194, to fully fund the Class Size Initiative and the Individuals with Disabilities Act with mandatory funds, the amendment reduces the resolution's tax cut by one fifth, frees up $43 billion in discretionary spending within Function 500 (in 2001–2009) for other important education programs, and leaves adequate room in the revenue reconciliation instructions for targeted tax cuts that help those in need and tax breaks for communities to modernize and rebuild crumbling schools. **Page S3336**

Lautenberg (for Feinstein) Amendment No. 198, to express the sense of the Senate regarding the need for increased funding for the State Criminal Alien Assistance program in fiscal year 2000. **Page S3336**

Domenici (for Coverdell) Amendment No. 233, to protect taxpayers from retroactive income and estate tax rate increases by creating a point of order. **Page S3348**

During consideration of this measure today, the Senate also took the following action:

Three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected motions to waive certain provisions of the Congressional Budget Act with respect to the consideration of the following amendments: **(See next issue.)**

By 47 yeas to 52 nays (Vote No. 64), Specter/Harkin Amendment No. 157, to provide for funding of biomedical research at the National Institutes of Health. **Pages S3310, S3352**

By 49 yeas to 50 nays (Vote No. 69), Reed Amendment No. 162, to provide for certain Federal revenues, total new budget authority, and total budget outlays. **(See next issue.)**

By 52 yeas to 47 nays (Vote No. 70), Craig Amendment No. 146, to modify the pay-as-you-go requirement of the budget process to require that direct spending increases be offset only with direct spending decreases. **Page S3377**

By 42 yeas to 57 nays (Vote No. 73), Crapo/Grams Amendment No. 163, to create a reserve fund to lock in additional non-Social Security surplus in the outyears for tax relief and/or debt reduction. **Page S3379**

By 54 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. 76), Domenici (for Snowe) Amendment No. 232, to allow increased tobacco tax revenues to be used as an offset for the Medicare prescription drug benefit provided for in section 209. **Page S3348**

By 45 yeas to 53 nays (Vote No. 77), Lautenberg (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 195, to express the sense of the Senate concerning an increase in the minimum wage. **Page S3336**

By 45 yeas to 54 nays (Vote No. 80), Lautenberg (for Kerry) Amendment No. 190, to provide for a 1-year delay in a portion of certain tax provisions necessary to avoid future budget deficits. **Pages S3333,–S3374–76**

Subsequently, a point of order that the amendments were in violation of the Congressional Budget Act was sustained, and the amendments thus fell. **(See next issue.)**

Senate insisted on its amendment and requested a conference with the House thereon. **(See next issue.)**

Subsequently, S. Con. Res. 20 was placed back on the Senate calendar. **(See next issue.)**

Senate National Security Working Group: Senate agreed to S. Res. 75, reconstituting the Senate Arms Control Observer Group as the Senate National Security Working Group and revising the authority of the Group. **(See next issue.)**

Microloan Program Technical Corrections Act: Committee on Small Business was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 440, to make technical corrections to the Microloan Program, and the bill was then passed, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **(See next issue.)**

Enzi (for Kerry) Amendment No. 248, to provide for the equitable allocation of appropriated amounts. **(See next issue.)**

SBA Disaster Mitigation Pilot Program: Committee on Small Business was discharged from further consideration of S. 388, to authorize the establishment of a disaster mitigation pilot program in the Small Business Administration, and the bill was then passed. **(See next issue.)**

House Mail Technical Corrections: Committee on Governmental Affairs was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 705, to make technical corrections with respect to the monthly reports submitted by the Postmaster General on official mail of the House of Representatives, and the bill was then passed, clearing the measure for the President. **(See next issue.)**

Aviation War Risk Insurance Program Extension: Committee on Governmental Affairs was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 98, to amend chapter 443 of title 49, United States Code, to extend the aviation war risk insurance program, the bill was then referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and then discharged from further consideration, and the bill was then passed, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **(See next issue.)**

Enzi (for Thompson) Amendment No. 249, to strike section 2 relating to the Centennial of Flight Commemoration Act. **(See next issue.)**

Risk Management Decisions Affecting the 1999 Crop Year: Senate passed S. 756, to provide adversely affected crop producers with additional time to make fully informed risk management decisions for the 1999 crop year. **(See next issue.)**

Crop Revenue Coverage PLUS Supplemental Endorsement: Senate passed H.R. 1212, to protect producers of agricultural commodities who applied for a Crop Revenue Coverage PLUS supplemental endorsement for the 1999 crop year, clearing the measure for the President. **(See next issue.)**

New Mexico Land Conveyance: Senate passed S. 278, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the county of Rio Arriba, New Mexico. **(See next issue.)**

New Mexico Land Conveyance: Senate passed S. 291, to convey certain real property within the Carlsbad Project in New Mexico to the Carlsbad Irrigation District. **(See next issue.)**

Route 66 Resource Protection: Senate passed S. 292, to preserve the cultural resources of the Route 66 corridor and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance. **(See next issue.)**

New Mexico Land Conveyance: Senate passed S. 293, to direct the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to convey certain lands in San Juan County, New Mexico, to San Juan College, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto:

(See next issue.)

Enzi (for Domenici) Amendment No. 250, in the nature of a substitute. **(See next issue.)**

Perkins County Rural Water System Assistance: Senate passed S. 243, to authorize the construction of the Perkins County Rural Water System and authorize financial assistance to the Perkins County Rural Water System, Inc., a nonprofit corporation, in the planning and construction of the water supply system. **(See next issue.)**

Enzi (for Johnson/Daschle) Amendment No. 251, in the nature of a substitute. **(See next issue.)**

FERC License Jurisdiction: Senate passed S. 334, to amend the Federal Power Act to remove the jurisdiction of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to license projects on fresh waters in the State of Hawaii. **(See next issue.)**

Wellton-Mohawk Transfer Act: Senate passed S. 356, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain works, facilities, and titles of the Gila Project, and designated lands within or adjacent to the Gila Project, to the Wellton-Mohawk Irrigation and Drainage District. **(See next issue.)**

National Historic Trail Designation: Senate passed S. 366, to designate El Camino Real de Tierra Adentro as a National Historic Trail, after agreeing to committee amendments. **(See next issue.)**

South Dakota Historic Site: Senate passed S. 382, to establish the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site in the State of South Dakota.

(See next issue.)

Alaska Hydroelectric Project Jurisdiction: Senate passed S. 422, to provide for Alaska state jurisdiction over small hydroelectric projects, after agreeing to a committee amendment. **(See next issue.)**

Coastal Heritage Trail Route Authorization: Senate passed H.R. 171, to authorize appropriations for the Coastal Heritage Trail Route in New Jersey, clearing the measure for the President.

(See next issue.)

Sudbury, Assabet, and Concord Wild and Scenic River Act: Senate passed H.R. 193, to designate a portion of the Sudbury, Assabet, and Concord Rivers as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, clearing the measure for the President. **(See next issue.)**

Treaty Approved: The following treaty having passed through its various parliamentary stages, up to and including the presentation of the resolution of ratification, upon division, two-thirds of the Senators present and having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification was agreed to:

Convention on Nuclear Safety, with six conditions and two understandings. (Treaty Doc. 104–6);

(See next issue.)

Authority for Committees: All committees were authorized to file legislative reports on Friday, March 26, 1999 from 10 a.m. until 11 a.m., and executive and legislative reports on Tuesday, April 6, 1999 from 11 a.m. until 2 p.m. during the adjournment of the Senate. **(See next issue.)**

Nomination-Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached to extend the Governmental Affairs consideration of the nomination of David C. Williams, of Maryland, to be Inspector General for Tax Administration, Department of the Treasury.

(See next issue.)

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

Rose Eilene Gottemoeller, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Non-Proliferation and National Security).

3 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

2 Army nominations in the rank of general.

22 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Army, Marine Corps, Navy. **(See next issue.)**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Johnnie E. Frazier, of Maryland, to be Inspector General, Department of Commerce.

James W. Klein, of the District of Columbia, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia.

Ellen Segal Huvelle, of the District of Columbia, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia.

Barbara M. Lynn, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas.

Marshall S. Smith, of California, to be Deputy Secretary of Education. **(See next issue.)**

Messages From the House: **(See next issue.)**

Communications: **(See next issue.)**

Petitions: **(See next issue.)**

Executive Reports of Committees: **(See next issue.)**

Statements on Introduced Bills: **(See next issue.)**

Additional Cosponsors: **(See next issue.)**

Amendments Submitted: **(See next issue.)**

Notices of Hearings: **(See next issue.)**

Authority for Committees: **(See next issue.)**

Additional Statements: **(See next issue.)**

Text of S. 544 (as passed the Senate on Tuesday, March 23, 1999 and inserted as an amendment to replace the entire text of H.R. 1141, as passed the Senate today.) **(See next issue.)**

Record Votes: Eighteen record votes were taken today. (Total—81). **Pages S3352–54, S3382**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9 a.m. and pursuant to the provisions of S. Con. Res. 23, adjourned at 10:42 p.m., until 12 noon Monday, April 12, 1999. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record, see next issue.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: FCC/SEC

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary concluded hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2000, after receiving testimony in behalf of funds for their respective activities from William E. Kennard, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission; and Arthur Levitt, Chairman, Securities & Exchange Commission.

APPROPRIATIONS: COAST GUARD

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Transportation and Related Agencies concluded hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2000 for the United States Coast Guard, after receiving testimony from Adm. James M. Loy, Commandant, United States Coast Guard, Department of Transportation.

APPROPRIATIONS: TREASURY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Treasury and General Government concluded hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2000 for the Department of the Treasury, after receiving testimony from Robert E. Rubin, Secretary of the Treasury.

TERRORIST ATTACKS AGAINST U.S. CITIZENS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Foreign Operations concluded hearings to examine certain incidents of terrorist attacks against U.S. citizens in Israel, and U.S. efforts to press for the indictment and extradition of terrorists who have taken American lives, after receiving testimony from Mark Richard, Deputy Assistant Attorney General of the Criminal Division, Department of Justice; Martin S. Indyk, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs; Jean-Claude Niddam, Head of the Legal Assistance between Israel and Palestine Authority, Israeli Ministry of Justice; Hasan Abdel Rahman, Chief Representative of the P.L.O. and the P.N.A. to the United States; Nathan Lewin, Miller, Cassidy Larroca, & Lewin, Washington, D.C.; Stephen Flatow, West Orange, New Jersey; Vicki Eisenfeld, West Hartford, Connecticut; and Diana Campuzano, New York, New York.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of Rose Eilene Gottemoeller, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Non-Proliferation and National Security), and 671 military nominations in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force.

Also, Committee approved its rules of procedure for the 106th Congress.

CHINESE ESPIONAGE AT DOE LABORATORIES

Committee on Armed Services: Committee resumed closed hearings to examine alleged Chinese espionage at Department of Energy laboratories, receiving testimony from Edward J. Curran, Director, Office of

Counterintelligence, and Notra Trulock, III, Acting Deputy Director, Office of Intelligence, both of the Department of Energy; Neil J. Gallagher, Assistant Director, National Security Division, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice; and Elizabeth A. Moler, former Deputy Secretary of Energy.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

BANKRUPTCY REFORM

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded hearings on proposed legislation on bankruptcy reform, focusing on financial services, the Bankruptcy Code, Federal Deposit Insurance Act, minimum payment disclosure, credit extensions to college students, debit cards, mortgage and home equity loans, and convenience users, after receiving testimony from Senators Torricelli and Durbin; Representatives Gekas and Boucher; Edward M. Gramlich, Member, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; Douglas H. Jones, Senior Deputy General Counsel, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; Mark McClellan, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Microeconomics Analysis, Office of Economic Policy; Terry McCormick, Plains Bell Federal Credit Union, Amarillo, Texas, on behalf of the Credit Union National Association; Brian L. McDonnell, Navy Federal Credit Union, on behalf of the National Association of Federal Credit Unions, Wright H. Andrews, Jr., Butera and Andrews, on behalf of the National Home Equity Mortgage Association, and David Warren, Morgan Stanley Dean Witter and Company, Inc., on behalf of the Bond Market Association, all of Washington, D.C.; Ronald A. Prill, Retailers National Bank, Dayton Hudson Corporation, Minneapolis, Minnesota; Beth L. Climo, Financial Industry Affairs, New York, New York, on behalf of the American Bankers Association; and Gary Klein, National Consumer Law Center, Boston, Massachusetts.

FHA SINGLE FAMILY INSURANCE FUND

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Subcommittee on Housing and Transportation concluded oversight hearings on challenges facing the Federal Housing Administration Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund, which backs the single family insurance fund, after receiving testimony from William C. Apgar, Assistant Secretary for Housing-Federal Housing Commissioner, Department of Housing and Urban Development; Stanley J. Czerwinski, Associate Director, Housing and Community Development Issues, Resources, Community, and Economic Development Division, General Accounting Office; and Timothy F. Kenny, KPMG, Washington, D.C.

AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL MODERNIZATION

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Aviation concluded hearings on proposed legislation to modernize air traffic control programs, focusing on the National Airspace System, infrastructure, safety features, increasing capacity and efficiency, equipment age and maintenance, Free Flight, Data Link, and year 2000 computer efforts, after receiving testimony from Jane F. Garvey, Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, and Kenneth M. Mead, Inspector General, both of the Department of Transportation; Robert W. Baker, American Airlines, Dallas, Texas; and John E. O'Brien, Air Line Pilots Association, International, Herndon, Virginia.

GRADE CROSSING SAFETY

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine concluded hearings on issues relating to highway-rail grade crossing safety, including the Commercial Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1986, Operation Lifesaver, warning sign improvement, emergency telephone systems, passive crossings, driving behavior, and enforcement, after receiving testimony from James E. Hall, Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board; Jolene M. Molitoris, Administrator, Federal Railroad Administration, and Kenneth R. Wykle, Administrator, Federal Highway Administration, both of the Department of Transportation; Billy Parker, Jacksonville, Florida, on behalf of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, and Gerri L. Hall, Alexandria, Virginia, both of Operation Lifesaver, Incorporated; Charles E. Dettmann, Association of American Railroads, Washington, D.C., and Paul C. Worley, North Carolina Department of Transportation, Raleigh.

INTERNATIONAL SATELLITE REFORM

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Communications concluded hearings on S. 376, to amend the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 to promote competition and privatization in satellite communications, after receiving testimony from Vonya B. McCann, Coordinator for International Communications and Information Policy, Department of State; Roderick Kelvin Porter, Acting Chief, International Bureau, Federal Communications Commission; Betty C. Alewine, COMSAT Corporation, and John Sponyoe, Lockheed Martin Global Telecommunications, both of Bethesda, Maryland; James W. Cuminale, PanAmSat Corporation, Greenwich, Connecticut; and Conny Kullman, INTELSAT, Washington, D.C.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Robert Wayne Gee, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Fossil Energy), and the nomination of Carolyn L. Huntoon, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Environmental Management).

ECONOMIC EFFECTS OF KYOTO PROTOCOL

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded oversight hearings to examine the economic impact of the Kyoto Protocol, which imposes legally binding emissions limits for greenhouse gasses on the industrialized nations, to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, after receiving testimony from Senator Hagel; Janet Yellen, Chair, Council of Economic Advisers; Jay Hakes, Administrator, Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy; Mary H. Novak, WEFA, Inc., Burlington, Massachusetts; and Margo Thorning, American Council for Capital Formation, and Cecil E. Roberts, United Mine Workers of America, both of Washington, D.C.

U.S.-TAIWAN RELATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded hearings on issues relating to United States-Taiwan relations, including the twentieth anniversary of Taiwan Relations Act, Taiwan Strait security, defense assistance, the engagement strategy with China, free market economy, and protecting U.S. interests, after receiving testimony from Senator Murkowski; Franklin D. Kramer, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs; Stanley O. Roth, Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs; Harvey J. Feldman, Heritage Foundation Asia Studies Center, Arlington, Virginia; and Carl W. Ford, Jr., Ford and Associates, and David M. Lampton, Johns Hopkins University Nitze School of Advanced International Studies, both of Washington, D.C.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

Committee on Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, Restructuring, and the District of Columbia held oversight hearings to examine multiple program coordination in early childhood education, focusing on the Results Act 1993, which requires executive agencies, in consultation with the Congress and other stakeholders, to prepare strategic five-year plans, receiving testimony from Marnie S. Shaul, Associate Director, Education, Workforce, and Income Security Issues, Health, Education, and Human Services Division, General Accounting Office, who was accompanied by several of her associates.

Hearings recessed subject to call.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 461, to assure that innocent users and businesses gain access to solutions to the year 2000 problem-related failures through fostering an incentive to settle year 2000 lawsuits that may disrupt significant sectors of the American economy, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

The nominations of William J. Hibbler, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois, Matthew F. Kennelly, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois, Carl Schnee, to be United States Attorney for the District of Delaware, and Thomas Lee Strickland, to be United States Attorney for the District of Colorado.

JUSTICE BUDGET

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Youth Violence concluded hearings on the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2000 for the Office of Justice Programs and funding for state and local law enforcement, focusing on Juvenile Justice Accountability Incentive Block Grant, the Local Law Enforcement Block Grant, and the Truth in Sentencing/Violent Offender Incarceration, after receiving testimony from Laurie Robinson, Assistant Attorney General, Office of Justice Programs, Department of Justice; John H. Wilson, Montgomery Police Department, Montgomery, Alabama; Chet W. Vahle, Illinois Juvenile Court, Quincy, on behalf of the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges; Patricia L. West, Virginia Beach Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court, Virginia Beach, Virginia; and Harry L. Shorstein, Fourth Judicial Circuit Court, Jacksonville, Florida.

BIOTERRORISM

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Subcommittee on Public Health concluded hearings on issues relating to bioterrorism, including United States public health and medical readiness, biological terrorism deterrence, outbreak containment and investigation, national pharmaceutical stockpile, and research and development, after receiving testimony from Margaret A. Hamburg, Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, Jeffrey P. Koplan, Director, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and William E. Clark, Deputy Director, Office of Emergency Preparedness, all of the Department of Health and Human Services; Donald A. Henderson, Johns Hopkins University School of Hygiene and Public Health, Richard L. Alcorta, Maryland Institute for Emergency Medical Services Systems, and John G.

Bartlett, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, on behalf of the Infectious Diseases Society of America, all of Baltimore, Maryland; Stephanie B.C. Bailey, Metropolitan Health Department, Nashville, Tennessee, on behalf of the National Association of County and City Health Officials; Jerome M. Hauer, Mayor's Office of Emergency Management, New York, New York; and Michael T. Osterholm, Infection Control Advisory Network, Inc., Eden Prairie, Minnesota, on behalf of the Council of State and Territorial Epidemiologists, and the Association of Public Health Laboratories.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed sessions on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 82 public bills, H.R. 1281–1362; and 5 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 78–80 and H. Res. 133–34 were introduced. **Pages H1779–H1803**

Reports Filed: No reports were filed today.

Concurrent Budget Resolution: The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 68, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2009 by a yea and nay vote of 221 yeas to 208 nays, Roll No. 77. **Pages H1711–80**

Amendments Rejected:

The Coburn amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order by the rule and printed in House Report 106–77 that sought to substitute the President's completed budget proposal as scored by CBO (rejected by a recorded vote of 2 ayes to 426 noes with 1 voting "present," Roll No. 74; **Pages H1747–56**

The Minge amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order by the rule and printed in House Report 106–77 that sought to reserve 100% of the Social Security surplus for Social Security, and devote one-half of the expected on-budget surplus to debt reduction, 25% for tax cuts, and the remaining 25% for investments in priority programs (rejected by a recorded vote of 134 ayes to 295 noes, Roll No. 75); and **Pages H1756–66**

The Spratt amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order by the rule and printed in House Report 106–77 that sought to make tax cuts or spending initiatives contingent on legislation addressing the solvency of Medicare and Social Security; protect 100% of the Social Security surplus; require Treasury to apply 100% of the surplus to the repurchase of government bonds held by the public and transfer that debt reduction to Medicare part A and Social Security trust funds (rejected by a recorded vote of 173 ayes to 250 noes, Roll No. 76). **Pages H1766–78**

The House agreed to H. Res. 131, the rule that provided for consideration of the bill by a recorded vote of 228 ayes to 194 noes, Roll No. 73. **Pages H1699–H1710**

Earlier, agreed to order the previous question by a yea and nay vote of 224 ayes to 203 nays, Roll No. 72. **Pages H1709–10**

Pursuant to the rule, the Kasich amendment, printed in House Report 106–77, that makes technical changes, adds a sense of the Congress on child nutrition, increases defense outlays in FY 2000 by $2 billion, and requires CBO to consult with Social Security trustees when re-estimating the Social Security surplus was considered as adopted. **Page H1742**

Late Report: The Committee on Commerce received permission to have until midnight on April 9 to file a report on H.R. 851, to require the Federal Communications Commission to establish improved predictive models for determining the availability of television broadcast signals. **Page H1781**

Spring District Work Period: The House agreed to S. Con. Res. 23, providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and the House of Representatives. **Page H1781**

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Morella or, if not available, Representative Wolf to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through April 12, 1999. **Page H1781**

Joint Economic Committee: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of Representatives Stark, Maloney of New York, Minge, and Watt of North Carolina to the Joint Economic Committee. **Page H1781**

Resignations-Appointments: Agreed that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Monday, April 12, 1999, the Speaker, Majority Leader, and Minority Leader be authorized to accept resignations and to make appointments authorized by law or by the House. **Page H1782**

Calendar Wednesday: Agreed that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, April 14, 1999.

Page H1782

Senate Messages: Messages received from the Senate today appear on pages H1699 amd H1780.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea and nay votes and four recorded votes developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H1709–10, H1710, H1755–56, H1765–66, H1778, and H1780. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10:00 a.m. and pursuant to the provisions of S. Con. Res. 23, adjourned at 8:29 p.m. until 12:30 p.m. on Monday, April 12, for morning-hour debates.

Committee Meetings

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, STATE AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary held a hearing on SBA and on Drug Enforcement Programs. Testimony was heard from Aida Alvarez, Administrator, SBA; and the following officials of the Department of Justice: Thomas Constantine, Administrator, DEA; James Robinson, Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division; and Donna Bucella, Director, Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys.

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense continued appropriation hearings. Testimony was heard from Members of Congress and public witnesses.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development held a hearing on the Bureau of Reclamation. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of the Interior: Bruce Babbitt, Secretary; Patricia Beneke, Assistant Secretary, Water and Science; and Eluid Martinez, Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Foreign Operations held a hearing on AID Administrator. Testimony was heard from Brian Atwood, Administrator, AID, U.S. International Development Cooperation Agency.

INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior held a hearing on Department of Energy: Conservation. Testimony was heard from Dan Reicher, Assistant Secretary, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy.

LABOR-HHS-EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education held a hearing on the National Council on Disability; the National Commission on Libraries; the Armed Forces Retirement Home, the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission and the NLRB. Testimony was heard from Audrey McCrimon, Chairperson, Committee on Finance, National Council on Disability; Jeanne Hurley Simon, Chairperson, National Commission on Libraries; David F. Lacy, Chief Executive Officer/Chairman of the Board, Armed Forces Retirement Home; Gail Wilensky, Chairperson, Medicare Payments Advisory Commission; and John C. Truesdale, Chairman, NLRB.

TREASURY-POSTAL SERVICE APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government, on Office of National Drug Control Policy. Testimony was heard from Gen. Barry McCaffrey, Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy; Alan I. Leshner, Director, National Institute on Drug Abuse, NIH, Department of Health and Human Services; and public witness.

VA-HUD-INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies held a hearing on Corporation for National and Community Service. Testimony was heard from Harris Wofford, CEO, Corporation for National and Community Service.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION

Committee on Armed Services: Continued hearings on the fiscal year 2000 National Defense authorization budget request. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: Louis Caldera, Secretary of the Army; Richard Danzig, Secretary of the Navy; and F. Whitten Peters, Acting Secretary of the Air Force.

TECHNOLOGY AND BANKING

Committee on Banking and Financial Services: Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Securities, and Government Sponsored Enterprises held a hearing on Technology and Banking. Testimony was heard from Brooksley Born, Chair, Commodity Futures Trading Commission; Laura Unger, Commissioner, SEC; James Kamihachi, Senior Deputy Comptroller, Economic and Policy Analysis, Department of the Treasury; Arthur Murton, Director, Division of Insurance, FDIC; and public witnesses.

ROSA PARKS GOLD MEDAL AWARD

Committee on Banking and Financial Services: Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy approved for full Committee action H.R. 573, to authorize the President to award a gold medal on

behalf of the Congress to Rosa Parks in recognition of her contributions to the Nation.

SATELLITE COMPETITION AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

Committee on Commerce: Ordered reported amended H.R. 851, Satellite Competition and Consumer Protection Act.

JUVENILE CRIME CONTROL AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ACT

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth, and Families held a hearing on H.R. 1150, Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1999. Testimony was heard from Patricia Mantoya, Commissioner, Administration on Children, Youth, and Families, Department of Health and Human Services; and Shay Bilchik, Administrator, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Judicial Programs, Department of Justice.

EXPANDING AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on Employer-Employee Relations held a hearing on Expanding Affordable Health Care Coverage: Benefits and Consequences of Association Health Plans. Testimony was heard from Steven B. Larsen, Commissioner of Insurance, State of Maryland; and public witnesses.

LATEX ALLERGIES AND THE HEALTHCARE INDUSTRY

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing on Latex Allergies and the Healthcare Industry: Do OSHA's Actions Confuse or Clarify? Testimony was heard from Angela Presson, M.D., Medical Officer, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Department of Labor; Elizabeth D. Jacobson, M.D., Acting Director, Center for Devices and Radiological Health, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services; and public witnesses.

DIETARY SUPPLEMENT HEALTH AND EDUCATION ACT

Committee on Government Reform: Held a hearing on "Dietary Supplement Health and Education Act: Is the FDA Trying to Change the Intent of Congress?" Testimony was heard from Jane E. Henney, Commissioner, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services; and public witnesses.

TRADE DEFICIT

Committee on Government Reform: Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources held a hearing on "A Record Trade Deficit: How Can the U.S. Government Prevent a Looming Trade Crisis?" Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Commerce: Michael J. Copps, Assistant Secretary, Trade Development; and Johnnie E. Frazier, Acting Inspector General; and public witnesses.

U.S. CAPITOL POLICE MANAGEMENT

Committee on House Administration: Held a hearing on United States Capitol Police Management. Testimony was heard from Robert W. Gramling, Director, Corporate Audits and Standards, Accounting and Information Management Division, GAO; James W. Zigler, Chairman, U.S. Capitol Police; Alan M. Hantman, Architect of the Capitol; Wilson Livingood, Sergeant at Arms, House of Representatives; Gary L. Albrecht, Chief of Police; and a public witness.

RUSSIAN FOREIGN POLICY

Committee on International Relations: Held a hearing on Russian Foreign Policy: Proliferation to Rogue Regimes. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

RESOLUTION CONDEMNING MURDER OF A HUMAN RIGHTS LAWYER

Committee on International Relations: Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights approved for full Committee action H. Res. 128, condemning the murder of human rights lawyer Rosemary Nelson and calling for the protection of defense attorneys in Northern Ireland.

BANKRUPTCY REFORM ACT

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law approved for full Committee action amended H.R. 833, Bankruptcy Reform Act of 1999.

OVERSIGHT—PATENT REFORM; PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property held an oversight hearing on Patent Reform and a hearing on the Patent and Trademark Office Reauthorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000. Testimony was heard from Representatives Rohrabacher and Campbell; Todd Dickinson, Acting Assistant Secretary and Acting Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce; and public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT—BENEFITS OF A MORE EDUCATED WORKFORCE

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims held an oversight hearing on the benefits to the American Economy of a more educated workforce. Testimony was heard from the following Senior Legal Specialists, Directorate of Legal Research, Western Law Division, Library of Congress: Kersi Shroff and Stephen Clarke; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Science: Ordered reported amended the following bills: H.R. 209, Technology Transfer Commercialization Act of 1999; H.R. 1184, Earthquake Hazards Reduction Authorization Act of

1999; and H.R. 1183, Fastener Quality Act Amendments of 1999.

The Committee also approved its Oversight Agenda for the 106th Congress.

WOMEN'S BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Government Programs and Oversight held a hearing on women's business enterprises. Testimony was heard from Representatives Kelly and Dunn; and public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT—OFFICE OF MOTOR CARRIERS

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Ground Transportation held an oversight hearing on the Office of Motor Carriers. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT—VETERANS BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Benefits held an oversight hearing on the Veterans Benefits Administration. Testimony was heard from Joseph Thompson, Under Secretary, Benefits, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; Cynthia A. Bascetta, Associate Director, VA and Military Health Care, GAO; and representatives of veterans organizations.

DVA'S MANAGEMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION ACT PROGRAM

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing to examine the Department of Veterans Affairs management of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act program. Testimony was heard from Shelby Hallmark, Deputy Director, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, Department of Labor; and the following officials of the Department of Veterans Affairs: Richard J. Griffin, Inspector General; Ronald E. Cowles, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Human Resources Management; John Hancock, Director, Occupational Health and Safety Staff, Office of Administration; Fred Malphus, Director, Veterans Integrated Service Network 2; and Smith Jenkins, Jr., Director, Veterans Integrated Service Network 22.

SOCIAL SECURITY'S GOALS AND CRITERIA FOR ASSESSING REFORM

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Social Security held a hearing on Social Security's Goals and Criteria for Assessing Reforms. Testimony was heard from David M. Walker, Comptroller General, GAO; Stephen C. Goss, Deputy Chief Actuary for Long-Range Actuarial Estimates, SSA; and public witnesses.

BUDGET: ALL-SOURCE ANALYSIS

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Met in executive session to hold a hearing on Fiscal Year 2000 Budget: All-Source Analysis. Testimony was heard from departmental witnesses.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, *p. D284)*

S.447, to amend as timely filed, and process payment, the applications submitted by the Dodson School Districts for certain Impact Aid payments for fiscal year 1999. Signed March 23, 1999. (P.L. 106–3)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, MARCH 26, 1999

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Interior, on Indian Health Service, 10 a.m., B–308 Rayburn.

Committee on Commerce,, Subcommittee on Energy and Power, hearing on The Iraqi Oil for Food Program and Its Impact, 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform, Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology, hearing on "Oversight of Financial Management Practices at the Health Care Financing Administration", 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of March 29 through April 3, 1999

Senate Chamber

Senate will be in adjournment until Monday, April 12, 1999.

Senate Committees

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House Committees

Committee on Government Reform, March 31, Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology, hearing on "Can the Federal Government Balance Its Books? A Review of the Federal Consolidated Financial Statements", 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

12 noon, Monday, April 12

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 2 p.m.), Senate could begin consideration of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Conference Report and the Congressional Budget Conference Report, if available.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12:30 p.m., Monday, April 12

House Chamber

Program for Monday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Camp, Dave, Mich., E563
Condit, Gary A., Calif., E559
Crane, Philip M., Ill., E558, E561
Davis, Thomas M., Va., E563
Ford, Harold E., Tenn., E558, E561
Horn, Stephen, Calif., E557
Kildee, Dale E., Mich., E560
Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, E557, E561
Kuykendall, Steven T., Calif., E562
Lewis, Jerry, Calif., E559, E562
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E558, E562
Paul, Ron, Tex., E560
Pelosi, Nancy, Calif., E557, E561
Slaughter, Louise McIntosh, N.Y., E560, E562
Stark, Fortney Pete, Calif., E563
Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E559

Congressional Record The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶Public access to the Congressional Record is available online through *GPO Access,* a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the Congressional Record is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available on the Wide Area Information Server (WAIS) through the Internet and via asynchronous dial-in. Internet users can access the database by using the World Wide Web; the Superintendent of Documents home page address is http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs, by using local WAIS client software or by telnet to swais.access.gpo.gov, then login as guest (no password required). Dial-in users should use communications software and modem to call (202) 512–1661; type swais, then login as guest (no password required). For general information about *GPO Access,* contact the *GPO Access* User Support Team by sending Internet e-mail to gpoaccess@gpo.gov, or a fax to (202) 512–1262; or by calling Toll Free 1–888–293–6498 or (202) 512–1530 between 7 a.m. and 5 p.m. Eastern time, Monday through Friday, except for Federal holidays. ¶The Congressional Record paper and 24x microfiche will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $165.00 for six months, $325.00 per year, or purchased for $2.75 per issue, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $141.00 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly Congressional Record Index may be purchased for the same per issue prices. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to (202) 512–1800, or fax to (202) 512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.