

TABLE 3.—MAIN SUBJECT OF INVESTIGATION—Continued

Subject	N=314	
	Number of investigations	Percent
Unknown gun show source	18	5.7

Note.—Overall, 46.2 percent of the investigations involved a felon associated with selling or purchasing firearms. This percentage was derived from aggregate investigations in which trafficked firearms were recovered from felons; unlicensed dealers' criminal histories included felony convictions; felons had purchased firearms at gun shows, and a licensed dealer had a convicted felon as an associate. When only a licensed dealer was the main subject of the investigation, a convicted felon was involved in 6.8 percent (5 of 73) of the investigations as an associate in the trafficking of firearms. When the investigation involved an unlicensed dealer or a former FFL, 25.3 percent (43 of 170) of the investigations revealed that he/she had at least one prior felony conviction.

TABLE 4.—FIREARMS ASSOCIATED WITH GUN SHOW INVESTIGATIONS KNOWN TO HAVE BEEN INVOLVED IN SUBSEQUENT CRIMES

[34.4 percent of the investigations (108 of 314) had at least one firearm recovered in crime]

Crime	N=108	
	Number ¹	Percent
Drug offense	48	44.4
Felon in possession	33	30.6
Crime of violence	47	43.5
Homicide	26	24.1
Assault	30	27.8
Robbery	20	18.5
Property crime (burglary, B&E)	16	14.8
Criminal possession (not felon in poss.)	15	13.9
Juvenile possession	13	12.0

¹ Number of investigations with at least one category.
Note.—Since firearms recovered in an investigation may be used in many different types of crime, an investigation can be included in more than one category.

TABLE 5.—NUMBER OF FIREARMS RECORDED IN GUN SHOW INVESTIGATIONS

Number of firearms	N=314	
	Number of investigations	Percent
Less than 5	70	22.3
5 to 10	37	11.8
11 to 20	22	7.0
21 to 50	47	15.0
51 to 100	47	15.0
101 to 250	31	9.9
251 or greater	30	9.6
Unknown	30	9.6

Note.—For further details about this information, see the Methodology section of this report.

TABLE 6.—NEW, USED AND STOLEN GUNS KNOWN TO BE INVOLVED IN GUN SHOW INVESTIGATIONS

Type of firearm	N=314	
	Number of investigations	Percent
Used firearms	167	53.2
New firearms	156	49.7
Stolen firearms	35	11.1
unknown	75	23.9
MUTUALLY EXCLUSIVE CATEGORIES		
New firearms and used firearms	80	25.5
Used firearms only	62	19.7
New firearms only	61	19.4
Used firearms and stolen firearms	13	4.1
New firearms, used firearms, and stolen firearms	12	3.8
Stolen firearms only	7	2.2
New firearms and stolen firearms	3	0.9
unknown	75	23.9

Note.—Since more than one type of firearm can be recovered in an investigation, an investigation can be included in more than one category.

TABLE 7.—VIOLATIONS IN THE MAIN INVESTIGATIONS

Violation	N=314	
	Number of investigations	Percent
Engaging in the business of dealing without license	169	53.8
Possession and receipt of firearm by convicted felon	76	24.2
Illegal sales and/or possession of NFA weapons	62	19.7
Licensee failure to keep required records	60	19.1
Providing false information to receive firearms	54	17.2
Transfer of firearm to prohibited person	46	14.6

TABLE 7.—VIOLATIONS IN THE MAIN INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

Violation	N=314	
	Number of investigations	Percent
Straw purchasing	36	11.5
False entries/fraudulent statements in license records	27	8.6
Illegal transfer of firearms to resident of another State by nonlicensee	27	8.6
Illegal transfer of firearms to resident of another State by licensee	21	6.7
Receipt and sale of stolen firearms	15	5.8
Obliterating firearms serial numbers	14	4.5
Drug trafficking	11	3.5
Trafficking of firearms by licensee (unspecified violation)	9	2.9
Transfer of firearm in violation of 5-day waiting period	7	2.2
Illegal out of state sales by nonlicensee	7	2.2
Licensee doing business away from business premises	5	1.6
Illegal manufacture and transfer of assault weapon	3	1.0
Sales by a prohibited person	2	0.6
Forgery or check fraud to obtain firearms	2	0.6

Note.—Since an investigation may involve multiple violations, an investigation can be included in more than one category.

TABLE 8.—WEAPONS ASSOCIATED WITH NFA VIOLATIONS IN GUN SHOW INVESTIGATIONS

NFA violation	N=62	
	Number ¹	Percent
Machine guns	33	53.2
Converted guns	19	30.6
Silencers	9	14.5
Explosives (e.g., grenades)	8	12.9
Grenade launchers	7	11.3
Conversion kits/parts	7	11.3
Other (short barrel)	5	8.1

¹ Number of NFA investigations with at least one category.
Note.—Since investigations may involve different types of NFA violations, an investigation can be included in more than one category. However, "converted guns" have not been included in the "machinegun" count.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The time of the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) has expired.

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

There was no objection.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY).

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

TAXPAYER REFUND AND RELIEF ACT OF 1999—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith without my approval H.R. 2488, the "Taxpayer Refund and Relief Act of 1999," because it ignores the principles that have led us to the sound economy we enjoy today and emphasizes tax reduction for those who need it the least.

We have a strong economy because my Administration and the Congress have followed the proper economic course over the past 6 years. We have focused on reducing deficits, paying down debt held by the public, bringing down interest rates, investing in our people, and opening markets. There is \$1.7 trillion less debt held by the public today than was forecast in 1993. This has contributed to lower interest rates, record business investment, greater productivity growth, low inflation, low unemployment, and broad-based growth in real wages—and the first back-to-back budget surpluses in almost half a century.

This legislation would reverse the fiscal discipline that has helped make the American economy the strongest it has been in generations. By using projected surpluses to provide a risky tax cut, H.R. 2488 could lead to higher interest rates, thereby undercutting any benefits for most Americans by increasing home mortgage payments, car loan payments, and credit card rates. We must put first things first, pay down publicly held debt, and address the long-term solvency of Medicare and Social Security. My Mid-Session Review of the Budget presented a framework in which we could accomplish all of these things and also provide an affordable tax cut.

The magnitude of the tax cuts in H.R. 2488 and the associated debt service costs would be virtually as great as all of the on-budget surpluses the Congressional Budget Office projects for the next 10 years. This would leave virtually none of the projected on-budget surplus available for addressing the long-term solvency of Medicare, which is currently projected by its Trustees to be insolvent by 2015, or of Social Security, which then will be in a negative cash-flow position, or for critical funding for priorities like national security, education, health care, law enforcement, science and technology, the environment, and veterans' programs.

The bill would cause the Nation to forgo the unique opportunity to eliminate completely the burden of the debt held by the public by 2015 as proposed by my Administration's Mid-Session Review. The elimination of this debt would have a beneficial effect on interest rates, investment, and the growth of the economy. Moreover, paying down debt is tantamount to cutting taxes. Each one-percentage point decline in interest rates would mean a cut of \$200 billion to \$250 billion in mortgage costs borne by American consumers over the next 10 years. Also, if we do not erase the debt held by the public, our children and grandchildren will have to pay higher taxes to offset the higher Federal interest costs on this debt.

Budget projections are inherently uncertain. For example, the Congressional Budget Office found that, over the last 11 years, estimates of annual deficits or surpluses 5 years into the future erred by an average of 13 percent

of annual outlays—a rate that in 2004 would translate into an error of about \$250 billion. Projections of budget surpluses 10 years into the future are surely even more uncertain. The prudent course in the face of these uncertainties is to avoid making financial commitments—such as massive tax cuts—that will be very difficult to reverse.

The bill relies on an implausible legislative assumption that many of its major provisions expire after 9 years and all of the provisions are repealed after 10 years. This scenario would create uncertainty and confusion for taxpayers, and it is highly unlikely that it would ever be implemented. Moreover, this artifice causes estimated 10-year costs to be understated by about \$100 billion, at the same time that it sweeps under the rug the exploding costs beyond the budget window. If the tax cut were continued, its budgetary impact would grow even more severe, reaching about \$2.7 trillion between 2010 and 2019, just at the time when the baby boomers begin to retire, Medicare becomes insolvent, and Social Security comes under strain. If the bill were to become law, it would leave America permanently in debt. The bill as a whole would disproportionately benefit the wealthiest Americans by, for example, lowering capital gains rates, repealing the estate and gift tax, increasing maximum IRA and retirement plan contribution limits, and weakening pension anti-discrimination protections for moderate- and lower-income workers.

The bill would not meet the Budget Act's existing pay-as-you-go requirements which have helped provide the discipline necessary to bring us from an era of large and growing budget deficits to the potential for substantial surpluses. It would also automatically trigger across-the-board cuts (or sequesters) in a number of Federal programs. These cuts would result in a reduction of more than \$40 billion in the Medicare program over the next 5 years. Starting in 2002, they would also lead to the elimination of numerous programs with broad support, including: crop insurance, without which most farmers and ranchers could not secure the financing from banks needed to operate their farms and ranches; veterans readjustment benefits, denying education and training to more than 450,000 veterans, reservists, and dependents; Federal support for programs such as child care for low-income families and Meals on Wheels for senior citizens; and many others.

As I have repeatedly stressed, I want to find common ground with the Congress on a fiscal plan that will best serve the American people. I have profound differences, however, with the extreme approach that the Republican majority has adopted. It would provide a tax cut for the wealthiest Americans and would hurt average Americans by denying them the benefits of debt reduction and depriving them of the certainty that my proposals for Medicare

and Social Security solvency would provide as they plan for their retirement.

I hope to work with Members of Congress to find a common path to honor our commitment to senior citizens, help working families with targeted tax relief for moderate- and lower-income workers, provide a better life for our children, and improve the standard of living of all Americans.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 23, 1999.*

□ 1715

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the message and bill will be printed as a House document.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ARCHER

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message, together with the accompanying bill, be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking minority member, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just listened to the veto message that has been read to the House; and I am stunned by the hyperbolic rhetoric and failure to relate to the facts of the situation. And I use the word stunned advisedly.

Simply translated, the President's message means I know better how to spend the money than you do. He said that in Buffalo, New York, the day after his State of the Union address this year when he commented to an assemblage of roughly 20,000 people: Now we have this interesting new situation of a surplus. What should we do with it? Well, one alternative would be to give the money back to you. But who would know if you would spend it right? That is quote/unquote from the President of the United States.

All of the verbiage that we heard in the veto message is simply cover to keep the money in Washington because he believes that Washington knows best how to spend the people's money.

He vetoed this tax relief plan today, a plan which would downsize the power of Washington and upsize the power of people. He vetoed a plan that protects Social Security and Medicare; pays down the debt by \$2 trillion; improves education and gives taxpayers only a small portion of their money back.

Make no mistake, it is their money; not ours. We did not earn it here in Washington. In doing so, the President said no to new school construction. He said no to helping parents save for their children's education. He said no to marriage penalty relief for 42 million married Americans. He hurt baby-boomers who are saving for their retirement by blocking IRA expansions. By his veto, he has prolonged the confiscatory, unfair death tax.

He has made it especially tough on those caring for elderly relatives in their own homes who would get tax relief, by blocking health and long-term care tax relief for all American citizens. Since the President has vetoed this tax relief plan and said no to the American people, I challenge him to say no also to the special interests in Washington who cannot wait to get their hands on the people's money.

I have always said that if we do not get this tax overcharge out of Washington, Washington will most surely spend it; and now we are going to find out if I am right.

In fact, today I ask the American people to watch very closely what happens to their money over the next 60 days. What will happen to the projected \$14.5 billion surplus in the general treasury next year? And that is the non-Social Security surplus. Unfortunately, my guess is that Washington will spend the people's tax dollars like some Hollywood movie star on a Rodeo Drive spending spree, but unlike the movie stars who use their own money Washington will be using your credit card, your checkbook and your wallet, and, worse still, your Social Security money.

After this spending spree, Americans should ask themselves if they are happy with the way it was spent. Do they think the money was spent wisely or would they rather have had that extra \$1,000 a year in their own family budget? Because in the end, that is what this debate is all about. Do the people trust Washington to know better how to spend their money as the President says, or do they feel that they know best how to spend the money in their own budgets?

Do they want their excess money going for \$200 hammers or do they want it to go to their children's education and their own IRAs? We all know the answer to those questions, so I again ask the President to join with us and find a way to return this tax overcharge to the workers of the country.

President Clinton has once again put the needs of Washington above the needs of the American people, and I think that is sad. I think this is a sad moment for this country.

Republicans believe strongly that refunding excess tax dollars to American families and workers is a matter of principle. Taxes are too high. Government does not need all of the money that is coming in to pay government's bills, and the taxpayers should get a refund. Since President Clinton killed this reasonable tax relief plan, he has given himself a license to spend; and spend he will. Americans should know that the big blank check in Washington is drawn on their own checkbook, is coming out of their family's budget, is coming out of their opportunity to see investment to create better jobs; and they will get stuck with the bill.

I will fight the brewing explosion of government spending and instead use

every chance available to cut taxes and create more opportunity for all Americans, because I continue to put my faith and trust in the hard work and values of the American people, and I believe that they know best how to spend their own hard-earned dollars.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has the right and obligation to veto any bill that an abusive Congress sends to his desk if he or she believes that the bill, the legislation, is not in the interest of the American people.

The President of the United States has reviewed this piece of Republican legislation and has vetoed the bill.

Now, the Congress on the other hand, has the opportunity to override the veto. All they have to do is to indicate that they think the President is wrong and then ask for a vote and override the veto.

Now, the Republican majority obviously do not want a vote to override the veto. They would like to make a comment or two but they want to avoid having a debate on the floor and exercising their constitutional right to say that the President is wrong.

Now, why would they use this political or legislative tactic? One, it could be that they believe the President is right and they do not want a vote on this because they have changed their mind. They recognize the legislation was abusive. They went home. They tried to sell it to the American people, and the American people said they do not want it.

Or maybe it is two. Maybe they just counted the votes, and they found out that all of the Republicans really do not believe in this political rhetoric, so they do not have the votes to override the President. Maybe that is one of the reasons why they are not exercising their constitutional right.

Mr. Speaker, I really think that the reason that they do not want the override is because they never intended to have a legislative package. Why would they have worked so hard in the vineyards for a whole day among just Republicans in putting together this enormous \$792 billion tax cut and not send it to the President? Why did they carry this bill throughout the hills and valleys of their congressional districts to try to sell this political document?

What they were saying is, we cannot vote for anything in the Congress. We do not have the ability to get a bill out for Social Security. We cannot get a bill out for Medicare, not for prescription drugs, not for patients' rights, not for school construction, not for gun safety. Listen, we just do not know how to shoot straight. But there is one thing we can say that we want to do and that is reduce your taxes. So, Mr. President, please veto the bill so that we can go home and say that you were the one that knocked down the Christ-

mas tree that we put together in the House Republican leadership and the Senate Republican leadership.

□ 1730

All I am saying is this: Either you believe in the President by not wanting to override the veto, either you do not have the votes to override the veto, or either you do not believe in this document that you put together anyway.

Meanwhile, we will await to see what you want to do. We are here, and we are not in the majority; and we laud your efforts to attempt to convince the American people that you are right. But believe me, the American people want legislation, they want it on the floor, and they want votes. If you do not like what the President did, for God's sake, show it, and let us get a vote and let us try to override. If you do like what he has done, but you do not have the guts to say that he has it right, sit there, let the hour pass, and then we will move on to something else. I hope it is Social Security. I hope it is Medicare. I hope it is prescription drugs, but then again, I hope for too much from the majority party.

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

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the committee, and I thank the ranking member for offering a very interesting illustration: When one cannot talk facts and policy, let us return to process, and I welcome that attempt at rhetorical subterfuge.

I would say to the gentleman from New York, and to my colleagues on the left, we stand ready. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I would remind this House that we have reserved H.R. 1 for a plan from the President of the United States to help save and strengthen Social Security, but a funny thing, and really a tragic thing, has happened down Pennsylvania Avenue.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to remind this House that aside from certain budgetary measures required under the Budget Act, this administration has failed to send up any of its proposals in legislative language since the attempt to socialize medicine. Perhaps that is the reason why they have never sent anything back to us in detail.

So let me say to my colleague, in the best spirit of bipartisanship, we welcome you putting your plans on the table. We encourage you, as did our Democratic colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) to then Under Secretary of the Treasury Larry Summers, to have the President bring forth his plan to save Social Security; not rhetoric from the rostrum in a State of the Union message, but a true legislative plan.

So let me first respond to that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me explain why I must object in the strongest

terms possible to the veto of our tax relief and tax fairness legislation by the President of the United States. First, Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House and every American should know that in wielding his veto pen, President Clinton today extinguished the hopes and dreams of small business owners for quality health insurance for themselves and their employees in terms of 100 percent tax deductibility. Had this President signed the legislation into law, that would have taken effect. The President said no. And in essence, I say to my colleagues, what transpired, not content with the largest tax increase in American history foisted upon the American people in the 103d Congress when those who would claim to be such intrepid policymakers on this floor, gave us the largest tax increase in American history. Not content with that, today the President of the United States has, in essence, raised our taxes in excess of \$790 billion over the next 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, he said "yes" to a tax increase, "no" to health care deductibility for small business. He said "yes" to a tax increase, "no" to reducing the marriage penalty. He said "yes" to a tax increase and more spending, and "no" to an end to the death tax. He said "yes" to a tax increase and "no" to families who sought tax relief to care for an elderly member of the family in their home. He said "yes" to higher taxes, and he said "no" to the American people.

No, you should be punished for succeeding, for investing. How dare we reduce the rate of capital gains taxation, even though a noted Democratic President earlier in this century said that a rising tide lifts all boats in terms of tax relief. This President said no to the American people. He said no to the people of rural America and the inner city.

Mr. Speaker, he said "no" to the people of the inner city, with our American renewal package, incidentally, a bipartisan piece of legislation in stand-alone form that curiously was opposed once it became part of this overall plan.

The bottom line is, the President of the United States has again said "no" to the American people, "no" to their hopes and dreams and aspirations, and a resounding "yes" to what is, sadly, flawed logic.

There are many honest disagreements we have in this chamber, and I delight and revel in the fact that as free people, we have a chance to continue to thoughtfully debate the different philosophical dispensations we may have.

But one thing that cannot seem to be accepted as fact by the liberal minority on the Hill or by the President of the United States is the notion that the money belongs to the people who earn it, not to the Government itself, not to the Washington bureaucrats. The money belongs to the people. That is the message we reaffirm today, and as we went through a litany where the

President of the United States had a choice to empower the people who work and earn and pay taxes, and to use the terminology, Mr. Speaker, of the President of the United States, who often says he wants to help people who work hard and play by the rules, there was no better opportunity to do so than in signing this legislation into law. But now, the President says he wants to veto the legislation.

So, again it sets up this choice, and as he has enacted this veto he, in essence, has again raised our taxes. It is worth noting that we have two divergent paths here; and indeed, we can harken back to the State of the Union address by the President when we welcomed him into this chamber, again to hear his legislative priorities, although as we noted earlier, Mr. Speaker, curiously, words that come forth in a speech are never followed through with legislative language, for whatever reason.

We again await some sort of tangible product from the administration. Every school child learns in civics class: the President proposes, the Congress disposes. And we still look for some meaningful relationship, some meaningful leadership from the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

So it is in that spirit today, on behalf of the American people who work hard, who play by the rules, who understand inherently that the money they earn belongs to them and not to the Washington bureaucrats, that we say in this chamber, Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States was wrong to veto this legislation. We object to that veto in the strongest possible terms, and even as we object to this veto, we eagerly await tangible legislation offered in a truly bipartisan sense from the President of the United States to this body with the active help of those members of his party; and together, we will move to work out a credible, tangible, productive legislative program that will benefit the American people.

But we fail to benefit the American people, Mr. Speaker, when we hear the rhetoric that we heard from this President one day after he spoke here in his State of the Union message. He went the Buffalo, New York, and there was a statement there that was actually quite candid.

The President of the United States quoted in the press, saying, and I quote now, "We could give it," referring to the surplus that exists, "We could give it back to you and hope that you spend it right. But," close quote.

Well, the "but," Mr. Speaker, is the fact that there is an inherent distrust, sadly, that this President has for the American people and their ability to spend their own money. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, as I have heard my friend, the ranking member on many national broadcasts in recent days even attempt to defend a recent action by this President, I find it curious that in the fullness of time, it has been exposed that this President not only, not only can-

not trust the American people with their own money, but yet, he would trust the promises of convicted terrorists from Puerto Rico to whom he granted clemency.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, as we hear on the other side derisive laughter. How sad and how shameful that our Commander in Chief would trust the word of convicted terrorists over the ability of the American people to save, spend, and invest their money themselves. This may be honest disagreement, and we come to this chamber expressing that honest disagreement, and again, it is in that spirit when I state in the strongest possible terms that I must object to the veto of this tax fairness legislation by the President of the United States.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman used 5½ minutes of the time allocated to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER).

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) has 25 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my friend from New York for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, let me thank the President for vetoing this reckless tax bill. It was not easy for us to get the deficit down and to get our economy growing at a very strong rate. The issue is not whether we are going to be spending more money here in Washington. The issue is what is our priority, whether our priority is to cut taxes, or whether our priority is to reduce the deficit in order to preserve Social Security and Medicare so we can meet our obligations in the future.

When we passed this tax bill over a month ago, many of us said that we would be spending the projected surplus before we even produced the surplus, and that is still true. We said that the bill would explode in costs in the outyears, that we did not pay for it, adding to the potential deficits of our Nation. That is still true. We said we had a choice, but when those deficits explode, we would not have the money to pay for the baby boomer generation, and we would not be able to preserve Social Security and Medicare. That is still true. The choice is whether we want the tax cut, whether we want to pay down the deficit and protect Social Security and Medicare.

The President made the right choice for the American people. I agree with the President.

Now, the projected surplus was based upon us adhering to the spending caps in our appropriation bills, and we were

told when we passed this tax bill that we were going to adhere to those caps. Well, now, the majority has conceded that we are not going to adhere to those spending caps. We do not even have the projected surplus that was projected when this bill was passed. This irresponsible tax bill was based upon adhering to those spending caps.

So what is going to happen? It is a formula for large deficits. The public understands that. That is why there has been no support for this tax bill that the Republicans hoped to generate during the August recess. Instead, they are looking for gimmicks to meet the spending bills of this session. They are calling "emergency spending" things like the census. They are advancing funding over and over again, knowing full well you are just taking from next year to pay for this year and having a bigger problem next year.

And now, the suggestion on using the welfare money. We are going to take the money away from the governors this year, but we will give it back to you next year when the caps are even more difficult, while what we should be doing is reaching a bipartisan agreement with the President to put deficit reduction first, preserving Social Security and Medicare, and then we can deal with the tax issues and have an adequate amount of money to meet the spending needs of this Nation.

□ 1745

We can do it all if we want to be reasonable about it. But we first must be honest with the American people. This irresponsible tax bill was not honest with the American people. I applaud the President in vetoing it. I ask my colleagues to sustain the veto so that we can get to a bipartisan agreement.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the senior member of the committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority here delayed sending this bill for over a month so they could go back and sell it. They went home. They did not sell this package. The American people spoke by their reaction, and they said to the Republicans, keep to the path of fiscal responsibility that Democrats started this institution on many years before. Do not spend, the Americans said, a surplus not likely to occur in a way not helpful to most Americans.

But the Republicans, as evidenced by what they have said here, they do not hear. They are not listening. So, where are we? The Republicans cannot even put together a budget and appropriation bills for 1 year, the year 2000. How can the American people trust the majority here to put together a fiscally responsible bill over 10 years?

The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means earlier today said

this: "Since President Clinton killed this responsible," that is his word, "tax relief plan, he has given himself a license to spend, and spend he will."

But we all know the President cannot spend a dime without the approval of this Congress. Who is in control of this Congress? I think it is the Republican majority. Their message has been, help save me from myself. I will go recklessly.

Well, they are in the majority. They should now react by putting together, with the President and with the Democratic minority, a new package. But they are not doing that. What are they going to do? Instead, tomorrow, as we understand it, we get this somewhat by rumor, in the Committee on Ways and Means the Republican majority is going to put up a bill. It is going to cost, we are told, over \$50 billion over 5 years. It will be paid for at best for 1 year. That is another example of fiscal irresponsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have voted for previous fiscally responsible bills, deficit responsible bills; to have stood with all the Democrats in 1993 for fiscal responsibility.

This Democratic Party once again says to the Republican majority, begin to listen to the American people. They want us to sustain the path of fiscal responsibility that has brought low inflation and low interest rates. The President vetoed the bill because it would have moved us away from fiscal responsibility to irresponsibility.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

(Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of August, the strategy of the Republican Conference was to return home to their respective districts and make an attempt to convince the American people of the merits of this tax cut proposal. When they returned from the August break, they collectively, I think, would agree that the American people said, we prefer fixing social security and Medicare first, then paying down the national debt.

What this journey proves, I think, to the Republican party at this time is that they simply cannot sell a bad idea. The American people responded overwhelmingly to the message, in this instance, of President Clinton and the Democratic Caucus suggesting that, as we flip the last pages on this century, we have the rarest of opportunities, the opportunity to repair and fix social security, and listen to this number, for the next 75 years, and to repair and to fix Medicare for the next 35 years.

We would be hard-pressed to find or discover a responsible economist across this country who has suggested once that the Nation desired or needed or the current economic growth that we

have had would benefit from a \$1 trillion tax cut.

The wealthiest businesspeople that I know back in Massachusetts have not been clamoring for a tax cut. They argue, instead, and I think accurately so, that they prefer and that we prefer low interest rates, so that those who are getting into the homebuyer market for the first time can purchase a 30-year fixed mortgage at 7½ to 8 percent, or a 15-year fixed mortgage at 7 percent. They want stability and predictability as they forecast economic growth.

Let me state another, I think, compelling statistic here. When we used that suggestion of a \$3 trillion surplus over the next 15 to 20 years, let us emphasize on this occasion that it is a projected surplus, heavy emphasis on the word "projected." Then let me deflate the argument that we have \$3 trillion to toy with by suggesting that of the \$3 trillion, \$2 trillion comes from social security.

How can we argue honestly to the American people that we really desire this rarest of opportunity, to fix social security for generations to come, and in the next breath say that we are going to gamble with a projection of a surplus which might not even materialize 15 years out?

The President did the right thing on this. I hope that we will sustain the President's veto.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would remind the gentleman from Massachusetts who is just now leaving the floor that H.R. 7 was reserved by the Speaker for the President to submit a social security bill to this House. H.R. 1, H.R. 1 is still vacant.

I would also remind the gentleman, and I think that he is well-versed in the Archer-Shaw plan, it does save social security for 75 years and beyond. I would hope to tell the gentleman that we will be sure they are marking this bill up, and it is certainly within the limitations.

If we do nothing on social security over the next 75 years, we are looking at a \$20 trillion deficit. We desperately need the lead from the White House that we have not received. We need to get the bipartisan support from the minority side, which we have not received. We need to get a bill started. I can assure the gentleman that that is exactly what is going to happen.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Chair would inform the Members that the motion to instruct conferees will be voted on tomorrow. There will be no further votes.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS).

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, how dare this president go out to the common working Joe and common working Jane in this country and veto this tax bill, and then go out and spend \$42 mil-

lion, \$42 million for his little trip to Africa?

Mr. Speaker, the liberal Democrats are back to the same old tax and spend policies. For 40 years they had control of this House. For 40 years they ran up the national debt. Now all of a sudden here come the Democrats, the liberal Democrats. They like to act as if they are the guardian angels of debt reduction.

Guess what, Mr. Speaker? We had a marriage, a marriage penalty out there. It is their Tax Code. They put it in when they had control of this House. We, the Republicans, say it is unfair to penalize people because they are married. We think we should encourage marriage in this country.

So what does the President do? What does the President and the liberal Democrats do? They veto, so now the people who are married can expect another marriage penalty for 1 more year of marriage.

What about the death tax? It is important to the liberal Democrats that the day we visit the undertaker, we also visit the tax collector. If Members do not think it happens, take a look. Do they call these tax and spend policies something they can stand up here and be proud about? My gosh, look what they are doing to the American working person. Sure, they put out a lot of spin. Oh, we do not need a tax cut. But President Clinton should travel to Africa for \$42 million, or to China for \$40 million. But they do not need a tax cut, folks. The working slobs should just get back out and work and just keep sending money to Washington, D.C., because the liberal tax and spend Democrats want and think they ought to be working for them. It is finders, keepers.

Take a look at what Members are doing out here. If we could put spending and make it a person, I guarantee that spending would be affiliated with the Democratic Party. It would be a Democrat. We on this side of the aisle, and frankly some conservative Democrats, happen to think that the working man is entitled to more than what they have given him today by vetoing the marriage penalty, by vetoing the death tax, and by justifying the trips of the President to spend \$42 million to go to Africa, \$40-some million to go to China.

I do not know what he is going to spend in the next few months while he has his last year. He is going to spend that money every time and not even think of the taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to take a look at marriage in this country, to encourage it, and to quit penalizing it. I am urging the Members, and I have heard some very politely say, let us work in a very bipartisan fashion. What more bipartisanship do they want than let us get together and get rid of the marriage penalty?

What about the death tax? Let us say to our president, Mr. President, in a time that we are trying to give married

people a break, we do not need to make \$42 million trips to Africa. Mr. President, pitch in with something other than a veto.

Then why do Members not stand up and admit who is really the party of principles as far as that debt reduction? It does not belong on that side of the aisle, it belongs on this side of the aisle.

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

Mr. Speaker, I can understand how so many Members want to deal with the President's right to grant clemency or his trips to Africa, but I wish they would put their outrage and emotion to override the veto. Other than that, then I think what they are saying is either they have not got the votes, or they agree with the President.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, this kind of tired old sloganeering that we have just heard is a lot of what is wrong with Washington, the unwillingness to come together in a truly bipartisan fashion and try to address the issue of appropriate tax relief, but to do it in a way that does not harm our economy.

Tax and spend Democrats? That old tax and spend Democrat Alan Greenspan, appointed by Ronald Reagan as chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, told these Republicans time and time again that he thought their tax cut was a mistake, that it would threaten our economic prosperity, and the longest running span of economic prosperity we have had in this country in a long time.

They turned a tin ear to him. Fortunately, the American people did not turn a tin ear, they listened to that. They recognized that when the Sun is shining, as we have it in this great economic prosperity today, that is the time to repair the roof, not to borrow more on the credit card.

So it is today that the President has taken his pen out and vetoed, yes, this irresponsible tax bill, but it was really the American people that vetoed this bill when they had it presented to them because they recognized how truly irresponsible it was, that we cannot have it all. We cannot have a big tax break benefiting special interests, benefiting those at the top of the economy, and save Social Security and Medicare and meet the basic needs of the country.

So we Democrats have proposed that we pay down the national debt, that we reduce the debt that has been incurred, and act in a fiscally responsible way to provide some targeted tax relief that is paid for, but that we meet our social security and Medicare needs.

Mr. Speaker, I think as Americans look at this Congress, they probably recognize that Hurricane Floyd was not the only natural disaster to afflict the East Coast in recent days. This House Republican leadership has truly

been spinning out of control talking about this irresponsible tax break.

□ 1800

Meanwhile, the fiscal year, the Federal fiscal year, we have got 6 working days yet to conclude it. We have one of the 13 appropriation bills necessary to the operations of the government. After next weekend, one of those 13 has been signed into law.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, if the Republicans really thought that the President's veto was outrageous and they really thought that their \$792 billion tax cut made a lot of sense, why would they not demonstrate this by moving to override the President's veto?

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, that would be the only appropriate action if they had the courage behind the rhetoric. But I think, as a practical matter, they recognize they would do nothing but embarrass many of their own Members, many who have only voted for this measure because they were told it would never become law. They recognized and said in their own comments that it was irresponsible, but they would hold their nose as Republicans and follow their leadership because they knew it would never become law. The American people and this President would properly reject it.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Chair how much time is remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANCREDO). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) has 10 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) has 12½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the gentleman from New York would like to yield time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members to address their remarks to the Chair and not to the President.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the President was right to veto the Republican tax bill today. The President was right to put Social Security, Medicare, and pay down the national debt ahead of a tax break for the rich. The President was right. The Republican tax bill was wrong, dead wrong. It was a step in the wrong direction.

We must use this historic opportunity to save Social Security and Medicare and to pay down our national debt. We should not be wasting it on huge tax breaks for America's wealthiest people.

The Republican tax bill did nothing to save Social Security, nothing to strengthen Medicare, nothing to reduce our national debt. It was a huge windfall for the rich, pocket change for working Americans. It was a mistake. It was irresponsible. It was not the right thing to do. I thank the President for vetoing the Republican tax bill.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), a respected member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, there he goes again. President Clinton has imposed more total taxes on the American taxpayer than any President in history.

In 1993, with the help of the Democratic majority in the House, he gave the American taxpayer the largest tax increase, in total dollars, in this country's history.

Today, he has been able to impose yet another huge tax hike, \$792 billion, over the next 10 years.

But my colleagues ask how can this be. Well, as of this morning, the Congress had cut taxes on working people. But by the afternoon, with the stroke of a pen, President Clinton raised them again.

I regret that the President has today raised taxes on American workers by increasing marginal income tax rates, taxing those who choose to purchase health care insurance for themselves and families, and by taxing those who choose to buy long-term care insurance. He has also reinstated the confusing alternative minimum tax on individuals.

I further regret that the President has decided to increase taxes on American families by reimposing the marriage penalty on married couples, taxing educational savings accounts, which we wanted to set up for children and grandchildren, and by punishing, through taxes, those families who wanted to provide in-home care for senior relatives.

I also regret that the President has decided to endanger jobs through hiking taxes on American employers, by increasing the capital gains tax, by complicating retirement programs rules, and, finally, by reinstating the death tax which forces the sale of many family farms and businesses.

But, Mr. Speaker, the President believes he knows best what to do with the people's money. So he has decided to raise those taxes again.

He may talk about Social Security, but what he means is bureaucrats' job security. We Republicans have done the hard work in protecting Social Security and Medicare. Our tax bill not only set aside all Social Security and Medicare tax income, but our budget put aside \$870 billion in additional revenues for Medicare.

The truth is the President wants to spend the positive cash flow. His own budget would have busted the caps by \$30 billion and turned this year's positive cash flow into more debt. That is

why we wanted to return the money to the safety of the taxpayers' pocket. As it stands, it is a \$792 billion temptation to spenders, spenders on both sides of the aisle.

I regret that we shall see in the next few weeks and months to come spending schemes come out one by one at orchestrated "program of the day" press conferences. That is no way to treat the hard-earned money of America's families.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) to deal specifically with the question of Social Security.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the Ranking Democrat on the Committee on Ways and Means, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I think what we are seeing now is an example of the Republicans trying to get themselves out of a hole that they created back in February and March and April in this year when they came up with their budget. The budget was inconsistent. That is why, with the fiscal year ending on Wednesday or Thursday of next week, we only have one appropriations bill signed by the President.

They are struggling. They want us to work this weekend, but then they change their mind because some of their folks had fund raisers. So as a result of that, now we are going to find ourselves in a crunch in the middle of next week. That is exactly what is going on.

So they are really relieved that the President vetoed this bill, because now the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) want to bring up a Social Security bill sometime before we recess this year. That bill, as we all know, or we will find out very soon when they start to move that bill, is about \$1.1 trillion over the next 10 years. It would wipe out the entire tax cut.

What is also interesting, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) said earlier that their Social Security bill will balance out in 75 years. I hope all of us are alive in 75 years.

But in the next 35 years, by the year 2035, and I hope that the Republican Members know this when they vote for this bill, they will have a general fund transfer of money to the Social Security fund of \$11.7 trillion which, in 35 years, will be in constant dollars only about \$3 trillion, about twice the Federal budget today.

So what we can really do is, my colleagues can lament about the fact that the President vetoed this, but they are privately very happy because then, in the next month or so, they are going to bring up Social Security. They will bring that to the floor.

That will go down in flames because they do not have 218 votes. After all, they are in charge of this institution. They should be able to pass legislation. But it will fail. Then they will say, well, we tried to do all of these things.

But the only accomplishment, unfortunately, will be to pass these appropriations bills. I do not even know if they are going to be able to do that. But I hope they are going to be able to do that because we cannot afford to have social security checks in the next 2 months be delayed because of the incompetence of the leadership.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI), does he have a plan to save Social Security, and does it save Social Security for 75 years? Is he prepared to vote for a plan that would save Social Security?

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

Mr. SHAW. For a short answer, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has a plan in which will reduce the debt, will actually not cut benefits.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, that is not my question.

Mr. MATSUI. Will the gentleman from Florida let me finish? He asked the question.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman from California knows the rules of the House.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman not allow me to answer the question?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time is yielded. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) has requested his time back.

Mr. MATSUI. Was the gentleman from Florida asking a rhetorical question or asking me an honest question?

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the gentleman's trespassing on my time would not count against the time that I have.

I would say to the gentleman, who is the ranking member on the committee that I chair, that he does not have a plan that would save Social Security for all time. The President's plan does not save Social Security for all time. We have reached out across the aisle in order to try to formulate such a plan; but so far, we have not received that cooperation.

The Archer-Shaw plan does save Social Security for all time, and it has been scored by the Social Security Administration for doing that. It does it by preserving existing benefits without cutting one single benefit and preserving all of the COLA's. It does not raise the payroll taxes. As a matter of fact, it saves the \$20 trillion deficit that we would be leaving our kids over the next 75 years.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER).

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

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) for yielding me some time. But I want to express my disappointment that the President who

gave our country the biggest tax increase in history has now vetoed meaningful tax relief for all Americans. Why? Because Bill Clinton and AL GORE want to go on a spending spree. That is what this is all about.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican balanced budget sets aside 100 percent of the Social Security Trust Fund, payroll taxes, and interest on the Trust Fund for Social Security and Medicare. The President only wants to set aside 62 percent because he wants to spend 38 percent of Social Security on other things. It is about spending.

The Republican balanced budget sets aside \$2.2 trillion over the next several years to pay down the national debt, \$200 billion more than the President calls for. Why? Because the President wants to spend more.

Mr. Speaker, our balanced budget takes one-quarter out of every dollar for tax relief. In fact, over the next 5 years, we pay down \$861 billion of the national debt while providing \$156 billion in tax relief.

One of the biggest concerns I often hear in the district that I represent in Chicago in the south suburbs is the issue of fairness, particularly tax fairness. People are frustrated that taxes are so high, but they are also frustrated how complicated they are and how unfair they are.

I have often asked this question, is it right, is it fair that, under our Tax Code, married working couples pay more in taxes just because they are married? Is it right, is it fair that 21 million married working couples on average pay \$1,400 more in higher taxes?

I happen to have with me today a photo of a couple from Joliet, Illinois, two public school teachers, Michelle and Shad Hallihan who, by the way, just had a baby boy named Benjamin just the other day. They are celebrating the birth of that child. They are a typical couple that pays the marriage tax penalty.

My friends on the other side, they call Michelle and Shad a special interest because we are trying to help them. But these are folks who suffer the average marriage tax penalty. And \$1,400 is a lot of money in Joliet, Illinois. It is 1 year's tuition at a local community college, several months worth of day care. It is real money for people like Michelle and Shad Hallihan.

Now, President Clinton says he would much rather spend their money here in Washington because he could do it better than they can. That is really what this issue is all about. Do we spend Michelle and Shad's money, or do we eliminate that marriage tax penalty?

Of course the President vetoed that effort to eliminate their marriage tax penalty today. If my colleagues think about it, their little boy Benjamin just born just in the last few weeks, if they were able to take advantage of the education savings account tax relief that was included in this, which would allow them to set up to \$2,000 a year in a special account for Benjamin's education,

Michelle and Shad, if we were to eliminate their marriage tax penalty, could put that marriage tax penalty into that account and, in 18 years, be able to pay for much of Benjamin's college education.

That is a choice we are making here today. Do we follow President Clinton's lead and spend it here in Washington, or do we let Michelle and Shad Callahan keep it by eliminating the marriage tax penalty? That is what we should be doing.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, how many times have I stood in this well and have been reminded by others, as I remind tonight, Presidents do not spend money. Congress spends money. All of the rhetoric that I have heard about spending will only occur if a majority of this House votes to spend the money.

I have reached out in the hand of friendship to the gentleman on the other side, as he knows, regarding Social Security. I can honestly say we do have a plan.

□ 1815

My disappointment, and why I very strongly support the President's veto of this bill today, is that Congress has chosen not to lead on Social Security. It was our responsibility. It was the responsibility of the Committee on Ways and Means, in my opinion, obviously not shared by the majority, to come up and fix Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid first and then deal with the question of marriage tax relief, of capital gains tax relief.

And I have said it many, many times. I am for tax cuts. I am for tax cuts. There are many good proposals in the bill which is vetoed which I support philosophically. But I do not support tax cuts when they are the equivalent of taking candy from a baby, and that is what we are talking about today.

It is true that these dollars that we hear talked about are the American taxpayers' dollars, American people, all of us, but it is also true that the \$5.6 trillion debt is our debt. And I believe very strongly the President is correct in saying we should pay down that debt first before we spend additional dollars for any purpose. That debt will need to be paid back to the Social Security program. We should not be carelessly spending Social Security dollars.

And as we have discussed many times on the floor of this House, and why I have said in my opinion this bill that is vetoed today is the most fiscally irresponsible bill, because what it proposed to do in the second 10 years, precisely at the time Social Security was going to need some additional help, this bill proposed to take money from our children and grandchildren. If responsible tax cuts are brought for a vote, tax

cuts which are paid for by today's dollars, I will gladly consider their merits. But I will not steal from children and senior citizens.

The President is right to veto this irresponsible bill, and I support his action today. And I am glad to hear that finally, after September 22, we will have serious discussion of Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid, and I will certainly reach out and accept the hand from the other side. But in the meantime, let us stop this debate and this ceaseless rhetoric regarding this tax cut and openly acknowledge that if we are truly concerned about the future of Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid, do it first and then do these other things, that amount to what most of us would call the dessert.

That is why I support this veto, and I think now let us get on with doing what we should have been doing at the first of this year, and that is fixing Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ).

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

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for yielding me this time.

My colleagues, President Clinton vetoed the Republican tax plan for one simple reason. It uses the surplus on special interest tax cuts instead of investing it in the future of America. I call on the Republicans to go back to the drawing board and to produce a bipartisan tax and budget plan, one that addresses the needs of all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, as we debate how to divide up this budget surplus that is being projected, our primary goal should be to maintain the strong and growing economy that has benefited millions of Americans. Reducing the national debt is clearly the best long-term strategy for our U.S. economy, and, in fact, not only Mr. Greenspan but many economists from all political spectrums have said let us reduce the national debt.

There is a plan to do that. It is called the Blue Dog Budget. Imagine this: We are projected to spend about 15 cents of every dollar next year on interest for the national debt. Fifteen cents. That is 15 percent. If a family had a credit card and they were paying 15 percent or 18 percent or 19 percent interest rates, and all of a sudden they had more money than they thought they had at the end of the month, what should they do with it? If they are smart, they would pay down that credit card debt. Why? Because when they do not, the debt gets more and more and more.

This is the time to pay the debt down. The Blue Dog Budget saves the entire Social Security surplus for Social Security, and it locks up half of the on-budget surplus for debt reduction. This approach will help ensure

that our economy remains strong today and for our future.

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

Before we hear from our next Speaker on this subject, I would like to reiterate that if the Republicans are so outraged about this veto, I hope when the arguments are closed that they will explain to the American people, and some of the young students of the Constitution, why they are forfeiting their right to override the veto. When we do not like what a President has done in terms of legislation, either we accept it or we override it.

I am afraid what we are going to find, however, with this Social Security plan, is that perhaps the money that is going to be used in their plan for Social Security would be the very same money that they would have used for the tax cut. But who knows.

I think they are going to spend the rest of the time wondering when the President is going to come forward with a plan. And I think the gentleman from Texas pointed out, it is the Congress that legislates and it is the President that executes. If there is going to be any legislative plan, do not be running around howling at the moon asking for the President's bill.

They are part of the majority. They should assume the majority and legislate. Not that they have had a great history for it so far this session. But maybe they should try it. They might like it. It may work. Something may happen. But I cannot think of anything that has been done to give any evidence that they have appeared to lead. They did not lead in the tax bill, they did not lead in Social Security, they do not lead in Medicare, they do not lead in a patient's bill of rights, they do not lead in gun safety, and they do not lead in education.

So I do not know how much time they have to close, but I will be glad to yield some time to them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER).

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I have been over in my office listening to some of this rhetoric, and I was not going to come over here, but let me just say this.

I could agree with almost everything that the Republicans have said were it not for the fact that there is not a \$3 trillion projected surplus. There is only a \$1 trillion projected surplus. Because all of us have agreed that \$2 trillion of that \$3 trillion is Social Security money and ought to stay in the Social Security System or retire the national debt.

I could agree with almost everything that has been said were it not for the fact that we have a \$5.6 trillion debt, a \$3.8 trillion hard debt. Now, to ask us to take 80 percent of the on-budget projected surplus over the next 10 years and obligate it now is something that I do not think any prudent business person in this country would do.

And, furthermore, I was thinking about this. This bill, if we want to call it that, is asking basically for me to say to my children, I am going to go buy a new car, but, Mr. Banker, when I borrow the money from you for that car, I am only going to pay the interest on it. And when my children become 21, send them the bill for the car. Or I am going to buy a house, but, Mr. Banker, I am only going to pay the interest on it. Send the price of the house, the money that I borrowed to buy the house, send the bill for it to my children when they get to be 21.

We are not against tax cuts. We had in our budget a \$250 billion piece. That is a pretty sizable sum. But let me tell my colleagues how irresponsible I think this is and how far the American people are ahead of us on this. When they have got an \$800 billion tax package that has got something for almost every citizen in this country in it, and they cannot sell it and they cannot override it, they know it is irresponsible. The American people know that it is irresponsible, and that is why I am glad the President did what he did.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANCREDO). Time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) has expired.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS), a member of the committee.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, it is really humorous tonight to listen to this debate. For 40 years the liberal spending Democrats had majority in this House. When I got here, in 1994, we had a \$5 trillion debt. Now, they had control of spending for 40 years. How did we get a \$5 trillion debt?

For 40 years they did not mind spending out of the Social Security Trust Fund for every kind of program they could think of. They did not worry about balancing the budget then. They did not worry about paying down the debt. Now, all of a sudden, they are worried about it. That is very, very funny. Very strange.

Well, our plan, the Republican plan, sets aside \$1.9 trillion, 100 percent of the Social Security Trust Fund surplus money, to protect Social Security. One hundred percent. What are they setting aside? Twenty-seven trillion dollars is going to come into the Federal Government over the next 10 years. What is wrong with allowing the American people to have \$792 billion back of their money?

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, as I understand, all time has expired on the minority side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I say to my friend from New York (Mr. RANGEL), who has asked several times why we do not move to override the veto, that he knows as well as I do the very simple fact is that we do not have enough Democrats to go in with the

Republicans to raise the two-thirds majority necessary to give the American people the relief from the marriage tax penalty, relief from the death tax, and relief from so many of the other taxes that we have.

I think, too, that the Members on the other side are well aware of the fact that we have got locked away, as the gentleman from Kentucky just said, locked away sufficient dollars from the Social Security surplus in order to more than repair Social Security, more than take care of the problems that we are facing in Medicare. Indeed, it would be irresponsible to be spending that money, and that is why we passed the lockbox legislation, and that is why we have this in our budget, that was passed by the House, in order to prevent this type of spending.

But putting all this aside, and Members can say anything on this floor and it goes out like it is the truth, but the facts and the figures are there and they are there for all of us to see. But what I want to see is what is going to happen now next week as the spending bills, the appropriation bills, come to the floor. Are my friends on the other side of the aisle going to vote against them because we do not spend enough? I suggest that they will. Will the President veto them because we do not spend enough? I suggest that he will. And I wonder, when he does that, and as they vote and explain their votes on the other side of the aisle, how they will explain how they are saving this money for Social Security and saving Medicare.

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

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

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE PHIL ENGLISH, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable Phil English, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 21, 1999.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House that my office has received a subpoena for documents issued by the United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined to comply with the subpoena.

Sincerely,

PHIL ENGLISH,
Member of Congress.

PERIODIC REPORT ON THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO IRAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 106-131)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and section 505(c) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985, 22 U.S.C. 2349aa-9(c), I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12957 of March 15, 1995.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 23, 1999.

□ 1830

NATIONAL MONEY LAUNDERING STRATEGY FOR 1999—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANCREDO) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Banking and Financial Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by the provisions of section 2(a) of Public Law 105-310 (18 U.S.C. 5341(a)(2)), I transmit herewith the National Money Laundering Strategy for 1999.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 23, 1999.

PRESIDENT CLINTON VETOES TAX RELIEF PACKAGE

(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, today President Clinton vetoed the much-needed tax relief package passed by this Congress. President Clinton has permanently cemented his legacy as a tax raiser and sworn enemy of tax cuts.

By vetoing this legislation, the President is denying the average middle-class family relief from the marriage tax penalty. The President is robbing millions of workers the opportunity to obtain health insurance benefits who cannot afford to do so now. He is making it more difficult for parents to save for their children's education. He is making it more difficult for people to pass on the family farm or the family