

willing to negotiate. But we are not going to give the ship away. We are going to restrain the budget and do the best we can to keep the budget balanced.

ISSUE IS NOT HOW MUCH MONEY

(Mr. STENHOLM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, the issue is not how much money. The majority voted last week to increase the caps to \$645 billion in spending. That is \$13 billion more than the President requested. The Blue Dog Democrats suggested a compromise of \$633 billion a long time ago. The majority refused to talk to us.

I hope we will stop talking about money. Money is no longer the issue. Because if we exceed \$645 billion cap for 2001, there will be sequestration and we will bring all the spending back to \$645 billion, which is what the majority has set for the caps, which is way too much spending.

So I hope we will stop this misdirected rhetoric tonight. Because that sign there "how much is enough?" has no relevance whatsoever to any of the issues that we are talking about because we all agree now that \$645 billion is the cap.

PRESIDENT HAS DEMANDED BLANKET AMNESTY FOR ILLEGAL ALIENS

(Mr. ROHRBACHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman may or may not be correct in terms of what the issue is. The President always is pushing us to spend a little more on health care, a little more on education. But the fact is what is the real issue that is keeping us here?

The real issue is the President has demanded a blanket amnesty for millions of illegal aliens in our society. So all this money that he is talking about, a little more for education, a little more for health care, will be totally negated even if we give in to the President because we will be then adding millions of more people into eligibility for these same government programs.

The President is keeping us here in order to pressure Congress to issue a blanket amnesty for millions of illegal aliens and then thus making them eligible for every government benefit that supposedly should be going to the American people.

This is a noble cause for us to stand our ground here in Congress to protect the American people, not to let the President bring in millions of illegal aliens in order to consume the scarce resources available for them in health care, Social Security, and education.

ISSUE IS WHAT ARE WE SPENDING MONEY ON?

(Mr. TURNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I think it is apparent to all of us that the question is not how much is enough. We are already spending more than we ought to be. The majority voted to spend \$645 billion when you raise the caps. The President did not ask us but for \$637 billion.

The issue is what are we spending the money on? That is why we are here. That is what we are arguing about.

The truth of the matter is most of us on this side of the aisle want to spend more money on our rural hospitals and our health care providers and less money on the insurance company HMOs than the Republicans have put in the bill. And the truth of the matter, even Senator JOHN MCCAIN pointed out that there is \$21 billion in this legislation that is just pure pork.

Every newspaper in the country has been editorializing on the fact that the majority has stuffed this bill with pork for partisan purposes to help folks that are in tough races.

So let us get the pork out, and let us save our rural hospitals that are about to close in my district. Let us increase the reimbursements to our health care providers. And let us not give the lion's share to the big insurance companies.

REIMBURSEMENTS TO HMO'S AND MANAGED CARE

(Mr. HILL of Montana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring some clarity to the issue that we just debated and voted on, and that is this issue of reimbursements to HMOs and managed care.

I no longer have a managed care institution in Montana. The one that was there was forced to close down a year ago. I sat down with HCFA, the Clinton administration, and that HMO to try to keep it alive a year ago. And one of the things that I discovered is that when the Clinton administration forced the closure of that HMO, it knew that it was going to cost more to provide health care to those seniors under the fee-for-service Medicare than it would under the HMO. And this was a provider-based HMO.

I thought to myself, why in the world would they do that, would they force people into poor coverage, no prescription drug coverage, and higher deductibles when they knew it was going to cost more? Then it dawned on me. The Clinton administration wants to destroy managed care, Medicare+Choice.

What we have here is Democrats coming to this floor pretending that they want to keep those seniors who have that program covered, when the

reality is they want to destroy that program because they do not want seniors to have a choice, but they want to blame Republicans for doing it. And it is wrong, and they are wrong for doing it. We did the right thing by voting that resolution down.

CONGRESS HAS MORE TIME THAN MONEY

(Mr. THUNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, we are still here this evening because we have more time than we have money. And when it comes right down do it, the question of the day is "how much is enough?" We have passed appropriations bills through this House. We have passed appropriation bills that met our budget. As we went into the conference negotiations with the Senate, the numbers got bid up.

The President now has gotten almost everything I think he had asked for originally as far as the dollars included in his original budget. But he is demanding more. And that is why we are still here, because we have more time than we have money and more time than the American people have in their tax dollars to continue shoveling into Washington, D.C.

We have an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to pass a Medicare package, to pass a tax relief package. And all those things are going down to the President, and he is insisting on a veto. I think that is a wrong thing to do. It is the wrong thing to do for the people of this country, for the people of South Dakota, to the rural hospitals, the home health care agencies, the nursing homes, those who need this assistance. We do the right thing.

Let us pass this legislation, and let us get the President to sign it, and then we can go home.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning I was detained at a meeting on class size reduction and got here too late to cast my vote on rollcall No. 570, approval of the Journal. I ask unanimous consent that my statement be put in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? There was no objection.

REPUBLICANS ARE PROTECTING SOCIAL SECURITY AND SURPLUS

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans in the House have passed domestic discretionary spending that has kept within our budget. In fact, as a

percent of gross domestic product, it is the lowest since 1974.

Now, some of our opponents on the other side of the aisle would like to say that we have passed these larger and larger budgets, but the truth is we have been in negotiation with the White House and we have tried to reach an agreement with him.

As other speakers have said earlier, we have matched him on most of the bills that have been passed. There are just a few outstanding that are still being negotiated. But the President wants to continue to add more and more money in and start more and more new programs.

We are protecting Social Security. We are protecting the surplus on Social Security. We are protecting the surplus for Medicare. We have even passed a bill that gives some tax relief and also strengthens Medicare by adding more than \$12 billion and to strengthen hospitals, including more than \$1 billion for rural hospitals. In Kansas, rural hospitals are in desperate need of this legislation and this bill. But the President is holding it hostage and is refusing to do it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just hope that he will sign these bills into law and we can finish this session.

PRESIDENT THREATENS TO VETO FEDERAL EXCISE TAX ON TELEPHONES

(Mr. PORTMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, we are still here tonight for one very simple reason. We are here with another battling with the President of the United States. He would like us to spend more money, and he would like us not to cut taxes for the American people. It is unbelievable.

As we are working here tonight, the President is threatening to veto very reasonable, even targeted tax relief that helps people save more for retirement, helps people obtain health care, helps people be able to improve our schools and construct more schools around this country.

He has even threatened to veto tonight the repeal of the Federal excise tax on telephones. This is the 1898 temporary luxury tax put in place on telephones that lives on today. This tax hits particularly people that have fixed incomes very hard.

Think about it, everyone in America needs a telephone. It is very important to those of us who are worried about our economy and worried about what is going to keep our economy going that telecommunications not be taxed. Yet the President believes this tax, this 3 percent tax that is on every one of our phone bills that goes into general revenues that was put in place in 1898 as a temporary luxury tax ought to continue in existence.

We have a surplus all created by the American people. Let us hope this

President begins to give a little meaningful, serious, reasonable tax relief.

LET CONGRESS STAND UP FOR PARENTS AND TEACHERS AT LOCAL LEVEL

(Mr. HOEKSTRA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, we are in Washington today talking about some very important issues. Over the last 3 years, my subcommittee has had the opportunity to travel around the country and take a look at education to see what is working in America and what is not working in America.

It is exciting to go down to the State and local level and see what parents, teachers, and local administrators are doing to bring about excellence in education. We need to reinforce those efforts and let people at the local level continue to innovate and move forward.

We contrast that with what is going on here in Washington. We have a Department of Education that has failed its audit for the last 2 years, has numerous cases of waste, fraud, and abuse. And now the President wants to put additional programs under the jurisdiction of the Department of Education so that there are more Washington programs and bureaucrats telling our local parents and administrators what to do in education.

This is a discussion and a debate about who controls our local schools. Let us stand up for parents and teachers at the local level.

WHY CONGRESS IS IN SESSION ON SUNDAY NIGHT

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, we are here on a Sunday night. I want to tell my colleagues, I am kind of sad. I would rather be with my family. But I will tell you one thing, it is my duty to be here and fight for the things that I believe in.

One of the things that I am fighting for is little old Brantley County, Georgia. Because, see, the President has a scheme to federalize school construction. He wants to have school construction run out of Washington, D.C., for every county school board in the United States of America. We want local control.

I want to tell the folks back in Brantley County, Georgia, that you are going to continue to be in charge. We are here to fight for classroom size. I am with the President on that. We need to reduce the size of the classroom. But I am away from the President on Medicare reimbursement. He has threatened to veto a bill that has been endorsed by the American Hospital Association. I am here because the President has threatened to veto a

bill that would take away 100 percent health care deductibility, which would make health care affordable for small businesses and farmers. That is worth fighting for. And I am here for the Social Security lockbox, which the President has yet to commit himself to.

That is why we are here on a Sunday night, and I am not going to leave until we get this thing done.

2115

LET US SET THE RECORD STRAIGHT

(Mr. SHERMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have heard discussion of the school construction provisions of the tax bill. Let me set the record straight. We Democrats want provisions where school boards are given a chance to issue bonds, where the Federal Government pays the interest costs and the bond money is used immediately to build schools. Unfortunately, this tax bill, while it provides some of those bonds, provides not enough and then provides over a \$2 billion cost to the Federal Government to liberalize the arbitrage rules in which school boards will be told by the Federal Government to delay building schools, take the money, put it on Wall Street and try to make money by arbitrage provisions. That is how Orange County, California, went bankrupt. That is not a way to help our local schools. The way to help our local schools is to reject the tax bill that passed through this House and instead provide a full \$25 billion worth of bonds where the Federal Government will pick up the interest cost. We need to build schools on Elm Street, not skyscrapers on Wall Street.

HOW MUCH IS ENOUGH?

(Mr. SCHAFFER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, how much is enough? Three and a half weeks ago we were supposed to have been adjourned, but we are here because of the politics down at the White House, the politics of putting partisanship ahead of people.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many of our colleagues ever saw the movie "The Jerk." It is a rags to riches to rags story wherein the main character is evicted, and he is kind of hanging on to the last bits of furniture and items in his home as he is walking out the door, as he says, I don't need anything else. I have everything I need except for this lamp.

We are seeing that go on over at the White House today: We do not need anything else except for amnesty for illegal aliens. We do not need anything else, I got everything I need except