

he says that under his plan every American who pays taxes will get tax relief. He forgets that 15 million Americans pay FICA tax and do not pay any income tax and for these people, the people who clean up for us in restaurants, the people who take care of our old people in senior citizens' homes and nursing homes, people struggling to get by an \$15,000 and \$18,000 a year, he gives not one penny of tax relief because he is providing over 43 percent of the tax relief to the richest 1 percent of Americans; nothing for the janitors, everything for the billionaires. He ought to at least be honest enough to tell the country that that is what his tax policy provides.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, when the Governor of Texas tells us that his plan will provide only \$223 billion of tax relief to the richest 1 percent over the next 10 years, he ignores everything he is doing with the estate tax. He tells the country he is going to repeal the estate tax but never includes the fiscal effect of that repeal in his description of his overall tax and budget policies.

I can only refer to this as fuzzy fiscal figures and false fiscal facts. The fact is that the estate tax will be generating \$50 billion a year. That is \$500 billion over 10 years, which means under the Governor's proposal, the richest 1 percent of Americans will save over \$700 billion a year under the Governor's proposal. He admits to only \$223 billion. He ignores the other \$500 billion.

That is why it is true when it is stated that the proposals of the Governor of Texas would provide more relief to the richest 1 percent of Americans than he proposes to spend to improve our health care system, strengthen Medicare, strengthen the military, and improve education combined.

Mr. Speaker, our choice is clear. On the one hand, we can have fiscal responsibility, economic expansion, reduction and eventual elimination of our national debt and moderate tax cuts for working families, all combined with investments in education, Medicare, military preparedness and health care, or we can provide \$700 billion to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans.

#### THE PROBLEM WITH THE POLITICS OF DIVISION INSTEAD OF THE POLITICS OF UNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, let me just say this, that under the plan proposed by Governor Bush, the janitor, the worker in the restaurant, would, in fact, get great sums of tax relief. But more importantly, rather than this class division, rather than the politics of envy, the Bush promise is to make that restaurant worker the restaurant owner. That is the biggest difference between the Bush vision and the Gore vision, which keeps the poor, poor. And that is the problem when we have the

politics of division instead of the politics of unity. I think that is what this is all about.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we want to talk a little bit about what we are doing here on a Sunday night, and joining me are my colleagues from Arizona, Michigan, Minnesota and Colorado; and we are going to ask the question, we are here because how much is enough, Mr. President? Last year the Labor and Education bill, Health and Human Resources, had a sum of \$96 billion.

2130

This year, negotiating with the President, we are up to \$106 billion. But it is not enough for the President and Mr. GORE. They want more money.

So I will ask my colleague from Arizona, how much is enough? How much does the President want to spend?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Well, if my friend from Georgia will yield, that remains the question, because, the fact is, we are not getting a clear and compelling signal from the White House or from our friends on the left.

You see, we worked together to achieve a consensus in many areas, especially on the bill we passed just last week, which offered not only tax relief, but Medicare refinement and improvement to strengthen Medicare payments to hospitals and home health care facilities and nursing homes, but also something the President embraced when he came to Phoenix, Arizona, the so-called "new markets initiative." Community empowerment. So we had a very broad bipartisan piece of legislation there, and yet we hear now that the President says he intends to veto the legislation.

So, sadly, the answer to the question that my friend from Georgia poses tonight has no quantifiable answer.

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

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to first of all say that as I was stepping out of the Committee on Rules upstairs, I could hear without the electronic means my friend from Georgia talk about the fact that the Vice President is pursuing policies that will help to keep poor people poor, which I think is right on target. That is the one thing I heard, so I compliment the gentleman on offering the truth.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and to congratulate my colleagues for the time that they are taking this evening to enlighten the American people on these very important issues.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), does he know how much is enough? I want to refer to our chart again. How much is enough, Mr. President? How much do you want to spend?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I think what we are finding, especially in the area of

education, where I have spent a lot of time and our subcommittee has spent a lot of time, it is no longer an issue about money, but, for the President, how much is enough? How much more authority does he want to move from a local and State level to Washington?

We know that he would love to start getting Washington involved in school construction, get Washington involved in hiring teachers. So for the President, it is not an issue of money anymore. Republicans have said we will match him on money.

"Enough is enough" now for the President is only when we move the decision-making for how we spend those dollars from the local level to the Department of Education here in Washington. That is now where the President is saying, "I need more and I want more."

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for that, because one of our major issues that is outstanding right now with the President is the fact that he wants school construction to be federally controlled; and we want to leave it locally controlled, where less dollars will be spent and local people will decide what needs to be built. It should not be in the hands of Washington bureaucrats.

I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE).

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, how much is enough? That is the question of the evening. Well, I would suggest to the gentleman from Georgia that is really a moving target. We do not know, because the President insists upon every bill that comes down there, this much more, this much more. I think whatever the number was yesterday, it just increased by about 20 percent today.

But if one looks at why we are still here, and the gentleman from Michigan is absolutely right, this really is about whether or not you want to consolidate more power in Washington or whether you want to distribute power back to the people who live in our States and our communities, our families. That is the issue of the day.

#### PREPARING THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to get into this tonight, but I know my friends on the other side of the aisle are not intentionally attempting to mislead the people tonight, because I know them too well. I have worked with them on too many issues, and I think it is awfully important. Anything I say that any of them wish to challenge me on, I will be glad to yield some time, because I do not want to do that which I accuse you of doing.

When we start talking about how much is enough, I believe when we passed the foreign operations appropriation bill, those of you who voted

for that voted to increase the caps for spending for this coming year to \$645 billion. Now, that is more than the President has requested to spend.

Therefore, when you start talking about the budget, the President originally this year called for \$637 billion in spending. My friends on the other side said you wanted to hold it to \$625 billion. The Blue Dogs suggested a good compromise in between at \$633 billion.

Our \$633 billion got 170 votes. In fact, we had 37 of you voting with us on that. Forty-one more of you and we would not be here tonight arguing about the numbers, because we would have held spending at \$633 billion, not at \$645 billion.

Now, for about 16 years I was in the majority, and many times I voted with you, and I got criticized quite a bit for being the big-spending Congress. Well, I was voting with you. This year I did not vote with you, because \$645 billion was \$12 billion more than I thought we ought to spend this year. You are the ones that increased it.

Now, you can put up your chart. I have got a chart over here that will show absolutely, unequivocally, no matter what you are saying on this, that you will spend more than the President has asked. We can point the blame all we want to.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I have a question, not so much for the gentleman, because I have a great deal of respect for the fact he is indeed a fiscal conservative. Many of us are very upset that we are spending as much as we are. But if what the gentleman is saying is true, then perhaps what we ought to do is just go back and take the President's original request and pass them and send them down to the White House. Is the gentleman telling us that he believes the President would sign those bills in those amounts?

That is a simple question, because, if that were true, that is what we ought to do, and we could all go home. But I know the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) knows this as well as I do, every day the bar gets moved. We are not even talking about what the President asked for. Most of the stuff that has been put in the bill right now is at the President's or White House's request.

We are upset we are going over the spending caps. We are now at over \$1.9 trillion. We think that is enough. But every day the bar moves. When I have told some of our leaders, maybe we ought to go back to what the President asked for and give him exactly what he asked for, you know what they all say? He would veto it.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, my point was this: if we had agreed on a budget with \$633 billion in spending, you would have had a very large number of Democrats standing up with you on that. It is too

late for that tonight. It is too late for that.

What I am saying is, your leadership seems to not be able to learn one constitutional fact: if you are going to beat the President, any President, now or any time in the future, you have got to have 290 votes. In order to get veto override numbers, you have got to work with somebody on this side of the aisle, which you have absolutely refused to even consider walking across the aisle to ask any one of us. And the Blue Dogs have given you not once, not twice, not three times, four opportunities to say, we want to work on holding spending down.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield further, I would say to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), I voted with you every time you put your budget up; and I want to tell you, your claim we would not be here I believe is in error, because this institution has a flaw in its design, and the design is it is easy to spend money and it is not easy not to spend it. If there is anything that needs changing in this Congress, it is the appropriations process, whereby staff members, not committee members, know what is in the bill, and backroom deals are done and the spending rises. That is the first thing.

The second thing is the House is gamed against the Senate, the Senate is gamed against the House, and then the President games them both, and the American people are getting a raw deal.

#### A CONTINUATION OF HOW MUCH IS ENOUGH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to continue this discussion as we can with the time allocated. Let me yield more time to my friend from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, the fact is we passed a budget out of this House, and we passed the appropriation bills out of this House within \$1 billion of that \$601 billion. That is a fact. All 13 bills went out and went out on time.

Now, the question is, the question is the American public ought to be asking is, what happened after it left the House? And I hope some day they will know how this process works and put people up here who will not allow it to continue.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank my colleague from Oklahoma. I thank my friend from Texas for his perspective. I think it is important to understand that there is far more that may unite us than divide us; and rather than pointing the finger of blame, I think it is important, after we await the verdict of the voters on the first Tuesday following the first Monday in November, if we should be fortunate enough

to return to this institution, we certainly welcome our friend from Texas and other like-minded friends on that side of the aisle to join us in a governing coalition to work with the next President of the United States, who could very well be the Governor of my friend's home State, to work to unify and put people before politics and to deal with these real questions.

I do appreciate the fact that he offers a voice of fiscal conservatism. We may not see eye to eye always on tax relief or a variety of other issues; but by the by, I think there is a great deal of agreement, and I do look forward to that opportunity.

I yield to my friend from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I also want to say to my friend from Texas, I do appreciate, number one, your yielding time for a real dialogue tonight; and, number two, your consistency on trying to hold down the budget numbers, because I think amongst those here tonight, we are all in agreement with you.

Of the other issues that are on the table, though, one of the ones that concerns me and everybody else here, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), who is a chairman on the Committee on Education and the Workforce, is the President's scheme to federalize school construction. As you know, he wants to put in a big union pay-off and have Davis-Bacon in there and that will drive school construction costs up 25 percent on an average. We in rural south Georgia just cannot afford that. That is one reason why I think that we are here tonight, to put schools above politics.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank my friend. I think this is important, because knowing my friend from Texas and his fiscal conservatism, it simply makes more sense to make the money work harder. You do not do that when you artificially inflate prices for the cost of construction, or, worse still, when you take the authority for school construction away from local school boards and transfer that authority here to Washington.

In fact, I yield to my friend from Michigan, who has great oversight of this in his role in the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that we found as we went and talked to local school districts, but also as we talked to the different State education boards, is that they typically get about 7 to 10 percent of their money from Washington, but they get 50 percent of their bureaucratic paperwork from Washington. So, for all of these 760 programs that come out of 39 different agencies that are targeted at our local classrooms, with each one of those there come costs, burden, and red tape and strings attached, telling local officials, this is what you need to do in your schools.