COMMENTS ON SELECTION OF HOUSE CHAPLAIN

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I, too, was not prepared to speak today, by I think the record does need some correction.

We met, as my cochair, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY), said, we had endless meetings. We narrowed the 38 to 17. We narrowed those to six. Then we decided, we at the next meeting, we would reduce the six to three. We interviewed the 17, and then we re-interviewed the six.

We decided that we would send them, and ''we'' as a group, without instructions from the leadership on either side of the aisle, that we would send the names to the leadership unranked, and, as the Speaker said, in alphabetic order. And that is exactly what we did.

Now, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) and I met with the Speaker, the majority leader and the minority leader in the Speaker's rooms, and we presented the three names. The gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) and I both said we personally thought that Father O'Brien was the best. But that was our personal opinion, that was not the statement from the committee. The committee clearly intended that the decision be made by the three leaders, without any bias for what we had done. Our job was to go out and advertise, bring in applicants, interview them, narrow the field to three, and send the names up to be picked by the leadership.

This Speaker should be commended for opening the process. Three of the last four Democrat Speakers were Catholic. They never considered a priest. Over 50 years of the last 60-some in the history of this House, the Democrat party has been in charge. They never considered a priest.

So I think that we have said enough. The record was we did not rank these people, and the decision was to be made by the leadership without bias.

□

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET—FISCAL YEAR 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). Pursuant to House Resolution 446 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 290.

□ 1655

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 290) with Mr. LAHOOD (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, 40 minutes of debate remained on the subject of economic goals and policies.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) has 17½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) has 22½ minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON).

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

Mr. Chairman, before we were delayed for the proceedings that just concluded, I was involved with the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) in carrying out the statutory rights that we have as members of the Joint Economic Committee to discuss the budget in the context of our economy and the various aspects of the economy that may have something to do with policies of our government.

I would like to turn to another subject. I discussed Fed policy at some length earlier, and I would like to spend a few minutes discussing one other set of issues that had to do with the potential effect of high oil prices on the economy as we move forward.

As I said before, overall economic conditions are strong. Rising oil prices and gasoline prices are one of several economic issues, however, that concerns millions of Americans.

This week Energy Secretary Richardson began a trip to OPEC nations to try to convince them to lower sky-high oil and gas prices. I believe the administration should release some oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, like several other Members do, but there is another source of pressure also available to help American consumers.

A review of the situation reveals that U.S. taxpayer dollars are being provided to nations involved with the OPEC conspiracy to raise oil and gas prices. Consumers across America are outraged when they pull up to the pump and view each day or each week the rapid price increase in home heating fuel and gasoline prices over the last few months. In the section of the country where I live, that is the Northeast, I am from New Jersey, of course, we are especially hard hit because of our dependence on home heating oil.

OPEC's supply restrictions are a primary reason for these price hikes, I think all Americans know that today, and many Americans are justifiably angry at the oil producing nations and their allies. These citizens would be even more angry if they knew their hard-earned tax dollars were being funneled to key oil producing nations by the United States Government. That is right, billions of U.S. taxpayer dollars are being funneled to oil producers such as Algeria, Venezuela, Indonesia, and Mexico. These U.S. resources are first contributed to the international monetary fund, the IMF, and then lent to various nations at cut-rate rates.

The oil producers are now borrowing from the IMF at interest rates of about 4.7 percent, much lower interest rates than typical taxpayers can get on their home or their car or their credit card loans. Interest rates this low do not make any economic sense. Subsidies are being provided by taxpayers, our constituents, to these borrowing nations who are Members of OPEC who are forcing up the price of petroleum.

Many argue that this is a way to provide foreign aid or to promote U.S. interests. However, the IMF is not supposed to be an aid agency, and much of its activity does not reflect U.S. interests. Only a year ago I had to act to force the IMF to stop a planned mission to Iraq, another oil producing Nation that is also an enemy and on the U.S. list of states that sponsor terrorism.

□ 1700

If taxpayer subsidies to several of the oil-producing nations cause them to argue against OPEC supply reductions, this would be consistent with the argument that U.S. subsidies to the IMF and its borrowers were in our Nation's best interest. However, this is not the case. These oil producers cooperate with OPEC even after receiving IMF loans. In other words, they take our money and act against us anyway. In fact, at least four of these oil-producing nations have been among the most active borrowers of the IMF over the last 2 decades. One of these, of course, is Algeria, traditionally one of the hard-line price hawks in OPEC.

I am currently drafting legislation to address this situation, and I hope to have the grand support of Members from both sides of the aisle. We will address the situation by exerting pressure on oil-producing nations that are subsidized by U.S. taxpayers through the IMF. The U.S. Government should tell these countries in no uncertain terms that past aid extended through the IMF demands reciprocity now. The perpetual IMF borrowers should be reminded that the U.S. is the largest single source of IMF funds and that the U.S. will not support continued IMF borrowing by unfriendly nations. The U.S. Government, including the U.S. representative on the executive board of the IMF, should pressure oil-borrowing producers to undercut the OPEC cartel and let market forces lower oil prices. U.S. taxpayers are under no obligation, Mr. Chairman, to subsidize OPEC or its allies as they conspire to keep oil prices high.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Chair will remind all Members to remove charts and exhibits from the well of the House when they are not being utilized in debate. The point is, if Members are not utilizing these, they should not be exhibited. When the Members come to the well, they can use them; but when they are not in the well, they should be removed.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE).

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, may I respond to the Speaker's comment before we go on?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman has 3 minutes. He may proceed.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I was the next speaker and had these charts up earlier, and I am the next speaker now, and that is why they are on the floor, in answer to the Chairman's announcement.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair will remind all Members to remove charts and exhibits from the well of the House when they are not being utilized in debate.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE).

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, we are embarked on a very important exercise this week, the adoption of the House budget resolution. I think that it is well that we keep in mind the state of our Nation's economy and the state of the Nation's debt as we proceed. So as a member of the Joint Economic Committee, I would like to review these matters in the context of the budget.

First, with respect to the debt, the United States currently has a debt of about $5.7 trillion, about $21,000 for every man, woman, and child in this country. And we can see, Mr. Chairman, how this debt has mushroomed since 1980. It has increased over fivefold, 570 percent, in fact, in a period of 20 years.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the previous person to address the House reminded us that we have seen good economic times. I would point out that during these good economic times we built the economy or strengthened it, if you will, on the backs of our children and our grandchildren. Now that we finally have an era when a balanced budget is possible, I think it is very important not to forget that even with a balanced budget, we still have $5.7 trillion of debt.

Balancing the budget in the year 2000 in no way wipes out the enormous size of this debt. Our first obligation, I submit, as we move ahead is to make sure that we responsibly use this surplus to pay down on this debt. We cannot say that we are doing that if we simply respect the integrity of the Social Security program. Yes, it may reduce some of this red ink in terms of what we owe to private investors or foreign investors in American bonds, but in no way does it diminish the debt that we owe all together. I submit that what we owe to the Social Security program is just as much debt as anything else that we owe.

Mr. Chairman, I know that my Republican colleagues like to try to paint over this with a happy scenario and neglect to explain that even with the 5-year projections that they have for their budget, that the size of the U.S. debt grows, let me emphasize that, that over the next 5 years, the size of the United States debt will grow to $5.9 trillion. This, I submit, is unconscionable. In a period of surplus, we ought to be reducing the debt that we owe, not seeing it expand to $5.9 trillion.

We have several different budget proposals that will be voted on this evening. I would like to point out the differences between three of them. This is how much is devoted to debt reduction over the next 10 years; that is, how much smaller will our debt be. The debt, unfortunately, will not shrink with the Republican proposal; it will shrink with the Democratic proposal, and it will shrink more dramatically with the Blue Dog Coalition proposal.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN).

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I sat in my office and I was listening to some of the debate today. I was meeting with different constituents, all coming up to ask for different things because of needs that they have, and I was somewhat astonished that we kept hearing about how only the Republican Congress put this national government back into surpluses. Well, I quite frankly do not agree with that. I just have to voice my opinion about that. I think that is just a real stretch here.

However, I do want to say that I will not vote for the Republican budget resolution and will support the Democratic alternative for lots of reasons. Yesterday on this floor I talked about renewable resources for gas so that we could go on with solar energy, wind, biomass; and I think that is an absolute necessity for this country. I think the veterans' mail order plan is absolutely something that has to be done, something that I have looked at and actually introduced. I think the extension of Social Security for 15 years, the Republican plan, does nothing in that area, Medicare by 10 years, and then the long-term tax credit for caregivers, and then also in education, reducing class size, renovation of schools, Pell grants, Head Start; we can go on and on. And as importantly as all of these expenditures are, so is paying down the debt.

Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons I come here today is to talk about an issue that I think has become a national interest; and obviously, it has caught people's attention, because everybody wants to talk about it now, and that is prescription drugs. Last year my colleagues and I on the Committee on Ways and Means actually offered a no-cost program to this country to have a prescription drug plan that would have cut the benefit or to have cut the actual drug cost in half. It was denied. We never even had the chance to talk about it last year.

Now, we have $40 billion in the Democratic budget, which I think is tied to a prescription drug benefit; and my understanding is that on the Republican side they have $40 billion reserve fund for an undefined prescription drug benefit and defined only if Medicare reform happens. If Medicare reform happens, as I know some on the other side would like to have, it changes how we see Medicare in this country. It actually potentially puts us in a voucher system, some people like to call it premium support.

So I cannot support something that is tied. Why, why are we going to hold our seniors hostage, hostage to Medicare reform to get a prescription drug benefit? Let us face it. We give them in the hospitals through health care already prescription drugs to make them better. We get them stabilized, we do everything that we possibly can, and then we send them home and we do nothing.

So please support the Democratic substitute.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), the vice chairman of the Joint Economic Committee on which I serve.

The purpose of this Humphrey-Hawkins debate here is to talk about the law and how it relates to the Federal Government; and for educational purposes, the Humphrey-Hawkins law is the law that governs the Federal Reserve. We are here to talk about how these laws impact our economy.

The chairman of the Federal Reserve, in multiple testimony to Congress in both the House and the Senate, has said, and this is a quote from the chairman of the Federal Reserve, Alan Greenspan, January 26, 2000, testifying before the Senate Banking Committee. Chairman Greenspan said,

> My first priority would be to allow as much of the surplus to flow through and into a reduction of the debt to the public. If that proves politically unfeasible, I would opt for cutting taxes, and under no conditions do I see any room in the longer term outlook for major changes in expenditures.

Let us review what we are trying to accomplish in this budget. What we have accomplished just in the last few years alone is an unprecedented level of debt reduction, following Chairman Greenspan's advice. In 1998 we paid $51 billion off on the Federal debt. In 1999, $88 billion paid toward reducing the Federal debt. In the year 2000, this year alone, we are dedicating $163 billion toward reducing the national debt held by the public; and next year as we project, we will be dedicating $170 billion to reducing the public debt, for a grand total of paying off the Federal debt held by the public to zero in 12 years.

Mr. Chairman, this budget we are considering before us today is the most sweeping document this body has ever agreed to in a generation. We, for the first time in a generation, are stopping the raid on the Social Security Trust Fund.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) and I plan to bring legislation to the floor of Congress which says no longer can Congress ever go back to the days of dipping into the Social Security Trust Fund. We are going to use those surpluses to pay off the debt held by the public. In the first 5 years alone in this budget, we will pay off $1 trillion of debt. We will bring our public debt from $3.5 trillion down to $2.4 trillion in the next 5 years alone. This is what fiscal responsibility is all about. This is what we are achieving in this budget resolution we are having here. This is what Chairman Alan Greenspan is telling us to do.

Remember what he said after we get the debt paid off. He said, after you pay off the public debt, reduce taxes. Under no conditions spend more money.

So here is what we are doing. The priorities of this budget are basically this: first, stop raiding the Social Security Trust Fund. Second, pay off the national debt. And as we pay off the national debt, if taxpayers are still overpaying their taxes, give them their money back, rather than spend it on new programs in Washington. That is the division here.

What are we trying to do by giving people their money back after paying off the debt, after stopping the raid on Social Security? We are doing this: we are ending the marriage tax penalty so that those who are married do not have to pay taxes just for being married. We are repealing the Social Security earnings limit so seniors who want to go back into the workforce are not penalized by losing some of their Social Security benefit simply for trying to supplement their insurance income. We are reducing the death tax, so that small business owners, family farmers, can pass their businesses, their farms on to the next generation without the Government taking it away from them. We are expanding educational savings accounts so parents can pay for sending their children to schools, to private schools, to public schools, to college, to vocational technical colleges. We are increasing health care deductibility for the self-employed. For people who, if they do not get health insurance from their job, we are saying, you should be able to write your premiums off of your income taxes just like any other corporation can do.

□ 1715

We are providing tax breaks for poor communities to revive those urban, inner-city areas that are in despair that need a help on that rung of the economic ladder where they are at the bottom.

We are trying to strengthen pension plans so that workers who are changing jobs in a rapidly changing economy can bring their pensions with them as they change those jobs without fear of tax taking away their pensions, without fear of losing some of their pension when they change their jobs. This is the priority spelled out in this budget.

Mr. Chairman, the responsible budget is the Republican budget and a budget that pays off debt and lets people keep more of their own hard working money in the Republican budget.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Doggett).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, as the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN) just pointed out, we offered the Republican majority an opportunity in the Committee on Ways and Means last fall in the Thurman-Doggett proposal to deal with this problem of prescriptions for our seniors. It was soundly rejected, as it is in this resolution.

Instead of addressing the price discrimination that our seniors face where, in Travis County, for example, on the five most commonly used drugs, those seniors who do not have insurance are paying 136 percent more than the most favored customers of the pharmaceutical industry, instead of addressing that discrimination which could be done for very little no cost to the federal government, the pharmaceutical industry's best friends in this Congress are blocking action.

What do they offer in this proposal as an alternative? A new welfare program. I can tell my colleagues that our seniors do not need another welfare program. What they need is an end to the discrimination that the pharmaceutical industry, backed by its many Republican supporters in this Congress, cause our American seniors to face with reference to getting the essentials for their health care.

But of course there is a medicinal aspect to this resolution. One can almost see in this resolution, coming out of the Old West, a dilapidated wagon with a banner that promises ''better health, restored youth, quality schools, more of one's money in one's pocket,'' this is the old time medicine man with ''tax cut elixir,'' the same old snake oil that pours out here every spring. We seem to have spring ritual, rite of spring in this House with this medicine man coming along most every year. It does not make any difference what the season is economically or the reason politically, there is always a tax cut for every need of this country. The same elixir that is offered every year at this time.

Mr. Chairman, they used to say, how do you spell relief? T-U-M-S. Now it is ''tax relief.'' What kind of tax relief does the ordinary American citizen get? Not much from this Congress.

We had the so-called ''marriage penalty relief.'' I do not know if my colleagues have noticed, but our Republican leadership devotes a lot more energy to the titles they put on their bills than what is in them. What did the marriage tax penalty bill do? Well, it gave most of its relief to people that do not incur any marriage tax penalty.

Yesterday, in committee, we considered the educational savings account that is to allow people to send their kids to elite private academies. It is not the kind of tax relief that benefits most American families. I believe in reasonable tax relief but it must be accomplished in a fiscally responsible way. And this resolution fails to do that.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time is remaining on each side.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) has 7 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the chairman of the Committee on Budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me that skimpy amount of time, but I will try to do it in that time.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to just talk for just a few minutes about the economic condition of our country. I wanted to say that it is amazing the prosperity that we are experiencing and continue to experience, with many Americans every day getting up and watching the market, reading the economic reports with disbelief.

I do not think this is just a wild happenstance that we have seen such economic growth and such economic progress. Number one, we have revived our tradition of free trade. When nations are able to trade across borders, it brings prosperity to everyone. That does not mean trade should supplant all values. But it does mean that the fundamental policy of free trade will lift all boats, as my friend Jack Kemp likes to say. He stole that, by the way, from John Kennedy. A free trade will, in fact, rise all boats.

Secondly, of course, we have had new markets. With the fall of the Berlin Wall and with the ability to trade in many parts of the world that we could not trade before, we have been able to, not only experience and promote free trade, but we have been able to practice it with more opportunity because more nations can avail themselves of a unique opportunity to practice free enterprise and free markets and free trade.

We also have had a policy of sound money. Obviously Alan Greenspan deserves a lot of the credit. But all of the Fed Board, and, frankly, even I will give credit today to Robert Rubin, the former Treasury Secretary, I think they always pursued the policy of sound money, which allowed this Nation and the Fed to pursue a policy of low interest rates, which has driven economic growth.

I also believe that the House, the Senate, and the President deserves a great amount of credit for the 1997 budget agreement, for our vigilance in wanting to keep government growth at a low rate to provide continual tax cuts to reduce some of the public debt.

But also, of course, has been the development of new technologies. We are on the edge of what is a remarkable revolution. It comes about every hundred years. How do we recognize it? We recognize it because industries grow off the major growth industries in these kinds of periods.

What we are seeing in biotech and with the communications and with all the information technologies is an amazing development of a new revolution that is driving the essential part of economic growth, which is greater productivity, the ability of people in the same amount of time with the same amount of resources to produce more.

With growing productivity, we begin to dampen the threat of inflation because we eliminate the bottlenecks. Increased productivity means more income for more workers, and it means more supply. When supply is consistent with demand and meets the wage growth, we lose the prospects of inflation.

Let me just give my colleagues a warning and a suggestion that I think the House ought to consider. We need to keep the incentives in place. We need to cut capital gains. Frankly, I think we ought to zero out the capital gains tax because we want people to have incentives to invest, risk take, and build this economy.

Secondly, we should do nothing destructive that damages this new economy. I want to applaud the commission that just met in Dallas for agreeing to extend the no tax of the Internet until at least 2006. We have obviously got to continue to promote free trade in the world.

In addition, the legal system in this country needs significant reform. We need a loser pays legal system with limits on the liabilities, the punitive damages that are strangling, not only medicine, education, all businesses in America, it is choking us, and it holds us back from even stronger economic growth.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we also need to have a school choice program in America where mothers and fathers can send their kids to the best educational settings. With all those, I believe we can continue to grow.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) a member of the Committee on Budget.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, if my colleagues review carefully the Republicans' budget, it really appears to be a massive shell game. They would have us believe that they can deliver massive tax cuts, extend the life of Social Security and Medicare, eliminate every dime of public debt, increase defense spending by massive amounts, not reduce other domestic programs, give prescription drug benefits. They sound like they used to accuse the Democratic Party of being, everything for everybody.

The problem is that the numbers system do not add up. There is not enough money to do all of this. So what one then has to do is figure out now what is their top priority, what will it be under all circumstances, regardless of what happens; and that is reducing taxes by unreasonable and massive amounts.

Now, what did Alan Greenspan say about this? One of the previous speakers put his quote up, and he said we ought to be paying down the debt. I was at the hearing where he testified, and he said we should not be giving tax cuts before we pay down the debt. That is the highest priority we have, paying down the debt. That is what is going to keep our economy moving and sustain the economy moving in the direction that it is going now.

Yet, do they put that at the top of the priority list? No. They put massive tax cuts ahead of paying down the debt. They want to be everything to everybody in this equation.

Mr. Chairman, when we look at the number of dollars that are projected in surplus, the money is simply not there to do all this. We should reject the Republican budget and pass some of the alternative budgets.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, last week, House Republicans held a press conference to announce that their budget would include $40 billion to help low-income elderly pay for their prescription drugs. Today the House Republicans present their budget. But they have already abandoned last week's $40 billion promise. The Republican budget contains no funds specifically reserved for a prescription drug benefit.

Instead, the resolution allows the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to allocate up to $40 billion of the non-Social Security surplus if a bill that reforms Medicare also provides coverage for prescription drugs. This is a separate reserve fund. If they did not create a separate reserve fund, their budget would have a deficit.

Furthermore, their prescription drug reserve is contingent upon a plan to reform the entire Medicare program by turning it over to HMOs. That is a non-starter.

In short, to make room for huge tax cuts for the wealthy, they have abandoned seniors who are trying to stretch their Social Security checks and modest pensions to cover both food and medicine. It is wrong, and this budget should be rejected.

Our seniors do not need empty promises. They need relief now. They are 12 percent of the population, but they use one-third of all prescription drugs. We have done studies which show that, on average, seniors pay twice as much for their medications as the drug companies' best customers, the HMOs, the hospitals, and the Federal Government. They pay more than consumers in Canada or Mexico or anywhere else in the world.

Seniors need action now. They do not get it in the Republican budget. They need a universal prescription drug benefit under Medicare and an end to pharmaceutical company price discrimination. The Democratic budget has $40 billion committed to those goals, and the Republican budget does not.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, here we are today debating the budget, which is the most important work that we have to do as Members of Congress. Our national budget should be a statement of our national values. We should spend our money on what is important to us. But it is hard to see how the Republican budget, the risky, irresponsible Republican budget is a statement of the values of the American people.

The differences between the two parties have been highlighted for us once again in today's debate on the budget resolution. While the Democrats fight for a budget that protects middle class values, extends the life of Social Security and Medicare trust funds, and enables families to meet their responsibilities at home and at work, the Republicans again have sacrificed fiscal responsibility for large and risky tax breaks.

Is it a statement of our national values to give a $200 million tax break to the wealthiest over the next 5 years while cutting $114 billion in domestic initiatives for education, health care, and the environment?

☐ 1730

This downpayment that Republicans are making on the trillion dollar tax scheme proposed by candidate George W. Bush will result in 750,000 fewer women receiving WIC benefits, and that applies to women, infants, and children; 316,000 fewer Pell Grants; and 1,100 fewer FBI agents.

Is it a statement of our national values to give a Republican tax break over the next 10 years which will utilize all of the resources needed to pay down the debt, strengthen the Social Security and Medicare trust funds, and fund priority investments like education, child care and law enforcement?

We know that trading health care, education, and law enforcement for tax cuts does not match the priorities of many American people. It is not a statement of our national values and should be rejected by this House of Representatives.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE).

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

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, as the ranking member of the House Subcommittee on Military Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services, I rise today in strong support of the amendment offered by my dear friend and colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

All Members who believe that we owe our military service members and their family members access to quality health care should support the substitute amendment being offered by the gentleman from South Carolina. The budget being proposed by the gentleman from South Carolina upholds the commitment to our armed forces personnel, particularly our military retirees who were promised health care in return for service to this great Nation.

I support the Democratic budget amendment because it embodies the spirit of H.R. 3655, a bill I introduced along with the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking member of the House Committee on Armed Services, and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR), to improve health care services for our Nation's service members, retirees, and their dependents.

I regret deeply that the Committee on the Budget failed to incorporate necessary authority for the Subcommittee on Military Personnel, enabling us to complete that which should be a bipartisan task. I have high regard for the commitment of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) on these issues. Last year's success on efforts regarding pay, promotion, and benefits in the context of recruitment, retention, and retirement demonstrated what can be done when we set aside partisan considerations. I intend to continue to work with the chairman to accomplish these goals.

But absent the Committee on the Budget preparing us for this, we have to go with the Democratic substitute in order to have our military retirees, our existing active duty members and their families receive the kind of health care that they have been promised. Our active duty troops and their families are having difficulty with access to military health care systems.

The budget alternative before us today would allow for the elimination of copays for active duty personnel and their families who are in the TRICARE Prime program. The amendment also increases access to health care.

Currently, families that receive care at a military treatment facility pay no co-payments. However, families that are not fortunate to live near a military treatment facility and use civilian health care providers in the TRICARE PRIME system must pay co-pays. This is not fair.

The amendment also increases access to health care for our military family members who are often living in remote, rural areas by expanding the TRICARE Prime Remote program. These families are doing some of the hardest duty in the military. We should ensure that these families are cared for, which means that they should not have to drive hundreds of miles to receive health care for which they are entitled. Their ability to access health care services is just as important.

Mr. Chairman, as our honored retired service members continue to age, their need for access to quality health care continues to grow. Today, thousands of our military retirees and their families are often going without the necessary medical care that they need and deserve because they have been shut out of the military health care system.

As you may know, under the current program, military retirees who reach the age of 65 are forced out of the TRICARE Program and receive their health care services through Medicare. For many of these retirees who were promised access to military health care for their lifetime, this has been a broken promise of their faith. Many of these retirees and their families were led to believe that they would have access to military health care services if they made a career of serving their nation.

Unfortunately, as the Department of Defense has drawn down and a number of military hospitals and clinics continue to close, space-available care remains elusive for most retirees. For these Medicare-eligible retirees, many of who are living on a fixed income, the prospects of costly medical care and high-priced pharmaceuticals is a scary proposition.

The alternative budget proposal before us today would allow us to restore the necessary access to quality health care for military retirees over age 65 and their families. The amendment includes a provision that would incorporate the expansion of the TRICARE Senior Prime program, more commonly known as Medicare Subvention. This three-year demonstration program, which will be completed at the end of the year, has been well received by the over 65 retirees. Expansion of this program within the Department of Defense will help a number of military retirees who live near military treatment facilities.

For those who may not live near a military treatment facility, the budget proposal includes funding to expand the current pharmacy benefits. Pharmacy costs for these individuals are often the largest share of health care spending. The average retiree over age 65 spends approximately $620 for prescriptions. For a retired enlisted noncommissioned officer and his family, pharmacy costs can sometimes be nearly 50 percent of their monthly income. Often these families are placed in a difficult and traumatic position of choosing between whether to purchase their prescription drugs or food on their table.

The substitute amendment before us today will improve access to the TRICARE program and enhance access to care for military retirees. I hope that my colleagues will support the Spratt budget amendment and uphold our moral obligation to provide for the health care of our nation's Armed Forces.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget returns to its old ways. The budget that is being offered to us ignores the wishes of the American public and caters to special interests. I would have thought the Republicans would have learned; but they did not, and they are back at it again.

The Republican leadership is offering a budget that fails to extend the life of Social Security and Medicare, that recklessly cuts taxes and squanders the surplus we have worked so hard to gain for the American public. At the same time, they are cutting Head Start and telling 40,000 children and their parents that they cannot participate in this very valuable program. They cut millions of funding from child care, even though families are having a more difficult time finding quality care for their children as more and more Americans find a place in the American work force for the sustainability of their families.

They make empty promises about fully funding special education, but they do so without providing the necessary funds to achieve that goal. They freeze higher education and training funds and cut the purchasing power by 9 percent over 5 years. That means that they deny Pell Grants to 316,000 students who desperately need that assistance to go on to higher education so they can participate in the American economy.

They fail to make the needed investments to fix crumbling and overcrowded schools. They fail to invest in boosting the skills and the knowledge of teachers while continuing to funnel money into scores of wasteful programs and dozens of tax loopholes that benefit those who least need it.

We, on the other hand, are offering a substitute and a clear alternative, a budget that supports millions of hardworking families; that protects Social Security and Medicare; that provides better care and real prescription drug coverage for all of our Nation's seniors with dedicated funds to do so; and that would direct sorely needed support to our schools, provide the resources necessary to help our children reach their highest academic potential.

When it comes to special education, we put our money where the Republicans' mouths are because we provide $4.8 billion more in our plan. We should support the Democratic substitute.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST).

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Chairman, it has been almost comical to watch Republican Member after Republican Member come to the floor today and read the same talking points off the same blue chart. Well, Mr. Chairman, in politics as in life, talk is cheap.

I was reminded of this fact earlier this week when I had the pleasure of speaking with a group of high school students. One of their major concerns, as we can all imagine, is the future of Social Security and Medicare. I remembered that the Republican talking points called this GOP budget ''senior friendly,'' Mr. Chairman. But these students wanted the facts, and the fact is that this Republican budget would have us spending the Social Security surplus in 4 years.

The fact is that this budget does not devote a single dime to extending the life of the Social Security and Medicare trust funds. Mr. Chairman, under the Republican budget, the Social Security Trust Fund would be insolvent just about the time these 17 and 18 year olds that I spoke to this week reach retirement age.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

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

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to issue a statement in response and in disagreement with the position of the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) that only the Democrats' budget has a response to military health care. That is false.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, may I ask what the remaining time is?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Each side has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. STARK. And the majority closes; is that correct, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct, the majority closes.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

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

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

Mr. Chairman, there have been a lot of comments made on the floor, particularly by the majority, about how they have come around to not spending any of the Social Security surplus. I think in our debate we have made it clear if their budget is fully implemented, if they really do make the cuts in discretionary spending, the 11 percent real cuts they talk about, even with their huge tax cut they will still spend part of the Social Security surplus.

But I think history is an even better guide, and there are two points of history that I will bring up. One is that back in 1998 the Republicans brought their budget to the floor, which cut into the Social Security surplus, spent the Social Security surplus as part of their tax cut. They made the argument then that they were going to preserve 80 percent of the Social Security surplus, but they were going to spend 20 percent for a tax cut.

The second point of history that I think needs to be made clear is that since the Republicans have been in control of the Congress, and this is the whole time I have been here, the rate of spending, for nondefense discretionary spending, has gone up above the rate of inflation. As such, it would be hard to make the case that the Republican majority this year is going to actually cut nondefense discretionary spending by 6 percent and by 2003 by 11 percent.

Now, they may pursue that, and they may tell us they are going to do that; but history is working against them. So I think the protestations that they are not cutting into the Social Security surplus are rather hollow.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS) to close the debate for us.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS) is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, as the ranking Democrat on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I rise in strong support for the substitute budget resolution offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking Democratic Member of the House Committee on the Budget.

The Spratt budget resolution is a strong pro-veteran proposal that deserves the support of every Member of this body. It provides more discretionary spending in fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Veterans Affairs than either the budget proposed by the President or the budget resolution reported by the committee. With these additional funds, VA can better meet the medical needs of our Nation's aging veteran population.

Specifically, for fiscal year 2001, the Spratt alternative provides $22.3 billion in appropriations for veterans' programs, $100 million more than the Republican plan and $200 million more than the President's plan. Over 5 years, 2001 through 2005, the Spratt alternative provides $1 billion more than the Republican proposal for veterans' medical care.

Significantly, the Spratt proposal also increases the monthly GI bill benefit, which is mandatory spending. This increase in the educational benefit for veterans who have honorably served our Nation in uniform is clearly needed and long overdue.

This increase proposed by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) is an important first step in restoring our commitment to providing veterans a readjustment benefit for education which is worthy of their sacrifices to this country. Under this proposal, the basic educational benefit for veterans will increase from the current $535 a month for 36 months to nearly $700 a month.

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

Mr. Chairman, this has been an interesting debate; but I would like to remind the last string of 1½ minute or 2-minute speakers on the other side that the purpose of the Humphrey-Hawkins discussion is to talk about the Federal Government and the potential effect the Fed has on the economy and the potential effect that our government has on the economy.

Let me make five points, five reasons why the economy is doing good. And maybe some people will feel good about it, I hope they will, because we have done some things right around here, both Republicans and Democrats, Members of the House and the administration.

I already talked about point number one. Lower inflation actually improves growth. And the Federal Reserve has gone out of its way to target inflation. It has brought interest rates down along with inflation and that has provided a lift for our economy.

Number two. Government spending has actually fallen as a percentage of GDP. This is an important point. As a matter of fact, in 1992, our government spent 22 percent of our GDP. Today, we spend 19.5 percent of our GDP. And members of the Committee on the Budget, led by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), should say a cheer for themselves for that point.

Number three. Lower tax rates remain in place. In spite of the hyperbole coming from the other side about Republicans that want to the cut taxes, marginal rates are still lower than they were in the 1960s, the 1970s, or the 1980s; and it is a primary factor in helping us lift the economy.

Number four. Investment has worked to expand capacity, particularly technological change, which has increased productivity. American workers today produce more per man-hour and woman-hour than ever before because of the technological changes that have taken place, another important factor in improving our economy.

Finally, global competition and freer trade have fostered growth. As we have opened markets around the world, as we have encouraged exports to take place, we have opened those new markets and created new opportunities for businesses all across our country and, therefore, opportunities for workers all across our country, another major boost to our economy.

□ 1745

So, Mr. Chairman, when speaker after speaker gets up on the other side, they are ignoring the facts, they are ignoring the progress that we have made in terms of spending, in terms of taxing, in terms of fighting inflation. All of these are important factors that need to be discussed.

So I am pleased to have had the opportunity to close, Mr. Chairman, to make these points.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in Part A of House Report 106–535 is considered as an original concurrent resolution for the purpose of amendment and is considered read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 290

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001.

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000 is hereby revised and replaced and that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001 and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2002 through 2005 are hereby set forth.

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2005:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,465,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,504,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,549,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,598,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,650,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,719,100,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be reduced are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $0.
Fiscal year 2001: $10,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $22,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $31,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $42,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $45,000,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,478,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,524,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,557,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,603,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,653,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,712,200,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,460,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,490,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,536,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,581,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,630,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,689,200,000,000.

(4) SURPLUSES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the surpluses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $5,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $14,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $12,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $16,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $20,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $29,900,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $5,640,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $5,710,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $5,787,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $5,869,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $5,944,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $6,007,800,000,000.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and budget outlays for fiscal years 2000 through 2005 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $288,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $282,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $306,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $297,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $309,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $302,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $315,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $309,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $323,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $317,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $331,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $328,100,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $20,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $19,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $19,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $18,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $18,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $18,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,800,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $19,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $20,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $20,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $20,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $20,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $21,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,500,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $1,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $1,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$900,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $24,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $25,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $25,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $25,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $25,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $25,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,100,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $35,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $19,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $18,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $17,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $17,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $15,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,200,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $7,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $6,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $8,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $9,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $13,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $13,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,600,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $54,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $59,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $57,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $58,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $58,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $58,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,100,000,000.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $11,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $9,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $8,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $8,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $8,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $8,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,800,000,000.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $57,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $72,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $74,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $72,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $75,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $76,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $77,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,200,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $159,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $152,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $169,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $167,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $179,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $177,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $191,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $190,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $205,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $205,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $221,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $220,300,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $199,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $199,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $215,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $216,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $221,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $221,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $239,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $239,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $255,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $255,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $278,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $278,700,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $238,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $248,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $252,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $254,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $263,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $264,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $272,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $273,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $281,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $283,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $294,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $295,900,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $14,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $14,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $15,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $16,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $17,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,400,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $46,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $47,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $49,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $50,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $52,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $55,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,900,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $27,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $28,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $27,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $27,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $28,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $28,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,100,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $13,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $13,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $13,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
ew budget authority, $13,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $13,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,500,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $284,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $284,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $288,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $288,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $290,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $290,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $285,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $285,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $280,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $280,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $275,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $275,400,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $8,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$4,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$8,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$2,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$2,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$2,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$4,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$4,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, −$4,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$4,300,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$34,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$34,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$38,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$38,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$41,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$41,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$40,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$40,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$38,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$38,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, −$39,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$39,200,000,000.

SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

(a) LEGISLATION PROVIDING $150 BILLION IN TAX RELIEF OVER A 5-YEAR PERIOD.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report to the House a reconciliation bill—

(1) not later than May 26, 2000;
(2) not later than June 23, 2000;
(3) not later than July 28, 2000; and
(4) not later than September 22, 2000;

that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the total level of revenues by not more than: $10,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and $150,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

(b) SUBMISSIONS REGARDING DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report to the House a reconciliation bill—

(1) not later than May 26, 2000, that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the debt held by the public by $10,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2001; and

(2) not later than September 22, 2000, that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the debt held by the public by not more than $20,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2001.

SEC. 5. LOCK-BOX FOR SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) under the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the social security trust funds are off-budget for purposes of the President's budget submission and the concurrent resolution on the budget;

(2) the social security trust funds have been running surpluses for 17 years;

(3) these surpluses have been used to implicitly finance the general operations of the Federal Government;

(4) in fiscal year 2001, the social security surplus will be $166 billion;

(5) this resolution balances the Federal budget without counting the social security surpluses;

(6) the only way to ensure that social security surpluses are not diverted for other purposes is to balance the budget exclusive of such surpluses; and

(7) Congress and the President should take such steps as are necessary to ensure that future budgets are balanced excluding the surpluses generated by the social security trust funds.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any revision to this resolution or a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2002, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that sets forth a deficit for any fiscal year.

(2) DEFICIT LEVELS.—For purposes of this subsection, a deficit shall be the level (if any) set forth in the most recently agreed to

concurrent resolution on the budget for that fiscal year pursuant to section 301(a)(3) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that legislation should be enacted in this session of Congress that would enforce the reduction in debt held by the public assumed in this resolution by the imposition of a statutory limit on such debt or other appropriate means.

SEC. 6. DEBT REDUCTION LOCK-BOX.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any reported bill or joint resolution, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that would cause a surplus for fiscal year 2001 to be less than the level (as adjusted for reconciliation or other tax-related legislation, medicare, or agriculture as considered pursuant to section 4, 7, 8(a) or (c), 9, 10, 11, or 12) set forth in section 2(4) for that fiscal year.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—The level of the surplus for purposes of subsection (a) shall take into account amounts adjusted under section 314(a)(2)(B) or (C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

SEC. 7. SPECIAL PROCEDURES TO SAFEGUARD TAX RELIEF.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS TO PRESERVE SURPLUSES.—Upon the reporting of a reconciliation bill by the Committee on Ways and Means pursuant to section 4(a) or, the offering of an amendment to, or the submission of a conference report on, H.R. 3081, H.R. 6, or H.R. 2990, whichever occurs first, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House shall reduce to zero the amounts by which aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be reduced as set forth in section 2(1)(B) (and make all other appropriate conforming adjustments).

(b) ADJUSTMENTS FOR REVENUE BILLS.—After making the adjustments referred to in paragraph (1), and whenever the Committee on Ways and Means reports any reconciliation bill pursuant to section 4(a) (or an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted) or an amendment to H.R. 3081, H.R. 6, or H.R. 2990 is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted after the date of adoption of this resolution, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House shall increase the levels by which Federal revenues should be reduced by the reduction in revenue caused by such measure for each applicable year or period, but not to exceed, after taking into account any other bill or joint resolution enacted during this session of the One Hundred Sixth Congress that causes a reduction in revenues for such year or period, $10,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2001 and $150,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005 (and make all other appropriate conforming adjustments).

SEC. 8. RESERVE FUND PROVIDING AN ADDITIONAL $50 BILLION FOR ADDITIONAL TAX RELIEF AND DEBT REDUCTION.

(a) ADDITIONAL TAX RELIEF AND DEBT REDUCTION.—Whenever the Committee on Ways and Means reports any reconciliation bill pursuant to section 4(a) (or an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted), or an amendment to H.R. 3081, H.R. 2990, or to H.R. 6 is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted after the date of adoption of this resolution (after taking into account any other bill or joint resolution enacted during this session of the One Hundred Sixth Congress that would cause a reduction in revenues for fiscal year 2001 or the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005) that would cause the level by which Federal revenues should be reduced, as set forth in section 2(1)(B) for such fiscal year or for such period, as adjusted, to be exceeded, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House may increase the levels by which Federal revenues should be reduced by the amount exceeding such level resulting from such measure, but not to exceed $5,155,000,000 in fiscal year 2001 and $50,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005 (and make all other appropriate conforming adjustments, including reconciliation instructions set forth in section 4(a)).

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ADDITIONAL HEALTH-RELATED TAX RELIEF.—It is the sense of Congress that the reserve fund set forth in subsection (a) assumes $446,000,000 in fiscal year 2001 and $4,352,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005 for health-related tax provisions comparable to those contained in H.R. 2990 (as passed the House).

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON FEDERAL EMPLOYEES BENEFIT PACKAGE.—It is the sense of Congress that the reserve fund set forth in subsection (a) assumes $17,000,000 in fiscal year 2001 and $107,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005 for legislation that permits Federal employees to immediately participate in the Thrift Savings Plan.

SEC. 9. RESERVE FUND FOR AUGUST UPDATE REVISION OF BUDGET SURPLUSES.

(a) REPORTING A SURPLUS.—If the Congressional Budget Office report referred to in subsection (c) projects an increase in the surplus for fiscal year 2000, fiscal year 2001, and the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005 over the corresponding levels set forth in its March 2000 economic and budget forecast for fiscal year 2001, submitted pursuant to section 202(e)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House may make the adjustments as provided in subsection (b).

(b) ADJUSTMENTS.—Whenever the Committee on Ways and Means reports any reconciliation bill pursuant to section 4(a) (or an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted), or an amendment to H.R. 3081, H.R. 6, or H.R. 2990 is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted after the date of adoption of this resolution that (after taking into account any other bill or joint resolution enacted during this session of the One Hundred Sixth Congress that would cause a reduction in revenues for such year or period) would cause the level by which Federal revenues should be reduced, as set forth in section 2(1)(B) for fiscal year 2001 or for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005, as adjusted, to be exceeded, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House may increase the levels by which Federal revenues should be reduced by the amount exceeding such level resulting from such measure for each applicable year or period (or for fiscal year 2000 may increase the level of the surplus and make all other appropriate conforming adjustments, including reconciliation instructions set forth in section 4(a)), but not to exceed the increase in the surplus for such year or period in the report referred to in subsection (a).

(c) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE UPDATED BUDGET FORECAST FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001—The report referred to in subsection (a) is the Congressional Budget Office updated budget forecast for fiscal year 2001.

SEC. 10. RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE.

Whenever the Committee on Ways and Means or Committee on Commerce of the House reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto is offered (in the House), or a conference report thereon is submitted that reforms the medicare program and provides coverage for prescription drugs, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the aggregates and allocations of new budget authority (and outlays resulting therefrom) by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, but not to exceed $2,000,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 2001 and $40,000,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005 (and make all other appropriate conforming adjustments).

SEC. 11. RESERVE FUND FOR AGRICULTURE IN FISCAL YEAR 2000.

Whenever the Committee on Agriculture of the House reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto is offered (in the House), or a conference report thereon is submitted that provides income support to owners and producers of farms, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of new budget authority and outlays to that committee for fiscal year 2000 by the amount of new budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) provided by that measure for that purpose not to exceed $6,000,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 2000, $0 in new budget authority and outlays for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2004, and $6,000,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004 (and make all other appropriate conforming adjustments).

SEC. 12. RESERVE FUND FOR AGRICULTURE IN FISCAL YEAR 2001.

Whenever the Committee on Agriculture of the House reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto is offered (in the House), or a conference report thereon is submitted that provides risk management or income assistance for agricultural producers, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of new budget authority and outlays to that committee by the amount of new budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) if such legislation does not exceed $1,355,000,000 in new budget authority and $595,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2001 and $8,359,000,000 in new budget authority and $7,223,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005 (and make all other appropriate conforming adjustments).

SEC. 13. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to section 7(b), 8(a) or (c), 9, 10, 11, or 12 for any measure shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution—

(1) the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives or the Senate, as applicable; and

(2) such chairman, as applicable, may make any other necessary adjustments to such levels to carry out this resolution.

SEC. 14. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) while the budget may be in balance, it continues to be ridden with waste, fraud, and abuse;

(2) just last month, auditors documented more than $19,000,000,000 in improper payments each year by such agencies as the Agency of International Development, the Internal Revenue Service, the Social Security Administration, and the Department of Defense;

(3) the General Accounting Office (GAO) recently reported that the financial management practices of some Federal agencies are so poor that it is unable to determine the full extent of improper government payments; and

(4) the GAO now lists a record number of 25 Federal programs that are at ''high risk'' of waste, fraud, and abuse.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that the Committee on the Budget has created task forces to address this issue and that the President should take immediate steps to reduce waste, fraud, and abuse within the Federal Government and report on such actions to the Congress and that the resolution should include reconciliation directives to the appropriate committees of jurisdiction to dedicate the resulting savings to debt reduction and tax relief.

SEC. 15. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PROVIDING ADDITIONAL DOLLARS TO THE CLASSROOM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) strengthening America's public schools while respecting State and local control is critically important to the future of our children and our Nation;

(2) education is a local responsibility, a State priority, and a national concern;

(3) a partnership with the Nation's governors, parents, teachers, and principals must take place in order to strengthen public schools and foster educational excellence;

(4) the consolidation of various Federal education programs will benefit our Nation's children, parents, and teachers by sending more dollars directly to the classroom; and

(5) our Nation's children deserve an educational system that will provide opportunities to excel.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Congress should enact legislation that would consolidate thirty-one Federal K–12 education programs; and

(2) the Department of Education, the States, and local educational agencies should work together to ensure that not less than 95 percent of all funds appropriated for the purpose of carrying out elementary and secondary education programs administered by the Department of Education is spent for our children in their classrooms.

SEC. 16. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING EMERGENCY SPENDING.

It is the sense of Congress that, as a part of a comprehensive reform of the budget process, the Committees on the Budget should develop a definition of, and a process for, funding emergencies consistent with the applicable provisions of H.R. 853, the Comprehensive Budget Process Reform Act of 1999, that could be incorporated into the Rules of the House of Representatives and the Standing Rules of the Senate.

SEC. 17. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON ESTIMATES OF THE IMPACT OF REGULATIONS ON THE PRIVATE SECTOR.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) the Federal regulatory system sometimes adversely affects many Americans and businesses by imposing financial burdens with little corresponding public benefit;

(2) currently, Congress has no general mechanism for assessing the financial impact of regulatory activities on the private sector;

(3) Congress is ultimately responsible for making sure agencies act in accordance with congressional intent and, while the executive branch is responsible for promulgating regulations, Congress should curb ineffective regulations by using its oversight and regulatory powers; and

(4) a variety of reforms have been suggested to increase congressional oversight over regulatory activity, including directing the President to prepare an annual accounting statement containing several cost/benefit analyses, recommendations to reform inefficient regulatory programs, and an identification and analysis of duplications and inconsistencies among such programs.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that the House should reclaim its role as reformer and take the first step toward curbing inefficient regulatory activity by passing legislation authorizing the Congressional Budget Office to prepare regular estimates on the impact of proposed Federal regulations on the private sector.

SEC. 18. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON BIENNIAL BUDGET.

It is the sense of the House that there is a wide range of views on the advisability of biennial budgeting and this issue should be considered only within the context of comprehensive budget process reform.

SEC. 19. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ACCESS TO HEALTH INSURANCE AND PRESERVING HOME HEALTH SERVICES FOR ALL MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES.

(a) ACCESS TO HEALTH INSURANCE.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) 44.4 million Americans are currently without health insurance, and that this number is expected to rise to nearly 60 million people in the next 10 years;

(B) the cost of health insurance continues to rise, a key factor in increasing the number of uninsured; and

(C) there is a consensus that working Americans and their families will suffer from reduced access to health insurance.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON IMPROVING ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE INSURANCE.—It is the sense of Congress that access to affordable health care coverage for all Americans is a priority of the 106th Congress.

(b) PRESERVING HOME HEALTH SERVICE FOR ALL MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 reformed Medicare home health care spending by instructing the Health Care Financing Administration to implement a prospective payment system and instituted an interim payment system to achieve savings;

(B) the Medicare, Medicaid, and SCHIP Balanced Budget Refinement Act, 1999, reformed the interim payment system to increase reimbursements to low-cost providers and delayed the automatic 15 percent payment reduction until after the first year of the implementation of the prospective payment system; and

(C) patients whose care is more extensive and expensive than the typical Medicare patient do not receive supplemental payments in the interim payment system but will receive special protection in the home health care prospective payment system.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ACCESS TO HOME HEALTH CARE.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(A) Congress recognizes the importance of home health care for seniors and disabled citizens;

(B) Congress and the Administration should work together to maintain quality care for patients whose care is more extensive and expensive than the typical Medicare patient, including the sickest and frailest Medicare beneficiaries, while home health care agencies operate in the interim payment system; and

(C) Congress and the Administration should work together to avoid the implementation of the 15 percent reduction in the prospective payment system and ensured timely implementation of that system.

SEC. 20. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING MEDICARE+CHOICE PROGRAMS/REIMBURSEMENT RATES.

It is the sense of Congress that the Medicare+Choice regional disparity among reimbursement rates is unfair, and that full funding of the Medicare+Choice program is a priority as Congress deals with any medicare reform legislation.

SEC. 21. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON DIRECTING THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TO ACCEPT NEGATIVE NUMBERS IN FARM INCOME AVERAGING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) farmers' and ranchers' incomes vary widely from year to year due to uncontrollable markets and unpredictable weather;

(2) in the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997, Congress enacted 3-year farm income averaging to protect agricultural producers from excessive tax rates in profitable years;

(3) last year, the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) proposed final regulations for averaging farm income which fail to make clear that taxable income in a given year may be a negative number; and

(4) this IRS interpretation can result in farmers having to pay additional taxes during years in which they experience a loss in income.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that during this session of the 106th Congress, legislation should be considered to direct the Internal Revenue Service to count any net loss of income in determining the proper rate of taxation.

SEC. 22. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING THE STABILIZATION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL PAYMENTS TO STATES, COUNTIES, AND BOROUGHS.

It is the sense of the House that Federal revenue-sharing payments to States, counties, and boroughs pursuant to the Act of May 23, 1908 (35 Stat. 260; 16 U.S.C. 500), the Act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 963; 16 U.S.C. 500), the Act of August 28, 1937 (chapter 876; 50 Stat. 875; 43 U.S.C. 1181f), the Act of May 24, 1939 (chapter 144; 53 Stat. 753; 43 U.S.C. 1181f–1 et seq.), and sections 13982 and 13983 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 (Public Law 103–66; 16 U.S.C. 500 note; 43 U.S.C. 1181f note) should be stabilized and maintained for the long-term benefit of schools, roads, public services, and communities, and that providing such permanent, stable funding is a priority of the 106th Congress.

SEC. 23. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE IMPORTANCE OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the year 2000 will mark the 50th Anniversary of the National Science Foundation;

(2) the National Science Foundation is the largest supporter of basic research in the Federal Government;

(3) the National Science Foundation is the second largest supporter of university-based research;

(4) research conducted by the grantees of the National Science Foundation has led to innovations that have dramatically improved the quality of life of all Americans;

(5) grants made by the National Science Foundation have been a crucial factor in the development of important technologies that Americans take for granted, such as lasers, Magnetic Resonance Imaging, Doppler Radar, and the Internet;

(6) because basic research funded by the National Science Foundation is high-risk, cutting edge, fundamental, and may not produce tangible benefits for over a decade,

the Federal Government is uniquely suited to support such research; and

(7) the National Science Foundation's focus on peer-reviewed merit based grants represents a model for research agencies across the Federal Government.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the function 250 (Basic Science) levels assume an amount of funding which ensures that the National Science Foundation is a priority in the resolution; recognizing the National Science Foundation's critical role in funding basic research, which leads to the innovations that assure the Nation's economic future, and in cultivating America's intellectual infrastructure.

SEC. 24. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING SKILLED NURSING FACILITIES.

It is the sense of Congress that the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission continue to carefully monitor the medicare skilled nursing benefit to determine if payment rates are sufficient to provide quality care, and that if reform is recommended, Congress should pass legislation as quickly as possible to assure quality skilled nursing care.

SEC. 25. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON SPECIAL EDUCATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) all children deserve a quality education, including children with disabilities;

(2) the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act provides that the Federal, State, and local governments are to share in the expense of educating children with disabilities and commits the Federal Government to pay up to 40 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure for children with disabilities;

(3) the high cost of educating children with disabilities and the Federal Government's failure to fully meet its obligation under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act stretches limited State and local education funds, creating difficulty in providing a quality education to all students, including children with disabilities;

(4) the current level of Federal funding to States and localities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act is contrary to the goal of ensuring that children with disabilities receive a quality education;

(5) the Federal Government has failed to appropriate 40 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure per child with a disability as required under the Individuals with Disabilities Act to assist States and localities to educate children with disabilities; and

(6) the levels in function 500 (Education) for fiscal year 2001 assume sufficient discretionary budget authority to accommodate fiscal year 2001 appropriations for IDEA at least $2,000,000,000 above such funding levels appropriated in fiscal year 2000.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Congress and the President should increase fiscal year 2001 funding for programs under the Individuals with Disabilities Act by at least $2,000,000,000 above fiscal year 2000 appropriated levels;

(2) Congress and the President should give programs under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act the highest priority among Federal elementary and secondary education programs by meeting the commitment to fund the maximum State grant allocation for educating children with disabilities under such Act prior to authorizing or appropriating funds for any new education initiative;

(3) Congress and the President may consider, if new or increased funding is authorized or appropriated for any elementary and secondary education initiative that directs funds to local educational agencies, providing the flexibility in such authorization or appropriation necessary to allow local educational agencies the authority to use such funds for programs under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; and

(4) if a local educational agency chooses to utilize the authority under section 613(a)(2)(C)(i) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to treat as local funds up to 20 percent of the amount of funds the agency receives under part B of such Act that exceeds the amount it received under that part for the previous fiscal year, then the agency should use those local funds to provide additional funding for any Federal, State, or local education program.

SEC. 26. ASSUMED FUNDING LEVELS FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION.

It is the sense of Congress that function 500 (Education) levels assume at least a $2,000,000,000 increase in fiscal year 2001 over the current fiscal year to reflect the commitment of Congress to appropriate 40 percent of the national per pupil expenditure for children with disabilities by a date certain.

SEC. 27. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON A FEDERAL EMPLOYEE PAY RAISE.

It is the sense of Congress that the pay increase for Federal employees in January 2001 should be at least 3.7 percent.

SEC. 28. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING HCFA DRAFT GUIDELINES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) on February 15, 2000, the Health Care Financing Administration in the Department of Health and Human Services issued a draft Medicaid School-Based Administrative Claiming (MAC) Guide; and

(2) in its introduction, the stated purpose of the draft MAC guide is to provide information for schools, State medicaid agencies, HCFA staff, and other interested parties on the existing requirements for claiming Federal funds under the medicaid program for the costs of administrative activities, such as medicaid outreach, that are performed in the school setting associated with school-based health services programs.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) many school-based health programs provide a broad range of services that are covered by medicaid, affording access to care for children who otherwise might well go without needed services;

(2) such programs also can play a powerful role in identifying and enrolling children who are eligible for medicaid, as well as the State Children's Health Insurance programs;

(3) undue administrative burdens may be placed on school districts and States and deter timely application approval;

(4) the Health Care Financing Administration should substantially revise or abandon the current draft MAC guide because it appears to promulgate new rules that place excessive administrative burdens on participating school districts;

(5) the goal of the revised guide should be to encourage the appropriate use of Medicaid school-based services without undue administrative burdens; and

(6) the best way to ensure the continued viability of medicaid school-based services is to guarantee that the guidelines are fair and responsible.

SEC. 29. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ASSET-BUILDING FOR THE WORKING POOR.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) 33 percent of all American households and 60 percent of African American households have either no financial assets or negative financial assets;

(2) 46.9 percent of children in America live in households with no financial assets, including 40 percent of Caucasian children and 75 percent of African American children;

(3) in order to provide low-income families with more tools for empowerment, incentives, including individual development accounts, are demonstrating success at empowering low-income workers;

(5) middle and upper income Americans currently benefit from tax incentives for building assets; and

(6) the Federal Government should utilize the Federal tax code to provide low-income Americans with incentives to work and build assets in order to escape poverty permanently.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the provisions of this resolution assume that Congress should modify the Federal tax law to include Individual Development Account provisions in order to encourage low-income workers and their families to save for buying a first home, starting a business, obtaining an education, or taking other measures to prepare for the future.

SEC. 30. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE IMPORTANCE OF SUPPORTING THE NATION'S EMERGENCY FIRST-RESPONDERS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) over 1.2 million men and women work as fire and emergency services personnel in 32,000 fire and emergency medical services departments across the Nation;

(2) over eighty percent of those who serve do so as volunteers;

(3) the Nation's firefighters responded to more than 18 million calls in 1998, including over 1.7 million fires;

(4) an average of 100 firefighters per year lose their lives in the course of their duties; and

(5) the Federal Government has a role in protecting the health and safety of the Nation's fire fighting personnel.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) recognizing the Nation's firefighters and emergency services crucial role in preserving and protecting life and property, such Federal assistance as low-interest loan programs, community development block grant reforms, emergency radio spectrum reallocations, and volunteer fire assistance programs, should be considered; and

(2) additional resources should be set aside for such assistance.

SEC. 31. ENHANCED ENFORCEMENT OF BUDGETARY LIMITS.

(a) PROHIBITION ON USE OF DIRECTED SCOREKEEPING.—

(1) It shall not be in order in the House to consider any reported bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that contains a directed scorekeeping provision.

(2) As used in this subsection, the term ''directed scorekeeping'' means directing the Congressional Budget Office or the Office of Management and Budget to estimate any provision providing discretionary new budget authority in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations for a fiscal year for budgetary enforcement purposes.

(b) PROHIBITION ON USE OF ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.—(1) It shall not be in order in the House to consider any reported bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that would cause the total level of discretionary advance appropriations provided for fiscal years after 2001 to exceed $23 billion (which represents the total level of advance appropriations for fiscal year 2001).

(2) As used in this subsection, the term ''advance appropriation''means any discretionary new budget authority in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations for fiscal year 2001 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2001.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall cease to have any force or effect on January 1, 2001.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. No amendment to that amendment is in order except the amendments printed in Part B of the report. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by the Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment.

After conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, there shall be a final period of general debate which shall not exceed 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 1 printed in Part B of House Report 106–535.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. OWENS

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Part B Amendment No. 1 in the Nature of a Substitute offered by Mr. OWENS:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001.

The Congress declares that concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001 and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2002 through 2005 are hereby set forth.

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2005:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2001: $2,026,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $2,097,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $2,171,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $2,262,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $2,352,000,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be reduced are as follows:

Fiscal year 2001: $96,800,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $109,700,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $129,994,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $154,043,480,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $182,241,520,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2001: $1,548,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,618,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,918,041,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $2,272,878,500,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $2,693,361,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2001: $1,525,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,589,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,883,202,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $2,231,594,300,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $2,644,439,200,000.

(4) SURPLUSES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the surpluses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2001: $20,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $20,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $20,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $20,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $20,000,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2001: $3,287,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $3,100,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $2,903,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $2,690,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $2,465,000,000,000.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and budget outlays for fiscal years 2001 through 2005 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $255,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $252,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $262,080,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $261,080,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $268,081,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $267,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $271,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $270,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $286,090,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $287,071,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $22,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $22,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $26,070,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,892,950,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $30,892,950,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,608,145,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $36,608,145,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,380,651,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $14,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $14,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $17,656,500,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,922,952,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $20,922,952,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,793,698,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $24,793,698,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,380,532,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $3,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $3,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $2,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $2,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $2,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $600,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $20,818,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,518,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $20,818,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,418,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $20,818,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,418,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $20,818,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,418,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $20,818,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,418,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $8,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $8,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $10,546,500,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,176,500,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $12,492,602,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,689,152,500.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $14,809,658,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,481,645,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $12,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $12,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $13,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $13,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $13,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,000,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $14,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $14,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $15,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $15,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $16,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,900,000,000.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $13,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $13,905,500,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,114,082,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $14,114,082,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,325,793,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $14,325,753,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,540,679,000.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $88,875,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $76,875,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $89,875,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $85,005,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $77,875,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $84,910,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $89,250,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $88,764,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $90,750,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $89,984,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $198,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $198,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $215,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $214,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $233,602,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $231,661,300,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $253,224,560,000.
(B) Outlays, $249,962,540,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $274,495,420,000.
(B) Outlays, $269,709,580,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $222,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $218,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $232,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $223,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $242,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $241,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $258,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $255,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $287,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $277,500,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $241,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $217,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $241,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $229,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $241,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $240,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $242,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $221,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $243,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $234,300,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $14,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $15,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $12,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,662,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $13,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $14,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,100,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $44,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $45,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $46,902,400,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,124,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $47,196,405,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,011,440,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $48,329,118,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,072,126,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $24,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $24,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $24,565,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $25,030,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,830,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $25,495,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,295,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $14,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $14,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $14,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $14,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $15,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,900,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $208,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $198,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $189,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $177,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $163,600,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,600,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 446, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to present the Congressional Black Caucus budget. I shall manage only a small part of the time.

The Congressional Black Caucus budget is a budget for maximum investment and opportunity. We are carrying forward the great Democratic Party traditions of Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal, Harry Truman's Marshall Plan and health care proposal, Lyndon Johnson's Great Society that produced Medicaid and Medicare.

As advocates for the Democratic Party mainstream philosophy, the Congressional Black Caucus sets forth this budget for maximum investment and maximum opportunities.

As we prepare the year 2001 budget, we are blessed by the long, warm rays of a sun of a coming decade of surpluses. Compassion and vision are no longer blocked by the spectre of budget deficits.

The conservative estimate is that there will be a $1.9 trillion non-Social Security surplus over the next 10 years. Using simple logic, we should be able to program and apply this year about $200 billion for the 2001 budget as this window of opportunity opens.

Investment for the future must be our first priority. Maximizing opportunities for individual citizens is synonymous with maximizing the growth and the expansion of a U.S. superpower economy.

It is the age of information, stupid. It is a time of a computer and a time of digitalization. It is the era of thousands of high-level vacancies because there are not enough information technology workers. With enlightened budget decisions, we can at this moment begin the shaping of the contours of a new cybercivilization.

The boldest and most vital proposal contained in the CBC budget is the Function 500. It is at the heart of our budget. Funding for school construction, responding to the fact that the American people in numerous polls have indicated that their number one priority for Federal budget action is education.

Each of the budgets being presented offer increases in education. Even the Blue Dog budget at one end of the spectrum of the Democratic Party offers a $21 billion increase in education. The Republican budget offers a slight increase, also.

But only the CBC budget has chosen to focus on the kingpin issue of school physical infrastructure. While we applaud the President's inclusion of $1.3 billion for our emergency repairs, we deem it to be grossly inadequate.

We support school financing via the Tax Code, also. However, most of the local education agencies cannot borrow money without a lengthy taxpayer referendum procedure. This CBC budget proposes a $10 billion increase for funding for school construction. This amount would be taken from the $200 billion surplus.

In addition to this 5 percent for infrastructure, and by ''infrastructure'' we mean wiring, repair, security, and new construction, the CBC budget also proposes another 5 percent, another $10 billion, to address other education, social service, and employment initiatives.

Only 10 percent of the overall surplus will be utilized for the all-important mission of investment in human resources, only 10 percent of this amount available above the Social Security surplus.

Other projected increases in our budget, and certainly the critical Function 500 section, include additional funding for Head Start, summer youth employment, TRIO programs, historically black colleges and universities, and community technology centers.

We oppose the Department of Education's elimination of certain vitally needed ongoing technical assistance and research programs. OERI projects should not be dumped into a general slush fund for the Department of Education.

The Department of Education's weak administration, with its bargain basement peer-review procedures, is not in a position to mount new programs on a timely basis. A better utilization of existing programs will be more efficient and more effective.

For the critically important welfare to work programs administered by the Department of Labor, the year 2001 budget assumes a life-and-death importance. Infant mortality rates in poor communities will continue to rise, and families will suffer needlessly unless there is an end to the current Federal permissive policy which allows States to pilfer funds from the poor and to use welfare contracts as political patronage.

The CBC proposes greater earmarking of funding connected with the chaotic welfare reform measures. A better funded and stronger Federal administration and direction is needed to restrain the greed and the neglect of our State governments.

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this budget because it taxes too much, spends too much, and does not pay down enough debt.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I want to just take a few minutes to say that we really believe that today, in the consideration of all these budgets, that we would like to take the six themes that I know the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) is so fond of. I am disappointed that he has left the floor. We wanted to take these six themes and kind of compare all the different budgets that are going to come to the House floor today against what we think is the best proposal.

If I could go through this again rather quickly. As my colleagues know, the Republican budget proposal will protect 100 percent of the Social Security surplus for the second year in a row. We will not dip into that surplus. We will use that Social Security surplus only for purposes of paying benefits and paying down the publicly held debt.

Secondly, we, in our budget, provide for the strengthening of Medicare, reform of Medicare, and also make money available for a prescription drug for the neediest of our senior citizens. We think it is absolutely vital that those who are needy have access to prescription drugs.

Thirdly, we also move to retire the publicly held debt over the next 5 years by $1 trillion. Now, some budgets are going to propose that we pay it down by more. Other budgets are going to propose that we pay it down by less.

We think that the trillion-dollar paydown, in combination with additional spending needs and with tax cuts, are the right formula. So we believe that not only should we move first to protect Social Security and Medicare, but we also believe that the trillion-dollar number is the right number to pay down public debt, thereby giving good signals to the Federal Reserve in terms of their interest rate policies.

Fourthly, we believe that we can have tax fairness. And we have a tax cut bill that approaches by the end of this summer, we believe, somewhere in the neighborhood of $250 billion. We provide for $200 billion in tax relief. That will provide tax relief to America's families by being able to ease the penalty on getting married that all too many couples face today; that, in fact, we will take small businesses and farmers and not force them to visit the undertaker and the IRS on the same day but begin to ease that penalty on success, ease that penalty that people experience when they try to pass their bounty on to their children.

We also believe that our senior citizens ought not to be penalized for their independence and hard work by cutting their Social Security as an offset to any dollar they earn. We think that is just a bogus idea that was cooked up here in Washington.

Furthermore, we think that it is important that we restore America's defense and also believe, however, that the message that the Black Caucus sends of one that this Pentagon needs reviewed and reformed is clearly a point of which we can all agree, and that we believe we need to support education and the National Institutes of Health and basic science research in the country.

So, today I would like to say that I think that this is the right formula. And if we can come with a formula that protects Social Security and strengthens Medicare and provides the prescription drug and pays down the public debt by a trillion dollars and provides significant tax relief while rebuilding our defense and education as a priority, we are going to be pretty close to what we think is the right formula.

I know that the Congressional Black Caucus comes to the floor every year with a budget, they lay it out there, and their priorities reflect the needs as they see them in this country. I want to offer my respect and congratulations to the members of the Black Caucus for their hard work. I know it is a tradition, and I am very thankful that they have the opportunity to come to the floor.

I do not want to stand here and say a number of negative things against their budget, because I think it reflects their priorities as they see them. We should study their budget and communicate with them; and perhaps at a later point we can improve on our priorities, we can have a better understanding of some of the priorities that they have. I hope that at some point, and maybe even in the conference committee, we can perhaps improve on our document.

But, nevertheless, I think that we should not approve that budget; and I think we ought to stick to the Republican proposal that we have today. I think it will provide for a continued strong economy, more power for individuals, and a sense of fairness for families and small businesses and our senior citizens in the country.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time we have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) has 14½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) has 15 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my appreciation for the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), our brilliant and distinguished budget chairman, and tell him that we welcome criticisms of our budget; and we certainly would criticize the other budgets. We very much would like to see some dialogue take place between the people who put forward these budgets.

We think a $17 billion increase for defense over the President's already very generous increases shows that there is a basic misunderstanding as to what the world is all about and where America and the rest of the world is going.

It is brain power, stupid. It is brain power. Brain power drives everything else. It drives the military. It drives the economy. And if we do not invest in education, we will have beautiful high-tech ships out there that nobody can operate.

□ 1800

We would like to see some dialogue. If you would agree to take part of that $17 billion and put about $10 billion of it into education, school construction, computers and wiring of schools, I think you would do far more for defense than you are doing with the kinds of increases that are there.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time for the management of our bill to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus; and I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman control the time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

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

I thank the gentleman from New York for his help in substituting for us as we got to the floor.

Let me begin by thanking the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget for all of his hard work and to assure him that we, the members of the Congressional Black Caucus, are very, very aware of the work that he has put into this budget, and we commend him for the work. I would also like to thank the Committee on Rules for working with us and helping us to bring our budget to this floor, because we think that we have some things worth discussing.

Mr. Chairman, if we fail to seize this moment to make investments that will allow our great Nation to surge forward in the creation of this new cyber-civilization, then our children and grandchildren will frown on us and will lament the fact that we failed not because we lacked fiscal resources but our failures, our very devastating blunder was due to a poverty of vision.

Mr. Chairman, we are the custodians of unprecedented wealth in a giant economy. But we must not allow midget minds and tiny spirits to control our destiny. At a time when positive generosity is possible, such a proposal maximizes great selfishness.

The preparation of this budget for maximum investment and growth was guided by a set of 10 principles and assumptions set forth below.

Number one. We accept the general direction of the President's budget and the House Democratic Caucus. Families First is a motto we wholeheartedly endorse. However, more resources must be directed toward working families and the unique problems of African American families.

Number two. We view the projection of a $1.9 trillion surplus over a 10-year period as an overriding factor for the basic decisions to be made for fiscal year 2001. Common sense dictates that we approach this first year of the decade of budget surpluses with proposals for the most advantageous uses of one-tenth of the projected surplus.

Number three. Investment in the CBC-designated priorities should be our number one concern. We support a moderate plan to pay down the national debt. However, the President's blueprint moves too far and too fast with debt reduction at the expense of investment.

Number four. The protection of Social Security, Medicaid, and Medicare are among the highest priorities of the CBC.

Number five. In budgeting for each function, the CBC accepts the principles of a balanced budget. However, increases in CBC priorities must not be inhibited by present budget caps and conventional assumptions.

Number six. The CBC accepts the basic thrust of President Clinton's proposal for the distribution of the surplus. However, the CBC will insist that the emphasis in priorities must be shifted. At least 10 percent of the surplus should be devoted to investments in programs for education and a second 10 percent should be allotted for investments which benefit working families and for the safety net programs.

Number seven. Tax cuts, which must be taken from the 80 percent of the surplus which remains, are not a high priority of the CBC.

Number eight. Within the priorities earmarked by the President's budget in each function, the CBC will strive to target some portion of the proposed allocations to the special needs of working families.

Number nine. Budget allocations for necessary programs that currently do not exist are encouraged.

And, number 10, the currently stated CBC fiscal year 2001 priorities are education, housing, health, economic development, and livable communities.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that serious consideration of this budget is called for at this time. We believe it provides a blueprint for the launching of this new millennium.

NATIONAL DEFENSE (050)

Function in brief

Function 050 funds the pay and benefits of military and civilian personnel; operations and maintenance; research, development, testing, evaluation, engineering, and procurement of new weapons systems (including nuclear weapons and research provided by the Department of Energy); and military construction, including family housing; and other military-related activities.

The CBC believes that the Defense budget, with it current estimates consumes more than one-half of the discretionary spending of the Federal government's budget. While the Caucus wants to ensure that our men and women in uniform enjoy necessary and proper support from sufficient forces and the right equipment, training, and housing, we do not want this reality to prevail at the expense of our nation's other priorities.

Function 050: National defense

[Fiscal years, in billions of dollars]

Budget Authority:	
2001	255.0
Outlays;	
2001	252.0
Budget Authority:	
2002	262.0
2003	268.0
2004	271.0
2005	286.0
Outlays:	
2002	261.0
2003	267.0
2004	270.0
2005	287.0

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS (150)

Function in brief

Functions 150 funds the operation of the State Department, embassies and consulate offices abroad, bilateral assistance programs, democracy and free market economies education, multilateral assistance programs, multilateral development banks, and public diplomacy through educational and cultural exchanges. It also funds libraries and broadcasting abroad as well as international security through peacekeeping assistance, nonproliferation and disarmament, foreign military grants and loans, military education and training, and refugee and disaster assistance: Some of the specific programs it funds include: Development Fund for Africa, African Development Fund, African Development Bank, Great Lakes Initiative, Development Assistance, Peace Corps, Inter-American Development, Debt Restructuring, Debt Restructuring (HIPC), Wye and Egypt Supplemental, UN Arrearage Payments, Migration and Refugee Assistance, Peacekeeping Operation (PKO), Child Survival and Disease Fund, Economic Support Fund (ESF), International Development Association, National Endowment for Democracy, World Health Organization, African Crisis Response Force, International Disaster Assistance, Trade and Development Agency and PL 480 Titles II and III.

Function 150: International affairs

[Fiscal years, in billions of dollars]

Budget Authority:	
2001	22.0
Outlays:	
2001	20.0
Budget Authority:	
2002	22.0
2003	26.0
2004	30.8
2005	36.6
Outlays:	
2002	20.0
2003	30.8
2004	36.6
2005	43.3

GENERAL SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY (250)

Function in brief

Function 250 provides funding for general science and basic research, including the National Science Foundation; Department of Energy general science programs, particularly the high energy physics and nuclear physics programs; space flight, research and supporting activities.

The CBC maintains a significant overall Federal investment in science and engineering research and development while paring back support for those research initiatives which offer minimal public benefits and would be more appropriately financed by private industry.

HIGHLIGHTS

NASA—Funds the International Space Station at the level proposed by the President which allows for space based medical research and breakthroughs in medicine for diseases that greatly affect the African American community.

HBCU's—Provides additional funding for Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU's) Minority University Research and Education Programs.

NSF—Provides additional funding for the Next Generation Internet initiative in order to connect HBCU's and other similarly situated educational institutions to the Internet.

Elementary, Secondary and information education—Provides additional funding to the Elementary, Secondary and Information Educational activity of the Educational and Human Resources appropriation of the NSF.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—Provides additional funding for the Global Learning and Observations to Benefit the Environment Program (GLOBE).

Function 250: General science, space and technology

[Fiscal years, in billions of dollars]

Budget Authority:	
2001	14.9
Budget Authority:	
2002	14.9
2003	17.6
2004	20.9
2005	24.7
Outlays:	
2001	14.9
Outlays:	
2002	14.9
2003	20.9
2004	24.7
2005	28.3

ENERGY (270)

Function in Brief

Function 250 provides funding for most of the programs for the Department of Energy, including research and development and energy conservation; the Power Marketing Administrations, the Strategic Petroleum Reserve; uranium enrichment; funding for electrification and telephone credit subsidies provided through the Rural Utilities Service; the Tennessee Valley Authority power program; the Nucelar Regulatory Commission and other activities.

Function 270: Energy

[Fiscal years, in billions of dollars]

Budget Authority:	
2001	3.3
Outlays:	
2001	1.8
Budget Authority:	
2002	2.0
2003	2.7
2004	2.4
2005	2.1
Outlays:	
2002	1.5
2003	1.2
2004	2.4
2005	0.6

NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT (300)

Function in brief

Function 300 Funds water resources management; activities of the Army Corps of Engineers; the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA); the National Park Service, including recreation programs; the Department of the Interior; conservation and land management; pollution control and abatement. Other agencies under this function are the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Fish and Wildlife Service, certain agencies within the Department of Agriculture, including the Forest Service and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), in the Department of Commerce.

Function 300: Natural resources and environment

[Fiscal years, in billions of dollars]

Budget Authority:	
2001	20.8
Outlays:	
2001	20.5
Budget Authority:	
2002	20.8
2003	20.8
2004	20.8
2005	20.8
Outlays:	
2002	20.4
2003	20.4
2004	20.4
2005	20.4

AGRICULTURE (350)

Function in brief

Function 350 provides funding for agricultural programs, including farm income stabilization, commodity price support programs, crop insurance, export credit guarantee loans, the emergency food assistance program, the Foreign Agricultural Service, the Agricultural Marketing Service, the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, the Economic Research Service, National Agricultural Statistics Service, animal and plant protection, and other agricultural programs and agricultural export promotion.

Function 350: Agriculture

[Fiscal years, in billions of dollars]

Budget Authority:	
2001	8.6
Outlays:	
2001	7.1
Budget Authority:	
2002	8.9
2003	10.5
2004	12.4
2005	14.8
Outlays:	
2002	6.9
2003	8.1
2004	9.6
2005	11.4

COMMERCE AND HOUSING CREDIT (370)

Function in brief

Function 370 includes funding for mortgage credit rural housing programs, the Census Bureau, International trade and export promotion programs, technology programs, and the patent and trademark program of the Department of Commerce; small business assistance; the U.S. Postal Service; and major regulatory agencies, such as the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Federal Trade Commission.

Function 370: Commerce and housing credit

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

Budget Authority:	
2001	12.4
Outlays:	
2001	7.6
Budget Authority:	
2002	12.7
2003	13.0
2004	13.3
2005	13.6
Outlays:	
2002	8.2
2003	8.8
2004	9.4
2005	10.0

TRANSPORTATION (400)

Function in brief

Function 400 includes ground transportation programs, such as the federal-aid highway program, mass transit, rail transportation, and the Interstate Commerce Commission; air transportation through the Coast Guard and Maritime Administration; and related transportation support activities.

Rather than cutting investment in the nation's transportation infrastructure, the CBC Alternative Budget maintains investment in these vital functions by funding them at the level of current services through fiscal year 2000. Public investment in transportation produces broad economic benefits, and our nation must have a safe and efficient transportation system for all people if the United States is to compete successfully in the 21st Century.

Function 400: Transportation

[Fiscal years, in billions of dollars]

Budget Authority:	
2001	14.5
Outlays:	
2001	12.1
Budget Authority:	
2002	14.5
2003	15.1
2004	15.6
2005	16.3
Outlays:	
2002	12.1
2003	12.7
2004	12.9
2005	13.0

COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT: 450

Function in brief

The Community and Regional Development function provides for a wide variety of urban and rural development programs, including the Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG), the Economic Development Agency (EDA), the Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC, numerous rural development programs administered by the Rural Development Administration (RDA) and the non-power programs of the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA). The function also includes funding for most Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) programs.

Function 450: Community and regional development

[Fiscal years, in billions of dollars]

Budget Authority:	
2001	13.7
Outlays:	
2001	13.1
Budget Authority:	
2002	13.7
2003	13.9
2004	14.1
2005	14.3
Outlays:	
2002	13.3
2003	14.1
2004	14.3
2005	14.5

EDUCATION, TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES (500)

Function in brief

The boldest and most vital proposal contained in the CBC Budget is at the heart of this function: funding for school construction. Responding to the fact that the American people in numerous polls have indicated that their number one priority for federal budget action is Education, each of the budgets being presented offer increases in Education. But only the CBC Budget has chosen to focus on the kingpin issue of school physical infrastructure. While we applaud the President's inclusion of 1.3 billion dollars for "emergency repairs," we deem it to be grossly inadequate. We support school financing via the tax code; however, most of the Local Education Agencies can not borrow money without a lengthy taxpayer referendum procedure. This CBC Budget proposes a 10 billion dollar increase over the President's Budget for school construction. This amount would be taken from the 200 billion dollar surplus. In addition to this five percent for infrastructure-wiring, repair, security, and new construction—the CBC Budget proposes another five percent, 10 billion dollars, to address other education, social service, and employment initiatives. Only ten per cent of the overall surplus would be utilized for the all important mission of investment in human resources.

Other projected increases include additional funding for Head Start, Summer Youth Employment, TRIO programs, Historically Black Colleges and Universities, and Community Technology Centers. We oppose the Department of Education's elimination of vitally needed ongoing technical assistance and research programs. OERI projects should not be dumped into a general slush fund. The DOE's weak administration with its bargain basement peer review procedures, is not in a position to mount new programs on a timely basis. A better utilization of existing programs would be more efficient and more effective.

For the critically important welfare to work programs administered by the Department of Labor, the Year 2001 Budget assumes a life and death importance. Infant mortality rates in poor communities will continue to rise and families will suffer needlessly unless there is an end to the current federal permissive policy which allows states to pilfer funds from the poor, and to use welfare contracts as political patronage. The CBC proposes greater earmarking of funding connected with the chaotic welfare reform ''measures.'' A better funded and stronger Federal administration and direction is needed to restrain the greed and neglect of state governments.

Function 500: Education, training and employment services

[Fiscal years, in billions of dollars]

Budget Authority:	
2001	88.8
Outlays:	
2001	76.8
Budget Authority:	
2002	89.8
2003	77.8
2004	89.2
2005	90.7
Outlays:	
2002	85.0
2003	84.9
2004	88.7
2005	89.9

HEALTH (550) AND MEDICARE (570)

Function in brief

Functions 550 and 570 include funds for health care services, health research and training, consumer and occupational health and safety, and Medicare. The major agency budgets accounts include the Health Resources and Services Administration, National Institutes of Health, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Health Care Financing Administration, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health and the Office of Minority Health.

Function 550: Health

[Fiscal years, in billions of dollars]

Budget Authority:	
2001	198.8
Outlays:	
2001	198.0
Budget Authority:	
2002	215.5
2003	233.6
2004	253.2
2005	274.4
Outlays:	
2002	214.7
2003	231.6
2004	249.9
2005	269.7

Function 570: Medicare

[Fiscal years, in billions of dollars]

Function 570: Medicare—Continued

Budget Authority:	
2001	14.5
Outlays:	
2001	14.5
Budget Authority:	
2002	15.4
2003	12.5
2004	13.2
2005	14.0
Outlays:	
2002	15.4
2003	12.6
2004	13.1
2005	14.0

INCOME SECURITY (600)

Function in briefs

Function 600 contains programs which help meet the needs of individuals by insuring against loss of income from retirement, disability, death or unemployment of a wage earner, and by assisting those whose incomes are inadequate to meet minimum levels of nutrition, housing or other basic necessities.

Major programs within this function include: retirement and disability programs for federal civilian and military personnel; food stamps, school lunch, WIC and other nutrition programs; unemployment insurance; family support payments (AFDC); Supplemental Security Income (SSI); low-income home energy assistance; foster care and child welfare programs; child care; low-income and elderly housing assistance and programs for the homeless; and the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC).

Function 600: Income security

[Fiscal years, in million of dollars]

Budget Authority:	
2001	241.3
Outlays:	
2001	217.2
Budget Authority:	
2002	241.3
2003	241.8
2004	242.9
2005	243.8
Outlays:	
2002	229.7
2003	240.9
2004	221.1
2005	234.3

SOCIAL SECURITY (650)

Function in brief

Function 650 includes Social Security, Old-Age and Survivors Insurance (OASI), and the Disability Insurance (DI) programs. These programs provide monthly cash assistance to more than 42 million beneficiaries.

Function 650: Social Security (650)

[Fiscal year, in billions of dollars]

Budget Authority:	
2001	14.5
Outlays:	
2001	14.5
Budget Authority:	
2002	15.4
2003	12.5
2004	13.2
2005	14.0
Outlays:	
2002	15.4
2003	12.6
2004	13.1
2005	16.1

VETERANS BENEFITS AND SERVICES (700)

Function in brief

Function 700 includes compensation for veterans with service-related disabilities; pensions for low-income wartime veterans with non-service connected disabilities; education and training; medical care; and housing loan guarantees.

Function 700: Veterans benefits and services

[Fiscal years, in billions of dollars]

Function 700: Veterans benefits and services—Continued

Budget Authority:	
2001	44.0
Outlays:	
2001	42.8
Budget Authority:	
2002	45.1
2003	46.9
2004	47.1
2005	48.3
Outlays:	
2002	45.4
2003	48.1
2004	51.0
2005	54.0

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE (750)

Function in brief

Function 750 provides funding for the law enforcement and anti-drug abuse activities of the Departments of Justice and Treasury; federal judicial, litigation, and correctional activities; criminal justice assistance grants to state and local governments; and legal services for the poor.

The CBC Caring Majority Budget understands the urgency of addressing the rising rate of crime in the United States. All credible research has shown that prevention and early intervention initiatives, combined with a continuum of services aimed at high-risk youth, best serve to reduced crime when compared to incarceration and other punitive approaches.

A comprehensive prevention strategy includes an investment in education and training resources as well as research and evaluation of model programs that offer non-punitive methods of crime reduction.

Function 750: Administration of Justice

[Fiscal years, in billions of dollars]

Budget Authority:	
2001	24.7
Outlays:	
2001	25.6
Budget Authority:	
2002	24.1
2003	24.6
2004	25.0
2005	25.5
Outlays:	
2002	25.6
2003	25.4
2004	25.8
2005	26.3

GENERAL GOVERNMENT (800)

Function in brief

Function 800 provides funding for general overhead costs of the federal government.

Function 800: General government

[Fiscal year, in million of dollars]

Budget Authority:	
2001	14.7
Outlays:	
2001	14.0
Budget Authority:	
2002	14.5
2003	14.6
2004	14.8
2005	15.0
Outlays:	
2002	14.3
2003	14.0
2004	14.6
2005	14.9

NET INTEREST (900)

Function in brief

Function 900 provides for interest payments on the national debt. Net interest outlays are determined by the size of the debt, market interest rates, and debt management practices.

Function 900: Net interest

[Fiscal years, in billions of dollars]

Outlays:	
2001	208.3

Function 900: Net interest—Continued

Outlays:	
2002	198.6
2003	189.2
2004	177.4
2005	163.6

ALLOWANCES (920)

Function in brief

Function 920 reflects amounts of any budget increase or reduction for which specific funding levels by program or function have yet to be determined. It also includes amounts for contingencies which may affect more than one function.

Function 920: Allowances

[Fiscal years, in billions of dollars]

Budget Authority:	
2001	200.0
Budget Authority:	
2002	200.0
2003	300.0
2004	300.0
2005	300.0

UNDISTRIBUTED OFFSETTING RECEIPTS (950)

Function in brief

Function 950 includes the employer's share of employee retirement costs; government receipts (bonuses, rents, royals) from the sale of oil and gas produced from the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS); and receipts for the sale of assets controlled or owned by the federal government.

Function 950: Undistributed offsetting receipts

[Fiscal years, in billions of dollars]

Budget Authority:	
2001	.200
Outlays:	
2001	45.7
Budget Authority:	
2002	.200
2003	.200
2004	.200
2005	.200
Outlays:	
2002	49.1
2003	47.3
2004	46.9
2005	48.6

PRINCIPLES AND ASSUMPTIONS FOR THE CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS MAXIMUM OPPORTUNITY AND INVESTMENT BUDGET FY'2001

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS

[Congressman James Clyburn, Chairman; Congressman Bennie Thompson, Chairperson—CBC Budget Task Force; Congressman Major R. Owens, Vice Chairperson, CBC Budget Task Force]

The mission of the Congressional Black Caucus is advocacy for those left out and forgotten: the poor in general and more specifically African Americans and other neglected minorities. To guide the budget preparation process and fully accomplish our mission we shall begin by adopting the following Principles and Assumptions:

1. We accept the general direction of the President's Budget and the House Democratic Caucus. ''Families First'' is a motto we wholeheartedly endorse; however, more resources must be directed toward working families and the unique problems of African American families.

2. We view the projection of a 1.9 trillion surplus over a ten year period as an overriding factor for the basic decisions to be made for the FY'2001 Budget. Common sense dictates that we approach this first year of the decade of budget surpluses with proposals for the most advantageous uses of one-tenth of the projected surplus.

3. Investment in the CBC designated priorities shall be our number one concern. We support a moderate plan to pay the national debt; however, the President's blueprint moves too far and too fast with debt reduction at the expense of investment.

4. The protection of Social Security, Medicaid and Medicare are among the highest priorities of the CBC; however, investments in the education and training of the present and future workforce will provide greater guarantees for the solvency of Social Security and the sound financing of health care than any other policies or actions under consideration.

5. In budgeting for each function, the CBC accepts the principles of a balanced budget, however, increase in CBC priorities must not be inhibited by present budget caps and conventional assumptions. We assume that there is waste in several key areas which may be transferred to enhance better investments for the future. We also assume that there are excessive revenue expenditures to continue corporate welfare which may be eliminated to increase funding for our designated priorities. And finally, we assume that one-tenth of the projected ten year surplus must be factored into the development of this budget for maximum opportunity and investment.

6. The CBC accepts the basic thrust of President Clinton's proposal for the distribution of the surplus; however, the CBC will insist that the emphasis in priorities must be shifted. At least 10 percent of the surplus should be devoted to investments in programs for education and a second 10 percent should be allotted for investments which benefit working families and for safety net programs.

7. Tax cuts, which must be taken from the 80 percent of the surplus which remains, are not a high priority of the CBC; however, since the current political power equation dictates the inevitability of a White House approved tax cut, the CBC must insist that the tax cuts not exceed the percentage of the surplus which is allocated for CBC priorities.

8. Within the priorities earmarked by the President's budget, in each function, the CBC will strive to target some portion of the proposed allocations to the special needs of working families, the poor and the African American Community. New market opportunities and minority contract set-asides must apply across the board—and special units should be funded to implement and facilitate the targeting of CBC designated constituents.

9. Budget allocations for necessary programs that currently do not exist are encouraged. The proponents must also later develop legislation for authorization as part of the process to sell the ideas and convince the President to place the item on his priority list at the time of the end-game negotiations. Proposals for new methods of proposal solicitation, peer review, technical assistance, etc. are also in order.

10. The currently stated CBC FY 2001 Priorities are: Education, Housing, Health, Economic Development and Livable Communities, Foreign Aid, Welfare and Low Income Assistance and Juvenile Justice and Law Enforcement. Some additions or subtractions from these categories are possible; however, they will remain as the basic frame-work for CBC Budget and Appropriations demands for the entire session of the 106th Congress. Members preparing budget functions should also consider promoting tactics and strategies which support the CBC's ongoing advocacy of these dollar allocation positions.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN).

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, the health budget is a critical piece of our overall budget and agenda. It is defined by the glaring disparities in health status that exist for the African American community. HIV and AIDS have been our focus, but we also die from heart disease, cancer, diabetes, infant mortality, stroke, and other diseases in numbers greater than all other minority groups combined.

Mr. Chairman, this is an emergency. Specifically, this budget will include a minimum of $500 million for the CBC Minority HIV/AIDS initiative. In addition to continuing the programs already started, the increase will allow us to address HIV and AIDS in correctional facilities, increase funding to more vulnerable groups, increase prevention and treatment activities for sexually transmitted diseases and substance abuse, expand research, increase Medicaid funding, bring our programs to smaller cities and rural areas, and greatly increase the technical assistance that will enable our community-based organizations to take advantage of this important resource.

In the broader area of disparities, we will fund an expansion of the racial and ethnic approach to community health programs, to expand it beyond the existing 32 communities and enhance funding to the health careers opportunities program and National Health Service Corps to do better outreach and provide scholarships for young people of color to enter health profession schools. We would fully fund, also, the provisions of H.R. 1860, 2391, and 3250.

Mr. Chairman, with regard to our children, the CBC funds the continuation and strengthening of the Healthy Start program in communities of color and also provides for increased child care at $917 million. Mr. Chairman, the elimination of health disparities in African American communities and other communities of color is one of the most important challenges facing this country. For the sake of all of those who have been left behind in past centuries and for the sake of a fairer and healthier Nation, I ask my colleagues to support the CBC budget.

Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman CLYBURN for yielding me this time to present the CBC Health Budget.

This is a critical piece of the overall Budget and Agenda. Our health is the necessary underpinning of everything else we aspire to accomplish to make our communities whole, and prepared to meet the challenges of the new Century and the Coming millennium.

What defines our Health Agenda and thus this budget are the glaring disparities in health status, and services that exist for the African American community and other communities of color. HIV and AIDS has been our focus, and rightfully so because of our overwhelmingly disproportionate numbers, and the devastation it has wrought in our communities.

But we also die and are disabled in far greater proportion than our representation in the population from heart disease, cancer, diabetes, infant mortality, stroke and other diseases in numbers greater than all other minority groups combined.

Our budget not only includes funding to address prevention and treatment for HIV/AIDS and related illnesses, and continue and expands capacity building within communities of color in this country for this disease, it will extend this effort to the international community. Beyond this it will better address some of the glaring infrastructure deficiencies that have caused the epidemic to take root, and the other diseases to have such adverse impact, severely reducing our life expectancy, in our communities in the first place.

Mr. Chairman, responding to our health needs is nothing less than an emergency, and a matter of national security.

We ask our colleagues to consider the CBC request in that light.

More specifically, this budget will include a minimum of $500 million for the CBC Minority HIV/AIDS initiative.

In addition to continuing the programs already started, the increase will allow us to address HIV and AIDS in correctional facilities, increase funding to more vulnerable and at-risk groups, such as women and youth, increase prevention and treatment activities for Syphilis, other sexually transmitted diseases and substance abuse which contribute greatly to this crisis, expand research, increase Medicaid funding to provide treatment at the earlier stages of HIV infection, bring our programs to smaller cities and rural areas, and greatly increase the technical assistance that limited many of our community based organizations from taking advantage of these important resources.

In the broader area of the disparities, we are asking for $162.3 million for REACH—Racial and Ethnic Approach to Community Health—to expand this program beyond the now 32 communities who have been provided the resources to improve their health outcomes. The CBC Budget will also enhance funding for the Health Careers Opportunities Program, and National Health Service Corps to do better outreach and provide scholarships for young people of color to enter health profession schools. We would fully fund the provisions of H.R. 1860, H.R. 2391, and H.R. 3250, to increase access for providers and patients of color into managed care, address the need for data, and diversity training in the health professions, and elevate the Office of Minority Health Research at NIH to a center.

Mr. Chairman, in all this, we have grave concern for the welfare of our children, and are committed to giving them the best possible start in life. The CBC Budget therefore funds the continuation and strengthening of Healthy Start in communities of color and other disadvantaged communities, in the amount of $130 million. This measure also provides, among other things, for increased child care. In this regard our request is above that of the Department, at $917 million.

Our communities are at great risk. The elimination of health disparities in African American communities and other communities of color is one of the most important challenges facing this country.

For the sake of all of those who have been left behind in past centuries, and for the sake of a fairer and healthier nation, I ask my colleagues to support the CBC budget.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL of Montana. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I have only had the privilege of serving in this House for 4 years. Over these 4 years we have had this annual budget debate. What I have noticed is that my Democratic colleagues have come to the floor every one of those 4 years, and they have predicted doom and gloom over the Republican budget. They are the most pessimistic group of people I have ever met in my life.

When Republicans 4 years ago said that we wanted to balance the budget, this group cried crocodile tears saying that we were going to create great hardship in America. But they were wrong when they said that budget would threaten seniors. They were wrong when they said that budget would threaten Social Security. They were wrong when they said that budget would threaten the economy. The fact is the economy is now stronger, Social Security is more secure than ever, Medicare is more solvent than it has been in over a decade; and we are doing more to educate our children today than we ever have.

Just last year when Republicans said we were going to set aside 100 percent of Social Security for Social Security, they said that was impossible. But we did it. Some of those who were so strong in their opposition now cannot wait to stand in line to take credit for that effort. Two years ago, we said we could lower taxes and we could keep the economy growing. They said that tax cut was irresponsible, some said it was a risky scheme; and they said it would undermine government. They were wrong again.

I asked my constituents what should we do with this surplus. Here is what they said. They said protect Social Security so that Congress cannot raid it ever again in the future. They said pay down the debt. This budget pays down $1 trillion of the debt in 5 years, and pays it off entirely by the year 2015. They said to me, let us modernize Medicare. We have made it solvent now till the middle of the next decade, but let us modernize it. This budget sets aside $40 billion to do that. And then they said, let us make the Tax Code fairer than it has been. Get rid of this marriage penalty and the unfair death tax that is out there.

But bigger government and higher taxes were never on that list. But one or the other of every one of the Democrat alternatives either raises taxes or cuts Medicare or puts more IOUs in the Social Security Trust Fund, and that is wrong. They are wrong again. I say reject all of these Democrat plans and support the Republican budget.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the budget we are trying to accomplish here has six very simple principles. We have been talking about these six principles today, but I want to talk about the Social Security portion of our budget, the most important aspect of this budget. This budget with Social Security starts on the work we tried to accomplish last year. If Members recall last year, Mr. Chairman, the President sent us a budget that said he would take 38 percent of the Social Security surplus out of Social Security to spend on the creation of other government programs, 120 to be specific, and keep 62 percent of the Social Security surplus in Social Security. Last year we said, no, that is not enough. One hundred percent of Social Security should go to Social Security. We, in fact, did that.

But last year during consideration of this budget resolution, many Members from the other side of the aisle were actually saying we were raiding Social Security, we were taking money out of Social Security. So what actually happened last year? We heard the rhetoric, and we are hearing it again today. Let us dispense with the rhetoric and look at the results. The results are that for the first time in a generation, this Congress actually stopped the raid on Social Security. If we look at the year 1999, last year, we stopped raiding Social Security. This year, in the year 2000, we stopped raiding Social Security. What we are trying to accomplish is to forever stop the raid on the Social Security Trust Fund with this budget, make sure that every penny of Social Security taxes actually go to Social Security.

I am going to be bringing a piece of legislation to the floor later with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, to pass a law to make sure that we never again go back to the days of raiding the Social Security Trust Fund and so that we take that money to pay back the debt we owe to Social Security and pay off the national public debt.

If we take a look at the President's plan, the President tries to give the illusion that he is actually increasing the solvency of Social Security; but what the President's plan actually only does, and I would like to add the Spratt budget's plan as well, is take the Social Security government credit card and add more money to the credit card limit. They are putting more IOUs into the Social Security Trust Fund, not committing an additional penny to paying benefits to Social Security. But they are simply saying, put more IOUs, raise the credit card limit to Social Security and hope the problem goes away.

Mr. Chairman, we need results. We need legislation that actually stops the raiding of Social Security. We need to pass this budget resolution.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to stand in strong support of the Congressional Black Caucus budget. This substitute shows that supporting good fiscal policy does not have to mean excluding low-wage workers, the poor, communities of color and African Americans. This budget increases domestic spending by 50 percent and spends 25 percent less on defense by cutting waste, fraud and abuse.

Let me highlight what we have proposed in the areas of housing and also in order to end the HIV/AIDS crisis abroad. First, the Congressional Black Caucus addresses these issues by investing $1 billion more for section 8 housing, $100 million more for the community development block grant program, and $350 million more for the HOME program. We also invest over $1 billion over 5 years to stop the spread of HIV and AIDS in countries hardest hit in sub-Saharan Africa and the Caribbean.

☐ 1845

It funds H.R. 3519, the World Bank AIDS Marshal Trust Fund Plan. And we passed that last week out of the House Banking Committee. I stand in strong support for the CBC alternative.

Mr. Chairman, I commend my colleagues for their vision and leadership in bringing this to the floor.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

I congratulate the caucus for a budget that very well represents what the priorities ought to be. We have a very wealthy Nation now. We have a greater degree of power disparity between the United States militarily and the rest of the world than we have ever seen in our history.

What this budget does is to make a sensible, prudent reduction in the amount of money spent on the military so that we can deal with the real threats to America's security to the problems of health, poverty, inadequate education. We have a real deadlock in this country right now. We have people telling us that we ought to participate more enthusiastically in the international economy for the World Trade Organizations and elsewhere.

As long as grave disparities persist within this country, as long as lower-income people, people working at the low end of the skill level feel threatened by it, we are not going to be able to go forward. This budget takes a very big set of steps forward towards creating within the United States by reducing the excess that the military has gotten the kind of social stability that we need as a framework for going forward.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) has 10½ minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE).

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

I would first like to compliment the Congressional Black Caucus on their budget. Every year since I have been in Congress, the CBC has come forward with a budget. It is not easy to do; but every single year, you have in a very responsible way outlined your priorities.

And, in fact, it has always amazed me that you have been able to do a better job than even, in some instances, over the last 7 years than our President has been able to do in outlining the priorities that you happen to believe in and putting real numbers with those priorities.

Your numbers add up. The concern I have with the President's budget, and it is probably the reason why the Congressional Black Caucus and so many others are providing substitute amendments is they do not agree with the priorities that the President has laid out. We did not agree with that either.

We felt it was important to protect 100 percent of the Social Security Trust Fund; to strengthen Medicare and provide a real prescription drug benefit within that; to retire the public debt entirely; to promote tax fairness for families, farmers, seniors; to restore America's defense, and to do it in a way that recognizes that people do come first; and strength for support for education and science.

Let me just talk about Medicare, because I think this is the one that probably is the most different. We have heard so many folks run to the floor today to talk about how their plan looks exactly like the Republicans, and there is a reason, because when the Democrats or through the President provided their original proposal, what we found out is that the way they paid for a prescription drug benefit was by cutting Medicare.

You cut Medicare in one side to pay for increases in another side, and those increases did not even take effect to the fourth year. So the President held this great Rose Garden ceremony and had a great 96-minute State of the Union address; and he said how we were all going to have prescription drug benefit and then didn't fund it in the budget he proposed 2 weeks later.

So I can understand why you would come forward with a substitute amendment, a substitute amendment that hopefully does not cut, as the President does, the kidney program, the hospital payments. As I said to a gentleman earlier today, you cannot close hospitals around this country and extend a prescription drug benefit and call that health care.

If my hospital in my hometown of Manchester, Iowa, closes, that is a 30-minute drive for everybody who lives in my town for every emergency that occurs in that town, and you can add up your own miles and minutes that that would occur. You cannot cut hospitals to give a prescription drug benefit. That is why we reject the President's budget, and I believe that is why you do, too.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, we all know that budgets really are about priorities. And this budget presented by the Congressional Black Caucus speaks to the needs of millions of Americans who, in many instances, are left behind and left out of the great economic expansion we are experiencing.

It speaks to the needs of the 165,000 people in my congressional direct who live at or below the poverty line and millions of others throughout America. It speaks to the needs of individuals living in public housing and low-income communities. This budget is compassionate, comprehensive, and balanced.

This budget would provide 250 million additional dollars for community and migrant health centers who do an outstanding job of providing health care for the poor.

In reality, Mr. Chairman, this budget protects Medicare, Social Security, and small businesses and provides a prescription drug benefit for older Americans.

It lifts a lot of those considered to be at the bottom of the economic ladder, the working poor, children, older Americans. I am proud to support it and urge its adoption.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, might I clarify, we do have the right to close, is that correct? We may end up having 1 minute or 1½ minutes that we will be able to yield over. We will go through our speakers and see how much time we do have.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman is correct, he does have the right to close.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU).

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, the preceding speakers on this side talked a little bit about the vision and the values that are embodied in the Republican budget, setting aside every penny of Social Security, paying down debt. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) talked about the importance of setting aside $40 billion, not just to cover prescription drug benefits but to improve and strengthen the Medicare system as well.

We have heard about the investments that we think are important to make in education and in defense and in basic science, and, of course, the tax relief that is in this budget, to make the Tax Code more fair and to reduce taxes for all Americans. And, unfortunately, that is one of the real shortcomings of the alternative being offered here, not only does it not lower taxes, it increases taxes, and that is just the wrong direction to take the country.

Let us, in fact, look where we have come over the past few years, even while cutting taxes. Under this Republican Congress, we have seen the public debt begin to decrease. We are actually making payments against the debt held by the public, reducing that debt and increasing America's financial security.

We can see clearly the red, increases in debt year after year under a Democrat Congress. The tide was turned in 1998. Shortly after we had a Republican Congress, clearly the amount of debt was lower and lower in 1996, 1997. And what has happened over the past 4 years? What a turn around. In 1998, we paid down over $50 billion in debt; 1999 paid down over $80 billion in debt; and in fact, with this Republican budget that is here on the floor today, we will reduce the debt held by the public $450 billion over just 4 years.

It gets even better, because over the next 5 years we will pay down a trillion dollars in public debt, reducing the public debt, keeping interest rates low, even while making the Tax Code more fair, eliminating death tax provisions, giving health insurance deductibility for those that are self-employed.

Those are the values that are embodied in the Republican budget, and that is why we should reject this alternative and support the resolution.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, if there is no objection, we have 1½ minutes of our time we can yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) and allow him to distribute it.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, that means that according to my records we have 5 minutes left?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, my understanding is we have 4½ minutes remaining?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN).

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) for yielding, and I also recognize the hard work of the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS).

Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise in strong support of the CBC budget. The Congressional Black Caucus gives a progressive vision with an emphasis on education. We need to look to our future, and that means protecting education for our children. The CBC budget emphasizes an increase for Head Start to help our youngest children; an increase in Pell grants to help young people who are trying to go to college; and, critically, an increase in the 21st century schools programs that will enable us to provide care for young people after school to address the problem of crime and violence.

This is a progressive vision of a budget that will work for all Americans. I urge support of the CBC budget.

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, America's veterans are not just Function 700 of the budget. They are the men and women who put their lives on the line protecting our freedom, and they need to be made a priority now, when they need our help the most.

I will never understand how Republicans can offer billions of dollars of tax cuts while our veterans are struggling for the services in health care that we promised them. The CBC budget offers our veterans the service that they have earned. It provides additional funds for medical research, nursing home construction, and the Montgomery GI bill, and the VA Center for Minority Veterans.

Mr. Chairman, we talk about a surplus; but we cannot have a surplus when we have not paid our bills. We owe the veterans. We should make them a priority, and I urge the support of the CBC budget substitute.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, since we have such little time, we have heard about the domestic priorities which I support, I would just like to say that in light of the flooding in Mozambique we have requested $320 million to the Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance to support in that emergency. Also we are asking for emergency supplemental of $1.6 billion for the HIPC countries hit by the floods, such as Mozambique, South Africa, Madagascar, Zimbabwe, and Zambia.

We also ask to restore the Development Fund for Africa to $804 million. This budget also provides an additional $100 million for the African Development Fund; $10 million for the Great Lakes Initiative, designed to build a credible and impartial system of justice in that region. We support an additional $200 million for AIDS through the World Bank; $60 million for economic development to support democratic institutions in Haiti; and $1 million to support bilateral/multilateral efforts in Papua New Guinea and to help the United Nations administration resolve the conflict on the island of Bougainville.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, we are evaluating all of the budgets based on six basic principles. One is to protect Social Security surpluses. Another is to provide for prescription drugs. Another is to retire debt. Another is to promote tax fairness. Another is to restore America's defense and strengthen education, science and health care. That is why we oppose the budget that is coming before us.

With regards to tax cuts, we want to provide an end to the marriage penalty tax, repeal Social Security earnings limits, reduce the death tax, expand educational savings accounts, increase health care deductibility, provide tax breaks for poor communities, and strengthen private pensions.

The President regretfully came in with a gross tax increase of $96 billion. Republicans have no tax increase. This tax increase results in the fact that next year the President would increase taxes $10 billion; we would cut taxes $10 billion.

Finally, over 5 years, the President has a net tax cut of $5 billion. We have over $200 billion of tax relief.

The reason we have that is we want a marriage penalty tax elimination. We want to eliminate and phase out the death tax. We have educational savings accounts. We would have health care deductibility. We had community renewal and we want pension reform.

The bottom line for us is that we need to get our country's financial house in order. A tax cut is part of it. We are cutting down and reducing debt. We are saving Social Security. We are providing $200 billion in the next 5 years for a tax cut.

☐ 1830

It is only 2 percent of all revenues that are going to come in, $10 trillion, and we are asking this Congress to accept the fact that the taxpayers deserve a break of $200 billion in the next 5 years.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the Chair the time remaining?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Each side has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this substitute, and especially call attention to the section dealing with the National Science Foundation and NASA, which is the area that will have the potential of closing the digital divide. I will point out that the President's recommendations clearly took care of this area.

This is not a substitute for the President's proposal, it is a substitute for the Republican's proposal. If the President's proposal had been presented here today, we would have very little alteration to it.

So I rise in support of this substitute, in lieu of the fact that we have to speak on behalf of the people.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget is fiscally sound and family fair. It continues our stride towards debt elimination, one of those principles, while making a stand against poverty. It protects Social Security and Medicare, while giving priority to our families and our children.

Mr. Chairman, we are experiencing the longest economic expansion in the history of the United States. However, many people are left out of that. Housing is an example of that. In fact, The Washington Post said that people are sleeping in their cars making $60,000.

Mr. Chairman, in our proposal there is a reasonable proposal in section 8, $100 million, and it could go into $1 billion, and you could buy homes. That is the way you accumulate wealth.

Mr. Chairman, The Congressional Black Caucus Alternative Budget is fiscally sound and family fair.

It continues our stride towards debt elimination, while making a stand against poverty.

It protects Social Security and Medicare while giving priority to our families and our children.

Mr. Chairman, we are experiencing the longest economic expansion in the history of the United States.

However, despite this rosy economic picture, many are being left out.

One sign of this dichotomy is in the area of housing.

It should concern all of us that, according to a recent report in the Washington Post, a man earning Sixty Thousand Dollars a year can not afford housing in Silicon Valley.

He sleeps in his car.

The headline in a recent edition of the Christian Science Monitor is equally alarming, ''Hot economy, but more homelessness''.

Housing is basic.

Housing affects every person alive on this earth.

Everyone has to live somewhere.

The lack of adequate housing is a problem, but the lack of affordable housing is an even greater problem.

A growing number of poor households have been left to compete for a shrinking supply of affordable housing.

The Congressional Black Caucus Alternative Budget addresses this problem, and we do so without any new spending. No offsets are required.

In our Budget, we shift $100 Million of Section 8 Voucher Funds to a cash assistance program.

This program would be used to promote home ownership, and thereby, stabilize families, help create wealth and ultimately reduce the dependency on Section 8 funds.

Moreover, when leveraged against private sector dollars, this program is valued at least ten times the amount of the investment.

One Hundred Million Dollars multiplies to a Billion Dollars.

Mr. Chairman, housing is the most important asset for wealth accumulation.

Home ownership is a good way to ease ''Cost-burden.''

Home ownership instills pride in a family.

Home ownership provides dignity.

When one owns a home, they are more likely to take care of it, maintain it and keep it clean and presentable.

The Congressional Black Caucus Alternative Budget embodies prudent economic policies while putting people as priority. It deserves our support.

THE NATION'S ECONOMY IS ROBUST

The economy of the United States is strong and robust, however, the challenge of the Congressional Black Caucus to find ways to have more citizens benefit from the growth we are currently experiencing.

We are experiencing the longest economic expansion in the history of the United States. We have gone from record federal deficits to record surpluses. 20 million new jobs have been created in the last eight years, and we currently have the highest overall home ownership rate ever, the lowest unemployment rate in 30 years and the lowest poverty rate in 20 years. Based upon current projections, we can expect to eliminate the federal debt in ten years. In 1992, when my Class entered Congress, we faced a $290 billion deficit that was on the rise and spiralling out of control. Today, we are anticipating a surplus in the unified budget of almost $3 trillion over the next ten years and to eliminating the federal debt by the year 2015.

YET, MANY ARE BEING LEFT OUT

For at least twenty years, however, there has been a troubling trend emerging—a trend that affects the quality of life for many Americans. Income and wealth inequality—the disparity in incomes and wealth due to wages, accumulated wealth, equity, investments and returns, etc.—has increased in intensity. As a result of this trend, those who have more end up getting more, while those who have less end up merely treading water, or in some instances, getting less.

This is a disturbing trend because, even in this time of prosperity, many Americans still cannot afford to purchase healthy meals for their families night after night or afford decent housing or health care. Many still cannot afford education expenses and other means needed to better their lives. This is a disturbing trend because slightly less than one-third of Americans remain poor; many remain hungry; many remain homeless.

John C. Weicher, a Senior Fellow at the Hudson Institute notes that, ''Wealth is much more concentrated than income.'' The top 1 percent of U.S. households own roughly one-third of total household net worth, yet receive roughly 10 percent of income. On the other hand, some 20 percent of the poorest households have no net worth, and a few percent have negative net worth.

But, the most troubling aspect of this trend is that income and wealth inequality is often influenced by Government Policy—what Government does and does not do. This has been documented by reliable sources—the Internal Revenue Service, the Census Bureau, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities and the Federal Reserve Board, among others.

WHAT IS THE TREND?

''By 1997, one Man, Bill Gates, was worth about as much as the 40 million American households at the bottom of the wealth distribution!''

According to Edward N. Wolff, a Professor of Economics at New York University and a leading authority on income and wealth inequality. ''In the 1970s, the level of wealth inequality in the United States was comparable to that of other, developed, industrialized countries.'' Since 1983, however, those with incomes in top 5 percent have steadily accumulated wealth and grown income. Persons with incomes in the lower brackets, however, have steadily fallen behind in wealth accumulation and income growth. As a consequence, according to Professor Wolff, the United States has now become the most unequal society with respect to the distribution of wealth among industrialized nations.

This inequality is reflected in the raw income and wealth data as well as by the inequity's apparent social impact. Recent Survey of Consumer Finances information assembled by the Federal Reserve Board, illustrates that the ''mean'' household net worth—adding together the net worth of the rich and poor alike, and then finding an average value—is close to $250,000. However, the ''median'' household net worth—ranking net worth values and finding the very middle value in the overall distribution—is slightly more than $60,000.

To further illustrate, in 1983, the top 1 percent of our population held 34 percent of total net worth, while the bottom 40 percent held .9 percent. Since then, the share of the top 1 percent has grown to nearly 40 percent, while the share of the bottom 40 percent has declined, to .2 of one percent. In 1998 dollar values, mean net worth of the top 1 percent was more than $7 million and has now grown to almost $8 million. On the other hand, the mean net worth of the bottom 40 percent was $47,000 in 1983, and currently has declined to $10,000—a precipitous decline in net worth!

Professor Edward Wolff in noting the trend toward the greater concentration of wealth, is mindful of the racial implications of this trend. More than 95 percent of the top one percent of wealth holders are White. Less than 1 percent are Black. Asians represent about 4 percent of the top one percent of wealth holders. The wealthiest 20 percent of households own 84 percent of the Nation's wealth. The top 2.7 million Americans—mostly White Americans—have as much income as the bottom 100 million persons in the Nation, which encompasses a sizeable portion of Black Americans. This wealth gap will likely continue to grow, especially if our economy remains strong and prosperous. The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities has concluded that both the top 2 percent and the top 20 percent of households are projected to receive a larger share of the after-tax income in the United States than in any previous year since data began to be collected.

WAGES ARE THE MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR AFFECTING INCOME

There is a close association between wealth and income. Income, however, is largely driven by wages. Moreover, there is greater inequality in the distribution of wages than in the distribution of income generally. Yet, while employment has been growing and unemployment falling, hourly wages—taking inflation into account—have remained stagnant. Due to the fact that wages have remained relatively stagnant, the overall gap in income distribution has widened.

WHITES EARN MORE AND HAVE MORE THAN BLACKS

More than one-fifth of Black households, about 21 percent, have incomes under $10,000 per year. Another 30 percent of Blacks have annual incomes above $10,000 but below $25,000. Thus, more than half of Black households have incomes below $25,000. On the other hand, only 11 percent of all Americans have incomes under $10,000, while 22 percent of all Americans have incomes between $10,000 and $25,000. The per capita income of all White Americans is $20,425, while the per capita income of Black

Americans is $12,351. Asian Americans have a per capita income of $18,226, while Hispanics, the only group below Blacks, have a per capita income of $10,773.

THERE IS A RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EDUCATION, INCOME, AND WEALTH

More education generally means more income and more wealth. Those with more schooling generally experience fewer bouts with unemployment and have higher earnings. Male college graduates today earn 92 percent more, on average, than male high school graduates. This compares to thirty years ago, when male college graduates earned 50 percent more than their high school counterparts. Female college graduates have a similar earnings advantage over those females with only a high school diploma. This advantage grew from 41 percent in 1970 to 76 percent in 1998.

While education generally means higher earnings, Black men and women college graduates do not always fare as well as White men and women college graduates. And, for women, Black or White, income disparities remain between them and their male counterparts.

HOUSING AN IMPORTANT ASSET FOR INCREASING WEALTH

Owner-occupied housing is the single most important asset that increases wealth. Indeed, almost two-thirds of the wealth of the bottom eighty percent of households is invested in their home. Yet, in the past decade, the percentage of owner-occupied housing as it relates to all assets has declined from more than 30 percent in 1990 to less than 24 percent in 1998. Mortgage debt has increased, from 21 percent of the value of homeowners' property in 1983, to 36 percent in 1995. This increase in debt relates to income and wealth inequality. Inasmuch as debt accounts for less than 10 percent of the assets of the top 1 percent of the population, it accounts for 71.7 percent of the bottom 80 percent of the population.

WHAT ARE SOME PROBLEMS RELATED TO INCOME AND WEALTH INEQUALITY?

Children are affected the most

Until 1993, there had been a steady decline in the number of children in poverty. This decline however, has slowed markedly, and worse yet, the children who remain in poverty are becoming poorer. Changes in government policies and practices have had severe impacts on children. Food stamps and cash assistance to families have in the past, been a vital part of helping to reduce the stinging pain of poverty. However, according to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, in 1995, 88 children received food stamps for every 100 who were poor, while 57 children received cash assistance for every 100 such poor children. By 1998, only 72 out of 100 poor children received food stamps, and only 41 out of 100 poor children received cash assistance—the lowest proportion since 1970.

Housing is often not affordable or available

The lack of adequate housing is a problem, but the lack of affordable housing is an even greater problem. A growing number of poor households have been left to compete for a shrinking supply of affordable housing. Studies indicate that a dearth of some 4 million affordable housing units exists in the country.

Also, unfortunately, substandard housing is a way of life for millions across the Nation. As unimaginable as it may seem, in the year 2000, some 3 million renters and another 3 million owners of housing reside in homes without bathrooms or fully equipped kitchens, in homes with poor and dangerous electrical wiring, in homes with falling ceilings and peeling plaster and in homes that have little or no heat in the winter and little or no cooling in the summer. Overcrowding for many remains a harsh reality.

Recently, there have been record lows in mortgage interest rates, leaving many to believe that housing in the United States is more affordable than ever. That is not true. Despite lower mortgage rates, many people are unable to afford to purchase homes. This is because income growth for the poor and working poor has been limited. This group of Americans are ''cost-burdened'' under H.U.D. standards. That is, they spend more than 40 percent of their income for housing. Therefore, many in the ranks of the poor and working poor find themselves on a treadmill to nowhere when it comes to breaking into the home ownership market.

Much attention has been placed on low interest rates and ''affordable'' mortgages, but the rising prices of rental housing have been ignored. Families locked into paying spiraling rental costs have a more difficult time of improving the quality of their lives, lifting themselves up, warding off poverty, main streaming and laying a solid foundation for the future.

Homelessness is on the rise

For too long in America, the homeless have been those we do not want to see. We believed that the homeless were those who wanted to be homeless—vagrants and derelicts who just did not want to work to improve their situations. We now know better. We know that the causes of homelessness are poverty, joblessness, declining incomes, changing family structures and the lack of affordable housing.

While it is hard to obtain an accurate account of the homeless, some estimates suggest that there may be as many as one and a half million who are homeless in America on any given day. They are not vagrants and derelicts. According to a 1996 study by the Urban Institute, about one-fifth of the homeless are families, with children. Many are women, single, female heads of households. The average age of homeless adults is mid to late thirties. Many of the homeless have been jobless longer than they have been homeless. The homeless, in urban areas primarily, are also disproportionately minority. According to one estimate, 54 percent of the homeless are non-white persons.

The average homeless person experienced a range of health difficulties. More than half had at least one major health problem. Lethal problems like HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis occur with uncommon frequency among the homeless. At least half have had a problem with the debilitating diseases of alcohol and drug abuse. It is no wonder then that more than half of the homeless have suffered from depression and demoralization, many have a history of mental hospitalization. Suicide attempts, far too many, is a way of life. Homeless women with children are five times more likely to attempt suicide than other adults. Almost half of the homeless have answered this Nation's call in the Armed Services of the United States. A large number of these veterans, who happen to be homeless, suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder.

WHAT CAN THE CBC DO TO ADDRESS THESE CONCERNS?

While we cannot and must not rely solely on the Federal Government as the solution to our problems, we must be prepared to push our federal partners to provide more help with this problem. This pushing will not be easy, however, we know that the best way to stabilize our communities is by increasing home ownership and by providing a sufficient stock of affordable housing.

In July of last year, we convened our first Regional Housing Summit. There in Charlotte, North Carolina, we pledged to try to help create a million new African American homeowners. Home ownership is a good fundamental way to generate equity and wealth. Home ownership instills a sense of pride and dignity in families and communities alike. When people own homes, they are more likely to establish strong ties and commitments to the community, and because of those ties, are more inclined to become civically engaged.

One of the greatest barriers to home ownership, however, is credit. According to recent reports, a disproportionate number of African Americans are especially burdened by what the industry deems as ''bad credit.'' Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac have exercised important leadership in dealing with credit problems many African Americans face. This is the kind of leadership we need as we begin this new millennium.

So, what do we have to do? First, we need to join together and push the public and private sectors to help resolve the ''hurricane-like'' housing situations that African Americans face each and every day.

Second, we have to fight to preserve Section 8 Housing and to increase funding for the Community Development Block Grant Program—the largest source of federal funding for housing. We need to protect the Community Reinvestment Act—an act that has played a critical role in improving housing. We need to be strong advocates for the full funding of the Shelter Plus Care Program. Let us push for improvement in the Section 202/811 GAP Funding Program. Let us ensure that Congress extends the HOPE Six Program. Let us vow that our elderly are properly housed. We must push for adequate funding for Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities. If we advocate and fight for the provisions listed above, we will have taken measurable steps toward bringing more African Americans into the fold of home ownership and decent housing.

EXAMPLES OF RELATED GOVERNMENT POLICIES AND PRACTICES WE CAN INFLUENCE

Increasing the minimum wage or restructuring tax rates are obvious ways to increase income for those who have less. There are, however, other actions we can seek, actions that in some cases may be more achievable. The mortgage deduction program in the United States is an $83 billion program. Again, however, the largest beneficiaries of this program are those with more income and wealth. Those with less income and wealth get fewer benefits from this program Some $53 billion of the mortgage deduction program benefit those in the higher income brackets. The other $30 billion benefits those in the remaining income brackets. Thus, persons earning $40,000 and below get minimal benefits from the program.

Do persons like Bill Gates really need to participate in the mortgage deduction program? What harm would it do to the rich—

what good might it do the working class—if the mortgage deduction program were changed to exclude those with incomes of a quarter of a million dollars or more and to ensure substantive benefits for those with incomes of $40,000 or less? The answer is no harm, but a lot of good!

Another example relates to how we spend money for housing programs. The President is seeking additional funds for Section 8 vouchers, and that, on its face, is a good thing. However, we have had generation upon generation of families, dislocated from the rest of society, isolated in public housing and, very often, dependent upon the government to provide them with a relatively decent place to live. Why not take some of those Section 8 funds and provide a suitable amount of cash assistance to these families—assistance that can be used to finance homes! If we do that, these families can begin the process of reducing their reliance on government and take the first step toward accumulating equity and wealth.

Investing in education can produce similar results. Education is a major contributor to net worth. According to reports, the average wealth of college graduates is 2.5 times the wealth of those with only a high school diploma. Moreover, a better educated population means a stronger and better work force, well into the future. We must develop programs and policies that provide lower income and working families with affordable educational options for our children.

For too long, the rich have gotten richer and the poor have gotten poorer, and America is less well off because of that trend. We, in the Congressional Black Caucus must work to reverse this trend. This rising tide of economic prosperity must lift many more boats. That is why it is important that we present and push an Alternative Budget. In so doing, we can send a critical message and lay the foundation for the enactment of authorizing and appropriations language that will impact Government policies and practices that will begin to reverse the severity of existing income and wealth inequality trends. By presenting and pushing an Alternative Budget, we can force policies and measures that benefit all of society, not just those who are better off.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK).

(Mrs. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the only budget that has been submitted that will help the conscience of the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Congressional Black Caucus' (CBC) substitute budget for FY 2001. Included in the CBC budget is an allocation for $150 million in support of lupus research and the delivery of lupus services. These funds will help to expand and intensify the research efforts of the NIH to diagnose, treat, and eventually cure lupus.

Lupus attacks the immune system. A patient's immune system loses its ability to tell the difference between foreign substances and the patient's own cells. As a result, the patient's immune system makes antibodies which end up attacking the patient's immune system. This can result in debilitating pain and fatigue, making it difficult for lupus victims to maintain employment and lead normal lives. Lupus can be fatal if not detected and treated early.

Thousands of women with lupus die each year. Lupus afflicts women nine times more than it does men, and has its most significant impact on women during the childbearing years. About 1.4 million Americans have some form of Lupus—one out of every 185 Americans. As estimated 1 in 250 African American women between the ages of 15 and 65 develop lupus.

Perhaps the most discouraging aspect of lupus for sufferers and family members is the fact that there is no cure. Lupus is devastating not only to the victim, but to family members as well. Research, treatment, education and financial support are essential so that we can help victims and their families cope until we are able to conquer this terrible disease.

I urge my colleagues to join us in providing this essential support for persons suffering from lupus and vote in favor of the CBC budget.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this fundamentally fair and morally principled budget.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentleman from California (Ms. WATERS).

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute budget.

I rise to support the alternative budget resolution presented by the Congressional Black Caucus (CBC). In particular, the CBC's alternative is significant for the funding allocated in the International Affairs portion of the budget resolution.

Between the fiscal years 2001 and 2005, the CBC budget resolution would allocate $43 billion more to International Affairs compared to the Republican budget resolution. This would provide essential funding to institutions such as the African Development Bank, the African Development Fund, the Child Survival and Disease Fund, and the Peace Corps.

This additional funding is critical particularly to ensure full funding for debt relief for heavily indebted poor countries.

Today, I am introducing the Limpopo River Debt Relief and Reconstruction Act to provide assistance to Mozambique and other countries of southern Africa that have been devastated by recent floods.

The Limpopo River Debt Relief and Reconstruction Act would completely cancel the debts owed by these countries to the United States and provide assistance for the repair and reconstruction of damaged infrastructure in these countries. Limpopo River Debt Relief and Reconstruction funding is essential to enable Mozambique and other southern African countries to provide for the needs of their people, repair their damaged infrastructure and rebuild their economies.

Debt relief is desperately needed by many other heavily indebted poor countries as well. The governments of these countries have been forced to make drastic cuts in basic services such as health and education in order to make payments on their debts.

Nigeria, for example, is a deeply impoverished country that would receive tremendous benefits from debt relief. Nigeria's per capita income is only $300 per year and the country spends no more than $5 per person per year on health services. Without debt relief, Nigeria's fragile democracy is in danger of collapse. Debt cancellation will give Nigeria a fresh start and a sound basis for a democratic future.

For these and many other important reasons, I urge my colleagues to support the Congressional Black Caucuses' alternative budget.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

(Mrs. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the other side for being so generous with their time this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, to close this debate, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), who sort of put this whole thing together for us.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) for his leadership in directing the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) and myself to prepare this budget. This budget, as you have heard, clearly reflects the priorities of the Congressional Black Caucus. Those priorities reflect our district.

For too long this economic upswing has missed a lot of the people we represent. So our budget, offered in the nature of a substitute, clearly directs the resources of this country to those individuals who have been left out.

Mr. Chairman, this budget will increase the education budget over $10 billion. We have to do something about educating our children.

In addition to this, we have to work on housing. The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) talked about a housing initiative for home ownership. We support that home ownership initiative.

More than that, Mr. Chairman, this budget is a balanced budget. Unlike many budgets of the past, we understand fiscal integrity. So what we have offered, in addition to this balanced budget, is one that also provides modest tax cuts for working Americans.

Mr. Chairman, we also protect Social Security, Medicare, and, yes, we pay down on the national debt.

Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Black Caucus budget is a reasonable budget, and one I urge all my colleagues to support.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the vice chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to take a minute to commend the Black Caucus for putting this budget together and setting their priorities right. I have an historic black college in my district, Fort Valley State University, which I am very proud to represent and work very closely with those folks individually as well as through the university system to ensure their priorities are addressed. I have any number of good friends who are members of this caucus, and we appreciate the hard work that you all have done.

I want to talk for just a minute and remind folks again why we deem our budget to be the best. First of all, we are going to save and continue to protect Social Security by setting aside 100 percent of the Social Security surplus to pay the beneficiaries of Social Security. We are going to strengthen Medicare to include a prescription drug provision. We are going to retire the public debt. We are going to set it on course to be retired by 2013. In this budget, over the next 5 years we are going to retire $1 trillion worth of debt.

We are going to promote tax fairness for families, for small business people, for farmers, and for seniors. We are going to restore America's defense, and we are going to strengthen support for education and science.

I want to take just a minute to refer back to the defense budget that the President has submitted and show again what we have done with respect to plussing up the President's defense budget over the last 5 years. The red line represents the President's proposed budget. The blue line represents what we in this Congress have passed. The majority has made a real commitment to the defense of this country, and we continue to do so in this budget.

There is one particular provision that I want to make reference to that has an effect on everybody in this room, and it is the provision on impact aid. If you live near a military reservation, a military base of any sort, and you do not get the appropriate impact aid for your school system, then the ad valorem taxpayers in that jurisdiction wind up paying a penalty.

So what the President has done every year that this majority has been in Congress is to come in with a reduction in his budget for impact aid. What that is is a hidden tax on the landowners or everybody who resides close to a military base. We have got to have impact aid going to the school districts where our children are educated if they are going to get the quality education that we demand.

So what we have done over the last 5 years, what we again do in our budget this year, is to plus up the President's budget from an impact aid standpoint, so that we can ensure that all children, irrespective of whether their parents are in the military or not, will be able to get the quality of education that we dictate and demand.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the Black Caucus budget and a ''yes'' vote on the Republican budget.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the substitute amendment to H. Con. Res. 290 offered by Representative CLYBURN.

In particular, I offer my enthusiastic support for the $225.5 million in funding the substitute provides to the National Telecommunications and Information Agency (NTIA). NTIA administers many important programs designed to begin closing the Digital Divide—the gap between those with access to the Internet and information technologies and those without. NTIA will also be active next year in encouraging meaningful improvements to the Nation's telecommunications infrastructure by giving directed research and program grants.

Mr. Chairman, I am encouraged that the Clyburn substitute allocates $97.5 million to NTIA's Digital Divide cluster of programs. The centerpiece of this cluster of programs is the allocation of $45.1 million to fund grants for the Technology Opportunities Program. The Technology Opportunities Program matches private contributions with government funds to promote the widespread availability of advanced telecommunications technologies. Dollars allocated through this program would be used to purchase equipment for building networks and linking networks to one another, connect communications networks such as the Internet, train people in the use of equipment and software, and purchase telephone links and access to commercial on-line services. With these projects, rural and low-income communities that may not otherwise have the means or opportunity, are able to tap into the wealth of information that is accessible via advanced telecommunications technologies and use this technology to improve the delivery of health care, public safety efforts and other services.

Another important allocation for part of the NTIA's Digital Divide cluster of programs is $50.0 million for the Home Internet Access Program. This new program would provide low-income individuals and families with the connections, training, and support necessary for full participation in today's information economy. The goal of the Home Internet Access program is to bridge the digital divide by providing targeted investments to bring these at-risk populations online.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to closing the Digital Divide, the Clyburn substitute would support NTIA's programs to support critical infrastructure projects. Specifically, the Clyburn substitute allocates $110.1 million for Public Telecommunications Facilities, Planning, and Construction. Grants funded by this allocation would assist communities in purchasing the equipment needed by local public broadcasting organizations to meet the 2003 FCC deadline for public broadcasting organizations to convert to digital transmission.

Mr. Chairman, the Digital Divide is a major socio-economic problem facing our nation today, and it threatens future opportunities for large segments of the population that lack access to the Internet and other new technologies. In the new digital age, it is vital that all Americans have access to the new telecommunications and information technologies, and the Clyburn substitute provides essential funding to meet this challenge.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) as the designee of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 70, noes 348, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 70]

AYES—70

Barrett (WI)	Gutierrez	Napolitano
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Olver
Berman	Hilliard	Owens
Bishop	Hinchey	Pastor
Blumenauer	Jackson (IL)	Payne
Bonior	Jefferson	Pelosi
Brady (PA)	Johnson, E. B.	Rahall
Brown (FL)	Jones (OH)	Rangel
Capuano	Kilpatrick	Roybal-Allard
Carson	Kucinich	Rush
Clay	Larson	Sabo
Clayton	Lee	Sanders
Clyburn	Lewis (GA)	Scott
Conyers	Lofgren	Serrano
Coyne	Markey	Stark
Cummings	Martinez	Thompson (MS)
Davis (IL)	McGovern	Towns
DeFazio	McKinney	Velazquez
Engel	Meek (FL)	Waters
Farr	Meeks (NY)	Watt (NC)
Fattah	Millender-McDonald	Waxman
Filner	Mink	Woolsey
Ford	Nadler	Wynn
Frank (MA)		

NOES—348

Abercrombie	Buyer	Doggett
Aderholt	Callahan	Dooley
Allen	Calvert	Doolittle
Andrews	Camp	Doyle
Armey	Campbell	Dreier
Baca	Canady	Duncan
Bachus	Cannon	Dunn
Baird	Capps	Edwards
Baker	Cardin	Ehlers
Baldacci	Castle	Ehrlich
Baldwin	Chabot	Emerson
Ballenger	Chambliss	English
Barcia	Chenoweth-Hage	Eshoo
Barr	Clement	Etheridge
Barrett (NE)	Coble	Evans
Bartlett	Coburn	Everett
Barton	Collins	Ewing
Bass	Combest	Fletcher
Bateman	Condit	Foley
Bentsen	Cook	Forbes
Bereuter	Cooksey	Fossella
Berkley	Costello	Fowler
Berry	Cox	Franks (NJ)
Biggert	Cramer	Frelinghuysen
Bilbray	Crowley	Frost
Bilirakis	Cubin	Gallegly
Blagojevich	Cunningham	Ganske
Bliley	Danner	Gejdenson
Blunt	Davis (FL)	Gekas
Boehlert	Davis (VA)	Gephardt
Boehner	Deal	Gibbons
Bono	DeGette	Gilchrest
Borski	Delahunt	Gillmor
Boswell	DeLauro	Gilman
Boucher	DeLay	Gonzalez
Boyd	DeMint	Goode
Brady (TX)	Deutsch	Goodlatte
Brown (OH)	Diaz-Balart	Goodling
Bryant	Dickey	Gordon
Burr	Dicks	Goss
Burton	Dingell	Graham

Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—16

Ackerman
Archer
Bonilla
Crane
Dixon
Greenwood
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Largent
Lowey
McCollum
McDermott
McHugh
Quinn
Royce
Schakowsky
Vento

□ 1900

Ms. DEGETTE and Messrs. PALLONE, ADERHOLT and BEREUTER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. KUCINICH, FARR of California, JACKSON of Illinois, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in Part B of House Report 106–535.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Part B Amendment No. 2 in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. DEFAZIO:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001.

The Congress declares that concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001 and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2002 through 2005 are hereby set forth.

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2005:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:
Fiscal year 2001: $1,533,703,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,582,252,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,634,316,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,702,913,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,766,406,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be reduced are as follows:
Fiscal year 2001: $0.
Fiscal year 2002: $4,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $10,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $17,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $24,000,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:
Fiscal year 2001: $1,558,245,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,595,233,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,640,506,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,706,914,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,775,092,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:
Fiscal year 2001: $1,502,313,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,566,294,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,616,960,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,682,278,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,752,016,000,000.

(4) SURPLUSES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the surpluses are as follows:
Fiscal year 2001: $31,390,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $15,958,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $17,357,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $20,636,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $14,390,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:
Fiscal year 2001: $______________.
Fiscal year 2002: $______________.
Fiscal year 2003: $______________.
Fiscal year 2004: $______________.
Fiscal year 2005: $______________.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and budget outlays for fiscal years 2001 through 2005 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $276,216,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $274,507,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $279,140,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $276,447,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $284,794,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $283,017,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $291,766,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $287,368,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $299,355,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $296,317,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $21,710,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,979,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $22,306,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,691,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $22,615,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,617,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $23,120,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,998,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $23,777,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,284,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $19,527,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,857,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $19,883,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,508,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $20,141,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,727,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $20,732,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,129,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $21,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,573,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $1,238,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $197,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $1,310,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $1,186,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−83,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $1,265,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−131,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $1,297,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−31,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $26,862,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,926,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $26,621,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,619,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $26,325,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,416,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $27,004,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,626,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $27,518,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,851,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $21,697,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,923,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $19,848,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $18,583,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $16,093,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,633,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $15,498,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,944,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $14,230,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,642,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $6,827,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,656,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $8,988,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,089,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $9,711,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,016,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $14,144,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,099,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $14,150,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,076,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $58,756,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,537,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $55,580,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,270,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $57,017,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,712,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $58,439,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,403,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $60,077,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,326,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $20,048,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,279,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $30,420,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,144,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $30,780,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,710,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $31,723,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,944,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $32,542,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,855,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $85,882,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,768,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $86,635,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $82,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $87,788,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $85,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $89,453,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $87,708,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $91,570,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $89,757,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $171,749,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $166,795,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $184,237,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $181,297,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $197,553,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $194,924,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $213,097,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $211,383,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $231,207,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $230,061,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $218,227,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $214,711,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $227,226,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $225,737,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $243,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $242,517,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $265,454,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,253,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $289,877,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $289,519,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $265,819,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $260,890,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $276,396,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $277,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $287,353,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $289,509,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $299,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $301,594,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $313,203,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $316,095,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $9,723,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,723,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $11,567,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,567,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $12,266,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,266,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $13,013,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,013,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $13,833,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,833,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $47,791,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,703,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $50,428,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,125,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $51,903,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,606,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $53,248,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,906,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $56,651,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,285,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $80,392,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,814,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $30,869,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,297,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $30,655,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,472,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $30,866,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,077,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $31,579,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,503,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $15,924,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,190,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $16,053,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,512,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $16,131,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,816,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $16,392,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,465,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $16,619,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,512,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $287,910,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $287,910,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $288,957,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $288,956,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $284,821,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $284,821,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $280,128,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $280,128,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $275,160,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $275,160,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $20,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $−38,073,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−38,073,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $−41,230,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−41,230,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $−40,381,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−40,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $−37,629,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−37,629,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $−38,652,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−38,652,000,000.

SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report to the House a reconciliation bill not later than May 26, 2000, that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to increase the total level of revenues by $9,345,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and $151,574,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 446, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

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

Mr. Chairman, this is a debate about values and priorities. We are setting the scene for the entire spending of the budget of the United States of America, all the billions of dollars in taxes collected from our citizens. We want to see a change in the priorities.

Today, the United States ranks first in military spending. We spend five times as much as our strongest potential adversary, the Russians, who are pretty pathetic. Yet, the United States is tenth, tenth in per capita education spending. If we addressed what the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman KASICH) of the Committee on the Budget referred to earlier as sloppy management at the Pentagon with the 10 percent cut in exotic weapons procurement, keeping whole the readiness budget, keeping whole the housing, personnel, and other budgets, supporting our troops, we could be number one in the world in military spending by four and a half times instead of five times our next adversary.

But we could move from tenth to first in education. We could invest more in health care; in our veterans, fulfilling our obligations to them; infrastructure; schools; clean waters; sewers; transportation; housing. The list goes on.

The Republican budget assumes that all of those things I listed, except for the Pentagon, will be reduced by $19 billion below current levels of spending. Our budget, instead, would raise the levels of spending on education by more than $20 billion over the Republican levels. Health care would be dramatically increased. We would increase veterans over $2 billion over the Republican budget. Infrastructure, schools, clean water, sewers, housing, the list goes on.

This is about priorities, and it is about values, and it is about how we spend our people's money. We are proposing a budget that would spend the money more in line with the values of a majority of the American people.

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

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA).

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I think the most important thing that we compare this budget to the budget that the Republicans have proposed is that the Republicans have proposed a balanced, common sense approach.

What will this mean to the average American family? It means that we will have a debt-free Nation for our children. We have balanced the budget. The Republican budget will pay down the $3.6 trillion debt over the next 13 years. It means a more secure future for our seniors. We stop the 30-year raid on Social Security, and we preserve the Social Security surplus into the future.

It means a stronger effort to find cures for cancer and Alzheimer's. We are making a significant commitment to further research in the health area.

It means a safer world and fulfilling our pledge to those who made it that way. We are going to keep our commitment to our veterans.

We increase funding for education. What we do in education is we target those dollars so that, when the Federal dollars get down to the local level, it gives the local entities a maximum amount of flexibility to design the programs that best fit the needs of that community, that school, and the children in that area.

We increase funding for IDEA, the Individuals With Disabilities Education. We increase funding for title VI. This is innovative education programs. This is the most flexible dollars that come to a local school district.

We keep our commitment to defense by ensuring that those communities that have defense installations will get the Federal assistance that they need.

What does this mean? It means that we give local communities maximum flexibility. It is a very different approach than what the President is taking. The President's approach, the Democratic approach, is to develop more programs and run them through a bureaucracy in Washington and force local communities to accept programs that do not necessarily work, in many cases that do not work at all. We are running them through a bureaucracy that for 2 years has failed its audits and has told us that for 2 more years we can expect failed audits. It means that we are running $35 billion through this agency each and every year, and they cannot tell us where the dollars are going.

The Republican budget says and the Republican program says let us get these dollars back to a local community, let us give these dollars to local administrators, to parents and teachers that know the names of our kids.

It is not an issue of spending. It is an issue of getting maximum effectiveness for each and every dollar that we have committed to education.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Oregon for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Progressive Caucus budget. Unlike the Republicans, progressives understand and have developed a budget which addresses the reality that millions of Americans today are working longer hours for lower wages; that this country has, by far, the most unfair distribution of wealth and income in the industrialized world; and that, while the wealthiest people have never had it so good, 20 percent of our children live in poverty, 44 million Americans lack health insurance, and millions more are unable to afford the prescription drugs they need.

This budget understands that many in the middle class are going deeply into debt to be able to send their kids to college and that we must significantly increase funding for education so that every child has the opportunity to succeed.

This budget understands that we do not need to give tax breaks to billionaires, spend huge sums of money on wasteful and unneeded weapons systems, or provide multinational corporations with $125 billion a year in corporate welfare.

Mr. Chairman, the progressive budget addresses two particular outrages that this Congress must deal with. First, we significantly increase funding for the veterans of this country who have put their lives on the line to defend this Nation, and we are proud to do that.

Secondly, this budget in a meaningful way begins to address the horrific Medicare cuts brought about by the so-called Balanced Budget Act of 1997, cuts which have caused terrible reductions in services for the elderly, in hospitals, home health care agencies, and nursing homes.

The bottom line is that when we talk about priorities, we do not give tax breaks to millionaires and billionaires and turn our backs on the elderly, the children, or the veterans. The Progressive Caucus budget is a sensible budget that meets the needs of the middle class and working families of this country and must be passed.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. FLETCHER), a member of the Committee on the Budget and also a member of the House Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot of rhetoric regarding this progressive budget. But let me say this, as I was listening, if Ronald Reagan had paid attention to this sort of rhetoric and allowed our national security to slip as much as what this progressive budget would be, I could imagine we would still have the Soviet Union, we would still have the Iron Curtain.

But let me talk about what our budget does. It protects 100 percent of the Social Security surplus, strengthens Medicare with prescription drugs, $40 billion for that. It retires the publicly held debt by the year 2013. It strengthens education and science, and I want to talk specifically about science. It promotes tax fairness. Eliminating the marriage penalty tax is not to the wealthy, it is a fairness issue. It gets to the very values that we have in eliminating the earnings limit and decreasing the inheritance tax and allow farmers to pass on their farm from one generation to the next. It restores America's defense.

I want to talk a little bit about NIH funding, the National Institutes of Health. As we can see from this chart, we clearly show that the Republican priority over the Clinton-Gore priority and the Democratic priority has been to fund basic research, the kind of research that provides the cures to diseases that affect every family in this country.

Let me read a statement from the NIH: In these final years of the 20th century, we have seen an explosion of progress against cancer. We have begun to gather significant information from programs launched only 2 or 3 years ago, right during the time we increased the funding. With our recent funding increase, we have been able to launch innovative new programs that will have far-reaching effects into the next century.

I think about results from the breast cancer prevention trial, showing that we had a 49 percent reduction in the incident of primary breast cancer during the treatment period in women of high risk for the disease. Things like this that affect every single family in America.

Is there anybody out there that has not been affected by Alzheimer's disease?

We have one of the major centers at the University of Kentucky, the Sanders Brown Center for Aging that does a lot of research on Alzheimer's disease. NIH is very important to that institution providing money to back basic research. One day my hope is that we do not have any family affected by this disease that has such tragic effects.

Because of the increased funding, I am hopeful that one day, because of the Republican priorities, which stand for the values of making sure that we provide the health care for this Nation, that we are going to cure diseases like cancer, diabetes, and Alzheimer's disease.

So I encourage my colleagues to vote against this progressive budget, vote for the Republican budget. It provides the necessary basic dollars for science, education, national defense, paying down the debt, providing real tax relief and fairness, and protecting Social Security.

□ 1915

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS).

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I begin by congratulating the Progressive Caucus budget for going a long way toward strengthening our defense and our security because they recognize that education is the most important priority of our government.

It is brainpower that will carry us forward in the military sector, the economic sector, whatever. Brainpower. Viewing our schools and our education system as a giant mobilization for whatever the future brings.

In our Republican budget, and even to some degree in the President's budget, we are still making the same error that the Russians made. They were building tanks, millions and millions of tanks, for a war theater that had long ago left tanks behind. We are increasing defense by $17 billion in the Republican budget and increasing it by too much in the President's budget; and we are neglecting the place where we should mobilize for all kinds of contingencies, and that is education.

I want to congratulate the Progressive Caucus budget. I want to say the Blue Dogs' budget is impressive in the area of education. They have increased education in their budget. It is only the Democratic substitute that lags behind and the President that lags behind in terms of understanding that it is brainpower that is going to drive our future.

As we go into a cyber-civilization, where digitalization is the key to all activities, it is ''dot com'' all over the place. We need smarter and smarter people to run our economy.

Social Security is jeopardized if we have a workforce that cannot get out there and generate the income and we have to contract all our income-generating activities to foreign countries which have the people who can run our high-tech society.

We are way behind in our thinking. This was a golden opportunity. I think that we should look at education, defense, and economics as being inextricably interwoven. We cannot separate education out from the rest and education comes first.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), a member of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Armed Services.

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

Mr. Chairman, anytime we have to try to put together a Federal budget, we have a number of priorities and demands, and we have to try to find the appropriate balance among those different demands and priorities. I think that the budget which the Committee on the Budget has recommended is a far superior budget to the substitute now being offered.

It starts out by making sure that we set aside 100 percent of the money we take from people in social security taxes and not let that money be spent for any other government program. It then goes on to strengthen Medicare and trying to set aside $40 billion so that we can modernize and improve Medicare to include a prescription drug benefit. I think all of us recognize that a system born in the 1960s needs to try to keep up with the changes of health care and this will allow us to do that.

It goes further to retire a billion dollars of debt over the next 5 years, and it will strengthen and increase support for education and science, including vital medical research.

It then has two other important priorities, I think, that are missing from the substitute now before us. The budget recommended by the Committee on the Budget has important provisions to have tax relief for American taxpayers. And I think it is very easy for those of us in Washington to forget whose money it is that we are talking about. We have got to remember that the Federal Government reaches into the pockets of hard-working Americans and takes away from them part of the money that they work hard each day to earn. We have to be sure that if we are going to do that, and take their money out of their pockets, that we spend that money better than they. I think that is a very difficult test for us to meet.

Federal taxes are now higher than they have been at any time since World War II, and one of the priorities of this budget is to allow people to keep more of the money that they earn.

Finally, this budget also has a priority to restore America's defenses. I believe that the first function, really, of the Federal Government, is to defend the country. So we have a 6 percent increase in defense spending, $1 billion more than the President.

Our armed forces are committed all around the world. Some of us would not choose to have those same commitments, but the fact is they are there. Texas National Guard people are today on station in Bosnia. And while I wish they were not there, it is essential that we provide them everything that they need to do their job.

But in addition to making sure we keep the commitments we have today around the world, we have to prepare for the future, and that means some investment; that means research; that means developing new kinds of systems to help protect us from incoming ballistic missiles, to help fight against the spreading of nuclear, chemical, biological and radiological weapons that are going all across the world.

It means we have to be prepared to deal with new kinds of threats, threats with computers and threats to our vital national infrastructure. New things are threatening our country, and we have to be prepared to defend against them.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, how this Congress chooses to spend our Federal funds says a lot about who we are as people and as a Nation.

So what are we saying today? The Republican budget, which will cause 40,000 children to lose Head Start services by the year 2005, says that preschool services for low-income children just is not very important. On the other hand, the Progressive Caucus budget is the only budget resolution being offered today that will fully fund Head Start.

And should this Nation not increase funds for child care subsidies by $4 billion, as the Progressive Caucus budget does, instead of causing over 12,000 low-income children and their families to lose their child care subsidies, as the Republican budget does?

What priorities are being reflected when the Republican budget freezes funding for higher education, for training and employment programs? The progressive budget increases funding for education at every level, including education technology and after-school programs.

The Republican budget, which increases defense spending, while making deep cuts in domestic spending, says loud and clear that weapons are more important than people. Is that what this Nation is really about? Is that who we are as people? I am not, and I say that this Nation's national security should be measured by how we invest in our children, not weapons.

Our true national security depends on how well our children are educated. That is why I will be voting against the Republican budget resolution, and I will be voting for the progressive budget. I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the 8th District of North Carolina (Mr. HAYES).

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

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time to speak about what is an excellent Republican budget.

This is a good budget. Maybe it is not a perfect budget, but it has balance. It meets critical needs. It addresses crucial policy issues. It saves every penny of Social Security for our seniors.

This budget provides generously for education, while stressing local decisions, local control, assuring opportunities for our public school system and for our children.

This budget wipes out the national debt in the very near future.

This budget restores our national defense and begins to mend broken promises made to our veterans and active duty personnel by this administration.

This budget addresses vital health care needs, strengthens Medicare, and provides assistance for seniors with prescription drugs.

Last but not least, the theme of my friends on the left is that Washington is more wise than the taxpayers are; Washington can spend taxpayers' money more wisely than they can. I respectfully disagree with this position. It is my belief that Americans can make better decisions than Washington can about how they spend their own money. Americans, and my folks in the 8th District, deserve tax fairness, and they deserve more of their own money to spend on their own needs.

This budget is good for North Carolina's 8th District and it is good for America. I recommend a ''yes'' vote for this fine Republican budget.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ).

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

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the House Republican budget and in support of the Progressive Caucus budget.

Mr. Chairman, at a time when our Nation is experiencing the most unprecedented economic expansion ever, more than 35 million Americans still live below the poverty level and have yet to experience benefits of this historic boom. Never in our Nation's history have so many had so much, and still the gap widens between this country's haves and have-nots. As the greatest industrial Nation in the world, this is a travesty; and changing this should be our top priority.

Instead of addressing this issue head on, the Republican budget fails to help those across ethnic communities that need the most help. It fails our seniors by providing nothing to strengthen Social Security or Medicare. It fails more than 300,000 low-income women dependent on programs like WIC and Head Start. It fails our youth by cutting student loans. And it fails our urban communities who want to help themselves by cutting funding for empowerment zones.

Republicans have sacrificed this Nation's working families all to fund another reckless scheme to benefit a wealthy few. My colleagues, the American people have been clear. They want Social Security fixed, they want better schools for their children, and they want all Americans to benefit from this current economic prosperity, not just the wealthy few who the Republicans carve out a special tax break for.

I ask my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this irresponsible budget that includes a risky tax proposal which leaves working families, American families, behind.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN), an outstanding freshman member of the Committee on the Budget.

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

Right now we are talking about the so-called progressive substitute amendment. That term, progressive, actually means something very specifically to me, because I come from the State of Wisconsin, where the Progressive Party perhaps reached its greatest heights. Our two statutes, our contribution to Statuary Hall, include Fighting Bob La Follette, really the father of the Progressive Party.

I would also say that that progressive tradition is alive and well in Wisconsin today. All of my colleagues know about what we are doing in the area of education reform and welfare reform. Well, it seems to me, from the Wisconsin perspective, if we want to talk about progressive themes and a progressive budget, the budget that we should be supporting, quite frankly, is not the so-called progressive substitute, but is, instead, this budget, the Republican budget plan. Because in my view that is the true Republican progressive plan.

Number one, it strengthens retirement security. It protects 100 percent of the Social Security surplus. It sets aside $40 billion to provide for prescription drug coverage. That is progressive, to me.

It promotes tax fairness, attacking some of the absurdities, some of the injustices in our Tax Code. It provides for reducing the marriage penalty. It provides for small business tax relief. And thanks to a sense of the Congress resolution that we added in the Committee on the Budget, it also takes care of one of the great problems that our farmers are facing in income averaging.

My colleagues may not be aware, but as the IRS is looking to implement the income averaging plan from the 1997 balanced budget agreement, they will not let farmers take into account years in which they lose money. Well, I have news for the IRS. Coming from the Midwest, I know that we have lots of family farms who are losing money.

□ 1930

That to me is a progressive plan. Our budget plan strengthens support for science and education. We increase education funding by 9.4 percent over last year; that is progressive. A difference between our budget and the so-called progressive plan is that our education funding is student centered, not bureaucracy centered.

Under our plan, we ensure that money leaves Washington, leaves the bureaucracy and gets in the hands of classrooms and communities all across the Nation. We believe that our budget plan is the true progressive plan, because it seeks to make sure that every American will have the tools and the opportunity to pursue the American dream; that is progressive.

Let us take a look quickly at the progressive budget plan. It is well-intentioned; however, it cuts $30 billion out of defense. How is that progressive? How is that progressive? How can you worry about progressive values if you are not secure? How can you worry about progressive values if your Nation is at risk?

The progressive plan also raises taxes by about $151 billion over 5 years. How is that progressive? As we all know, the tax burden that we are facing right now is the highest that we faced since World War II. We are paying wartime taxes at a time when we are supposedly at peace.

More and more families have to have two wage earners, not by choice, they have to have two wage earners just to make ends meet. And, yet, the progressive plan would increase their tax burden.

My friends, I do not believe it is progressive. I am afraid I believe it is regressive. It is going backwards. It is going back to the days of tax and spend. Look carefully at what our budget does. It strengthens the retirement security system by locking away 100 percent of the Social Security surplus and providing for prescription drug coverage; that is progressive.

It retires the debt by the year 2013 to hopefully keep interest rates down and keep the economy growing and keep those good jobs coming; that is progressive. It strengthens dramatically our investment in education and science; that is progressive. It promotes tax fairness for families and farmers and seniors, and, yes, it provides for defense. My friends, this is the progressive budget plan.

I urge you all to vote for it. I urge you all to reject the well-intentioned, but, I am afraid, regressive progressive budget plan.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) has 9½ minutes remaining and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

If it is progressive to cut taxes for the wealthy and continue huge corporate tax loopholes while taking the money out of the pockets and cutting the programs for middle-income and lower-income Americans, then, yes, your version of a budget is progressive. Our version of a budget puts money in the pockets of middle-income and working families, funds programs that are important to them. Yes, it does raise taxes on the largest corporations in the world that are skating on their taxes today and those who are the most wealthy who are doing very well.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Progressive Caucus Budget. I want to talk about one of the most important pieces of this budget, housing. As we all know, home is where the heart is, but if we leave America's current housing crisis in the hands of our Republican counterparts, a lot of hearts and families will be broken.

Do not ever forget that in 1994 the Republicans wanted to abolish the Department of Housing in their Contract on America. At a time when we have seen economic expansions throughout the Nation, the Republican budget makes significant decreases in critical housing programs.

Our housing and development programs are some of the most important things that we do to help communities and working people help themselves. The progressive budget increases funding for community development, grants empowerment zones, and economic development.

This budget would help our cities develop sewer systems and help our local government rebuild schools and water treatment plants. This budget would make a real difference for the Americans who need it the most.

I want to make it clear that I will be voting for the progressive budget and against the Republican continual reverse Robin Hood, robbing from the poor and working people to give a tax break to their rich friends.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, could the Chair tell us the remaining time, please?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) has 7½ minutes remaining and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I believe we have the right to close.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has the right to close.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who was here just a few moments ago mischaracterizes the tax portion of the progressive budget. I think that ought to be noted. During the Eisenhower administration, corporations in this country paid about one-third of the taxes that are collected by the Federal Government, under the Republican-run Congress, that number has declined to one-eighth, therefore, all of that tax obligation has been transferred to working Americans.

The working Americans that he was complaining about are bearing a higher share of the burden, as a result of the tax policies that are contained within the Republican budget.

The progressive budget would create a much fairer system, a system which recognizes that working people ought to get tax relief, and that is what that budget does. Among the other deficiencies in the Republican budget, it fails to recognize the fact that we live in community and community obligations and responsibilities.

The progressive budget would help rebuild America by providing a rebuild America infrastructure program which would provide tens of billions of dollars to communities across our country to rebuild schools, highways, bridges, and to fund water supply and sewer treatment facilities, all of which are desperately needed in every community across America.

Furthermore, the progressive budget recognizes our responsibility to education. For the first time, it fully funds Head Start. Head Start is recognized as the most effective educational program ever devised. It gives little children an opportunity to get a head start with their education. The progressive budget does many things that are good for our communities. Let us support it.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I thank him for introducing the progressive budget substitute.

There are many reasons to support this budget substitute: education, Head Start, the commitment to working people. But I would like to comment on fulfilling the long overdue commitment on public lands resources in this country.

Over 300 Members of the House have cosponsored legislation in this session which would reverse the shameful record of recent Congresses in severely underfunding programs to protect the public lands to promote recreation and resource protection.

The House Committee on Resources has reported out the Conservation Reinvestment Act by a 3–1 margin, and we are waiting for the Republican leadership to allow the full House to work its will on this historic bill.

In the meantime, the Republican budget perpetuates the failure of recent Congresses to protect threatened resources on behalf of future generations.

Congress made a promise to the American people 35 years ago: when we develop our offshore energy reserves, we will dedicate a small portion of the proceeds to the permanent protection of America's parks, wilderness, forests and other public lands.

So what happened? The leasing, exploration and development of the Outer Continental Shelf has proceeded for four decades, but the taxpayers and the Lands and Water Conservation Fund have been cheated. The money has been credited to the Land and Water Conservation Fund, but the Congress has refused to spend it year after year. And now the leaders of the Republican Party in this House are telling the American people that they want more offshore oil drilling off of California, off of New Jersey, off of Alaska, off of Florida, but still no willingness to live up to the promise they made in 1965 to protect our natural resources.

The Republican budget resolution that is before this House today perpetuates this larceny against the American public and American environment. Because the Republican budget ignores the Land and Water Conservation Fund, it ignores the current bill and it ignores what the American people said they want.

Eighty to 90 percent of the American people want the full funding of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. They want it in the North and the South, in the East and the West, and even in the Rocky Mountain West. These people want their resources protected, and the way that can be done is by fully funding the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

The substitute introduced by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) on behalf of the Progressive Caucus is a substitute that does that, and this Congress ought to support that effort tonight.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the alternative budget presented by the Progressive Caucus.

This resolution is a significant alternative for many reasons. Particularly, it is significant for the funding allocated to education, training, employment services, housing, and community development programs.

For Fiscal Year 2001, the progressive budget resolution will provide $9.13 billion more to education, training, and employment services and $15 billion more to community and regional development programs compared to the Republican budget resolution. This would provide essential funding to programs and institutions such as the Community Development Block Grant, the Economic Development Agency, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, historically black colleges and universities, summer youth employment, community technology centers, Head Start, and Pell Grants.

These programs are essential to enable America's most vulnerable citizens to improve their economic, educational, and housing circumstances.

Conversely, the Republican's budget resolution would cut those programs and other essential services such as Women, Infants and Children's nutrition program, known as WIC; the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, the Child Care Block Grant, and Section 8 Housing.

The Republicans intend to cut these important programs in order to give unreasonable and massive tax cuts.

Unlike the Republicans' plan, the Progressive Caucus's alternative budget puts America's most vulnerable citizens first.

For this reason, I urge my colleagues to support the Progressive Caucus's alternative budget.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE).

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Chairman, it is not enough around here to be against something. We have to be for something.

What we have laid out here is our marker. It is what we believe in. The President told us what he believed in in his budget. Nobody around here wanted it, which is why we have all these alternative budgets.

The alternative budget in front of us right now is different from the press's but, in a lot of respects, it is the same. It increases spending and raises taxes, cuts defense. That is what they are for.

What we are saying what we are for in this budget is protecting 100 percent of the Social Security surplus, strengthening Medicare, providing $40 billion, and making possible a prescription drug program, retiring the public debt by the year 2013, paying it down, strengthening support for education, increasing spending on special-ed by $2 billion, and promoting tax fairness for families, farmers and seniors, getting rid of the marriage penalty, earnings limit for seniors, and also dealing with small business tax relief. These are the things that we believe in. And, also, making investment and rebuilding the defense system in this country, which has been badly neglected for the past several years.

That is what this debate is about. We all get to vote. Everybody has their day. Everybody gets to talk about what they believe in. We have heard what they believe in. This is what we believe in. This is our budget. This is our statement of priorities. This is our vision for the future: Paying down debt, locking up Social Security for our seniors, strengthening support for education, promoting tax fairness, and helping our families and farmers, and also making investment in agriculture.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) for his leadership and his vision and thank the Progressive Caucus for putting forth this vision for a better America. I want to stand today in strong support of this budget.

Like the Congressional Black Caucus, the Progressive Caucus budget balances the budget, saves Social Security and Medicare, without excluding low-wage workers, the poor, and communities of color.

☐ 1945

While poverty and unemployment have gone down, there are still millions of Americans who are not able to take advantage of this great economic boom. As a member of the Subcommittee on Housing and from northern California, I am particularly concerned about the rising cost of housing and access to affordable housing. The Joint Center for Housing Studies at Harvard University reports that because of the cost of housing, because it has actually outpaced wages, some renters are paying more for their housing today than they did for comparable units in the 1970s.

According to a February 12 Washington Post article which I will submit for the RECORD, the cost of housing is so high in northern California that software executives making over $53,000 a year are homeless and living out of their cars. In fact, the article cites one individual making $80,000 a year forced to live in a shelter. This is outrageous. The Progressive Caucus budget invests more in section 8 housing, homeless assistance, senior housing, housing for the disabled and other important housing programs.

This budget shows that during significant economic growth, we can invest where it is most needed, for education, for housing, the environment, foreign assistance, health care and violence prevention. This budget shows that sound fiscal policy does not have to leave out the poor, low-wage workers, communities of color, the disabled, our senior citizens, and our veterans. Let us make our peace dividend work here in America by ensuring our national security interest from within our own country as well as ensuring a safe and secure world. We must defend our country, not only from outside threats but from the threats of poverty and unemployment and income inequality and inadequate education and the growing gap between the rich and the poor.

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

THE HIGH-TECH HOMELESS; IN SILICON VALLEY, A DARK SIDE TO BOOMING ECONOMY

(By Mark Leibovich)

CUPERTINO, CALIF.—Each night, on the floor of a church that sits a few hundred yards from the campus of Apple Computer Inc., software executive Gordon Seybold unfurls a bedroll and attempts to sleep. It rarely comes. He often spends hours staring into blackness, wondering how Silicon Valley's wealth stampede could keep rushing past a man with his resume.

Last January, Seybold lost his job as a corporate sales manager for Oakland-based C2Net Software Inc., where he said he was on track to earn $125,000 last year, including commissions. He tried to find a new job, came close a few times, but ultimately turned up nothing after several months. In August, he was evicted from his $1,600-a-month apartment in West San Jose.

Since then Seybold, who holds three degrees and speaks five languages, has landed on the Silicon Skids, joining a fast-growing homeless population that might be the best credentialed in the nation.

They are marked by the same runs of bad luck, bad habits and bad decisions that lead to shelter doors anywhere. But Silicon Valley's homeless also provide a starkly different perspective on the giddy high-tech world, one that mocks every common mythology about this place. They are, in many cases, victims of the same aura of promise that keeps technology workers flooding here. Largely hidden and ignored—in shelters, on floors, in cars—their plights define this boom era just as aptly as any overnight geek tycoon.

If this were another place, at another time, it might be easier to reduce expectations, forget stock options and move to a place where tiny rooms don't rent for $1,200 a month. But it's hard not to wish big here. New millionaires get spawned in bull market litters—64 a day, by one count—and it imbues even homeless shelters with a gambler's sense of possibility.

''There's so much sudden wealth here, it's creating a Vegas mentality,'' said Barry Del Buono, executive director of the Emergency Housing Consortium, which operates seven shelters in Silicon Valley. ''A lot of our homeless are living on the hope this economy is creating. But people don't realize how brutal it can be here if you lose your footing.''

Or how the downward spiral can spin just as fast as the sudden-wealth machine. Seybold, 56 said he lost his job at C2Net in a mass layoff, though a company spokesman cited ''other factors.'' Whatever the reason, it caused him to become depressed, which hurt his employment prospects. So did his advancing age, an unspoken liability in a high-tech industry obsessed with the new and young. He spent last fall living in a 1984 Chevrolet van.

Today, Seybold is in a program for homeless men run by Cupertino Community Services. It provides career guidance, shelter and donated meals at a network of Silicon Valley churches, many of them nestled in neighborhoods of million-dollar homes. At night, his floormates keep him awake with their somnolent gunts and moans, which echo through the sanctuary in a chorus of unconscious unease.

''One of the drawbacks of sleeping in a big church room is that they have perfect acoustics.'' Seybold said. He stays in Silicon Valley because he has worked in technology for 25 years. ''There is 10 times more opportunity here than anywhere else for someone like me,'' he said, but added that he is thinking about leaving to join the Peace Corps. He recently took a job as a salesclerk at a drugstore in Cupertino. It pays $8.50 an hour.

RETHINKING FAILURE AS SUCCESS

Here, as elsewhere, accounts of becoming homeless often involve a unique, precipitating circumstance: a fire or a big rent increase; some physical or mental hardship. It is rare to find a homeless person who has had plenty of breaks and has done everything right.

But the pioneer's mentality of Silicon Valley can impose perverse interpretations on personal failure. In entrepreneurial circles, failure is said to be a valuable experience, laudable even. It can be the source of vital business lessons and proof of a pioneer's willingness to take chances. And in the strange calculus of the dot-com world, failure is success, as revealed by the stock prices of Internet companies that have never made a profit.

But that's a santized notion of failure, describing an entrepreneur's ability to make large amounts of money vanish, often someone else's. Technology workers who wind up homeless represent a baser notion of failure.

''This is the kind of failure that no one in Silicon Valley likes to think about,'' said Ray Allen, who runs the Community Technology Alliance, a San Jose organization that provides voice-mail service to local homeless people and online resources to community aid groups. ''The fact is, the technology industry is creating incredible wealth, and it's also creating incredible poverty.''

At its crux, this poverty is born of simple economics. The prosperity has sent the cost of housing soaring and pushed lower-income people, many of them employed, onto the * * * margins of society.

''We all have perceptions of what a homeless person is supposed to be like, and I'm not it,'' said Tom McCormack, 38, who works as a system engineer at CompuNet Systems Solutions Inc., a network-software firm in San Jose. He wears crisp blue dress shirts and earns $52,000 a year, which should be enough to pay for a low-rent place, but isn't when it's added to child-support payments and past credit-card debts.

McCormack faced desperate circumstances last spring when a roommate moved out of his San Jose apartment and his landlord doubled the rent to $1,600. ''I'm a workaholic and I didn't have much of a social network,'' he said. ''I had nowhere to go.'' He moved into his 1982 Subaru.

Until a few days ago McCormack lived at Inn-Vision, a beige concrete shelter tucked between the San Jose Arena and a cluster of auto body shops. His quarters were a 4-by-7-foot cubicle separated from 88 roommates by curtain walls, as in a military hospital ward. Rules are strict. Last week one of his shelter mates, Randall Condon, 46, a computer-networking expert, said he was written up by a shelter manager for leaving a book about non-Euclidian geometry on his bunk bed.

Last weekend McCormack reached his six-month limit at Inn-Vision and is back living in his Subaru. He spends hours at night lying in the back seat, reading books on computer programming by flashlight.

The question recurs: Why does he stay in Silicon Valley?

The answer recurs: ''This place is just full of opportunity,'' he said. ''This is where my brain food is.''

And prospective Cyber Cinderellas keep coming: ''This place has this incredible mystique,'' said Cathy Erickson, who runs the Georgia Travis Center, a drop-in office for homeless people in San Jose. ''People come from all over the world to expect instant success, instant hope. But there's only so long you can afford to stay in a hotel.'' She frequently tells them to go back where they came from.

HIGH-TECH HELPING HANDS

Cisco Systems Inc., the San Jose-based computer-networking giant, comes to the main Emergency Housing Consortium shelter to train prospective technology workers. And Mary Ellen Chell, the executive director of Cupertino Community Services, said one large technology company, the name of which she can't divulge, has inquired about housing new-to-town employees in its shelters. This symbiosis between Silicon Valley's wealth centers and its fringes underscores a precarious separation between the two.

While homeless populations are notoriously difficult to track and quantify, Silicon Valley's has risen steadily in recent years, local social service workers said. Nearly 20,000 people will experience a ''homeless episode'' this year in Santa Clara County, which covers most of Silicon Valley, up from about 16,000 five years ago.

But what's most striking is the increasing percentage of working people who now live in homeless shelters, a nationwide phenomenon that is poignantly evident in Silicon Valley. Since 1992, 250,000 new jobs have been created here and only about 40,000 new housing units have been built.

''If they were somewhere else, there's a good chance they'd be living in the suburbs,'' the Emergency Housing Consortium's Del Buono said. ''We turn out people every day who are making $60,000 a year.'' He said that about half of the consortium's 1,100 clients are employed. The biggest shelter, a converted office building that houses 250 people next to a San Jose industrial park, is open 24 hours, but is nearly empty at midday.

Many of Silicon Valley's shelter dwellers fit the conventional shopping cart prototype: hard-luck veterans, unemployed single mothers, the mentally or criminally deinstitutionalized. But talk to enough homeless people and a theme resonates—it doesn't take a lot of misfortune here to start a rapid descent.

''I have a good job and I can't believe I wound up without a place to live,'' said Tracy Ramirez, a customer service representative at Cyantek, which makes chemicals for the semiconductor industry. She lives half a mile from the main runway of San Jose Airport in a one-room, Emergency Housing Consortium ''transitional home,'' where she shares a bed with her 3- and 9-year-old daughters.

Ramirez, 35, earns $16.90 an hour, about $34,000 a year. She pays $600 a month in daycare costs, $300 a month in car payments. She also has a litany of other bills, expenses and debts trailing from her past, many accrued during a since-ended marriage. A bad credit history, a bankruptcy and an eviction last September inevitably kill her chances with landlords, aside from the fact that the Department of Housing and Urban Development considers $47,800 a year to be ''low income'' for a three-person household in Silicon Valley. She started getting anxiety attacks last summer.

Her mother, Carolyn Cabral, earns $14,80 an hour working on an assembly line at 3COM Corp. but can't afford a place closer than Mantica, a two-hour drive to her office in Santa Clara. Cabral, 59, who has worked 16 years at 3COM, wakes up at 3:15 a.m. to come to work in the valley. (The commute can reach three hours with traffic.) She could get a job closer to home, but says it would cut her pay by half.

''Silicon Valley is a victim of its own success,'' said Carl Guardino, chief executive of the Silicon Valley Manufacturers Group, the area's biggest high-tech industry trade organization. With an unemployment rate of 2.7 percent and average annual wages that are nearly $20,000 higher than the national average, it's impossible to deny the success.

It's of some consolation that shelters receive donations from tech zillionaires, especially during the holidays. In December, for example, a Yahoo Inc. employee gave $100,000 in stock to 10 social service agencies, said Maury Kendall, communications manager at the Emergency Housing Consortium. Last month, after local news outlets reported that pets belonging to homeless people could not stay in shelters, donations poured in, Kendall said. ''We just got $15,000 to start a kennel.''

But the housing crisis is clearly exacting a toll on humans, A study revealed this week that for the first time in five years, more people are leaving Santa Clara County than are arriving. While the difference was negligible—1,284 more people moved out than in—the lack of affordable housing has become the biggest obstacle that valley companies face in keeping and recruiting employees, Guardino said.

''We would like technology workers to drive their cars, not live in them.''

A FAST FREE-FALL

''There's a very thin line in Silicon Valley between being a director and being a derelict,'' said Randall Condon, the computer-networking expert encamped at San Jose's Inn-Vision. ''Everything here is accelerated—business cycles, wealth creation, and certainly the rate at which your life can fall apart.''

Condon was living in Olympia, Wash., where he had moved to be with a girlfriend and work at an Internet service provider. In November, as the relationship was ending, he lost everything in an apartment fire. He came to Silicon Valley because he had worked in technology for 20 years.

After a brief and futile search for a rental, Condon came to Inn-Vision. He sleeps—or tries to—in a large room with 43 other men, whom he collectively refers to as ''the snoring symphony.'' Condon, who has sad blue eyes and oily chestnut hair, said he tries to stay busy and positive.

On a rainy Monday in mid-January, he calls his existence ''tortuous.'' Libraries were closed for Martin Luther King Jr. Day, which denied him access to his prime job-seeking tool, the Internet. ''I'm a total cyber-cripple in here,'' he said.

But a postscript: Condon got a job last week, at a San Jose Internet start-up company where he says he will earn more than $80,000 a year, plus stock options. He won't name his new employer because he doesn't want people there to see this article. They don't know that he lives in a shelter.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), a member of the Committee on the Budget.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I rise tonight in opposition to the Progressive budget and in favor of the common sense Republican budget. I do want to at least congratulate the progressives for their intellectual honesty. I may disagree with their conclusions, but at least I think they have been intellectually honest in bringing this budget forward. In fairness, what this budget does that they are proposing would cut $30 billion from defense. That is at a time when we have 265,000 troops in 132 different countries. Some of us do not believe that is the right thing to do. They increase spending by

$38 billion in fiscal year 2001, and they raise taxes by about $9 billion this year and $151 billion over 5 years. That is their conclusion. That is the plan that they are offering. We respect that.

But let me talk a little bit about where we are. I told the story earlier about the little red hen. That was that little red hen that had the chicks and she found some wheat, she planted the wheat, she asked how many of her barnyard friends would help her grow the wheat. Not I, said the cow; not I, said the pig; not I, said the cat. No one wanted to help her grow the wheat. Then when it was time to harvest the wheat she asked for help. Not I, said the cow; not I, said the pig; not I, said the cat. When it was time to bake the bread, nobody wanted to help. Not I, said the cow; not I, said the pig; not I, said the cat. But when it was time to eat the bread, everybody wanted to be there.

Over the last several years, we have built up a surplus. We have done it by making some of those tough decisions. Now everybody wants to get in on the act and decide how we will divide that surplus. This is a common sense budget, but let us look at where we have been. If we would have stuck just to the spending levels that we were left when we came here as a majority in 1995, we would have spent an additional $625 billion. That is not my numbers, that is the Congressional Budget Office.

Let us compare where we are compared to what the President proposed. What the President proposed this year in additional discretionary spending was a 6.6 percent increase. We are proposing only 1.8 percent. You can see the inflation line. We are making tremendous progress. But I think this is the most important chart of all. For the first time in my adult lifetime, the Federal budget is going to grow at a slower rate than the average family budget over the next 5 years.

The average family budget according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics is going to grow by 4.6 percent annually and our total Federal budget is going to increase by 2.9 percent. What will happen? We will create enormous surpluses and we are saying, $1 trillion over the next 5 years ought to go to pay down debt, debt held by the public, about another third of it ought to go to strengthen Social Security and Medicare, and yes, make room for a prescription drug benefit. But the final third ought to go back to the people who pay the taxes.

Here is one other area where we differ. We do not believe that married couples just because they are married are rich. We do not think businesspeople and farmers just because they are farmers are rich. We believe this is a fair budget. We hope that you will support us in the common sense Republican budget and oppose the so-called Progressive budget.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 61, noes 351, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 71]

AYES—61

Baldwin	Gutierrez	Owens
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Blumenauer	Hilliard	Pelosi
Bonior	Jackson (IL)	Rahall
Brady (PA)	Jefferson	Rangel
Brown (FL)	Jones (OH)	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Kilpatrick	Rush
Carson	Lee	Sabo
Clayton	Lewis (GA)	Sanders
Clyburn	Markey	Serrano
Conyers	McGovern	Slaughter
Coyne	McKinney	Stark
Cummings	Meek (FL)	Thompson (MS)
Davis (IL)	Meeks (NY)	Towns
DeFazio	Millender-McDonald	Velazquez
Engel	Miller, George	Waters
Farr	Minge	Watt (NC)
Fattah	Mink	Weiner
Filner	Oberstar	Woolsey
Ford	Olver	Wynn
Frank (MA)		

NOES—351

Abercrombie	Coble	Gillmor
Aderholt	Coburn	Gilman
Allen	Collins	Gonzalez
Andrews	Combest	Goode
Armey	Condit	Goodlatte
Baca	Cook	Goodling
Bachus	Cooksey	Gordon
Baird	Costello	Goss
Baker	Cox	Graham
Baldacci	Cramer	Granger
Ballenger	Crowley	Green (TX)
Barcia	Cubin	Green (WI)
Barr	Cunningham	Gutknecht
Barrett (NE)	Danner	Hall (OH)
Barrett (WI)	Davis (FL)	Hall (TX)
Bartlett	Deal	Hansen
Barton	DeGette	Hastings (WA)
Bass	DeLauro	Hayes
Bateman	DeLay	Hayworth
Bentsen	DeMint	Hefley
Bereuter	Deutsch	Herger
Berkley	Diaz-Balart	Hill (IN)
Berman	Dickey	Hill (MT)
Berry	Dicks	Hilleary
Biggert	Dingell	Hinojosa
Bilbray	Doggett	Hobson
Bilirakis	Dooley	Hoeffel
Bishop	Doolittle	Hoekstra
Blagojevich	Doyle	Holden
Bliley	Dreier	Holt
Blunt	Duncan	Hooley
Boehlert	Dunn	Horn
Boehner	Edwards	Hostettler
Bono	Ehlers	Houghton
Borski	Ehrlich	Hoyer
Boswell	Emerson	Hulshof
Boyd	English	Hunter
Brady (TX)	Eshoo	Hutchinson
Brown (OH)	Etheridge	Hyde
Bryant	Evans	Inslee
Burr	Everett	Isakson
Burton	Ewing	Istook
Buyer	Fletcher	Jenkins
Callahan	Foley	John
Calvert	Forbes	Johnson (CT)
Camp	Fossella	Johnson, E. B.
Campbell	Fowler	Johnson, Sam
Canady	Franks (NJ)	Jones (NC)
Cannon	Frelinghuysen	Kanjorski
Capps	Frost	Kaptur
Cardin	Gallegly	Kasich
Castle	Ganske	Kelly
Chabot	Gejdenson	Kennedy
Chambliss	Gekas	Kildee
Chenoweth-Hage	Gephardt	Kind (WI)
Clay	Gibbons	King (NY)
Clement	Gilchrest	Kingston

Kleczka	Obey	Sisisky
Klink	Ortiz	Skeen
Knollenberg	Ose	Skelton
Kolbe	Oxley	Smith (MI)
Kucinich	Packard	Smith (NJ)
Kuykendall	Pallone	Smith (TX)
LaFalce	Pascrell	Smith (WA)
LaHood	Pastor	Snyder
Lampson	Paul	Souder
Lantos	Pease	Spence
Largent	Peterson (MN)	Spratt
Larson	Peterson (PA)	Stabenow
Latham	Petri	Stearns
LaTourette	Phelps	Stenholm
Lazio	Pickering	Strickland
Leach	Pickett	Stump
Levin	Pitts	Stupak
Lewis (CA)	Pombo	Sununu
Lewis (KY)	Pomeroy	Sweeney
Linder	Porter	Talent
Lipinski	Portman	Tancredo
LoBiondo	Price (NC)	Tanner
Lofgren	Pryce (OH)	Tauscher
Lucas (KY)	Radanovich	Tauzin
Lucas (OK)	Ramstad	Taylor (MS)
Luther	Regula	Terry
Maloney (CT)	Reyes	Thomas
Maloney (NY)	Reynolds	Thompson (CA)
Manzullo	Riley	Thornberry
Mascara	Rivers	Thune
Matsui	Rodriguez	Thurman
McCarthy (MO)	Roemer	Tiahrt
McCarthy (NY)	Rogan	Tierney
McCrery	Rogers	Toomey
McInnis	Rohrabacher	Traficant
McIntosh	Ros-Lehtinen	Turner
McIntyre	Rothman	Udall (CO)
McKeon	Roukema	Udall (NM)
McNulty	Ryan (WI)	Upton
Meehan	Ryun (KS)	Visclosky
Menendez	Salmon	Vitter
Metcalf	Sanchez	Walden
Mica	Sandlin	Walsh
Miller (FL)	Sanford	Wamp
Miller, Gary	Sawyer	Watkins
Moakley	Saxton	Watts (OK)
Mollohan	Scarborough	Waxman
Moore	Schaffer	Weldon (FL)
Moran (KS)	Scott	Weldon (PA)
Morella	Sensenbrenner	Weller
Murtha	Sessions	Wexler
Myrick	Shadegg	Weygand
Nadler	Shaw	Whitfield
Napolitano	Shays	Wicker
Neal	Sherman	Wilson
Nethercutt	Sherwood	Wise
Ney	Shimkus	Wolf
Northup	Shows	Wu
Norwood	Shuster	Young (AK)
Nussle	Simpson	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—22

Ackerman	Greenwood	McHugh
Archer	Hinchey	Moran (VA)
Bonilla	Jackson-Lee (TX)	Quinn
Boucher	Lowey	Royce
Crane	Martinez	Schakowsky
Davis (VA)	McCollum	Taylor (NC)
Delahunt	McDermott	Vento
Dixon		

☐ 2012

Messrs. RADANOVICH, PASTOR, PALLONE and HOLT changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. SLAUGHTER changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 106–535.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. STENHOLM

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 3 offered by Mr. STENHOLM:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001.

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000 is hereby revised and replaced and that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001 and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2002 through 2005 are hereby set forth.

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2005:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,405,500,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,509,718,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,557,246,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,610,844,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,610,757,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,738,810,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be reduced are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $0.
Fiscal year 2001: $5,082,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $6,254,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $7,556,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $8,281,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $9,919,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,475,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,527,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,569,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,619,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,704,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,753,000,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,465,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,504,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,507,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,551,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,603,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,737,000,000,000.

(4) SURPLUSES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the surpluses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $8,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $14,017,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $16,547,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $19,112,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $16,429,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $20,103,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $5,640,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $5,710,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $5,766,007,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $5,866,788,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $5,947,471,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $6,018,197,000,000.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and budget outlays for fiscal years 2000 through 2005 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $287,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $282,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $308,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $298,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $311,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $303,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $317,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $311,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $327,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $320,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $336,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $332,400,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $17,510,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,640,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $19,080,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $18,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,990,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $18,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,030,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $18,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,750,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $18,480,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,840,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $19,280,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,460,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $19,670,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,260,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $20,740,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,150,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $20,840,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,240,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $21,240,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,640,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $21,540,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,150,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $−1,020,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,328,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $167,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,731,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $−140,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,728,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $−110,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,730,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $−120,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,817,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $3,850,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $24,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,160,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $25,010,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,780,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $25,080,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,070,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $25,150,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,220,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $25,280,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,170,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $25,350,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,070,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $35,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $22,830,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,910,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $24,130,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,090,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $21,150,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,180,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $20,020,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $18,350,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,770,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $8,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $7,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $9,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $10,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $15,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $18,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,600,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $51,820,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,580,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $55,960,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,260,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $54,060,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,520,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $55,360,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,840,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $56,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,050,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $56,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,860,000,000.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $11,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,760,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $12,030,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,220,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $11,870,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,340,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $12,040,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,180,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $12,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $12,490,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,480,000,000.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $57,740,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $74,380,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,650,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $76,380,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,820,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $78,050,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $76,920,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $79,660,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $78,420,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $82,220,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $80,640,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $159,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $152,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $170,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $167,172,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $181,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $181,272,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $193,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $191,572,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $207,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $206,372,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $224,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $222,172,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $199,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $199,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $218,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $218,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $227,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $227,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $247,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $246,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $269,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $269,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $295,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $295,700,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $238,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $247,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $252,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $255,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $263,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $264,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $272,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $274,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $294,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $285,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $295,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $297,200,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $14,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $15,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $15,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $26,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $17,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,400,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $46,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,180,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $48,760,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,160,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $50,070,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,670,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $52,520,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $55,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,720,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $58,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,340,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $27,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $28,410,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,330,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $28,290,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,750,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $29,010,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,940,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $31,080,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,760,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $31,850,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,550,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $13,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,680,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,640,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,240,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $13,570,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,860,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $13,540,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,740,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $13,530,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $13,560,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,520,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $284,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $284,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $288,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $288,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $290,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $290,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $286,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $286,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $281,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $281,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $28,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $278,700,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $7,732,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,730,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $−3,430,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−7,270,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $−1,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−3,130,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $−1,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−1,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $−2,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−2,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $−2,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−2,500,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $−41,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−41,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $−46,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−46,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $−50,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−50,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $−50,020,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−50,020,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $−48,210,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−48,210,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $−50,130,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−50,130,000,000.

SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

(a) SUBMISSIONS REGARDING REVENUES.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report to the House a reconciliation bill—

(1) not later than May 26, 2000;
(2) not later than June 23, 2000;
(3) not later than July 28, 2000; and
(4) not later than September 22, 2000;

that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the total level of revenues by not more than: $5,082,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and $35,680,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

(b) SUBMISSIONS REGARDING DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report to the House a reconciliation bill—

(1) not later than May 26, 2000; and
(2) not later than September 22, 2000;

that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the debt held by the public by not more than $8,189,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and $80,580,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

SEC. 5. USE OF CBO ESTIMATES IN ENFORCEMENT OF RESOLUTION.

For purposes of enforcing the budgetary aggregates and allocations under this resolution, the Chairman of the House Committee on the Budget shall, in advising the presiding officer on the cost of any piece of legislation, rely exclusively on estimates prepared by the Congressional Budget Office or the Joint Tax Committee, in a form certified by that agency to be consistent with its own economic and technical estimates, unless in each case he first receives the approval of the Committee on the Budget by recorded vote to use a different estimate.

SEC. 6. TAX CUTS AND NEW SPENDING CONTINGENT ON DEBT REDUCTION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, it shall not be in order to consider a reconciliation bill pursuant to Section 4 of this resolution or any legislation reducing revenues for the period of fiscal years 2001 to 2005 or increasing outlays for mandatory spending programs unless there is a certification by Director of the Congressional Budget Office that the House has approved legislation which:

(1) ensures that a sufficient portion of the on-budget surplus is reserved for debt retirement to put the government on a path to eliminate the publicly held debt by 2013 under current economic and technical projections;

(2) legislation has been enacted which establishes points of order or other protections

to ensure that funds reserved for debt retirement may not be used for any other purpose, except for adjustments to reflect economic and technical changes in budget projections.

SEC. 7. RESERVE FUND FOR AUGUST UPDATE REVISION OF BUDGET SURPLUSES.

(a) ALLOCATION OF INCREASED SURPLUS PROJECTIONS.—If the Congressional Budget Office report referred to in subsection (b) projects an increase in the surplus for fiscal year 2000, fiscal year 2001, and the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005 over the corresponding levels set forth in its economic and budget forecast for 2001 submitted pursuant to section 202(e)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House shall make the adjustments as provided in subsection (c).

(b) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE UPDATED BUDGET FORECAST FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001.—The report referred to in subsection (a) is the Congressional Budget Office updated budget forecast for fiscal year 2001.

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—If the Committee on Ways and Means reports any reconciliation legislation or other legislation reducing revenues exceeding the revenue aggregates in section 2(1)(B), reduce the revenue aggregates in section 2(1)(A) and increase the amounts the revenues can be reduced by in section 2(1)(B) by an amount not to exceed one-quarter of the increased surplus. If the Committees on Agriculture, Appropriations, Commerce, National Security, or Ways and Means report legislation increasing spending above the allocation for that committee, increase the allocation for that committee and the aggregates set forth in sections 2(2) and 2(3) by an amount not to exceed one-quarter of the increased surplus.

(d) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments made pursuant to subsection (c) for any measure shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

SEC. 8. SAFE DEPOSIT BOX FOR SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) under the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the social security trust funds are off-budget for purposes of the President's budget submission and the concurrent resolution on the budget;

(2) the social security trust funds have been running surpluses for 17 years;

(3) these surpluses have been used to implicitly finance the general operations of the Federal Government;

(4) in fiscal year 2001, the social security surplus will exceed $166 billion;

(5) for the first time, a concurrent resolution on the budget balances the Federal budget without counting the social security surpluses;

(6) the only way to ensure that social security surpluses are not diverted for other purposes is to balance the budget exclusive of such surpluses; and

(7) Congress and the President should take such steps as are necessary to ensure that future budgets are balanced excluding the surpluses generated by the social security trust funds.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any revision to this resolution or a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2002, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that sets forth a deficit for any fiscal year.

(2) DEFICIT LEVELS.—For purposes of this subsection, a deficit shall be the level (if any) set forth in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for that fiscal year pursuant to section 301(a)(3) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

SEC. 9. DEBT REDUCTION LOCK-BOX.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any reported bill or joint resolution, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that would cause a surplus for fiscal year 2001 to be less than the level (as adjusted pursuant to section 7) set forth in section 2(4) for that fiscal year.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—The level of the surplus for purposes of subsection (a) shall not take into account any adjustment made under section 314(a)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

SEC. 10. RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE.

If the Committee on Ways and Means or Committee on Commerce of the House reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto is offered (in the House), or a conference report thereon is submitted that reforms medicare, provides coverage for medicare prescription drugs, or adjusts medicare reimbursement for health care providers, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the aggregates and allocations of new budget authority (and outlays resulting therefrom) by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, but not to exceed $2,000,000,000 in new budget authority and $2,000,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2001 and $40,000,00,000 in new budget authority and $40,000,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005 (and make all other appropriate conforming adjustments).

SEC. 11. RESERVE FUND FOR AGRICULTURE.

(a) FISCAL YEAR 2000.—If the Committee on Agriculture of the House reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto is offered (in the House), or a conference report thereon is submitted that provides income support to owners and producers of farms, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of new budget authority and outlays to that committee for fiscal year 2000 by the amount of new budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) provided by that measure for that purpose not to exceed $6,000,000,000 in new budget authority and $6,000,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2000, $0 in new budget authority and outlays for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2004, and $6,000,000,000 in new budget authority and $6,000,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004 (and make all other appropriate conforming adjustments).

(b) FISCAL YEAR 2001.—If the Committee on Agriculture of the House reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto is offered (in the House), or a conference report thereon is submitted that provides risk management or income support or other assistance for agricultural producers, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of new budget authority and outlays to that committee by the amount of new budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) if such legislation does not exceed $4,998,000,000 in new budget authority and $4,354,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2001 and $24,761,000,000 in new budget authority and $23,610,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005 (and make all other appropriate conforming adjustments).

SEC. 13. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to section 10, 11, or 12 for any measure shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution—

(1) the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives or the Senate, as applicable; and

(2) such chairman, as applicable, may make any other necessary adjustments to such levels to carry out this resolution.

SEC. 14. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING BUDGET ENFORCEMENT.

It is the sense of Congress that legislation should be enacting enforcing this resolution by—

(1) establishing a plan to eliminate the publicly held debt by 2012;

(2) setting discretionary spending limits for budget authority and outlays at the levels set forth in this resolution for each of the next five years; and

(3) extending the pay as you go rules set forth in Section 252 of the BBEDCA for the next ten years.

SEC. 15. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING THE STABILIZATION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL PAYMENTS TO STATES, COUNTIES, AND BOROUGHS.

It is the sense of the House that Federal revenue-sharing payments to States, counties, and boroughs pursuant to the Act of May 23, 1908 (35 Stat. 260; 16 U.S.C. 500), the Act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 963; 16 U.S.C. 500), the Act of August 28, 1937 (chapter 876; 50 Stat. 875; 43 U.S.C. 1181f), the Act of May 24, 1939 (chapter 144; 53 Stat. 753; 43 U.S.C. 1181f–1 et seq.), and sections 13982 and 13983 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 (Public Law 103–66; 16 U.S.C. 500 note; 43 U.S.C. 1181f note) should be stabilized and maintained for the long-term benefit of schools, roads, public services, and communities, and that providing such permanent, stable funding is a priority of the 106th Congress.

SEC. 16. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON DIRECTING THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TO ACCEPT NEGATIVE NUMBERS IN FARM INCOME AVERAGING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) farmers' and ranchers' income vary widely from year to year due to uncontrollable markets and unpredictable weather;

(2) in the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997, Congress enacted 3-year farm income averaging to protect agricultural producers from excessive tax rates in profitable years;

(3) last year, the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) proposed final regulations for averaging farm income which fail to make clear that taxable income in a given year may be a negative number; and

(4) this IRS interpretation can result in farmers having to pay additional taxes during years in which they experience a loss in income.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that during this session of the 106th Congress, legislation should be considered to direct the Internal Revenue Service to count any net loss of income in determining the proper rate of taxation.

SEC. 17. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON ESTIMATES OF THE IMPACT OF REGULATIONS ON THE PRIVATE SECTOR.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) the Federal regulatory system sometimes adversely affects many Americans and businesses by imposing financial burdens with little corresponding public benefit;

(2) currently, Congress has no general mechanism for assessing the financial impact of regulatory activities on the private sector;

(3) congress is ultimately responsible for making sure agencies act in accordance with congressional intent and while the executive branch is responsible for promulgating regulations, Congress ultimately can and should curb ineffective regulations by using its oversight and regulatory powers; and

(4) a variety of reforms have been suggested to increase congressional oversight over regulatory activity, including directing the President to prepare an annual accounting statement containing several cost/benefit analyses, recommendations to reform inefficient regulatory programs, and an identification and analysis of duplications and inconsistencies among such programs.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that the House should reclaim its role as reformer and take the first step toward curbing inefficient regulatory activity by passing legislation authorizing the Congressional Budget Office to prepare regular estimates on the impact of proposed Federal regulations on the private sector.

SEC. 18. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING EDUCATION REFORM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) strengthening America's public schools while respecting State and local control is critically important to the future of our children and our Nation;

(2) education is a local responsibility, a State priority, and a national concern;

(3) a partnership with the Nation's governors, parents, teachers, and principals must take place in order to strengthen public schools and foster educational excellence;

(4) the consolidation of various Federal education programs will benefit our Nation's children, parents, and teachers by sending more dollars directly to the classroom;

(5) our Nation's children deserve an educational system that will provide opportunities to excel; and

(6) our children and society will benefit from States and local educators working together with the Federal Government to raise standards and improve educational opportunities, particularly for America's poorest children.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Federal funding should be increased to States and local schools, with funds targeted to the poorest schools;

(2) the role of Federal education policy is to raise standards for all children, and close the achievement gap between groups of students;

(3) legislation should be enacted which gives States and local schools flexibility with Federal funds coupled with increased accountability for performance and results, including the requirement that states to ensure that all students have fully qualified teachers; and

(4) the Federal Government should demand increased student performance, with consequences for schools and school districts that continuously fail.

SEC. 19. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON SPECIAL EDUCATION.

(a) Congress finds that—

(1) all children deserve a quality education, including children with disabilities;

(2) the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act provides that the Federal, State, and local governments are to share in the expense of educating children with disabilities and commits the Federal Government to pay up to 40 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure for children with disabilities;

(3) the high cost of educating children with disabilities and the Federal Government's failure to fully meet its obligation under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act stretches limited State and local education funds, creating difficulty in providing a quality education to all students, including children with disabilities;

(4) the current level of Federal funding to States and localities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act is contrary to the goal of ensuring that children with disabilities receive a quality education;

(5) the Federal Government has failed to appropriate 40 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure per child with a disability as required under the Individuals with Disabilities Act to assist States and localities to educate children with disabilities; and

(6) the levels in function 500 (Education) for fiscal year 2001 assume sufficient discretionary budget authority to accommodate fiscal year 2001 appropriations for IDEA at least $2,000,000,000 above such funding levels appropriated in fiscal year 2000.

(b) It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Congress and the President should increase function 500 (Education) fiscal year 2001 funding for programs under the Individuals with Disabilities Act by at least $2,000,000,000 above fiscal year 2000 appropriated levels;

(2) Congress and the President should give programs under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act the highest priority among Federal elementary and secondary education programs by meeting the commitment to fund the maximum State grant allocation for educating children with disabilities under such Act prior to authorizing or appropriating funds for any new education initiative;

(3) Congress and the President should, if new or increased funding is authorized or appropriated for any education initiative, provide the flexibility in such authorization or appropriation necessary to allow local educational agencies the authority to use such funds for programs under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; and

(4) if a local educational agency chooses to utilize the authority under section 613(a)(2)(C)(i) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to treat as local funds up to 20 percent of the amount of funds the agency receives under part B of such Act that exceeds the amount it received under that part for the previous fiscal year, then the agency should use those local funds to provide additional funding for any Federal, State, or local education program.

SEC. 20. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS ON ACCESS TO HEALTH INSURANCE AND PRESERVING HOME HEALTH SERVICES FOR ALL MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES.

(a) ACCESS TO HEALTH INSURANCE.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) 43.4 million Americans are currently without health insurance, and that this number is expected to rise to nearly 60 million people in the next 10 years;

(B) the cost of health insurance continues to rise, a key factor in increasing the number of uninsured; and

(C) there is a consensus that working Americans and their families and children will suffer from reduced access to health insurance.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON IMPROVING ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE INSURANCE.—It is the sense of Congress that access to affordable health care coverage for all Americans is a priority of the 106th Congress.

(b) PRESERVING HOME HEALTH SERVICE FOR ALL MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 reformed Medicare home health care spending by instructing the Health Care Financing Administration to implement a prospective payment system and instituted an interim payment system to achieve savings;

(B) the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999, reformed the interim payment system to increase reimbursements to low-cost providers, added $900 million in funding, and delayed the automatic 15 percent payment reduction for one year, to October 1, 2000; and

(C) patients whose care is more extensive and expensive than the typical Medicare patient do not receive supplemental payments in the interim payment system but will receive special protection in the home health care prospective payment system.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ACCESS TO HOME HEALTH CARE.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(A) Congress recognizes the importance of home health care for seniors and disabled citizens;

(B) Congress and the Administration should work together to maintain quality care for patients whose care is more extensive and expensive than the typical Medicare patient, including the sickest and frailest Medicare beneficiaries, while home health care agencies operate in the interim payment system; and

(C) Congress and the Administration should work together to avoid the implementation of the 15 percent reduction in the interim payment system and ensure timely implementation of the prospective payment system.

SEC. 21. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON EMERGENCY SPENDING.

It is the sense of Congress that as a part of a comprehensive reform of the budget process the Committees on the Budget should develop a definition of and a process for, funding emergencies consistent with the applicable proviso of H.R. 853, the Comprehensive Budget Process Reform Act of 1999 that could be incorporated into the Rules of the House of Representatives and the Standing Rules of the Senate.

SEC. 22. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON MEDICARE+CHOICE PROGRAMS/REIMBURSEMENT RATES.

It is the sense of Congress that Medicare+Choice regional disparity among reimbursement rates are unfair; and that full funding of the Medicare+Choice program is a priority as Congress deals with any medicare reform legislation.

SEC. 23. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON SKILLED NURSING FACILITIES.

It is the sense of Congress that the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission continue to carefully monitor the medicare skilled nursing benefit to determine if payment rates are sufficient to provide quality care, and that if reform is recommended, Congress pass legislation as quickly as possible to assure quality skilled nursing care.

MODIFICATION OF AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. STENHOLM

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment in the nature of a substitute be modified.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification of amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 3 offered by Mr. STENHOLM:

Page 11, line 5, in the matter proposed to be inserted, strike $51,820,000,000. Insert $54,320,000;

Line 9, strike $55,960,000,000 and insert $55,020,000;

Line 13, strike $54,060,000,000 and insert $57,360,000;

Line 17, strike $55,360,000,000 and insert $58,760,000;

Line 21, strike $56,300,000,000 and insert $58,800,000;

Line 25, strike $56,330,000,000 and insert $58,800,000.

☐ 2015

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 446, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) and a Member opposed each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, for 4 years, the Blue Dogs have offered an honest, fiscally responsible budget. We were the first to talk about balanced budgets without counting Social Security surpluses. We are the folks who consistently have hounded our colleagues about debt reduction. Why have we obsessed on this one topic? Because, just as tax dollars are your money, as is so often said by Members on this floor and at home, so is the $5.6 trillion debt your debt, and it is unconscionable to continue to pass that burden on to our children and grandchildren.

In a release just delivered to my office, the highly respected Concord Coalition says, ''We believe the Blue Dog alternative provides the best overall budgetary framework for the next 5 years.''

Last year the Blue Dog budget established the 50–25–25 rule in dealing with any non-Social Security surpluses: 50 percent to debt reduction, 25 percent to tax cuts, 25 percent to spending priorities. This substitute we now consider continues that philosophy.

We retire the debt by 2012, 1 year earlier than any other proposal considered in the House today. We reject all budget gimmicks, like unrealistic caps or baselines, insecure lockboxes, backloading, and directed scorekeeping. We protect 10 percent of the Social Security trust funds. We provide for fiscally responsible tax cuts. We also respond to critical program needs in agriculture, in defense, for veterans and military retirees, in education and health care, including Medicare.

We are proud of this budget, and we are proud of the influence which we think our small band of relentless true believers have had on this body over the past number of years. We encourage Members on both sides of the aisle, regardless of your label, to listen seriously to the next 40 minutes of debate to see if you do not agree with us, and with the Concord Coalition, that this is the most reasonable and responsible and doable budget on the floor today.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER).

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, balanced budget security for America's future, a GOP plan. I would like to go down this, if I could, to outline the six points of the Republican plan.

Number one, protects 100 percent of Social Security surplus. All of the $166 billion Social Security surplus is off limits to Clinton-Gore spending. This will be the second year in a row that Republicans will be protecting the Social Security surplus.

Secondly, we strengthen Medicare with prescription drugs. It sets aside $40 billion to help needy seniors afford their prescription drugs, and it rejects the $18.2 billion Clinton-Gore Medicare cuts.

Point three, it retires the public debt by 2013. It pays off more than $1 trillion of public debt over the next 5 years. Our budget has already repaid $302 billion since 1998.

Our next point, it promotes tax fairness for families, farmers, and seniors. It provides for the House-passed marriage penalty an average of $1,400 per married couple and small business tax relief, education and health care assistance amounting to $150 billion, and it rejects the $96 billion gross tax increase over 5 years in the Clinton-Gore budget.

Number five, it restores American defense, 6 percent more than last year's for overdeployed Armed Forces. The GOP defense budget provides $1 billion more than the Clinton-Gore plan.

Finally, number six, it strengthens support for education and science, 9.4 percent for elementary and secondary education, IDEA increases of nearly $2 billion. It fights cancer, AIDS and diabetes and other diseases with $1 billion more for NIH, and also $1 billion for basic research into biology, science, engineering, and math.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, our Federal public debt stands now at $3.6 trillion. This equates to $56,000 for the average family of four. This year nearly $1,000 in taxes from every man, woman, and child in the United States will be used just to pay the interest on the debt.

The Republican budget resolution sends our Nation on the path towards eliminating public debt by paying off $1 trillion over the next 5 years. Paying off public debt makes good sense. It makes more money available in the private sector and saving and for investment in health.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 seconds to respond in saying that this was great rhetoric we just heard, but it has nothing to do with the budget we are now discussing.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE).

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, the critical question this evening as we debate the budget is how much are we doing to reduce our Nation's debt?

The budget that is before us, the Blue Dog Coalition budget, clearly comes out ahead. To understand this, we have to begin by understanding the size of the Nation's debt. It now stands at about $5.7 trillion. My good friend from California, the previous speaker, talked about the debt that is held by Federal trust funds. Well, that is all very interesting, and he is talking about limiting the debt to Social Security.

Well, that is interesting. But that does not mean it is not debt. If you look at the Republican budget that is under consideration tonight, you will find that at the end of 5 years the debt that we owe, that is that the United States of America owes, is up to $5.9 trillion. We are not reducing debt. All we are doing is what we are supposed to do with the Social Security trust fund, we are not invading it.

Now, the Blue Dog Coalition budget is going to reduce the Nation's debt in a significant way. Over a 10-year projected period of time it would reduce the debt, and this includes the debt owed to Social Security, by $428 billion. We are also doing the same things that our colleagues on the Republican side talk about, prescription drugs and so on. We are not neglecting that. But we are reducing our debt by $428 billion, whereas the Republican proposal is increasing that debt by $84 billion over that 10-year period of time.

I believe that this is a stinging indictment of the budget that the majority is trying to pull over our eyes. This is not a budget that they proposed that meets the demands of the American people, that we protect our children and grandchildren from this enormous $5.9 trillion debt that has been accumulated.

I would like to ask my colleagues how they can explain that, when they are done, the debt will be $5.9 trillion over 5 years.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to quickly reiterate and correct the math from the past speaker. If you look at the debt at the end of the 5-year window, the debt by the Republican budget resolution, the total debt subject to limit is actually lower than the debt in the Blue Dog budget, subject to limit, at the end of the 5 year window.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS).

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

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to rise in support of the Committee on the Budget budget and in opposition to the Blue Dog budget, with all due respect to what I think is a good effort to deal with the issue of debt retirement. However, as is the case in all budgets, we need to achieve balance. I just want to reiterate that what our budget does, most importantly, is to set aside 100 percent of the entire surplus in Social Security for Social Security. That will result in the reduction in the national debt of over $1 trillion over 5 years.

Now, we need to talk apples and apples here. I think, unfortunately, we had a 10-year budget cycle last year. We are back to 5 years this year. We should stick with 5 years, because it is as easy to predict the budget 5 years from now or 6 years from now as it is to predict the weather 6 or 7 days from now. We know with our budget we will strengthen Medicare and provide a prescription drug coverage for seniors; and, if we fail to do it, those resources will go into debt reduction as well.

Our budget will retire the entire public debt, if you believe in projections that go way out, by the year 2013, and our budget balances the issues of debt reduction and a stronger defense with the need to promote tax relief for working Americans. Never have taxes been higher than they are today. As we strive to deal with making a balance in a budget surplus environment, some portion of that budget surplus has to go to tax relief, to eliminate the marriage tax penalty, to eliminate the Social Security earnings limit, just to name a couple of them.

Lastly, what our budget does, and it is so important, is to strengthen support for education and science, most notably to increase funding for IDEA by over $2 billion.

Mr. Chairman, I respect the Blue Dog budget, but I think that our budget is a more balanced budget that will meet the needs of the American people.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY).

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise tonight in support of the Blue Dog substitute and in opposition to the Republican budget resolution.

The Republican budget is plain and simple, it is irresponsible. Basically their budget adds up to $800 billion in tax cuts that they pay for at the expense of everything else in the budget, especially at the expense of future generations and our Nation's seniors. It puts Social Security and Medicare at risk.

The Blue Dog budget protects our Nation's seniors. It increases funding for discretionary health care programs by $4.6 billion over the Republican budget. This higher funding level will allow for increased funding for rural health care programs, health research, and other programs to expand access to health care.

The Blue Dog budget establishes a Medicare reserve of $40 billion over the next 5 years and $150 billion over the next 10 years. This reserve could be used to extend the solvency of Medicare, create a prescription drug benefit and provide provider relief that is desperately needed by our hospitals.

☐ 2030

The Blue Dog budget allocates 25 percent of the debt reduction dividend of the savings and interest on the debt held by the public to provide additional resources for Medicare reform after 2010. We need to do what is right for our Nation's seniors and for our Nation's children and pass the Blue Dog budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY MILLER).

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of debate today. Our budget clearly protects 100 percent of the Social Security surplus. Our budget strengthens Medicare and prescription drugs. I am going to save retiring the debt to last because I think that is an important issue here. Our budget promotes tax fairness, our budget restores America's defense where it should be, and our budget strengthens and supports education.

The reason we are here today with our debt is because the Democrats controlled this Congress from 1962 to 1994, and every dollar they took in, they spent $1.20. Since Republicans took over Congress, since 1994, for every new dollar we took in, we only spent 50 cents.

But that is not the main issue today. I rise to draw attention as to why we should not pass this amendment, and that is because this amendment puts the Federal budget on auto pilot again. We need to reform government; we need to get rid of the waste.

Let me show my colleagues one agency we could attack to get rid of much of the waste, and that is HUD. HUD is losing taxpayer dollars in huge amounts by keeping large inventories of foreclosed FHA houses. Just let me list a few of the statistics that we have.

The Federal Housing Administration, FHA mortgage insurance paid out almost 77,000 claims, or $6 billion, in 1998. There is no reform for that. That cost is passed on to consumers in higher premiums. In 1997, single-family homes stayed in Federal inventory on an average of 5.4 months; in 1998 it was 6.6 months; and in 1996, they had 25,000 single-family homes in inventory; and in 1998 it increased to 40,000; and in 1999, it was 50,000.

The HUD single-family inventory was valued at $1.9 billion in 1996, and it increased in value to $3.3 billion in 1998. Fifteen percent of HUD inventory properties are held longer than 12 months. The industry average out there has about 3 months in inventory for 12 months. In 1996, the average loss for property was $28,000. In 1998, the average loss had increased to $31,700. The average loss in 1999 was $32,470. If we multiply 50,000 properties in inventory by an average loss of $32,470, it is $1.6 billion.

This is a bad proposal. Let us take government off auto pilot. Let us give people their money back. Let us give people tax cuts. Let us not say that we are going to take the money that belongs to taxpayers and we are going to continue to invest it in programs that do not work. Let us change the Federal Government, and the best way to change the Federal Government is get the money out of Washington. We can do it two ways. Are we going to continue to have government on auto pilot, or are we going to give hard-working people their money back to do what they think they should do with it? This is a bad proposal.

The focus on paying down debt by 2012 compared to our proposal, paying it down by 2013 only changes the focus from the issue of putting government on auto pilot. We need to take it off auto pilot, we need to reform government, we need to get the waste and abuse out of government.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, American families deserve an honest budget based on realistic and conservative estimates of the surplus, a budget that takes a responsible approach to protecting Social Security and to ensuring that our children will not inherent a big national debt.

The Blue Dog Democrat budget protects 100 percent of the Social Security surplus for Social Security. It commits the projected surplus 50 percent to paying down the national debt, 25 percent to saving Social Security and Medicare, and 25 percent to tax relief. It is not fancy, it is not gimmicky, and it does not make promises that it cannot deliver. Most importantly, it is an honest budget that is good for our future.

The Blue Dog budget contrasts sharply with the Republican budget. The Blue Dog budget adopts a more conservative estimate of the surplus. After all, this good economy may not go on forever. The Blue Dog budget makes a stronger commitment to paying off our $5 trillion national debt, rather than risking our historic opportunity to give our children a debt-free America. The Blue Dog budget is stronger on national defense and veterans' health care.

The Blue Dog budget offers a realistic promise that not only will we keep our hands out of the Social Security Trust Fund, but that we will be prepared to put more in it when the baby boom generation retires and those deficits begin to mount in the trust fund. Finally, the Blue Dog budget guarantees that the tax relief we grant will be targeted to working, middle-income families who deserve to have their fair share of the prosperity of this new economy.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues, do the right thing and support the Blue Dog Democrat budget.

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I would just like to say I have the greatest respect for the Blue Dogs; I think they honestly approach things in a straightforward fashion. I just think they are a little shy when it comes to the amount of money that they are getting back to the taxpayer.

With taxes at an all-time high and non-Social Security surpluses growing, we need to provide tax relief to the hard-working Americans who earned it. The Blue Dog budget, as I understand it, would provide a net tax cut of only $36 billion over the next 5 years. That will not even begin to pay for the marriage penalty relief; it will not pay for the Social Security earnings limit or the small business tax relief bills that have been demanded by the American people.

The Republican budget provides tax relief of at least $150 billion over the next 5 years, and an additional $60 billion for tax relief or debt reduction. The Republican budget is a responsible plan for all Americans. We have set our Nation on a course to pay down the public debt, to protect Social Security, to provide needed funds for Medicare reform and with prescription drug coverage. With these priorities met, how can we not justify providing tax relief for the American worker?

Mr. Chairman, this is not our money. It does not belong to Washington bureaucrats; it does not belong to Members of Congress. This budget is paid for by the hard work and the sweat of the American worker. Americans know how better to spend their money than a micromanaging Washington bureaucrat.

By lowering taxes, we will be telling the American people they are more important than bloated government bureaucracy. The Federal tax burden is at an all-time high, as I have said; and taxpayers frankly have overpaid. If we cannot give them their money back now, with the Government in the black and taxes at an all-time high, when the economy is strong, when can we do it?

Mr. Chairman, I urge a no vote on this amendment so that we can give the taxpayers what they rightly deserve.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time.

I rise today to speak to the agriculture part of the Blue Dog budget. Those of us from farm country, and I think we all ought to listen up and look at what is in this budget for agriculture. As we all know, we have a big problem out in farm country. Farmers are having a tough time. The Blue Dog budget increases the baseline for mandatory agriculture programs by $23.6 billion over the next 5 years, in addition to the $6 billion that is in the Republican budget, as well as ours. The increase in the agriculture baseline will provide funding for crop insurance legislation, initiatives to provide long-term agricultural safety net and income support programs, including dairy.

I would point out to my good friend from Wisconsin, this budget has money to extend the price supports for the program for dairy, and the Republican budget does not. We also have money for agriculture research, expanded conservation research programs. So we have the money to do the kinds of things that we need to do in agriculture.

The Republican budget does not provide any increase in the agriculture baseline beyond the increase necessary to fund crop insurance reform. I want to repeat that. There is no increase in the Republican budget for the baseline, which is going to be very important to us when we move out into doing something meaningful for agriculture in the future. There are no funds in the Republican budget to improve the agriculture safety net by providing any kind of income support program, which we all know we are going to need.

So support the Blue Dog budget, because we provide a greater commitment to agriculture with over $16 billion more than the Republican version over the next 5 years.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the vice chairman of the Committee on the Budget, a gentleman who has worked long and hard on agriculture issues.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say, as I said last night, that this budget is not a bad budget. It has a lot of provisions in it that I really like, particularly when it comes to agriculture and defense, two issues which I have a very keen interest in.

But there is a problem here. There are a couple of problems with this budget that need to be addressed; and if those were addressed, it would certainly make it a much better budget.

First of all, there is too much spending. The budget that the Republicans have put forward, really we had hoped would not spend as much money as we do, but we spend $595 billion. The Blue Dog budget spends $606 billion over the next 5 years, and those are uncontrollable expenses out there.

From an agricultural perspective, I agree with the gentleman that we have to work towards a safety net. I am not sure we know what the answer to it is, but some of the things that are in your budget I think do head us down that direction.

But there is one other problem with the agricultural portion in your budget that really ought to be addressed, that is, my farmers want a balance. They want a balance between some sort of income security and some sort of tax relief. The number one issue with my farmers outside of income is estate tax relief, and there is not enough room in the Blue Dog budget to provide for real meaningful estate tax relief.

Now, we are going to get there eventually. I think we are going to wind up working together to get there because I know my colleagues' feelings on that; and I think it is something that ultimately we are going to be able to get together on that is going to be extremely beneficial for farmers. But unless my Democratic colleagues address those major issues in the budget, it simply does not provide for the things that we provide for in the Republican budget that create that balance in agriculture country.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 seconds.

I would remind my friend from Georgia that our budget provides a better death tax than the budget that our Republican colleagues are supporting. Our budget does.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD).

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

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Stenholm substitute, better known as the Blue Dog budget.

Mr. Chairman, the cornerstone of this budget is debt reduction, and the Republican budget guarantees only $8 billion of their own budget surplus for debt reduction over 5 years. The Blue Dog budget, in contrast, provides $85 billion of their own budget surplus for debt reduction. The Blue Dog budget pays down 30 percent of the publicly held debt over the next 5 years. The Republican budget, in contrast, has most of its debt reduction after 2005.

Secondly, the Blue Dog budget provides realistic domestic discretionary spending levels. The Republican budget calls for a $20 billion inflation-adjusted cut in domestic spending. I say to my colleagues, the 5 years that the Republicans have been in control of this Congress, the average nondefense discretionary spending has increased by 2½ percent. We all know that a $20 billion inflation-adjusted cut is unreasonable. The Blue Dog budget recognizes this and provides for realistic budget-spending levels.

Thirdly, the Blue Dog has five spending-priority areas. Number one is defense, and it provides $15 billion more than the Republican budget in defense.

Fourthly, veterans. It provides over $3 billion more; agriculture, over $2 billion more; education, over $15 billion more; and health care, over $4 billion more than the Republican budget.

In addition to all of this, the Blue Dog budget provides over $36 billion over the next 5 years in tax relief. I say to my colleagues to support the Blue

Dog budget, support realistic spending levels that will not require gimmicks in the appropriations process later this year. This is a fiscally-responsible budget, and it provides responsible tax relief.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) has 8 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time.

The Republican budget as we have heard tonight has six key features, and I want to take a moment to talk about one of them, which is tax relief for hard-working Americans. When we talk about Federal taxes, it is useful to consider the overall context of the Federal budget here.

Let us remember, Federal spending is higher than it has ever been. Federal taxes are higher than any peacetime in our Nation's history. As we heard earlier, about 21 percent of our entire economic output goes to the Federal Government.

What the Republican budget does is it says after we set aside all of the Social Security funds for Social Security and to retire debt and after we pay down $1 trillion in debt over the next 5 years and after we set aside $40 billion of additional funding for Medicare over the next 5 years, and after rebuilding our national defense and reprioritizing funding for elementary and secondary education; after all of that, there is still an unprecedented surplus projected as far as the eye can see.

☐ 2045

When taxpayers are paying more money than it takes to fund all of that, then it is obvious to me that taxes are just too high. So the Republican budget offers a modest but a meaningful measure of tax relief and tax fairness. We need to lower taxes and restore to working Americans some more of their freedom to decide how they want to spend their own money.

Our colleagues with this amendment are offering a tiny, little, merely symbolic, but not a real meaningful tax cut. It is just not enough.

Let us remember, when the Federal Government takes people's money away from them, it is taking part of their freedom away. This is money that the government takes from hard-working Americans that they will never be free to spend for themselves as they see fit. It is money that takes time to earn and that means time taken away that folks could spend doing other things like maybe spending more time with their children, maybe caring for an elderly family member, maybe volunteering in their community, or just enjoying some leisure time.

At a time of already huge government spending, record high Federal taxes, it is unconscionable at this point not to provide the American people with the opportunity to keep a little bit more of the money that they earn.

The Republican budget strikes the right balance. No more raiding of the Social Security surplus for the second consecutive year. Funding America's priorities like national defense and education, retiring a trillion dollars of debt over 5 years in tax relief for an overtaxed Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment with its puny, little tax cut and, instead, support the Republican budget.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHN).

Mr. JOHN. Mr. Chairman, truly a budget debate is strictly over priorities, priorities on what one does with one's money. The indisputable champion of debt reduction is the Blue Dog budget, $5.7 trillion, $21,000 for every man, woman, and child to pay off our national debt, $354 billion in interest.

Let me give my colleagues an idea of what that means. That is 100 times more than we spend on cancer research. It is six times more than we pay for salaries for the military, 15 times the size of the veterans' budget. The debt simply should be the priority.

The Republicans say that they pay off the debt by 2013. But their plan allots $50 billion over 5 years towards debt reduction, but it provides a loophole that says that they can use it for tax cuts. I do not understand that.

Let us give a true tax cut. Pay down the debt, keep interest rates low. The Blue Dog plan is the champion.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, when I sent out my legislative questionnaire, my constituents wanted me to protect Social Security and not spend the surplus. My constituents wanted prescription drug assistance. They wanted us to pay down the debt, and they wanted tax fairness. They wanted a tax cut. That is what our budget does. That is why we see absolutely no reason at all to have any other budget but the one we have.

What have we done? In the year 1999, the last year, we do not spend Social Security. We are not spending it in this year's budget, and we are not spending it in next year's budget. That is in our budget plan.

When we were elected in 1994 and took office in 1995, we were looking at public debt going up $34 billion, $48 billion, $67 billion. That is what we were looking at. Our plan changed that so it goes down rather than up. Public debt is going down.

In fact, what happened is, not only is it going down, it would have continued to go up but we are actually reducing public debt significantly.

What have we paid back? We paid back $51 billion in 1998, $88 billion in 1999, $163 billion in the year we are in now, for $332 billion of debt payment down, and in our budget another $170 billion in the budget to come. That has left us as well the opportunity, out of $10 trillion, to have a $200 billion tax cut.

I am absolutely amazed that we cannot cut 2 percent of our revenue in the next 5 years. We get $10 trillion, and we cannot cut $200 billion? We can, and we do.

We have a marriage penalty tax elimination. We reduce the death tax. We have educational savings account. We have health care deductibility, community renewal, and pension reform. Not a tax cut for the wealthy, as my colleagues would imply, but a tax cut for the middle class.

Then we make sure that, if we get additional surplus, we do not allow Democrats, frankly, to spend it. We set it aside for further debt reduction and more tax cuts. This is a sensible budget. We do not need another one.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL), the newest member of the Indiana Basketball Hall of Fame.

(Mr. HILL of Indiana asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILL of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, for many years, people in Washington, Democrats and Republicans, have not been writing budgets that use real numbers. The majority's budget we are considering today is more of the same old song and dance, spend money the government does not have and make promises Congress cannot keep.

The budget we are asked to vote on today sets spending levels that we all know will not address our national priorities and forces us to take money from Social Security and increase the national debt.

I am a fiscal conservative Democrat who believes we should write a budget that uses real numbers and makes promises Congress can actually keep. The Blue Dog budget does this. It proves we can write a realistic budget that addresses the national priorities both parties share.

For example, the Blue Dog proposal makes a serious commitment to our national defense and to the men and women who serve in the military. It provides $15 billion more than the Republicans do and the administration's plan and $10 billion for veterans. The Blue Dog budget also calls for a $40 billion tax relief. The American people need it, and we can afford this. It gives families, farms, and small business owners much needed tax relief but within a framework of fiscal responsibility.

The organizing principle behind this Blue Dog budget is restoring fiscal responsibility to a government that has been spending more than it has taken in over the years. It pays off the national debt faster than any other budget proposal the House will consider today.

The moral thing to do is to relieve our children and our grandchildren of this debt. I urge my colleagues to support this Blue Dog budget resolution.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. Stenholm) has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, article 1, section 8 of the United States Constitution gives Congress the authority to provide for the common defense. It goes on to say that no money can be drawn from the Treasury except by appropriation by Congress.

For more than a decade, the budget for national defense has decreased. In particular, for the past 6 years, a Democratic President has asked for far too little, and the Republican Congress has achieved almost all of the debt reduction at the expense of our Nation's defense.

The result is its shrinking Navy fleet, almost 300 ships, aging weapons systems, the shortchanging of our men and women in uniform, the delay of their paychecks so that it will go on next year's bill instead of this.

In human terms, it means people like Harry Schein, a Marine Corps lance corporal has to work two part-time jobs to make ends meet and to take care of his son. It means that people like Lisa Joles, the wife of a United States Marine, has to pick up used furniture on the side of the road to take care of her and other Marine families.

But do my colleagues know, it gets worse. Our military retirees who were promised a lifetime of free health care if they served our country honorably for 20 years are being told they cannot come to the base hospital anymore.

The Blue Dog budget increases defense spending over the Republican proposal by over $4 billion a year. One billion dollars of that would fulfill the promise of lifetime health care to our military retirees. That proposal has been endorsed by over 24 veterans organizations.

The other $3 billion can go to address the pay problems. It can go to address the aging weapons systems. It can go to take care of readiness.

The promise that was made to our service members and military retirees are more important than the promises that were made over a steak dinner and cocktails to some big contributor for a tax break.

Tonight my colleagues get to decide which they think are more important.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, I support the Blue Dog budget very simply because it provides debt reduction with savings to Social Security and Medicare, priority spending for education, veterans, agriculture, defense, health care and prescription drugs, and provides responsible tax relief from the death tax, the marriage penalty, and it gives deductions for health care to the self-employed. It is a good budget. It is fiscally responsible, and we just ought to pass it.

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

Mr. Chairman, the caps are right. The budget we will consider next recognizes the gimmicks in the budget that we are considering at the base bill.

The reason my colleagues can claim all of the things that they claim regarding debt is they are back end loading. They are in fact double counting in areas in which many of them who have been speaking do not truly appreciate what their committee has done. They are back end loading.

It is true when we talk about Social Security and our tax cuts, it is true, ours are puny compared to theirs. The problem is that theirs explodes in 2014 when the Social Security drain will become real. When the baby boomers become retirees and begin drawing Social Security, that is when their tax cut will become a problem that the Blue Dogs wish to avoid. I wish they would recognize that.

We have been criticized for too much spending, but at the same time folks on this side have said we agree with your military spending. We agree with your defense spending. We agree with your spending for veterans. They cannot have it both ways. Ours is the most responsible.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 seconds to rebut.

The difference between the Blue Dog budget and the Republican budget is that the Blue Dog budget cuts less taxes and spends more money.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU).

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, one of the previous speakers, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), described very clearly what the fundamental difference is between these two budgets.

The Republican budget, after we set aside every single penny of the Social Security surplus, and after we set aside $40 billion for medical care reforms and prescription drug coverage, and after we pay down $1 trillion in debt over 5 years, and after we fund critical needs and defense, $2 billion more for the unfunded mandate of special education costs, after we invest in veterans' health care, only then do we recognize the importance of letting Americans keep a little bit more of their own money.

The Blue Dog budget just does not understand this. It is a minuscule tax cut over 5 years.

Let us look at the difference, the difference in values here. This is the tax relief in the Republican budget and the marriage penalty. Now, we could pay down a little bit more debt if we wanted to keep penalizing married couples simply because they chose to get married, but that would be wrong.

Repeal the Social Security earnings limit. We could pay down a little bit more debt if we wanted to keep punishing those seniors that want to be a productive part of the workforce, but that would be terribly wrong.

We could keep taxing family farms and small businesses, send them to the IRS and the undertaker on the same day, but that would be wrong.

We could decide not to give individuals health insurance deductibilities just like we give to big corporations, but that would be wrong.

☐ 2100

Sure, we could pay down a little bit more debt in addition to the trillion dollars in debt over 5 years, but that would be wrong.

We fundamentally recognize that what we need to do is not just reduce the tax burden on citizens in this country, which is at an all-time high, but we need to make the Tax Code more fair through health insurance deductibility, eliminating the death tax, repealing the earnings limit, and expanding the opportunity to invest in IRAs and education savings accounts. The Republican proposal does just that.

Reject this amendment that does not treat the American taxpayer fairly and support the Republican resolution.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SISISKY).

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

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Chairman, I didn't now whether I was going to get into this debate or not. But after listening to everything that has been said today, I think I have to. Make no mistake about it: I support the Blue Dog Budget.

The Blue Dog Budget is the most balanced plan of any before us. It eliminates the public debt more quickly than any other plan. It makes room for responsible tax cuts. It provides realistic discretionary spending. It makes Medicare work better. It saves 100% of the Social Security surplus.

It addresses many other problems, ranging from agriculture to health care for military retirees, in better ways than any other option.

But what is of major importance to me is—over the next five years, it increases defense discretionary spending by $32 billion over the inflated baseline.

What's good about that is that it's $15 billion more than the Republican budget.

What's problematic is that it still doesn't meet unfunded requirements submitted by the service chiefs. To do that, you would need to add at least $15 billion a year for the next five years. And while not going that far, the Blue Dog Budget clearly moves us closer to meeting our requirements. And let me tell you why that's important.

Our fleet admirals say they need more than 350 ships to carry out the missions assigned today. But we're not building enough ships.

The Army is trying to build a force that is both more maneuverable and more lethal—in order to respond to current contingencies.

But we're forcing them to achieve that goal by canceling systems and undercutting current capabilities. There's not enough money. And the future of the Air Force depends on whether we can afford the development of two new planes, the F–22 and joint strike fighter.

You know what's so great about those two planes? They have the capabilities and characteristics to ensure that their pilots always come home. You only have to think back to Kosovo, where we lost two aircraft and no pilots, to see how important that is.

Nevertheless, with money so tight, I'm afraid we may postpone one of the programs simply to harvest the money for other defense programs. I hope it doesn't come to that, but that's how desperate the situation really is.

Not only are we short of money, we're short of people. We've negated our commitments to health care.

The net result is that veterans and military retirees—from families who have served this country for many generations—are telling their sons and daughters: "Don't go into the service, they don't keep their promises." That's a very sad state of affairs.

It's a state of affairs that the Blue Dog budget tries to remedy, in part, by adding nearly $7 billion more for military retiree health care, and $10 billion more for veterans programs, than the Republican plan. I could go on and on. There are so many constructive solutions in the Blue Dog budget.

Unless you have a political agenda that carries you off in some other direction, this should be the easiest budget to vote for.

I ask you to support responsible, constructive solutions that will strengthen our nation at home and abroad. Vote "yes" on the Blue Dog budget.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER).

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

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Chairman, it has been a long day, and I think almost everything has been said, just not everyone has had a chance to say it.

I think it would be wise to remind ourselves that a budget and a budget resolution is merely a forecast of future economic events with an attending set of priorities based thereon.

It has been very well pointed out by the speakers before me that this country is right now laboring with a 13 percent mortgage on us. Over $300 billion a year. Now, my colleagues, no rational businessperson on earth, with a 13 percent mortgage on his business, would not make it a priority, when he came into some extra money, to reduce that staggering overhead.

My colleagues say the American people are overtaxed. We agree. And the reason they are overtaxed is because they are lugging around a 13 percent mortgage on themselves and their country.

Now, President Eisenhower said one time that he considered no money here in Washington a surplus as long as the Nation's children had a debt. And I know that all my colleagues have a priority of tax relief for the here and now, but the Blue Dog budget has a priority for tax relief for the then and there.

It is simply wrong to leave this country to our children, our posterity, with water so dirty that fish cannot live in it, air so polluted people cannot breathe it, and a 13 percent mortgage on it that they are going to have to strain and struggle and pay for eternity. That is simply wrong.

Our priority is debt reduction first, funding the programs we need to for the military; for the agriculture sector; for veterans; for education and for health care. It is a balanced budget. Tax relief for some; but more importantly, tax relief for those who follow.

This country will be stronger if we adopt the Blue Dog budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, let me first of all pay tribute to the Blue Dogs, because I think what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) said early on is right. I think the Blue Dogs have made an enormous contribution in this House towards the effort of being able to balance a budget and pay down debt.

I am, however, a little bit mystified with this budget because I have always felt that the Blue Dogs did not like the tax cuts because they wanted to pay down more debt. And in this budget they do not have the tax cuts, and they do not even pay down as much debt as we do. They went into the spending mode. We actually pay down $25 billion more than the Blue Dogs do.

But I want to pose a challenge to the Blue Dogs, because I am hopeful that we are going to beat their budget, and I am hopeful ours will pass. I think my colleagues ought to like our budget. It does cut a lot of taxes, but it pays down a trillion dollars in debt; and it does restrain spending, and it does protect Social Security. So I would ask my colleagues to think about it when we get to final passage.

But I also want my colleagues to know that today we unveiled, I think it was 170,000 general accounting reports today on waste, fraud and abuse in the Federal Government. And the Committee on the Budget is going to start an effort to try to root out that waste in order to make this government more efficient. And we need the Blue Dogs. We need all my colleagues to participate with us, and we invite them to participate with us through the Committee on the Budget. If Members want to come and sit with us, we would like to deputize them.

I think on a bipartisan basis we ought to attack the waste and the fraud and the abuse, and set our priorities. And the things that touch my colleagues' hearts, the poverty, they touch all our hearts too. So let us prioritize; but at the same time, let us clean it up and let us do it together.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Blue Dog budget which balances fiscal responsibility with the need to adequately fund programs addressing our national priorities and needs. The Blue Dog budget is a responsible plan that balances the budget and retires public debt without tapping into the Social Security trust fund.

Mr. Chairman, I am particularly pleased the Blue Dog budget provides needed funding to expand the Montgomery G.I. bill. The Armed Forces face serious recruiting problems. In order to meet our defense needs, the Armed Forces must have the tools it needs to draw men and women into uniform. The Montgomery G.I. bill has proven to be the military's most valuable recruiting tool. Unfortunately, the combination of a substantially devalued G.I. bill, which now pays only 36 percent of the cost of receiving a 4-year college education, and expanded Federal financial assistance to college-bound students without military service has crippled the G.I. bill's effectiveness.

Recent recruiting gimmicks such as psychedelic humvees, Spike Lee advertisements, drag racers, or desperate cash giveaways are not the answer to these problems. Nor is conscription. Congress would best help our Armed Forces by improving the G.I. bill. Providing access to higher education in exchange for national service is the right thing to do. A strong G.I. bill helps veterans and their families, aids our national defense, and strengthens the economy.

Last year, my colleague, LANE EVANS and I introduced the Montgomery GI Bill Expansion Act (H.R. 1071) to ensure that our All-Volunteer Armed Forces had the ability to attract recruits, and, at the same time, provide veterans with the skills they need to better our economy and their lives. The Blue Dog budget wisely provides funding to expand the G.I. bill in line with H.R. 1071 and will restore the MGIB's value both as a meaningful readjustment benefit and an effective recruiting incentive.

Mr. Chairman, the Blue Dog budget is good for America's veterans and soldiers and is a solid blueprint for our Nation's future. Unlike the Republican budget that would foolishly squander the surplus, the responsible Blue Dog budget pays down the national debt. It will put the nation on a course to eliminate the publicly held debt by 2012 with a strong, immediate commitment to debt reduction. In addition to this, it provides for needed investments in our Nation's health, establishing a $40 billion Medicare reserve fund that can be used to fund Medicare reform and a prescription drug benefit for our seniors.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to do the right thing for veterans, soldiers and our nation's future. Vote for the Blue Dog budget.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the conservative Blue Dog substitute to H. Con. Res. 290, the fiscal year 2001 budget resolution, because it establishes a responsible fiscal framework for Congress to maintain a true balanced budget and to eliminate our national debt.

The majority's budget resolution calls for $596.5 billion in discretionary spending for fiscal year 2001, which is 2 percent more than the current levels. This budget protects funding for some education programs, veterans, and the NIH; however, it does so at the expense of other domestic priorities—most of which would be cut by the majority, on average, by nearly 10 percent. While I commend the majority's discipline on setting spending levels and prioritizing funding for some of our most pressing domestic needs, I am disappointed about the insistence on passing huge tax cuts that jeopardize our efforts to save Social Security, protect Medicare, and pay down the national debt.

Additionally, the majority plan sets no funding aside to extend the solvency of Social Security one single day. While the majority plan creates a ''reserve'' that could be used to fund Medicare reform or provide a prescription drug benefit; however, how these funds might be used are undefined. Finally, the majority plan provides little, if any room for debt reduction; they allow for a $150 billion tax cut that could explode to almost $250 billion if the majority uses its $40 billion Medicare ''reserve'' for tax cuts and the additional $50 billion reserve for tax cuts. Worse, if both reserves are used, all on-budget surpluses would be wiped out and there would be a $7 billion on-budget deficit in fiscal year 2004.

The majority's budget resolution clearly guides us down the wrong fiscal path by proposing risky tax cuts that will return us to an era of fiscal deficits and exploding national debt, without extending Social Security solvency, protecting Medicare, or reducing any of our national debt.

Similarly, the Democratic alternative does not do enough to focus on this nation's most pressing needs. While this substitute preserves Social Security and Medicare for the long run, begins paying down our national debt and provides targeted tax relief, it forsakes immediate attention to these needs by unnecessarily increasing discretionary spending levels by calling for $19.2 billion in spending increases for fiscal year 2001 and $118.3 billion more in discretionary budget authority than the majority's plan over five years. Like the majority budget resolution, the Democratic alternative directs our fiscal resources away from Social Security away from Medicare and away from debt reduction.

The conservative Blue Dog budget, by contrast, sets out responsible budgetary policy that achieves and maintains a true balanced budget raiding Social Security. The Blue Dog budget reserve half of the on-budget surpluses for debt reduction rather than spending it on tax cuts or new programs. This will allow the budget to remain balanced without dipping into the Social Security trust fund even if optimistic budget projections don't materialize. The Blue Dog budget divides the remaining half on the on-budge surplus between tax reduction and shoring up our nation's commitment to our other domestic priorities—education, veterans, health care and a strong national defense.

Mr. Chairman, the conservative Blue Dog budget, by prudently and responsibly allocating our resources, will allow this nation to maintain our unprecedented economic growth. This budget gets back to basic and common sense principles that most American families follow in their daily lives: Paying our debts; don't spend money we don't have; and provide for basic needs.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the conservative Blue Dog budget substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 171, noes 243, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 72]

AYES—171

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barton
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blumenauer
Bonior
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Clayton
Clement
Coburn
Condit
Cramer
Crowley
Danner
Davis (FL)
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Frost
Gilman
Gonzalez
Granger
Green (TX)
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hill (IN)
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Jefferson
John
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Levin
Lofgren
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McIntyre
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Napolitano
Neal
Norwood
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pickering
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sawyer
Scarborough
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shimkus
Shows
Sisisky
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Turner
Upton
Visclosky
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOES—243

Allen
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Biggert
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Green (WI)
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kasich
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
McCrery
McGovern
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meeks (NY)
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Myrick
Nadler
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Obey
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Payne
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Saxton
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Waters
Watts (OK)
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Young (AK)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Bateman

NOT VOTING—19

Ackerman
Archer
Bonilla
Crane
Dixon
Gordon
Greenwood
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Lowey
Martinez
McCollum
McDermott
McHugh
Porter
Quinn
Rangel
Royce
Schakowsky
Vento

□ 2125

Mr. GALLEGLY and Mr. HOEKSTRA changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. GRANGER, Ms. BROWN of Florida and Messrs. WELDON of Pennsylvania, GILMAN, and GREEN of Texas changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

Mr. BATEMAN changed his vote from ''no'' to ''present.''

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). It is now in order to consider

Amendment Number 4, printed in part B of House Report 106–535.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. SUNUNU

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 4 offered by Mr. SUNUNU:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001.

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000 is hereby revised and replaced and that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001 and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2002 through 2005 are hereby set forth.

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of the fiscal years 2000 through 2005:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,945,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $2,016,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $2,096,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $2,177,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $2,263,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $2,361,000,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be reduced are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $0.
Fiscal year 2001: $13,207,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $40,337,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $54,528,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $67,518,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $95,497,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,799,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,839,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,877,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,933,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,991,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $2,059,700,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,784,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,809,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,860,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,914,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,968,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $2,037,000,000,000.

(4) SURPLUSES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the surpluses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $.
Fiscal year 2001: $.
Fiscal year 2002: $.
Fiscal year 2003: $.
Fiscal year 2004: $.
Fiscal year 2005: $.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $.
Fiscal year 2001: $.
Fiscal year 2002: $.
Fiscal year 2003: $.
Fiscal year 2004: $.
Fiscal year 2005: $.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and budget outlays for fiscal years 2000 through 2005 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $288,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $282,500,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $309,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $299,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $317,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $307,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $326,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $319,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $335,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $328,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $344,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $340,500,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $20,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $17,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $16,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $15,800,000,000.,
(B) Outlays, $12,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $15,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $15,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,800,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $19,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $19,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $19,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $19,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $19,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $19,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,000,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $1,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $0:
(B) Outlays, −$1,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, −$300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,500,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $24,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $22,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $22,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $22,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $22,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $22,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,800,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $35,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $19,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $18,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $17,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $17,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $15,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,200,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $8,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $6,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $7,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $9,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $12,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $12,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,400,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $51,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $54,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $52,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $53,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $53,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $53,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,100,000,000.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $11,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $9,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $8,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $8,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $8,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $8,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $7,800,000,000.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $57,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $70,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $71,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $71,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $71,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $71,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,300,000,000.

(11) Health (550):

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $159,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $152,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $168,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $166,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $127,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $177,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $189,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $189,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $202,700,000.
(B) Outlays, $203,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $218,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $217,800,000,000.

(12) Medicare (570):

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $199,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $199,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $215,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $216,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $221,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $221,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $239,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $239,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $255,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $255,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $278,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $278,200,000,000.

(13) Income Security (600):

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $238,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $248,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $251,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $255,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $258,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $267,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $273,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $276,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $278,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $288,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $290,500,000,000.

(14) Social Security (650):

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $405,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $405,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $422,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $422,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $443,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $443,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $463,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $463,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $486,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $485,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $510,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $510,100,000,000.

(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $46,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $47,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $49,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $50,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $52,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $55,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,900,000,000.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $27,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $25,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $25,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $25,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $25,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $24,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,800,000,000.

(17) General Government (800):

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $13,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $12,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $12,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $12,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $12,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $12,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,000,000,000.

(18) Net Interest (900):

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $.
(B) Outlays, $.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $.
(B) Outlays, $.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $.
(B) Outlays, $.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $.
(B) Outlays, $.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $.
(B) Outlays, $.

(19) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $8,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$4,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$8,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$1,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$1,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$2,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$2,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, −$2,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$2,500,000,000.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$41,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$41,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$46,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$46,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$50,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$50,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$50,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$50,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$48,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$48,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, −$50,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$50,100,000,000.

SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

(a) SUBMISSIONS REGARDING REVENUES.—In addition to changes in revenues included the House Committee on Ways and Means shall report to the House a reconciliation bill—

(1) not later than May 19, 2000 that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the total level of revenues by not more than: $4,100,000,000 for Fiscal Year 2001, and $50,700,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005;

(2) not later than May 19, 2000 that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the total level of revenues by not more than: $578,000,000 for Fiscal Year 2001, and $12,984,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005;

(3) not later than May 19, 2000 that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the total level of revenues by not more than: $2,353,000,000 for Fiscal Year 2001, and $45,750,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005;

(4) not later than May 26, 2000 that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the total level of revenues by not more than: $5,200,000,000 for Fiscal Year 2001, and $26,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005;

(5) not later than June 23, 2000 that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the total level of revenues by not more than: $500,000,000 for Fiscal Year 2001, and $15,600,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005;

(6) not later than July 28, 2000 that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the total level of revenues by not more than: $476,000,000 for Fiscal Year 2001, and $7,718,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005; and

(7) not later than September 22, 2000 that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the total level of revenues by not more than: $0 for Fiscal Year 2001, and $113,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005;

(b) SUBMISSIONS REGARDING DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report to the House a reconciliation bill—

(1) not later than May 26, 2000 that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the debt held by the public

by not more than $10,000,000,000 for Fiscal Year 2001; and

(2) not later than September 22, 2000 that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the debt held by the public by not more than $40,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2002 through 2005.

(c) SUBMISSIONS REGARDING MEDICARE.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report to the House a reconciliation bill not later than September 22, 2000 that reforms the medicare program and provides coverage for prescription drugs, but not to exceed $4 billion in new budget authority and $4,000,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2001 and −$2,000,000,000 in new budget authority and −$2,000,000,000 in outlays for the period fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

SEC. 5. SPECIAL PROCEDURES TO SAFEGUARD TAX RELIEF.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS.—

(1) Upon the reporting of a reconciliation bill by the Committee on Ways and Means pursuant to section 4(a) or, the offering of an amendment to, or the submission of a conference report on, H.R. 3081, H.R. 6, or H.R. 2990, whichever occurs first, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House shall reduce to zero the revenue aggregates set forth in section 2(1)(B) (and make all other appropriate conforming adjustments).

(2) After making the adjustments referred to in paragraph (1), and whenever the Committee on Ways and Means reports any reconciliation bill pursuant to section 4(a) (or an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted or an amendment to H.R. 3081, H.R. 6, or H.R. 2990 is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted after the date of adoption of this resolution, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House shall increase the levels by which Federal revenues should be reduced by the amount of revenue loss caused by such measure for each applicable year or period, but not to exceed, after taking into account any other bill or joint resolution enacted during this session of the One Hundred Sixth Congress that causes a reduction in revenues for such year or period, $ in fiscal year 2001 and $ for the period of fiscal year 2001 through 2005 (and make all other appropriate conforming adjustments).

(b) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments made pursuant to subsection (a)(1) for any measure shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

SEC. 6. RESERVE FUND FOR AUGUST UPDATE REVISION OF BUDGET SURPLUSES.

(a) REPORTING A SURPLUS.—If the Congressional Budget Office report referred to in subsection (b) projects an increase in the surplus for fiscal year 2000, fiscal year 2001, and the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005 over the corresponding levels set forth in its economic and budget forecast for 2001 submitted pursuant to section 202(c)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House may make the adjustments as provided in subsection (c).

(b) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE UPDATED BUDGET FORECAST FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001.—The report referred to in subsection (a) is the Congressional Budget Office updated budget forecast for fiscal year 2001.

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—If the Committee on Ways and Means reports any reconciliation bill pursuant to section 4(a) (or an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted), or an amendment to H.R. 3081, H.R. 6, or H.R. 2990 is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted after the date of adoption of this resolution that, after taking into account any other bill or joint resolution enacted during this session of the One Hundred Sixth Congress that causes a reduction in revenues for such year or period, would cause the level by which Federal revenues should be reduced, as set forth in section 2(1)(B) for fiscal year 2001 or for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005, to be exceeded, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House may increase the levels by which Federal revenues should be reduced by the amount exceeding such level resulting from such measure for each applicable year or period, but not to exceed the increase in the surplus for such year or period in the report referred to in subsection (a).

(d) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments made pursuant to subsection (c) for any measure shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

SEC. 7. SAFE DEPOSIT BOX FOR SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) under the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the social security trust funds are off-budget for purposes of the President's budget submission and the concurrent resolution on the budget;

(2) the social security trust funds have been running surpluses for 17 years;

(3) these surpluses have been used to implicitly finance the general operations of the Federal Government;

(4) in fiscal year 2001, the social security surplus will exceed $166 billion;

(5) for the first time, a concurrent resolution on the budget balances the Federal budget without counting the social security surpluses;

(6) the only way to ensure that social security surpluses are not diverted for other purposes is to balance the budget exclusive of such surpluses; and

(7) Congress and the President should take such steps as are necessary to ensure that future budgets are balanced excluding the surpluses generated by the social security trust funds.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any revision to this resolution or a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2002, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that sets forth a deficit for any fiscal year.

(2) DEFICIT LEVELS.—For purposes of this subsection, a deficit shall be the level (if any) set forth in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for that fiscal year pursuant to section 301(a)(3) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

SEC. 8. DEBT REDUCTION LOCK-BOX.

POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any reported bill or joint resolution, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that would cause a surplus for fiscal year 2001 to be less than the level (as adjusted) set forth in section 2(4) for that fiscal year.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—The level of the surplus for purposes of subsection (a) shall not take into account any adjustment made under section 314(a)(1)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

SEC. 9. RESERVE FUND FOR AGRICULTURE IN FISCAL YEAR 2001.

If the Committee on Agriculture of the House reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto is offered (in the House), or a conference report thereon is submitted that provides risk management or income assistance for agricultural producers, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of new budget authority and outlays to that committee by the amount of new budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) if such legislation does not exceed $ in new budget authority and $ in outlays for fiscal year 2001 and $ in new budget authority and $ in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005 (and make all other appropriate conforming adjustments).

SEC. 10. RESERVE FUND FOR RETIREMENT SECURITY

Whenever the Committee on Ways and Means of the House reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto is offered (in the House), or a conference report thereon is submitted that enhances retirement security through structural programmatic reform and the creation of personal retirement accounts, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may—

(1) increase the appropriate allocations and aggregates of new budget authority and outlays by the amount of new budget authority provided by such measure (and outlays flowing therefrom) for that purpose;

(2) reduce the revenue aggregates by the amount of the revenue loss resulting from that measure for that purpose; and

(3) make all other appropriate conforming adjustments.

SEC. 11. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocation and aggregates made pursuant to section 9 or 10 for any measure shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution—

(1) the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives or the Senate, as applicable; and

(2) such chairman, as applicable, may make any other necessary adjustments to such levels to carry out this resolution.

SEC. 12. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING THE STABILIZATION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL PAYMENTS TO STATES, COUNTIES, AND BOROUGHS.

It is the sense of the House that Federal revenue-sharing payments to States, countries, and boroughs pursuant to the Act of May 23, 1908 (35 Stat. 260; 16 U.S.C. 500), the Act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 963; 16 U.S.C. 500), the Act of August 8, 1937 (chapter 876; 50 Stat. 875; 43 U.S.C. 1181f), the Act of May 24, 1939 (chapter 144; 53 Stat. 753, 43 U.S.C. 1181f–1 et seq.), and sections 13982 and 13983 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 (Public Law 103–66; 16 U.S.C. 500 note; 43 U.S.C. 1181f note) should be stabilized and maintained for the long-term benefit of schools, roads, public services, and communities, and that providing such permanent, stable funding is a priority of the 106th Congress.

SEC. 13. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON DIRECTING THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TO ACCEPT NEGATIVE NUMBERS IN FARM INCOME AVERAGING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) farmers' and ranchers' income vary widely from year to year due to uncontrollable markets and unpredictable weather;

(2) in the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997, Congress enacted 3-year farm income averaging to protect agricultural producers from excessive tax rates in profitable years;

(3) last year, the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) proposed final regulations for averaging farm income which fail to make clear that taxable income in a given year may be a negative number; and

(4) this IRS interpretation can result in farmers having to pay additional taxes during years in which they experience a loss in income.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that during this session of the 106th Congress, legislation should be considered to direct the Internal Revenue Service to count any net loss of income in determining the proper rate of taxation.

SEC. 14. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON ESTIMATES OF THE IMPACT OF REGULATIONS ON THE PRIVATE SECTOR.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) the Federal regulatory system sometimes adversely affects many Americans and businesses by imposing financial burdens with little corresponding public benefit:

(2) currently, Congress has no general mechanism for assessing the financial impact of regulatory activities on the private sector;

(3) Congress is ultimately responsible for making sure agencies act in accordance with congressional intent and while the executive branch is responsible for promulgating regulations, Congress ultimately can and should curb ineffective regulations by using its oversight and regulatory powers; and

(4) a variety of reforms have been suggested to increase congressional oversight over regulatory activity, including directing the President to prepare an annual accounting statement containing several cost/benefit analyses, recommendations to reform inefficient regulatory programs, and an identification and analysis of duplications and inconsistencies among such programs.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that the House should reclaim its role as reformer and take the first step toward curbing inefficient regulatory activity by passing legislation authorizing the Congressional Budget Office to prepare regular estimates on the impact of proposed Federal regulations on the private sector.

SEC. 15. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PROVIDING ADDITIONAL DOLLARS TO THE CLASSROOM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) strengthening America's public schools while respecting State and local control is critically important to the future of our children and our Nation;

(2) education is a local responsibility, a State priority, and a national concern;

(3) a partnership with the Nation's governors, parents, teachers, and principals must take place in order to strengthen public schools and foster educational excellence;

(4) the consideration of various Federal education programs will benefit our Nation's children, parents, and teachers by sending more dollars directly to the classroom; and

(5) our Nation's children deserve an educational system that will provide opportunities to excel.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Congress should enact legislation that would consolidate thirty-one Federal K–12 education programs; and

(2) the Department of Education, the States, and local educational agencies should work together to ensure that not less than 95 percent of all funds appropriated for the purpose of carrying out elementary and secondary education programs administered by the Department of Education is spent for our children in their classrooms.

SEC. 16. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING TAX RELIEF.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that this concurrent resolution dedicates $272,800,000 over 5 years to reduce the tax burden on American families.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that these funds should be used to—

(1) eliminate the marriage penalty by enacting into law the provisions of H.R. 6;

(2) increase access to health care by enacting into law the revenue provisions of H.R. 2990;

(3) provide tax relief to small business owners by enacting into law the revenue provisions of H.R. 3832;

(4) repeal the 1993 tax increase on Social Security benefits;

(5) expand educational opportunities by expanding Education Savings Accounts;

(6) repeal the 1993 4.3 cent tax increase on motor fuels;

(7) repeal the ''death tax''.

SEC. 17. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) For more than 30 years, the Social Security Trust Fund has been used to mask on-budget deficits and this year the debt to the Social Security Trust Fund will exceed $1 trillion,

(2) While the debt held by the public will decrease over the next 10 years, the debt owed to the Social Security Trust Fund will continue to increase and the national debt is projected, by the Congressional Budget Office, to increase to more than $6 trillion by Fiscal Year 2006.

(3) By 2014, in order to pay benefits, the Social Security Trust Fund will begin redeeming the certificates of debt that are currently held and if nothing is done to reform the system before then, Congress will be forced to implement emergency provisions that either raise taxes, increase publicly held debt, or cut benefits,

(4) Although the Social Security Trust Fund has been taken off-budget, the only true way to prohibit Congress and the President from borrowing from the surpluses of the Social Security Trust Fund is to return those surpluses to workers today in the form of rebates to be used solely for the purposes of personal retirement accounts,

(5) Personal Retirement Accounts are the key to true retirement security and wealth creation that is owned and controlled by the worker, not the government.

(6) Only through Personal Retirement Accounts can this country achieve a fully-funded retirement program, and not one dependent on the taxation of the next generation.

(7) Sec. 10 of this concurrent resolution provides the necessary authority to accommodate structural Social Security reform that includes personal retirement accounts within the Fiscal Year 2001 budget.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that prior to the adjournment of the 106th Congress that Congress should enact structural Social Security reform that includes personal retirement accounts.

SEC. 18. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING THE MODERNIZATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The health insurance coverage provided under the Medicare Program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) is an integral part of the financial security for retired and disabled individuals, as such coverage protects those individuals against the financially ruinous costs of a major illness.

(2) During the nearly 35 years since the Medicare Program was established, the Nation's health care delivery and financing system has undergone major transformations. However, the Medicare Program has not kept pace with such transformations.

(3) Former Congressional Budget Office Director Robert Reischauer has described the Medicare Program as it exists today as failing on the following four key dimensions (known as the ''Four I's''):

(A) The program is inefficient.

(B) The program is inequitable.

(C) The program is inadequate.

(D) The program is insolvent.

(4) The recommendations by Senator JOHN BREAUX and Representative WILLIAM THOMAS received the bipartisan support of a majority of members on the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare.

(5) The Breaux-Thomas recommendations provide for new prescription drug coverage for the neediest beneficiaries within a plan that substantially improves the solvency of the Medicare Program without transferring new IOUs to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund that must be redeemed later by raising taxes, cutting benefits, or borrowing more from the public.

(6) Sec. 4 of this concurrent resolution provides the necessary authority to accommodate structural Medicare reform within the Fiscal Year 2001 budget.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that:

(1) Congress should work in a bipartisan fashion to extend the solvency of the Medicare Program and to ensure that benefits under that program will be available to beneficiaries in the future.

(2) The recommendations by Senator BREAUX and Congressman THOMAS provide for new prescription drug coverage for the neediest beneficiaries within a plan that substantially improves the solvency of the Medicare Program without transferring to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund new IOUs that must be redeemed later by raising taxes, cutting benefits, or borrowing more from the public.

(3) Congress should move expeditiously to consider the bipartisan recommendations of the Chairmen of the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare.

SEC. 19. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING FOREIGN AID.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The nation of Israel has been a reliable and dependable ally to the United States.

(2) The United States' support for Israel is vital to achieving peace in the Middle East.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that aid to Israel should not be reduced.

SEC. 20. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING DEPARTMENT AND AGENCY AUDITS AND WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Each branch of government and every department and agency has a fiduciary responsibility to ensure that tax dollars are spent in the most efficient and effective manner possible and to eliminate mismanagement, waste, fraud, and abuse.

(2) A minimal measure of whether a department or agency is upholding its fiduciary responsibility is its ability to pass an audit.

(3) The most recent audits, for Fiscal Year 1998, revealed that six major agencies—the Department of Agriculture, Defense, Education, Justice, and Transportation, and the Agency for International Development—could not provide financial statements that could be independently audited.

(4) Mismanagement, waste, fraud, and abuse cost American taxpayers billions of dollars.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that no agency or department which has failed its most recent audit should receive an increase in their budget over the previous year, unless the availability of the increased funds is contingent upon the completion of a complete and successful financial audit.

SEC. 21. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING TITLE X FUNDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The title X of the Public Health Service Act family planning program provides contraceptives, treatment for sexually transmitted diseases, and sexual counseling to minors without parental consent or notification.

(2) Almost 1,500,000 American minors receive title X family planning services each year.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that organizations or businesses which receive funds through Federal programs should obtain parental consent or confirmation of parental notification before contraceptives are provided to a minor.

SEC. 22. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING INTERNATIONAL POPULATION CONTROL PROGRAMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) There is international consensus that under no circumstances should abortion be promoted as a method of family planning.

(2) The United States provides the largest percentage of population control assistance among donor nations.

(3) The activities of private organizations supported by United States taxpayers are a reflection of United States priorities in developing countries, and United States funds allow these organizations to expand their programs and influence.

(4) The United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) has signed contracts with the People's Republic of China (PRC) which persists in coercing its people to obtain abortions and undergo involuntary sterilizations.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that—

(1) United States taxpayers should not be forced to support international family planning programs;

(2) if the Congress is unwilling to stop supporting international family planning programs with taxpayer dollars, the Congress should limit such support to organizations that certify they will not perform, or lobby for the legalization of, abortions in other countries; and

(3) United States taxpayers should not be forced to support the United Nations Populations Fund (UNFPA) if it is conducting activities in the People's Republic of China (PRC) and the PRC's population control program continues to utilize coercive abortion.

SEC. 23. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING HUMAN EMBRYO RESEARCH.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Human life is a precious resource which should not be created or destroyed simply for scientific experiments.

(2) A human embryo is a human being that must be accorded the moral status of a person from the time of fertilization.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that Congress should prohibit the use of taxpayer dollars for the creation of human embryos for research purposes and research in which human embryos are knowingly destroyed, a prohibition which also excludes support for stem cell research which depends upon the intentional killing of a living human embryo.

SEC. 24. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING FUNDING OF UNAUTHORIZED PROGRAMS.

(a) The House finds that—

(1) Each year, the House Appropriations Committee provides funding to hundreds of programs whose authorization has expired or were never authorized by an Act of Congress.

(2) For Fiscal Year 2000, there were 247 programs funded in 137 laws totaling over $120 billion whose authorization had expired.

(3) Rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives prohibits the funding of an appropriation which has not been authorized by law.

(4) The House Rules Committee typically waives Rule XXI when considering general appropriation bills.

(5) The respective authorizing committees have not made reauthorization of unauthorized programs a priority.

(6) The lack of congressional oversight over the years, some as late as 1979, has led to the deterioration of the power of the respective authorizing Committees and thus the loss of congressional oversight and fiscal responsibility, which is a blow to the voters of America and their role in the process.

(7) The lack of congressional oversight over the years has led to the shift of power away from the Legislative Branch toward the Executive Branch and unelected federal bureaucrats.

(b) It is the sense of the House that—

(1) Congress should pass, and the President should sign into law, legislation to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to require Congress to fund programs that are currently unauthorized at 90 percent of prior fiscal year levels.

(2) Congress should pass, and the President should sign into law, legislation to require the Congressional Budget Office to prepare budget baselines based on the figures where unauthorized programs are frozen and funded at 90 percent of current levels.

SEC. 25. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON FULLY FUNDING OF SPECIAL EDUCATION.

(a) Congress finds that—

(1) all children deserve a quality education, including children with disabilities;

(2) the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act provides that the Federal, State and local governments are to share in the expense of educating children with disabilities and commits the Federal Government to pay up to 40 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure for children with disabilities;

(3) the high cost of educating children with disabilities and the Federal Government's failure to fully meet its obligation under the Individual with Disabilities Education Act stretches limited State and local education funds, creating difficulty in providing a quality education to all students, including children with disabilities;

(4) the current level of Federal funding to States and localities under the Individual with Disabilities Act is contrary to the goal of ensuring that children with disabilities receive a quality education;

(5) the Federal Government has failed to fully fund the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and appropriate 40 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure per child with a disability as required under the Individual with Disabilities Act to assist States and localities to educate children with disabilities;

(6) the levels in function 500 (Education) for fiscal year 2001 assume sufficient discretionary budget authority to accommodate fiscal year 2001 appropriations for IDEA at least $11 billion above such funding levels appropriated in fiscal year 2000, thus, fully funding the Federal Government's commitment to special education;

(7) the levels in function 500 (Education) to accommodate the fiscal year 2001 appropriation for fully funding IDEA may be reached by eliminating inefficient, ineffective and unauthorized education programs.

(b) It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Congress and the President should increase function 500 (Education) fiscal year 2001 funding for programs under the Individual with Disabilities Act by at least $11 billion above fiscal year 2000 appropriated levels, thus fully funding the Federal Government's commitment;

(2) Congress and the President can accomplish the goal by eliminating inefficient, ineffective and unauthorized education programs.

SEC. 26. ACTION PURSUANT TO SECTION 302(b)(1) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT.

(a) COMPLIANCE.—When complying Section 302(b)(1) of Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Committee on Appropriations of each House shall consult with the Committee on Appropriations of the other House to ensure that the allocation of budget outlays and new budget authority among each Committee's subcommittees are identical.

(b) REPORT.—The Committee on Appropriations of each House shall report to its House when it determines that the report made by the Committee pursuant to Section 301(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the report made by the Committee on Appropriations of the other House pursuant to the same provision contain identical allocations of budget outlays and new budget authority among each Committee's subcommittees.

(c) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report providing new discretionary budget authority for Fiscal Year 2001 allocated to the Committee on Appropriations unless and until the Committee on Appropriations of that House has made the report required under paragraph (b) of this Section.

SEC. 27. CHANGES TO HOUSE RULES.

(a) Rule XIII(f)(1)(B) of the Rules of the House Representatives is amended by striking the section and inserting the following:

''(B) a list of all appropriations contained in the bill for expenditures not currently authorized by law along with the last year for which the expenditure was authorized, the level of expenditures authorized that year, the actual level of expenditure that year, and the level of expenditure contained in the accompanying bill (This provision shall not apply to classified intelligence or national security programs, projects or activities).''

(b) Rule X 2.(d) of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by adding at the end of section (b) the following and redesignating (C) as (D):

''(C) give priority consideration to including in its plan the review of those laws which are currently unauthorized and outline how the Committee intends to authorize currently unauthorized programs under its jurisdiction.''

SEC. 28 SENSE OF THE CONGRESS ON ACCESS TO HEALTH INSURANCE AND PRESERVING HOME HEALTH SERVICES FOR ALL MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES.

(a) ACCESS TO HEALTH INSURANCE.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(B) the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999, reformed the interim payment system to increase reimbursements to low-cost providers, added $900 million in funding, and delayed the automatic 15 percent payment reduction for one year, to October 1, 2000; and

(C) patients whose care is more extensive and expensive than the typical Medicare patient do not receive supplemental payments in the interim payment system but will receive special protection in the home health care prospective payment system.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ACCESS TO HOME HEALTH CARE.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(A) Congress recognizes the importance of home health care for seniors and disabled citizens;

(B) Congress and the Administration should work together to maintain quality care for patients whose care is more extensive and expensive than the typical Medicare patient, including the sickest and frailest Medicare beneficiaries, while home health care agencies operate in the interim payment system; and

(C) Congress and the Administration should work together to avoid the implementation of the 15 percent reduction in the interim payment system and ensure timely implementation of the prospective payment system.

SEC. 29. REDUCTION OF PUBLICLY-HELD DEBT.

(a) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this section to ensure that the fiscal year 2000 on-budget surplus is used to reduce publicly-held debt.

(b) REDUCTION OF PUBLICLY-HELD DEBT.—

(1) POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CERTAIN LEGISLATION.—Except as provided by paragraph (2), it shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report if—

(A) the enactment of that bill or resolution as reported;

(B) the adoption and enactment of that amendment; or

(C) the enactment of that bill or resolution in the form recommended in that conference report.

would cause a decrease in the on-budget surplus for fiscal year 2000.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The point of order set forth in paragraph (1) shall not apply to a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion of conference report if it—

(A) reduces revenues;

(B) implements structural social security reform; or

(C) implements structural medicare reform.

(3) WAIVERS AND APPEALS IN THE SENATE.—

(A) WAIVERS.—Paragraph (1) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(B) APPEALS.—(i) Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to paragraph (1) shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the mover and the manager of the bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report, as the case may be.

(ii) An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under paragraph (1).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The provisions of this section shall cease to have any force or effect on October 1, 2000.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 446, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU).

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

This is a budget proposal that highlights the vision and the priorities of the conservative Members of the House. It establishes a clear benchmark for fiscal responsibility, for commitment to our national security, and for lowering the tax burden on the American people.

We pay down over a trillion dollars in Federal debt over the next 5 years. We offer tax relief for all Americans that makes our Tax Code more fair.

We have a commitment to a strong defense that meets the priorities that have been outlined by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and we do not just set aside funds for Medicare or talk about Social Security.

We make a commitment to real reform of these programs, to strengthen them, not just for today's beneficiaries, but for future retirees and our children as well.

□ 2130

We set aside every penny of the Social Security surplus, and this is an idea that while it seems somewhat new was first offered in the conservative budget 2 years ago. But we go further than that. We endorse proposals to let employees control a portion of their own payroll taxes, empower the individual to invest in their own retirement security, and give them the peace of mind that comes from knowing that that savings will be there for them when they retire. We invest in priorities. As I mentioned, national defense, which over 15 years has been allowed to decay year on year. We saw our first real increase in defense spending last year. This budget increases our defense priorities up to a higher level than any other budget offered in this session. We make a commitment to veterans' health care, $1 billion above last year's spending. And we make a greater commitment to special education, the largest unfunded mandate on the books today, than any other budget that has been offered before us today, over $2.4 billion in immediate additional funding for special education, and make clear that this is our number one education priority to fully fund the special education mandate.

And once we fund these priorities, once we set aside the entire Social Security surplus, once we set aside funds to honestly reform and strengthen Medicare and provide prescription drug coverage, then we reduce taxes in a way that makes the Tax Code more fair for every American. We eliminate the marriage penalty entirely. We eliminate death taxes entirely, not because we are concerned about one income group or another but because we recognize that it is unfair to take 55 percent of what anyone in America wants to leave to their descendants whether they are rich or poor or otherwise.

We eliminate not just the Social Security earnings limit, but we repeal the 1993 increase on the taxes on Social Security beneficiaries. We expand IRA savings opportunities, educational savings opportunities, and cut the gasoline tax, the tax increase imposed as part of the biggest tax increase in this country's history that raised the price of gasoline at the pump. We roll back that tax as well.

Mr. Chairman, this is a budget that is committed not just to fiscal responsibility and lower taxes, not just to a real commitment to national defense; but it is committed to reform, reforming and strengthening Social Security and Medicare in a way that we recognize needs to be done on a bipartisan basis.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I think we have finally reached the point in this debate where we are getting to the facts. And I think we need to start off with the central fact that has finally been established tonight and that is the size over 10 years with respect to the tax cut. Let me start by reminding everyone about a statement that was made during the presidential campaign that we need to honor, both Democrats and Republicans, or it will come back to haunt us. It is a statement by Senator JOHN MCCAIN. He said,

> It's fiscally irresponsible to promise a huge tax cut that is based on a surplus that we may not have. To bank it all on unending surpluses at the possible risk of the Social Security trust fund is our fundamental disagreement.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman will suspend.

Members are reminded that the rules of the House do not permit such quoting of Senators.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, that concludes the quote with respect to a presidential candidate, but here is the point. There has been no even attempt tonight to rebut the statement that the tax cut that we are dealing with here over 10 years exceeds $1 trillion. This exceeds the tax cut that we adopted here last year and ultimately failed, and it will fail again ultimately. The reason it will fail is because what the American public expects us to do is to use the lion's share of this projected surplus to pay down the Federal debt, to preserve Social Security and Medicare for the future, to contribute to lower interest rates; and because it is simply the right thing to do, we should not pass this enormous Federal debt on to our children and grandchildren.

We can do a responsible tax cut, we can do responsible spending, we can invest in education and defense; but we need to take the lion's share of the projected surplus and pay down the Federal debt. That is why this particular proposal should be defeated. It is why the underlying budget resolution should be defeated.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the CATs budget for many reasons, but in particular I would like to emphasize the principal statement that this budget makes regarding true, meaningful Social Security reform by acknowledging the need to create personal savings accounts. What we are talking about in this budget is first of all that the CATs budget sets aside every penny of Social Security surplus dollars for Social Security, not to be spent on other programs. We do that because we recognize we have got a sacred obligation to honor the promise we have made to senior citizens, those who are at or near retirement. They need to have this program ensured for their benefit.

But we also acknowledge that that alone does not solve the problems facing our Social Security system. But one way to solve that problem is to allow younger workers the opportunity to take a portion of the payroll tax they already pay and put that into accounts that they would own and control. They could invest and that savings would grow and provide the basis for their future benefits and their retirement, giving them more security and a better retirement than the current system promises and cannot deliver. This would be a permanent solution to the unfunded liability problem of Social Security. It would grant unprecedented freedom to working people who currently do not have the opportunity to make this kind of savings because the payroll tax takes it away from them.

We know this will cost money. This CATs budget is honest enough to acknowledge that it will cost money and create a mechanism that would provide the flexibility to fund that transition of one of our most important programs in the history of this government to one that would have long-term financial stability and provide enormous freedom to the working people of America.

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

The gentleman has explained that his resolution, which we are trying to understand over here because there is a huge paucity of information about it, but he said that it provides more for defense; but I think it probably forgets an essential element. There is something in the Democratic resolution that we will bring up shortly that distinguishes it sharply from what is being proposed here and, that is, we have specifically included in our resolution $16.3 billion over 10 years specifically for health care initiatives for military retirees who are over the age of 65. We have not forgotten defense, and in particular we have not forgotten the men and women who fought to make this country free. We provide for them. We keep the promises that were made to them by military health care. We put the money in function 550 and function 570. We provide $5.4 billion for a prescription drug initiative, $10.9 billion to allow Medicare eligible military retirees simply to go to a military treatment facility and use their Medicare benefits to gain admission. Today most of those over the age of 65 are not able to be treated there.

I would like to ask the gentleman if he makes any provision anywhere in his resolution for these men and women who are military retirees.

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

Mr. SPRATT. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, we have a number of Members that are going to talk about the defense provisions, the increase for funding of defense that is in this bill, the billion additional dollars for veterans' health care that is in this bill, and the fact that it represents $187 billion in real increases, in investment in the men and women serving in our armed services over 5 years. That is an unprecedented investment as compared to any of the budgets on this floor, whether it is yours or any other budget.

So I think that the commitment is there, it is delineated clearly in the resolution, and it is a substantial increase. And it is based on the recommendations of President Clinton's own Joint Chiefs that pointed out that there is an enormous unfunded mandate in operations and maintenance and in materiel and in procurement. That is where we are focused, on the technology and the resources necessary to provide adequate defense when we are deploying more military than ever before. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SPRATT. Reclaiming my time, the point still remains, you have put all this additional money into defense and forgotten the men and women who fought to defend this country. We in our resolution, everybody should know this, have included $16.3 billion, $5.4 billion for a prescription drug initiative for Medicare retirees and another $10.9 so that they can use their Medicare benefits at military treatment facilities. We are doing something about subvention. We have put it in a budget that is balanced and pays down the debt and also provides a modest tax cut.

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

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

Mr. COBURN. This is not a bidding war for the veterans. As a matter of fact, right now for every veteran we spend $4,000 more per veteran than we spend on the average Medicare patient in this country. So if we are going to spend more money into the VA system we have now that is not offering them the care, not giving them equivalent care, not offering them quality care that they could get in the private sector, you are throwing money down a rat hole. The fact is we spend $4,000 per year per veteran more than we do for the same person in Medicare. So yes, we may not direct it the way that your budget directs it; but the fact is we recognize that there is not an efficient system out there and that needs to be changed. Every veteran in this country needs to be given a card. Go get your health care wherever you want because we have an obligation to you. And if we did that, we can deliver the same health care for about 30 percent less than we are doing in the VA system now.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, if I could respond to the gentleman on my own time, this is not about the Veterans' Administration health care system. This is about retiree health care at military treatment facilities, base hospitals, not VA hospitals. However, I would add, if I can continue on my own time, that we do better in our resolution by veterans who have a claim, I think, on the Federal Government for the services they have rendered and the promises we have made. We have more than a billion dollars provided over 5 years than they have provided in their resolution for veterans' health care. We have an additional $16.5 billion for retiree health care.

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

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) who understands probably better than anyone else in Congress the scope and the nature of the unmet needs of our men and women serving in the armed forces.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his compliment which is undeserved, but let me tell my friend from South Carolina where we really have an obligation to those men and women and those service veterans of World War II who are departing at the rate of about 30,000 a month. Most of those folks now have young people, sons and daughters, serving in our armed forces around the world. I will tell him the best way to serve them, and I will tell him how this budget serves them.

We are short on ammunition. We are short on spare parts. We have so few precision munitions for our pilots, most of them do not even get a chance to train with one before they are sent into battle. We have a shortage on shipbuilding. We are building to a 200-ship Navy. We are short on military construction. I have got one of those veterans that the gentleman from South Carolina talked about. He is my uncle. But one thing he has got in his house is an old picture on the wall. That picture is of my cousin, Son Stillwell, who was killed in Korea along with 50,000 other people because the United States was not ready to fight.

The budgets that President Clinton has been presenting to the United States have taken us into a state of unreadiness where we cannot win a major war without massive casualties on our side. The best service we can give to those senior veterans is to make sure that their children have the ammo, the spare parts and all the other things that they do not have right now to be able to fight effectively and to survive and come home. With the $45 billion in extra money that this budget provides on defense, which the Democrat budget does not provide, of course you have got the head space for the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Personnel, to work a beautiful health care plan along with having something called ammunition.

The tragedy of the Democrat budget is it makes the service choose between having ammunition for the young people who are out there defending the country and having health care for the senior retired people.

□ 2145

That is a choice that we should not make them have to come to.

I thought the gentleman was going to come with a Democrat budget that would offer $40 billion, maybe $50 billion above this baseline Clinton budget on national defense, and he did not do it.

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

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I thought the gentleman in the well, who is one of the strongest proponents and advocates of defense in this House, and I sit on the same committee with him, week after week he has bemoaned how much the President had sought in defense for next year and the next 5 years. I thought surely the gentleman would persuade his conference, the Republicans, to come forward with a resolution that provided more for defense.

What do we get? One-tenth of 1 percent over the next 5 years. That is all the increase the gentleman could muster.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, over the last 5 years we have provided $45 billion above the President's budget.

The commandant of the Marine Corps said it best. He said if we had not provided it, the Marines would be the 9–1 force instead of the 911 force for this Nation.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

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

Mr. Chairman, I first want to commend the CATs. I guess that is permissible for a dog to do because their budget enforcement mechanisms are something that I totally support. I think they are right on target and I think their criticisms of the base bill are right on target and we agree with them.

We look at their defense numbers. They are making a move in the right direction there, and I appreciate the fact that they are talking about Social Security in a much more honest and realistic way than most folks have talked about it today.

My concerns with their budget stem from their funding for agriculture at the committee level. I believe that is totally inadequate, given the problems of rural America and agriculture, and I happen to disagree with that.

I also disagree in the area of veterans. As the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) so eloquently explained the Blue Dog position on military retirees and veterans, I happen to believe the CATs are inadequate in that area, but there again we can do as we have been doing all day. We can nitpick around.

That is not nitpicking. That is serious. My primary opposition to their budget stems again in the area of the tax cut and the size of it. Here again, I commend them because they are honest in saying that theirs is $270 billion over the next 5 years, which amounts to something like over a trillion dollars over 10, and that is an honest presentation and they are very honest in coming forward with that and they believe in that.

I happen to not believe in that, for a fundamental reason and it goes back to Social Security. I have joined with the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD), I have joined with the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and others in working in a bipartisan way on a long-term Social Security reform bill, and anyone that has spent any amount of time whatsoever knows that every year we delay in fixing Social Security for the long-term, every day we delay it makes it that much more difficult. 2014 is the magic day. That is when the surpluses we are all wanting to give away tonight, that is when they no longer are surpluses and that is when somebody in the Congress in 2014 is going to have to deal with it.

That is why I think it is fiscally irresponsible. With all due respect to those that believe otherwise, it is fiscally irresponsible to give back money today that we are going to need in the Social Security system in 2014, particularly since we are talking about projected surpluses.

How many times have we heard it, both sides of the aisle tonight, people talking about these surpluses like they are real? They are projected. They may or may not occur in 2006.

If they pass their budget and it becomes law and we do have a tax cut that benefits today, the people today that we are now in the longest peacetime economic expansion in the history of our country, people are doing well, they are paying taxes, but what if that stops in 2006?

More importantly, I ask all of my colleagues to start looking at the numbers of 2014. My primary opposition tonight to their bill is the 2014 problem that comes with tax cuts in the area of a trillion dollars over the next 10 years, which they advocate.

Anyone that has spent any time looking at the long-term problems of Social Security know we really cannot afford that. That is why with all due respect, I say to those who advocate tax cuts in this area that we are talking about tonight, in my judgment it is the most fiscally irresponsible thing that we could be doing.

They disagree. I respect that. I commend them for the things in their budget. They are honest. They are going at it. I just cannot bring myself to vote for this kind of a tax cut for two reasons. Their names are Chase and Cole, mine and Cindy's 4½ year old and 2½ year old grandsons. I resolved four and a half years ago that I did not want them to look back 65 years from tonight and say if only my granddad would have done what in his heart he knew he should have done when he was in the Congress we would not be in the mess we are in today.

That is why I would strongly oppose the CATs resolution on that one issue. I commend them on the other areas where they are very honest, and am offering some potential bipartisan support.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I certainly thank the gentleman for his supportive words about many elements in our budget, and I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, tonight we will talk about this and we will vote a little after midnight. A lot of my colleagues have their minds made up. So what can I say tonight to perhaps change their minds and have a realistic picture of this budget?

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), Mr. DAVIS, and others on this side talk about these huge tax cuts. Let us get real. This is $270 billion over 5 years. What is that, 20-some-billion a year? And we are spending $2 trillion a year.

The spending alone is going up at 9 percent. Last year, between 1999 and the year 2000 budget we spent 9 percent with emergency supplementals. The people in this House should be embarrassed that spending is increasing at 9 and 10 percent a year, with emergency supplementals, and we are talking about a tax cut, a tax cut of $24 billion a year.

Let us look at what Federal Reserve Chairman Greenspan said, appointed FBI Clinton administration, ''My first priority would be to allow as much of the surplus to flow through into a reduction of debt to the public. If that proves politically infeasible, I would opt for cutting taxes. And under no condition do I see any room in the longer term outlook for major changes in expenditures.''

''I would opt for cutting taxes.'' This is an objective individual who is trying to say reduce spending.

Now this budget by the CATs is the only budget that we are going to vote on tonight that has 302(B) allocations restraint. It actually puts restraints. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) was kind enough to acknowledge that.

I hope everybody in the House realizes that the CATs budget is going to restrain spending. If spending is not restrained around here, it is going to continue at 9 percent; 9 and 10 percent means that in 7 years this budget is going to double. Instead of $2 trillion we are talking about $4 trillion.

The other last point I want to make is our Nation's seniors would benefit because it repeals the 1993 tax increase on Social Security. So those who are going to vote against the CATs budget are going to vote with the Clinton administration on the tax increase on Social Security.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, what concerns me, and I think many on my side of the aisle, about this proposal is that it looks a lot like 1981.

First of all, what we have is an enormous tax cut, $270 billion over 5 years, bigger than anybody has yet proposed for this period of time.

We have shown earlier today how if one tries to fit a $200 billion tax cut over 5 years into the other numbers assumed in the Republican budget resolution, the base bill, it goes into deficit. In 2003, the surplus vanishes. In 2004 and 2005, the budget is in the red. This would go even deeper.

It avoids the deficit only by having enormous cuts in nondefense discretionary spending. Right out of the box, this particular resolution, the CATs resolution, proposes an immediate cut of $16 billion; $16 billion between this year and next year in nondefense discretionary spending.

Look at last year and ask if that is realistic. Look at 1998 and ask if that is realistic. Look at the entire period of the 1990s. Just 1996, since the Republicans have been in control of the House, we have had an annual rate of increase in nondefense discretionary spending of 2.5 percent real increase.

So what is being assumed here is an abrupt, radical about face, a cut of a magnitude in one year we have not been able to achieve in any recent year that I can recall. The whole surplus is being bet. All of this that we have worked to accomplish and achieve and have finally been able to succeed on, it is all going to be bet on a big tax cut and very unrealistic discretionary spending cuts.

If those discretionary spending cuts are not attained politically here on the House Floor in the Congress, because of presidential vetoes or for whatever reason, we are in the red again, big time and in a hurry. That is what is scary about this resolution.

It promises a lot, sure. I would like to go home and talk about $270 billion in tax relief over the next 5 years, but I could not realistically tell my people that we could make those cuts when I have been here 18 years and I have not seen the Congress, Democrat or Republican Congress, muster the will to make cuts of that magnitude.

I think this is a very risky venture. I think extremely thin ice is being skated on, and I think the budget that we have worked so hard to get in the black is being put back in the danger zone, back in the zone where we are likely to be in deficit. Once we go into deficit, we are right back into the Social Security trust fund. That is where this resolution leads us.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD), who understands that only in Washington and only in a Democrat budget is repealing taxes on Social Security beneficiaries called spending.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, with that lead-in, I will simply pick up on the Social Security portion and I would say to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) in particular has been magnificent in his leadership on Social Security. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) touched on just a moment ago the issue of Social Security and personal accounts, and that is what personally gravitates me towards the CATs budget, what it does to get us off dead center, a dead center that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), I will not say on the left by any means, but on the Democratic side has been what the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and others have been on the Republican side, and that is how do we get off dead center on Social Security?

To this budget's credit, it moves us forward because it begins this process of personal accounts. It is a sense of Congress, which is a small start, and it is a point of order for personal accounts but that is, again, a step in the right direction that we very, very much need.

Last year Washington borrowed $100 billion from Social Security and they did it without a lot of fanfare. Most of the folks back home I talked to do not even know that it happened and those that did, at most they wrote a letter to their Congressman or their Senator but they did not march on Washington. We had truckers in town last week. We had farmers in town last week, all protesting different things going on in Washington and yet this is sort of the quiet secret that is kept under the rug. It is something that I think would be brought about with simple private property rights.

The only thing that will in the long run protect Social Security balances are private property rights. So what this budget does is it sets up for the first time a move toward a system of personal accounts wherein, for instance, Social Security money, surplus Social Security money, would be rebated back to the people paying Social Security taxes to begin their own personal Social Security savings account, and by doing so would protect it because it would be out of Washington.

I think that that is a very small step but important step that we have to take in this debate.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, you will recall that two years ago this House failed to adopt a concurrent budget resolution. It was the first time in the 26-year history of the Budget Act that Congress failed to adopt a budget.

It disrupted the appropriations process and made it much more difficult for the entire House to complete any of its legislative business in an orderly way.

Then again last year we adopted a budget but it was an unrealistic budget. It was shot full of holes with gimmicks and blue smoke and mirrors. It treated things like the decennial census, that has been going on since 1790, as an emergency. We did not complete action on the appropriations bills until well after the fiscal year had begun. We failed the American people again.

Now again this budget resolution is equally unrealistic.

□ 2200

It is so filled with assumptions that we know will not be met that it is not fair to the American people to even propose it, never mind pass it, on the floor of the House.

We know it is not a real budget. We know that what this is is not serious legislation, but political expediency. We would probably be better off doing what we did in 1998 without a budget resolution; whether it be the Republican leadership budget or the CATs budget, which are not all that substantively different. These Republican budgets start with the wholly unrealistic assumption that we will be able to hold non-defense discretionary outlays to $114 billion below inflation over the next 5 years. That is not going to happen.

Next year alone, as the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) suggested, we will have to cut nearly $20 billion below the level needed just to keep level with inflation. Yet we know that the Congress has increased nondefense appropriations faster than inflation every year since 1996. Who are we kidding?

If we were honest with the American people, we would admit that we have no intention of cutting Federal law enforcement or education or environmental programs, or veterans care. You name it, we are not going to cut it. We are going to do what our constituents demand that we do, and at least keep these programs level with inflation.

Who are we kidding? Ourselves? Why are we proposing a budget that we know we are not going to hold to? Maybe we are planning on putting all this money into the supplemental, hiding it, shifting it from fiscal year 2001 to fiscal year 2000. Maybe that will be this year's gimmick. But it is not right to the American people to be deceiving them in this way. The main problem is that to accommodate a tax cut in the range of $200 billion, whether it be the Republican leadership budget or the CATs budget, we know that we are putting in place a situation where we are going to be cutting revenue by almost $1 trillion over 10 years.

Those tax cuts are not fair. They are not fair to the American people. But, most importantly, they are not fair to our children. We have an opportunity today to pay off the debt that we incurred in the 1980s, to pay down that debt, to eliminate that debt by the year 2013. As well as the quarter of a trillion dollars in interest we have to pay every year on that debt. If we do not, our children have to pay off that debt. What could be more immoral than to pass that debt on to our children? What could be worse than to say to our children that they are going to have to pay for our retirement and our health care when we retire? We would not do that to our own children. Let us not do it to America's children. Oppose this budget.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to emphasize that only in Washington do people fail to realize that improving performance by 1, 2 or 3 percent per year is not just realistic, but it is expected, year after year after year. Those that say it is unrealistic to achieve any reduction at all in overall government spending are the same ones that said we could not balance the budget in 1994, the same ones that said we could not pass welfare reform in 1996, the same ones that said it was unrealistic and unattainable to set aside every penny of the Social Security surplus. They have been proved wrong time and again.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN).

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today as a member of the Committee on the Budget who believes we can meet not only spending caps, but we can pay down public debt, and we can do better for our defense as well as provide for tax relief to our working families.

This substitute provides enough tax relief to eliminate the marriage penalty, to provide greater access to health care, to expand choice in education, to give seniors relief by repealing the 1993 tax increase on Social Security benefits, and to give small businesses tax relief to keep our economy moving forward and to end the unfair death tax that penalizes savings.

Unfortunately, there are those on the other side that would like to call this risky and irresponsible. I ask them to talk to the hard-working people of my district in Kansas who believe that they should have relief, and ask them also to tell this to the hard-working people in their district who deserve to have some additional tax relief.

As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I have also seen the effects on morale caused by the years of neglect of our fine military personnel by this present administration. We have military families that are on food stamps; one family member is often deployed throughout the world on endless peacekeeping missions, with little time to spend at home. And there has been a failure to provide new equipment and spare parts as well as quality health services. This resulted in a dangerously low readiness, as well as serious problems with regard to recruiting and retention. We should never, never forget that providing for the common defense of our country is our first duty.

For those who say this substitute cannot be done, I say you have not tried hard enough. I urge my colleagues to support the CATs substitute.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from South Carolina for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, my friends who offer this budget have done a great public service, because I think they have shed some light upon the underlying dilution of the majority's Republican resolution that is the base bill. The base bill says that we are going to bring in $171 billion more over the next 5 years than we take in. Then it proceeds to spend $268 billion more than we take in, a $97 billion gap.

What they say to the American public is we can reduce your taxes by $200 billion and provide a prescription drug benefit under Medicare, and we can increase defense spending and increase some other spending, all to the tune of $268 billion. So, see, your surplus is $171 billion, but your additional giveaways are $268 billion.

To the credit of the alternative of the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU), you do not do that. The Sununu alternative tells the truth. It says in order to do those things, to have the prescription drug benefit and pay down the debt and cut taxes, one has to make very significant cuts in the budget. That is an honest proposition with which I disagree.

The proposition of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and the proposition of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) are honest. They say that to pay down the debt you basically have to leave taxes alone and leave spending alone and that will work.

The underlying bill is a repetition of the dilution of 1981. It says you can have your cake and eat it too; you can have your cake and bake it too; you can have your cake and give it away too, that you can increase Medicare, increase defense, cut taxes, and spend more money than you bring in. I think the priorities of this resolution are wrong in the CATs budget, but they are internally consistent.

The truth is the way to pay down the debt is to essentially leave spending alone, the way the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) does, to leave taxes alone, the way the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) does, not rely upon rosy scenarios, and pay down the national debt. I oppose this, but support the alternative of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), who understands leaving spending on autopilot and taxing at a higher level than ever in the history of our country is no way to run the Federal Government.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, among the many other positive aspects of the Conservative Action Team budget that I am up here to applaud and support is something that is a little less sexy perhaps than tax cuts, a little less easy to understand perhaps than increases in defense appropriations or anything else; but it is something, nonetheless, that we need to address, and this CATs budget does, in fact, address it for the first time in a long time, the first time, as far as I know, ever, and that is the practice of providing funds, authorizing every single year, year in and year out, money for unauthorized programs.

There is a process in this House that we are supposed to go through. The rule says that we cannot fund programs that are not authorized. Yet, year after year after year this has happened. Republicans, Democrats, it does not matter. This is not the way to provide fiscal responsibility. It is shirking our responsibility, if anything.

For example, of the programs that we have been appropriating for but are not authorized, I just bring these few to your attention. The National Endowment for the Arts, $98 million funding received this year. It has not been authorized for 7 years. The National Endowment for Humanities has not been authorized for 7 years. The Federal Communications Commission, for 9 years. Family planning programs have not been authorized for 15 years. Power Marketing Administration, 16 years.

Some of these are wonderful programs. They may be the most important things we do. But the fact is, unless we let the authorizing committees review what they are supposed to do, review them every few years, and unless we allow them to do it, we will never know.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, once again, we are debating a budget that does not strengthen social security or Medicare. In fact, none of the non-Social Security surplus is earmarked specifically for Medicare. The American people have made themselves heard loud and clear: they want Congress to save Social Security and Medicare, add a voluntary prescription drug program to Medicare, help our schools and help our children. Instead, we once again are seeing a bill that will provide tax cuts for the wealthy and cuts spending for programs that help our children.

How can Republicans claim to be pro-education when they will eliminate Head Start for more than 40,000 children and their families by 2005? We already have a long waiting list for families wanting to get their children into Head Start and this budget will only lengthen that list. Additionally, this budget would deny college access to 316,000 low-income students by 2005. In my district, Pell Grants are what enable many students to continue on to college.

Another area of concern to me in the Republican Budget is the cut to the LIHEAP program. As we all know, it has been a cold winter and with oil prices rapidly increasing, many families and especially senior citizens, are being forced to choose between heat and food.

In my district, one building that house senior citizens had no heat for 3 days before they contacted my office and we had the heat turned back on. At a time when oil prices are climbing higher, we must not cut LIHEAP assistance, as the Republican budget does, to 164,000 low-income families.

There are several Democratic substitutes that not only pay down the debt and shore up Social Security, but also increase funding for education programs.

My colleagues highlight their commitment to fully funding special education, yet when Democrats offered an amendment to provide full funding of the federal governments maximum authorized contribution for special education, Republicans diluted it to only a Sense of the Congress Amendment that Congress should provide this funding. If we should, why did they not vote to put it in the budget?

The Democratic Substitutes all provide a voluntary prescription drug benefit for seniors, provides targeted tax cuts to hard working families, and maintains or increases funding for non-defense discretionary programs. I urge my colleagues to vote against the Republican budget and support the democratic alternatives.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, this afternoon we talked about the Republican majority's budget resolution and some of the risks that it would pose. Their $200 billion tax cut in the first 5 years would take us into the red by 2004.

Well, if you are worried about that risky venture, just look at this CATs budget. It proposes a $270 billion tax cut in the first 5 years. Still not as much, I must say, as George W. Bush's proposed tax cut, which our Republican friends refused to vote on, but still $270 billion in the first 5 years, enough to eat up the entire non-Social Security surplus and to require renewed borrowing from the Social Security surplus. So the proposed tax cut is reckless. It bets the store on doubtful projections, which I think are simply not risks that our country ought to take.

Secondly, we talked this afternoon about the unrealistic assumptions about our domestic obligations and how the Republican budget assumes devastating and unrealistic declines in domestic investments, in education, in law enforcement, across the board.

Well, if you are worried about that set of cuts, look at this CATs budget. It goes even deeper. In fact, $16.5 billion deeper in 2001 alone.

I invite my colleagues to contrast the Democratic budget substitute, which is reasonable, which is balanced. It will provide a targeted, affordable tax cut. But it will also extend the solvency of both the Medicare and the Social Security trust funds. It will mandate the addition of a prescription drug benefit to Medicare. And it will use not only the entire Social Security surplus to buy down the publicly-held debt, but in fact will apply over $300 billion of the non-Social Security surplus to that same critical purpose.

Support the Democratic substitute.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

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

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time. I want to thank my colleague from New Hampshire for his hard work on the CATs budget. He has put in tremendous effort and drawn up what I believe is by far the best budget presented here tonight.

But I also want to begin by addressing this notion that appears to exist in Washington, D.C., and nowhere else in the world. Every single business in America and every single business in the world understands that each year you must do more with less. They also understand that the way you can do that is through improvements in efficiency and productivity. Indeed, every single report which now analyzes productivity in America shows that we as a society are becoming more productive, year after year after year.

In the last 2 years alone, we have grown more productive by 3 percent per year. That means that Ford Motor Company or General Motors or Motorola produces a better product year after year at a lower cost. Yet in government, nowhere else in all of the world do we say Oh, no, we can't do more with less, we have to do less with more. So you hear our colleagues on the other side decry the budget and say it cannot be done.

I would again compliment my friend from New Hampshire for pointing out that the people who say this cannot be done, that we can never deliver more government services because of improvements in efficiency or productivity, are the same people who said we could not balance the budget, the same people who said we could not accomplish welfare reform, and the same people who say the American people do not deserve a penny of tax relief.

Let us talk about what this budget does. Number one, it protects 100 percent of the Social Security surplus.

Number two, as the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) just pointed out, it provides the reform for Medicare by providing individual retirement accounts.

Let us talk about what it does for defense, since that is the number one priority of the government. It provides the strongest national defense of any of the budgets.

But, most importantly, and I want to compliment my friend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), it does what is critically important: It contains real budget enforcement. We cannot continue to pass budgets which are a fraud.

☐ 2215

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

Mr. Chairman, we have before us a conservative budget that sets the right priorities, represents a vision of a good number, a very large portion of the Members of this House. It starts by setting aside every single penny of the Social Security Trust Fund surplus, a vision that was criticized when it was first offered 2 years ago in a conservative budget. It pays down $1 trillion in debt over 5 years. That is four times more than this budget contains in tax relief. It strengthens the national defense, and it provides support for real bipartisan reform of both Social Security and Medicare. Finally, it offers unprecedented support for paying for the unfunded mandate of special education that burdens cities and towns at the local level all over this country; unprecedented, meant to fully fund that special education mandate.

After we have done all of these things, after we have paid down $1 trillion in debt, set aside for Social Security and done real reform on Medicare and Social Security, then we do cut taxes. We could pay down more in debt if we decided not to lift the tax increase on Social Security beneficiaries. Sure, we could pay down a little more debt if we did that; but if we did that, it would be wrong. We could pay down a little bit more debt if we did not think we should eliminate the marriage penalty, but penalizing a couple simply because they choose to get married is wrong.

In the Democrat budget and in the Blue Dog budget, there was no real effort to deal with that serious problem. We could pay down a little bit more debt if we decided that individuals should not get to deduct their health insurance costs, like big businesses can.

The final question I ask my colleagues is what hoops do the American people have to jump through to get a Tax Code that treats them a little bit more fair. I think we should support this resolution, and we should reject the notion that the American people cannot deal with their own money.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 78, noes 339, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 73]

AYES—78

Aderholt
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Boehner
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Cannon
Chabot
Chenoweth-Hage
Coburn
Collins
Cox
Cubin
Cunningham
Deal
DeMint
Dickey
Dreier
Ewing
Gekas
Gibbons
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Hansen
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hunter
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kingston
Largent
Latham
Lewis (KY)
Manzullo
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Miller, Gary
Myrick
Norwood
Nussle
Paul
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Radanovich
Riley
Rohrabacher
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sessions
Shadegg
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Tiahrt
Toomey
Vitter
Whitfield
Young (AK)

NOES—339

Abercrombie
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickett
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—17

Ackerman
Archer
Bonilla
Crane
Dixon
Greenwood
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Lowey
Martinez
McCollum
McDermott
McHugh
Porter
Quinn
Royce
Schakowsky
Vento

☐ 2239

Mr. KASICH and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey changed their vote from ‘‘aye’’ to ‘‘no.’’

Mr. STUMP and Mr. GRAHAM changed their vote from ‘‘no’’ and ‘‘aye.’’

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in Part B of House Report 106–535.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. SPRATT

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Part B Amendment No. 5 in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. SPRATT:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

SEC. 2. SPECIAL RULE.

In this resolution, all references to years are fiscal years and all amounts are expressed in billions.

TITLE I—BUDGETARY PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR 2001 AND COVERING 2000–2010.

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for 2000 is hereby revised and that the concurrent resolution on the budget for 2001, including the appropriate budgetary levels for 2002 through 2010, is hereby set forth.

SEC. 102. RECOMMENDED AGGREGATE LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

(a) ON-BUDGET LEVELS (EXCLUDING SOCIAL SECURITY AND THE POSTAL SERVICE FUND).—

For purposes of enforcement of this resolution, the following budgetary levels are appropriate for each year 2000 through 2010:

[In billions of dollars]

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
New budget authority	$1,475.2	$1,541.9	$1,578.2	$1,634.3	$1,696.2	$1,762.4
Outlays	1,459.2	1,496.5	1,555.9	1,610.4	1,672.2	1,739.2
Revenues	1,465.5	1,512.3	1,564.8	1,620.4	1,680.0	1,744.9
Revenue change	0.0	−2.6	−6.5	−9.1	−12.6	−19.2
Surpluses	6.3	15.8	8.9	10.0	7.8	5.7
Publicly held debt	3,472.3	3,312.1	3,131.3	2,942.0	2,740.8	2,524.0

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
New budget authority	$1,815.1	$1,873.4	$1,947.4	$2,022.0	$2,102.4
Outlays	1,786.8	1,841.6	1,920.4	1,995.4	2,077.9
Revenues	1,819.5	1,896.9	1,980.7	2,072.5	2,169.3
Revenue change	−23.0	−25.7	−29.3	−34.0	−39.0
Surpluses	32.7	55.3	60.3	77.1	91.4
Publicly held debt	2,265.2	1,967.7	1,650.2	3,102.2	926.8

(b) UNIFIED BUDGET SURPLUSES AND REDUCTION IN THE PUBLICLY HELD DEBT.—Congress declares that on-budget surpluses and the surpluses in the Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Trust Funds (Social Security trust funds) shall be devoted exclusively to reducing the debt held by the public. The cumulative ten-year on-budget surpluses of $365.0 billion set forth in subsection (a), combined with the estimated cumulative ten-year off-budget (Social Security) surpluses of $2,265.8 billion, will retire 73 percent of the publicly held debt by 2010 and all of it by 2013.

SEC. 103. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the following are the appropriate levels of new budget authority and budget outlays for each major functional category for each year 2000 through 2010:

(a) National Defense (050):

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
New budget authority	$288.9	$305.3	$309.0	$315.4	$323.1	$331.4
Outlays	$282.5	$297.2	$301.6	$309.1	$317.3	$327.8

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
New budget authority	$340.1	$349.0	$358.2	$367.6	$377.3
Outlays	$332.4	$338.2	$351.7	$361.4	$371.0

(b) International Affairs (150):

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
New budget authority	$20.1	$20.3	$20.2	$20.3	$20.6	$21.3
Outlays	$15.5	$17.6	$1‘6.6	$16.7	$17.0	$17.2

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
New budget authority	$21.7	$22.2	$22.5	$22.9	$23.2
Outlays	$17.4	$17.9	$18.4	$18.9	$19.4

(c) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
New budget authority	$19.3	$20.8	$20.4	$20.6	$20.8	$21.1
Outlays	$18.4	$19.6	$20.1	$20.3	$20.8	$20.8

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
New budget authority	$21.5	$21.9	$22.3	$22.8	$23.2
Outlays	$21.1	$21.5	$21.9	$22.3	$22.8

(d) Energy (270):

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
New budget authority	$1.1	$1.7	$1.3	$1.5	$1.5	$1.5
Outlays	$0.6	$0.2	$0.2	$0.2	$0.1	$0.2

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
New budget authority	$1.6	$1.4	$1.8	$2.0	$2.0
Outlays	$0.1	$0.1	$0.2	$0.4	$0.5

(e) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
New budget authority	$24.3	$25.8	$26.2	$26.8	$27.4	$28.0
Outlays	$24.2	$25.3	$26.0	$26.6	$27.0	$27.4

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
New budget authority	$28.7	$29.4	$30.1	$31.3	$32.1
Outlays	$28.0	$28.7	$29.3	$30.5	$31.3

(f) Agriculture (350):

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
New budget authority	$36.7	$19.3	$18.8	$18.0	$17.4	$16.4
Outlays	$34.3	$17.2	$17.0	$16.3	$16.0	$14.8

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
New budget authority	$15.7	$15.1	$15.1	$15.3	$15.6
Outlays	$14.1	$13.5	$13.4	$13.8	$14.2

(g) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
New budget authority	$7.5	$6.6	$8.8	$9.5	$13.7	$13.8
Outlays	$3.1	$2.4	$4.9	$4.8	$8.7	$9.7

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
New budget authority	$13.7	$12.3	$12.4	$12.8	$17.3

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Outlays	$9.3	$8.0	$8.0	$8.3	$12.0

(h) Transportation (400):

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
New budget authority	$54.3	$59.5	$57.8	$59.5	$59.7	$59.9
Outlays	$46.6	$51.1	$52.9	$54.6	$54.9	$55.4

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
New budget authority	$60.8	$61.3	$61.8	$62.3	$62.8
Outlays	$56.8	$57.6	$58.6	$60.0	$61.4

(i) Community and Regional Development (450):

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
New budget authority	$11.2	$11.9	$12.0	$12.2	$12.4	$12.7
Outlays	$10.7	$11.1	$11.4	$11.3	$11.5	$11.6

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
New budget authority	$13.0	$13.2	$13.4	$13.7	$13.8
Outlays	$12.0	$12.2	$12.5	$12.7	$12.9

(j) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
New budget authority	$57.7	$76.7	$77.8	$78.8	$80.0	$81.8
Outlays	$61.4	$69.7	$77.2	$78.4	$79.4	$81.0

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
New budget authority	$83.5	$85.4	$87.2	$89.2	$91.1
Outlays	$82.6	$84.3	$86.2	$88.1	$90.5

(k) Health (550):

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
New budget authority	$159.3	$171.0	$182.0	$194.6	$210.2	$228.4
Outlays	$152.4	$168.2	$180.8	$194.0	$209.8	$227.3

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
New budget authority	$247.7	$266.8	$286.8	$309.2	$333.0
Outlays	$246.4	$264.7	$284.8	$307.3	$331.7

(l) Medicare (570):

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
New budget authority	$199.6	$217.7	$225.0	$247.5	$267.5	$293.9
Outlays	$199.5	$218.0	$224.9	$247.2	$267.7	$293.9

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
New budget authority	$303.6	$332.0	$356.6	$384.6	$413.7
Outlays	$303.4	$332.2	$356.5	$384.3	$413.9

(m) Income Security (600):

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
New budget authority	$238.4	$254.8	$265.8	$276.4	$287.5	$298.0
Outlays	$248.0	$255.6	$267.2	$277.7	$288.4	$298.9

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
New budget authority	$312.0	$316.1	$331.1	$341.8	$353.4
Outlays	$312.9	$316.9	$331.8	$342.2	$353.6

(n) Social Security (650):

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
New budget authority	$11.5	$9.7	$11.6	$12.3	$13.0	$13.8
Outlays	$11.5	$9.7	$11.6	$12.3	$13.0	$13.8

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
New budget authority	$14.7	$15.7	$16.8	$18.0	$19.2
Outlays	$14.7	$15.7	$16.8	$18.0	$19.2

(o) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
New budget authority	$46.0	$48.2	$49.4	$51.0	$52.2	$55.6
Outlays	$45.1	$47.7	$49.2	$50.9	$52.0	$55.3

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
New budget authority	$55.3	$54.8	$58.1	$59.6	$61.1
Outlays	$54.9	$54.2	$57.8	$59.2	$60.7

(p) Administration of Justice (750):

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
New budget authority	$27.4	$29.1	$29.4	$30.2	$31.0	$31.7
Outlays	$28.0	$28.7	$29.5	$30.0	$30.6	$31.4

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
New budget authority	$32.5	$33.3	$34.2	$35.1	$35.9
Outlays	$32.2	$33.0	$33.8	$34.7	$35.5

(q) General Government (800):

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
New budget authority	$13.9	$13.4	$13.6	$13.8	$13.9	$14.1
Outlays	$14.7	$14.0	$13.7	$13.8	$13.8	$13.7

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
New budget authority	$14.6	$15.0	$15.5	$16.1	$16.5
Outlays	$14.1	$14.6	$15.2	$15.6	$16.1

(r) Net Interest (900):

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
New budget authority	$284.6	$288.6	$290.4	$286.6	$282.4	$278.2
Outlays	$284.6	$288.6	$290.4	$286.6	$282.4	$278.2

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
New budget authority	$274.6	$270.1	$266.0	$261.1	$256.0
Outlays	$274.6	$270.1	$266.0	$261.1	$256.0

(s) Allowances (920):

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
New budget authority	$8.5	$0.4	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0
Outlays	$13.4	$−7.0	$2.0	$0.3	$0.1	$0.0

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
New budget authority	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0
Outlays	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0

(t) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
New budget authority	$−34.1	$−38.4	$−41.3	$−40.7	$−38.1	$−39.2
Outlays	$−34.1	$−38.4	$−41.3	$−40.7	$−38.1	$−39.2

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
New budget authority	$−40.2	$−41.6	$−42.5	$−43.4	$−44.8
Outlays	$−40.2	$−41.6	$−42.5	$−43.4	$−44.8

SEC. 104. RECONCILIATION DIRECTIVES; SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE SOLVENCY.

(a) SUBMISSION OF BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than June 22, 2000, the following House committees shall submit legislation changing current law within their jurisdictions to the House Committee on the Budget in the specified manner and amounts.

	2000	2001	2001–2005	2001–2010
Agriculture—increase outlays	$6.000	$0.676	$9.015	$23.365
Armed Services—increase outlays	0.000	0.437	5.400	16.324
Banking and Financial Services—decrease outlays	0.000	0.367	1.035	1.170
Commerce—increase outlays	0.000	2.270	48.983	193.696
Education and Welfare—decrease outlays	0.000	−0.001	0.040	0.128
Government Reform and Oversight—decrease revenues	0.000	0.071	0.473	1.157
Resources—decrease outlays	0.000	−0.026	0.057	0.230
Transportation and Infrastructure—decrease outlays	0.000	0.065	0.001	−0.159
Veterans' Affairs—increase outlays	0.000	0.259	0.548	0.568
Ways and Means—increase outlays	0.000	2.174	40.441	156.022
Ways and Means—decrease revenues	0.000	0.012	1.413	4.412

(b) POLICY ASSUMPTIONS.—(1) Within the framework of this budget resolution, which provides for the extension of the solvency of the social security and medicare trust funds, the policy of this resolution is that there shall be gross tax relief of $5.6 billion and net tax relief of $2.6 billion in 2001, gross tax relief of $77.8 billion and net tax relief of $50.0 billion over fiscal years 2001 through 2005, and gross tax relief of $263.3 billion and net tax relief of $201.0 billion over fiscal years 2001 through 2010, including by illustration and not limitation provisions that—

(A) mitigate the marriage penalty on middle-income families and the application of the individual alternative minimum tax to middle-income taxpayers;

(B) expand the earned income credit to mitigate the marriage penalty on low-income households and to increase the credit for families with three or more children;

(C) facilitate financing of school construction and renovation;

(D) increase credits and deductions of tuition for post-secondary education;

(E) expand deductions and credits for medical insurance and the cost of long-term care;

(F) provide patient protections contained in the Dingell-Norwood Patient's Bill of Rights Act;

(G) foster community redevelopment and combat urban sprawl;

(H) reduce estate taxes, especially on decedents owning small businesses and family farms;

(I) encourage and expand retirement savings accounts; and

(J) extend credits that promote employment opportunities for welfare beneficiaries and low-income workers.

(2) The resolution assumes that $7.0 billion over fiscal years 2001 through 2005 and $14.6 billion over fiscal years 2001 through 2010 of the revenues forgone as a result of these new tax provisions may be offset by reinstating Superfund taxes; $9.8 billion over fiscal years 2001 through 2005 and $24.2 billion over fiscal years 2001 through 2010 may be offset by repealing or restricting some of the unwarranted deductions, credits, exemptions, and exclusions whose repeal or restriction were proposed by the President in submission of his budget for fiscal year 2001; and $11.0 billion over fiscal years 2001 through 2005 and $23.5 billion over fiscal years 2001 through 2010 may be offset by provisions restricting abusive tax shelters and other provisions proposed by Mr. Rangel in the motion to recommit H.R. 3832.

(3) The resolution also assumes $40 billion over fiscal years 2001 through 2005 and $155 billion through fiscal year 2010 for a medicare prescription drug benefit and cost-sharing protections. The resolution assumes voluntary prescription drug coverage for all Americans age 65 or older, in which not less than 50 percent of the cost of the benefit, based on the price of the prescription drugs, is borne by the Government. Beneficiaries also will pay monthly premiums. Beneficiaries with annual incomes below 150 percent of poverty ($12,525 for a single person; $16,875 for a couple) will not pay premiums, and those with annual incomes below 135 percent of poverty ($11,273 for a single person; $15,188 for a couple) are protected from the plan's cost-sharing requirements.

(c) FLEXIBILITY FOR THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—If the reconciliation submission by the Committee on Ways and Means alters the Internal Revenue Code in ways that are scored by the Joint Committee on Taxation as outlay changes, as through legislation affecting refundable tax credits, the submission shall be considered to meet the revenue requirements of the reconciliation directive if the net cost of the revenue and outlay changes does not exceed the revenue amount set forth for that committee in subsection (a). Upon the submission of such legislation, the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget shall adjust the budget aggregates in this resolution and allocations made under this resolution accordingly.

(d) EXTENDING THE SOLVENCY OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE TRUST FUNDS.—

(1) The purpose of this subsection is to extend the solvency of Social Security by at least 15 years and to extend the solvency of Medicare by at least ten years.

(2) Not later than June 22, 2000, the Committee on Ways and Means shall submit legislation to the House Committee on the Budget providing for the annual transfer from the General Fund of the Treasury to the Hospital Insurance (Medicare Part A) Trust Fund of an amount equal to $300 billion from 2001 to 2010. Such funds shall be derived from the on-budget surplus over that ten-year period.

(3) Not later than June 22, 2000, the Committee on Ways and Means shall submit legislation to the House Committee on the Budget providing for the annual transfer from the General Fund of the Treasury to Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, starting in 2011, of an amount equal to the reduction in unified budget Net Interest outlays in 2010 below the level of unified budget Net Interest outlays in 2000. Under this resolution, that reduction is expected to equal $148.9 billion.

(4) Provisions of legislation that only carry out the requirements of paragraphs (2) or (3) shall not be considered extraneous to a reconciliation bill under section 313 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(e) REPORTING OF RECONCILIATION BILL.—After receiving the legislation submitted under subsections (a), (b), and (d), the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

SEC. 105. SOCIAL SECURITY LOCKBOX.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) under the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the social security trust funds are off budget for purposes of the President's budget

submission and the concurrent resolution on the budget;

(2) the social security trust funds have been running surpluses each year for seventeen years, and until this year, these surpluses have been borrowed to fund the operations of the Federal Government;

(3) this resolution balances the Federal budget without including the social security surpluses in each year from 2000 through 2010;

(4) balancing the Federal budget exclusive of the social security surplus will strengthen the Nation's financial condition so that it is better prepared to ensure the long-term solvency of the social security program.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any revision to this resolution or a concurrent resolution on the budget for any fiscal year between 2001 and 2010, or any amendment thereto, or conference report thereto, or any reported bill or joint resolution or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon that sets forth or causes an on-budget deficit for any fiscal year.

SEC. 106. ALLOCATIONS TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) TREATMENT OF OASDI ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—In addition to amounts in this resolution, allocations to the Committee on Appropriations shall include the following amounts, which are assumed to be used for the administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration, and those allocations shall be considered to be allocations made under section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974:

	2000	2001
New budget authority	$3.175	$3.400
Outlays	$3.202	$3.370

(b) SPECIAL ALLOCATION FOR LANDS LEGACY INITIATIVE.—

(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), $1.4 billion in discretionary new budget authority and $1.0 billion in discretionary outlays included in this resolution shall not be allocated to the Appropriations Committee for 2001.

(2) Prior to consideration by the House of Representatives or the Committee of the Whole of any appropriations measure, amendment, or motion providing $1.4 billion in new budget authority for 2001 for: Federal land acquisitions; conservation-related grants to states, tribes, and localities; and ocean and coastal conservation programs, the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget shall increase the allocation for 2001 of the House Committee on Appropriations by $1.4 billion in new budget authority and by the outlays flowing therefrom.

SEC. 107. APPLICABILITY OF ADJUSTMENTS.

Section 314(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall apply as though the adjustments described in sections 104(c) and 106(b) were adjustments under section 314(a) of that Act.

TITLE II—SENSE OF CONGRESS PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT CONGRESS AND PRESIDENT AGREE ON DISCRETIONARY CAPS BASED ON REALISTIC LEVELS.

It is the sense of Congress that Congress and the President adopt discretionary caps based on the levels set forth in this resolution in order to control spending, establish sound budgeting projections and policies, and avoid budgeting gimmicks.

SEC. 202. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ASSET BUILDING FOR THE WORKING POOR.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) 33 percent of all American households and 60 percent of African American households have no or negative financial assets;

(2) 46.9 percent of all children in America live in households with no financial assets, including 40 percent of Caucasian children and 75 percent of African American children;

(3) in order to provide low-income families with more tools for empowerment, incentives which encourage asset-building should be established;

(4) middle and upper income Americans currently benefit from tax incentives for building assets; and

(5) the Federal Government should utilize the Federal tax code to provide low-income Americans with incentives to work and build assets in order to escape poverty permanently.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the provisions of this concurrent resolution assume that Congress should modify the Federal tax law to include provisions which encourage low-income workers and their families to save for buying a first home, starting a business, obtaining an education, or taking other measures to prepare for the future.

SEC. 203. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ACCESS TO HEALTH INSURANCE AND PRESERVING HOME HEALTH SERVICES FOR ALL MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES.

(a) ACCESS TO HEALTH INSURANCE.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) 44.4 million Americans are currently without health insurance, and that this number is expected to rise to nearly 60 million people in the next 10 years;

(B) the cost of health insurance continues to rise, a key factor in increasing the number of uninsured; and

(C) there is a consensus that working Americans and their families will suffer from reduced access to health insurance.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON IMPROVING ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE INSURANCE.—It is the sense of Congress that access to affordable health care coverage for all Americans is a priority of the 106th Congress.

(b) PRESERVING HOME HEALTH SERVICE FOR ALL MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 reformed Medicare home health care spending by instructing the Health Care Financing Administration to implement a prospective payment system and instituted an interim payment system to achieve savings;

(B) the Medicare, Medicaid, and SCHIP Balanced Budget Refinement Act, 1999, reformed the interim payment system to increase reimbursements to low-cost providers and delayed the automatic 15 percent payment reduction until after the first year of the implementation of the prospective payment system; and

(C) patients whose care is more extensive and expensive than the typical Medicare patient do not receive supplemental payments in the interim payment system but will receive special protection in the home health care prospective payment system.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ACCESS TO HOME HEALTH CARE.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(A) home health care for seniors and disabled citizens is vitally important;

(B) Congress and the Administration should work together to maintain quality care for patients whose care is more extensive and expensive than the typical Medicare patient, including the sickest and frailest Medicare beneficiaries, while home health care agencies operate in the interim payment system; and

(C) Congress and the Administration should work together to avoid the imposition of the 15 percent reduction in the prospective payment system and ensure timely implementation of that system.

SEC. 204. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING MEDICARE+CHOICE PROGRAMS/REIMBURSEMENT RATES.

It is the sense of Congress that the Medicare+Choice regional disparity among reimbursement rates is unfair, and that full funding of the Medicare+Choice program is a priority as Congress deals with any medicare reform legislation.

SEC. 205. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE STABILIZATION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL PAYMENTS TO STATES, COUNTIES, AND BOROUGHS.

It is the sense of Congress that Federal revenue-sharing payments to States, counties, and boroughs pursuant to the Act of May 23, 1908 (35 Stat. 260; 16 U.S.C. 500), the Act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 963; 16 U.S.C. 500), the Act of August 28, 1937 (chapter 876; 50 Stat. 875; 43 U.S.C. 1181f), the Act of May 24, 1939 (chapter 144; 53 Stat. 753; 43 U.S.C. 1181f–1 et seq.), and sections 13982 and 13983 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 (Public Law 103–66; 16 U.S.C. 500 note; 43 U.S.C. 1181f note) should be stabilized and maintained for the long-term benefit of schools, roads, public services, and communities, and that providing such permanent, stable funding is a priority of the 106th Congress.

SEC. 206. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE IMPORTANCE OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress Finds that—

(1) Recognizing the importance of the National Science Foundation, during the Budget Committee markup, the Holt amendment was offered which would have increased budget authority by $675 million in fiscal year 2001 and by $3.9 billion over five years and increased outlays by $170 million in fiscal year 2001 and by $2.8 billion over five years in Function 250 (General Science, Space and Technology) to reflect greater funding for the National Science Foundation;

(2) recognizing the National Science Foundation's importance during the markup, the Committee accepted a modified Holt amendment which succeeded in increasing the Chairman's mark for Function 250 by $100,000,000 in budget authority for 2001;

(3) further recognizing the National Science Foundation's importance and the wisdom of the original Holt amendment, the Rules Committee approved a substitute which changed the budget resolution, as approved by the Budget Committee, to increase budget authority for the National Science Foundation by an additional $.5 billion in 2001 and $3.0 billion over five years and to increase outlays by $0.1 billion in fiscal year 2001 and by $2.2 billion over five years to reflect increased funding for the National Science Foundation;

(4) even with the increases approved in the Rules Committee substitute for function 250, the outlays levels in this Democratic concurrent budget resolution are still above the levels in the House Republican budget resolution, as modified by the Rules Committee substitute, by $200 million for fiscal year 2001 and $1.3 billion over five years (2001–2005);

(5) the National Science Foundation is the largest supporter of basic research in the Federal Government;

(6) the National Science Foundation is the second largest supporter of university-based research;

(7) research conducted by the grantees of the National Science Foundation has led to innovations that have dramatically improved the quality of life of all Americans;

(8) because basic research funded by the National Science Foundation is high-risk, cutting edge, fundamental, and may not produce tangible benefits for over a decade, the Federal Government is uniquely suited to support such research; and

(9) the National Science Foundation's focus on peer-reviewed, merit-based grants represents a model for research agencies across the Federal Government.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the function 250 discretionary levels assume an increase for National Science Foundation that is sufficient for it to continue its critical role in funding basic research, cultivating America's intellectual infrastructure, and leading to innovations that assure the Nation's economic future.

SEC. 207. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING SKILLED NURSING FACILITIES.

It is the sense of Congress that the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission should devote particular attention to the medicare skilled nursing benefit to determine if payment rates are sufficient to provide quality care and to determine if reforms in payment are required. If reforms are recommended, Congress should pass legislation expeditiously to assure quality skilled nursing care.

SEC. 208. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE IMPORTANCE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) all children deserve a high quality education, including children with disabilities;

(2) the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act provides that the Federal, State, and local governments are to share in the expense of educating children with disabilities and commits the Federal Government to pay up to 40 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure for children with disabilities; and

(3) the discretionary levels in this concurrent resolution for function 500 (Education) are above the levels in the House Republic Budget Resolution by $4,800,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 and by $20,600,000,000 over five years (fiscal years 2001 to 2005).

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the higher discretionary levels for function 500 (Education) in this budget resolution compared with the Republican resolution recognize the importance of special education by allowing Congress to provide sufficient increases for special education while also funding the President's other top educational priorities.

SEC. 209. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON A FEDERAL EMPLOYEE PAY RAISE.

It is the sense of Congress that the pay increase for Federal employees in January 2001 should be at least 3.7 percent.

SEC. 210. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING HCFA DRAFT GUIDELINES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) on February 15, 2000, the Health Care Financing Administration in the Department of Health and Human Services issued a draft Medicaid School-Based Administrative Claiming (MAC) Guide; and

(2) in its introduction, the stated purpose of the draft MAC guide is to provide information for schools, State medicaid agencies, HCFA staff, and other interested parties on the existing requirements for claiming Federal funds under the medicaid program for the costs of administrative activities, such as medicaid outreach, that are performed in the school setting associated with school-based health services programs.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) many school-based health programs provide a broad range of services that are covered by medicaid, affording access to care for children who otherwise might well go without needed services;

(2) such programs also can play a powerful role in identifying and enrolling children who are eligible for medicaid or for the State Children's Health Insurance programs;

(3) undue administrative burdens may be placed on school districts and States and deter timely application approval;

(4) the Health Care Financing Administration should substantially revise or abandon the current draft MAC guide because it appears to promulgate new rules that place excessive administrative burdens on participating school districts;

(5) the goal of the revised guide should be to encourage the appropriate use of Medicaid school-based services without undue administrative burdens; and

(6) the best way to ensure the continued viability of medicaid school-based services is to guarantee that the guidelines are fair and responsible.

SEC. 211. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CORPORATE WELFARE.

It is the sense of Congress that the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate should hold hearings on H.R. 3221, the Corporate Welfare Commission Act of 1999.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 446, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and a Member opposed each will control 20 minutes.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we have considered a number of budget resolutions today. Naturally I think the one we are now presenting is the best of the lot. I want to give the Members of the House five strong reasons that this resolution is the best of the lot.

First of all, prescription drug coverage, a gaping hole in Medicare for many years, we need to close it. We provide reconciliation instructions and $40 billion to the Committee on Ways and Means with the directive to do it. We provide seniors with prescription drug coverage.

Education, the difference between our resolution and the base resolution is clear and distinct, $20.5 billion more for education over the next 5 years.

Debt reduction. Our resolution would lead to debt reduction cumulative surpluses of $48 billion over the next 5 years, $364 billion over the next 10 years.

Social Security and Medicare solvency, the two are directly related. We extend the solvency of Social Security, and we extend the solvency of Medicare. The base bill does not.

Finally, the clear distinct and very important distinction, civilian and military retirement. We provide $16.5 billion to keep the promises we have made to military retirees, particularly those reaching the age of 65 who have not been able to use their Medicare benefits at military treatment facilities.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. WEYGAND), going to the first aid that I mentioned, prescription drugs, a distinct difference between us and the base bill.

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

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, Paul and Judy came to me about a year and a half ago. They were both retired. He was 70. She was 66. About 4 years ago, when they retired, they thought their small pension and their Social Security check would be enough for them. They both had open heart surgery. They both had high blood pressure problems.

Now, after 4 years of retirement, Paul is going back to work part time, and his wife is going back to work part time to pay for their $8,350 a year of prescription drugs. They need relief now.

There are seniors that are in New Jersey, California, Washington, Rhode Island, wherever it may be. There are seniors across this country that want relief now for prescription drugs.

☐ 2245

Our plan clearly does that. We reconcile it. We direct Ways and Means to come up with a plan. We put aside, truly, $40 billion over the next 5 years for prescription drug coverage. The Republican plan does not do that. It is elusive, it is smoke and mirrors, it puts it in a reserve fund that is dwindling as we speak today because of a $20 billion error in the way they reconciled their own bill.

Paul and Judy need that relief now, not smoke and mirrors. They need the Democrat alternative that truly addresses the problem, sets aside the money, and comes up with a solution now for Medicare. This takes leadership. This takes courage. This takes bringing us into the 21st century, rather than keeping us in the 20th century.

If we are to make a difference for our seniors, this is the way we can start today. This is a budget proposal that has teeth, has leadership, and will provide the seniors the kind of relief they need. If we are serious about this, no matter what side of the aisle we are on, this is the alternative and this is the plan that will get us to that solution.

I implore my colleagues, forget about the bias between one plan or the other, think about the people in our districts that are truly like Paul and Judy and resolve the prescription drug plan today with our alternative.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I want to applaud the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) on putting together a budget, but I want to talk about what the base budget does, the goals we are accomplishing here.

First, we are protecting 100 percent of the Social Security surplus. We protected Social Security last year, we are going to do it again, and we are going to do it ad infinitum. We are strengthening Medicare by adding a prescription drug benefit to it; $40 billion to Medicare. We are retiring the entire public debt by the year 2013. We are promoting tax fairness for families, farmers and seniors. We are restoring

America's defense capabilities. And we are strengthening support for education and science.

But I want to talk about Social Security. What are we doing on Social Security? Well, last year the President said on Social Security, let us take 38 percent out of the trust fund and spend it on other government programs and dedicate just 62 percent to Social Security. That was not good enough. And we countered last year by saying lock away 100 percent of Social Security funds for Social Security.

Guess what? That is what we achieved this year. This Congress achieved the stop on the raid of the Social Security Trust Fund for the first time in 30 years. That is what we are accomplishing here. The reforms in the underlying bill, in the budget resolution on Social Security are real reforms.

The reforms in the Spratt budget on Social Security, and on Medicare, for that matter, are phony reforms. They are simply nothing more than adding more paper IOUs to the Social Security and Medicare trust funds. It is kind of like having a credit card, but our income does not change. We do not get more money on our FICA taxes, we do not get more money on our paycheck; but our credit card limit goes up.

That is what the Spratt budget does for Social Security. It simply says increase the limit on the credit card, but do not increase the income to the beneficiary. It does not add one extra penny to Social Security or Medicare. It just transfers IOUs to the two programs to give us the illusion that we are reforming Social Security and Medicare. It lulls us into thinking we are actually making a difference in Social Security and Medicare. My fear is that it will delay the important reforms to Social Security and Medicare that we so dearly need.

Mr. Chairman, the underlying budget, the Republican budget resolution, is the serious plan. It is the plan that locks away Social Security for now and future generations. It is the plan that pays off the entire national public debt in 13 years, a trillion over the next 5 years. It is the plan that lets people continue to keep more of their hard-earned money if they still overpay their taxes. It is a plan that fixes our problems in education and science. It is the plan that puts money back into our vital national defense interests. It is the plan for America's future for the 21st century.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, no challenge faces our country like the challenge of education. We, in our budget resolution, rise to that challenge. We pay down the debt, we provide for tax cuts, but we also provide for priority spending on things like education, which we believe the American people want.

What is the difference between our resolution and the base bill? $20.5 billion more in our resolution for education.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), who was a college professor at Duke University before coming here; and to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY), who was a high school teacher before coming here, to talk about the difference between our resolution and the base bill.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and the gentleman is certainly correct that there is no greater area of contrast in these two budgets than in the area of education.

This is a time when we need to be renewing our commitment to public education, our investments in public education so it becomes an engine of opportunity for all of our people. And what do our Republican friends do? Well, they freeze most education programs for a period of 5 years in this budget. They have a small increase for special education, which is mainly budget authority that cannot be spent. It is a kind of a hollow promise. And then the rest of the education budget is basically frozen.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, one of the things we talk about all the time is how important education is. And what this budget does, the Democratic substitute, is actually put money where our mouths are. That is the most important investment we can make, is in our children.

One of the things I find ironic about the Republican budget is that they cut 40,000 children out of Head Start, for example. And yet all the research shows us that that is the vital age for children to learn, and it is so important for them to have a good start.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Reclaiming my time, the gentlewoman is absolutely correct.

If there were ever a successful program in getting children ready to learn it is Head Start. Why over the next 5 years we would want to actually cut that program escapes me.

Then we look at the other end of the educational spectrum, Pell grants, these cuts would require that 316,000 fewer students receive Pell grants.

Ms. HOOLEY or Oregon. If the gentleman will continue to yield, again this is one of those areas where we say that to succeed with the new technologies and the new kind of markets that we have, it is vitally important that we provide a higher education and some training, and yet again the Republican budget cuts 316,000 students out of the opportunity to go to college.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Again reclaiming my time, I would point out that, by contrast, our Democratic alternative makes room for as much or more for special education, that is, education for disabled and handicapped children. It lets us get going on school construction in low-income and high-growth areas with an innovative tax plan, and it lets us proceed to hire these 100,000 new teachers, skilled teachers to get class size down in the early grades.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. And the reason it is so important to hire 100,000 new teachers is because they are for kindergarten through third grade. And we know if children have smaller classroom sizes, they learn better and it follows them all the way through.

So let us put our money where our mouths are and vote for a budget that funds education.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE).

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

It is interesting. I would like to focus on this prescription drug benefit and Medicare benefit that the Democrats are now rushing in at the last minute and providing. Interestingly enough, Paul and Judy, just a few months ago, I would say to my friend, did not get squat from the President. Did not get squat. In fact, when the President came here, Paul and Judy did not get a prescription drug benefit.

The President promised that, but it did not start until the fourth year. And the ultimate is that Paul and Judy's hospital probably had to close because of the provider cuts that went in order to fund this so-called prescription drug benefit that the President put into his budget.

So what did the Democrats do at the last minute, last night? They rushed in and said, oh no, we cannot do that. So, me too, $40 billion, just like the Republicans put into their plan. And now they come in and say, but we have a reconciliation protection.

Do my colleagues know what that means? That means that the committee is instructed to do the work. But if it is not done, the Democrats can spend that $40 billion anywhere they want. The Republicans have a reserve fund for their $40 billion. It has to be spent for Medicare reform with a prescription drug benefit.

Those are the facts. They can run as fast as they want from the President's budget, but the President did not provide a prescription drug benefit that was real. It included provider cuts that were real. And now they run from that, but they run in here with a weaker proposal.

Let us support the Republican plan that gives Paul and Judy and the people across this country the opportunity to have a real prescription drug benefit and a real Medicare reform that not only makes sure that prescription drug benefits are available but makes sure that our hospitals and our doctors and our health care providers are able to keep giving them quality health care.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to tell my colleagues that the third thing we would emphasize about our budget is debt reduction; that we provide for a Medicare prescription drug benefit; that we provide $20.5 billion more for education, but we also reduce spending and we save $48 billion in cumulative surpluses over the next 5 years. $364 billion.

This side has said repeatedly they are paying the debt down by $1 trillion. So are we. We are all going to use the Social Security surplus, $976 million over the next 5 years, to pay down debt held by the public. But we have $48 billion more in debt reduction over the next 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) to talk about the difference between our budget and the base budget when it comes to debt reduction.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, there is a big difference between the Republican and the Democratic budgets, and one of those big differences is the amount of debt that is paid down. The Republican budget does not use one cent of the on-budget surplus to pay down the national debt, whereas the Democratic budget uses 40 percent of the projected on-budget surplus to pay down the national debt, on top of the Social Security surplus, which both budgets, to be honest, propose paying down the debt.

But then there is a key difference as well, and that is that the Republican budget is predicated on unsustainable cuts in domestic discretionary spending that the Republican Congresses themselves, since 1995, have failed to make.

The Congressional Budget Office, in its most recent report, found that the Republican Congresses had increased nondefense discretionary spending above the rate of inflation, which is contrary to what they have in their budget. Therefore, combined with the trillion dollar tax cut that is in here, the Republican budget would end up not only eating through the on-budget surplus but would also go into the Social Security surplus. So, actually, they are paying down far less debt than what we propose in the Democratic budget.

I am glad, quite frankly, that the Republicans have come around to this way. When we had the budget markup last year, I proposed we dedicate all the surplus, both on-budget and off-budget to paying down the debt, and I was told that was not a good idea. And in 1998, the Republicans proposed using, I think it was either 10 or 20 percent of the Social Security surplus for a tax cut and then dedicating the rest of it.

It is a little bit like a tent meeting and everybody has gone and gotten religion now and they have come back and they want to pay down the debt. But the bottom line, when we compare the two, the Democrats pay down far more than the Republicans in debt.

☐ 2300

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

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, let us be clear about where we really were a year ago and who was making statements about setting aside the surplus, setting aside 100 percent of the Social Security Trust Fund surplus. It cannot possibly be more clear.

The President's budget, which we had a vote on on this very House floor, only received two votes because he was spending 38 percent of the Social Security surplus. And it was the Republican budget that, for the first time ever set aside every penny of the Social Security surplus. This year we are going to do it again for a historic third year in a row, set aside every penny of the Social Security surplus, create a reserve fund for Medicare, not just prescription drug coverage, but honest reforms, as well.

We are going to retire a historic level of the public debt, a trillion dollars over 5 years; promote a much fairer Tax Code; and make essential investments in defense, in veterans' health care, and in education.

But the previous speaker spoke a little bit about retiring debt, and they are talking about this budget being reckless. Well, let us take a look and see how reckless this budget is and how reckless Republican budgets of the past several years have been, paying down over $50 billion in debt 2 years ago, 1998; in 1999, paying down over $80 billion of the public debt.

Fiscal Year 2000, we are in the midst of it, we will pay down over $160 billion in debt. And in the budget we have brought to the floor here today, we are paying down over $170 billion in debt. $450 billion in debt retirement. And this is what the other side would term ''reckless''?

I do not think this is reckless. This is historic. This is an unprecedented commitment to paying down debt. A trillion dollars in debt relief over 5 years in this very budget. This is reckless? I do not think this is reckless. This is an historic commitment to reducing public debt. And that means lower interest rates for every American on home mortgages and car loans and student loans.

One to two percent lower interest rates on $100,000 home mortgage is $10,000 or $20,000 over a 20-year mortgage, $30,000 over a 30-year mortgage, money that never has to get sent to Washington, that the electorate never has to ask for us to return it back to them because we are in a charitable mood.

Lowering interest rates, tens of thousands of dollars of savings for average American families. I do not think this is reckless at all.

I think, instead, it is reckless to oppose tax fairness as the Democrat proposal has done; to oppose eliminating the marriage penalty; to oppose giving individuals health insurance deductibilities so that they can have a fair playing field with large corporations, that is reckless; to oppose repealing the Social Security earnings limit; to oppose expanding opportunities for retirement savings or education savings. That is reckless when we want to trap a family into leaving their child in a family school.

This is a budget of responsibility. It sets the right tone on debt retirement and it strengthens our country.

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

Mr. Chairman, there is a very significant difference between our bill and the base bill. We have something in our bill that there is no semblance of in the base bill, and that is $16.3 billion to provide for military retirees' health care at military treatment facilities.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, there are two groups I want to talk about. It is easy to beat up on Federal employees. After all, we are their bosses and they really cannot fight back. And maybe that is why they have had to contribute over $200 billion in the last few years toward deficit reduction. But at 3 a.m. last night, it was decided to require Federal employees to pay another $1.2 billion toward their retirement costs.

But worse than the way we treat Federal employees is the way we treat military retirees in this bill. It is wrong. We have brochures that are as current as 1991 that promise free lifetime quality health care if they will contribute 20 years of their life serving their country, defending their country.

And they took that promise. And now when they turn 65, they are out in the cold, no health care coverage, they get at the back of the line.

Well, the Democratic budget brings them in from the cold, provides full Medicare coverage, provides the same kind of prescription drug coverage that we provide enlisted personnel and their families.

I have got to tell my colleagues, if they vote for the Republican budget, they had better be willing to look in the face of our military retirees and explain why a politically appealing tax cut was more important than keeping their promise to them.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am a combat veteran and a veteran. I support the Republican budget, and so do other veterans.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

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

Mr. Chairman, we have heard all throughout the day and actually for several years now this recurring theme from the people on the other side about reckless, exploding, risky tax cuts for the rich.

Well, let us talk about the tax relief that is in our bill and let us let the American people decide just how risky or reckless and how much this really is for the rich.

We are talking about ending the marriage penalty tax. We believe fundamentally it is wrong to say they ought to pay extra taxes just because they have a marriage license. We think that is wrong.

We think it is wrong that Social Security recipients have this earnings limit and have to pay among the highest tax rates of any working people in America.

We think it is wrong that families have to visit the IRS and the undertaker in the same week.

We think it is wrong that we have a confiscatory tax of 55 percent on estates we have been paying taxes every year.

We think it is wrong that we are not making it easier for expanded education savings accounts. We want to increase the health care deductibility for self-employed for farmers, small business people.

We want to provide tax relief and breaks for poor communities. And we want to strengthen private pension plans.

Now, if those are tax cuts for the rich, if those are risky schemes, well, then let us have more of it.

Let us compare our plan to the Clinton-Gore plan. In the first year, the Clinton-Gore plan actually increases net taxes by $10 billion. We provide $10 billion of tax relief.

If we look at over 5 years, we are talking at least $200 billion in tax relief. We hope to increase that as additional surpluses go up. The President provides $5 billion in tax relief for the first 5 years.

This is not a risky plan. This is a common sense plan. But it is really a debate between those who believe in tax relief for working families; and ultimately, at the end of the day, it is a debate between two world views. It is a debate between those who believe that we know best and can spend the people's money smarter than they can and those of us who believe that they know best and they can spend their own money smarter than we can.

This is a common sense budget. The tax relief that is contained in this budget is really common sense. I think once the American people understand it is not just about numbers, it is about basic fairness.

I would ask my colleagues on the other side which of these tax relief provisions do they want to take away, the marriage penalty tax, the death tax, education savings accounts, health care deductibility, community renewal, or pension reform? Which of those is so unfair? How do they benefit the rich?

They are going to have to answer those questions if they vote against this budget. Because it is a common sense budget and the tax relief that is contained in here is common sense.

I think once the American people understand what we have put into this bill, they will demand the Republican budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the fifth point that we would make about our budget as opposed to the base budget deals with Social Security and Medicare.

There is a distinct difference, indeed there is a chronic difference, between the way we deal with Social Security and Medicare and the way they deal with it.

First of all, our budget protects, preserves, and defends the Social Security Trust Fund. Over the next 5 years, we are going to rack up $48 billion in surpluses under our budget. What do these ensure? They ensure that the Social Security Trust Fund will remain intact and untouched.

The Republican resolution, on the other hand, puts the budget back in the danger zone, on thin ice, close to the edge.

We have been talking about this chart all day long. The numbers can be argued over, but we have run the numbers different ways and the chart stands uncontradicted.

☐ 2310

To begin with, to do what they propose, to achieve this surplus that they claim of $17 billion, $110 billion over the next 5 years, they have got to do $117 billion in real reduction in discretionary spending over the next 5 years. That has not been done over the last 10 when we had deficits. It is not likely to be done over the next 5. And if it is not done, if that assumption is not met, the budget is back in the red again. It is that simple.

Secondly, even if that unlikely assumption were somehow met, if you claim a drug benefit for Medicare which you have got on all your posters, if you claim it, you have got to count the cost of it. That is $40 billion. And if you claim that you are going to do a $200 billion tax cut, then you have got to calculate in your calculation of the surplus the $200 billion tax cut.

And when you put the $40 billion for Medicare prescription drugs and the $200 billion tax cut over 5 years into this budget, the surplus is wiped out in 2003 and you are in the red, back into Social Security in 2004 and 2005. Our budget stays out of Social Security, it stays in the black; it has a $48 billion cushion over that 5-year period of time. That is the first reason ours is better for Social Security.

By the way, we would also buy back Treasury bonds. With the surplus built up in Social Security, we would pay down debt held by the public. We will pay down $976 million of debt just as you will with your proposal, so long as you stay out of Social Security; and over 10 years we will pay down $2.3 trillion in debt, and by the year 2013 we will wipe out the public debt if we abide by the budget that we are proposing.

Now, there is a second, more important, reason that our budget is better for Social Security, Medicare and distinctly different from the base budget. The Republican budget does not add a dime to Social Security or Medicare over the next 5 years or 1 day to the solvency of either program. Over the next 10 years, our budget contributes $300 billion out of the surpluses that we will accumulate. It takes $300 billion from the general fund and puts that money into the Medicare trust fund.

I have heard this talk over here about IOUs. If anybody has a government bond lying around that is an IOU and he would like to put it somewhere, I will be glad to receive it. It has a lot of value to it. It gives you secured status. We are going to put $300 billion in government bonds into the Medicare trust fund paid for, a net addition to national savings out of the general fund. And in 2011, we propose to calculate how much we have saved in the way of debt service on the last year and take that amount of money and transfer it into the Social Security Trust Fund. As a result, we extend the solvency of Medicare by 10 years and the solvency of Social Security by 15 years. These are profound differences and good reasons to vote for our substitute over the base bill.

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 seconds to point out that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle had 40 years to spend the Social Security surplus and this side of the aisle ended that practice. In the very footnotes of the chart just referred to, Democrats admitted they interpolated and they extrapolated to get their figures. In other words, they guessed.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) from the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the base budget bill. As one of the few classroom teachers in this body, who ran a chapter 1 program for 3 years in an urban school district, I am strongly in favor of this budget because of what it does for education. We focus on teachers. We focus on kids. We do not focus on bureaucracy. I am proud of what this budget does in terms of Social Security and Medicare, what it does to pay down the public debt. But I am most proud of what this budget and what this part of the Congress and the House has done for our defense.

The other side talks about rebuilding our defense. Over the past 5 years, Mr.

Chairman, it has been this side who has increased defense spending by $43.1 billion over the President's request. Even the former Clinton Secretary of Defense, Bill Perry, just 2 months ago acknowledged if we had not done that, we would be in a devastating position right now as this President tries to recapture a $15 billion increase and that is not enough.

This President has committed our troops to deployments 34 times in 8 years, versus 10 times in the previous 40 years. None of those 34 deployments were budgeted for. All the money for those deployments came out of an already decreasing defense budget. Our morale has never been lower. Our retention rates for pilots in the Air Force and Navy is hovering at 15 percent. Our ability to recruit young people, except for the Marine Corps, is going unmet by all the services. We are sending aircraft carriers into harm's way with five and 600 sailors short.

We have military personnel on food stamps. That is the legacy of this administration even though we have increased defense spending by $43 billion over the past 5 years. This budget reinvests in defense and makes a commitment to our military. But it does something else, Mr. Chairman, that no one has talked about tonight in any of the budgets and is not even mentioned in the budget that my good friend and colleague is offering tonight on behalf of the minority.

We talk about police and both budgets spend billions of dollars on law enforcement. We buy vests for police. We talk about teachers; 100,000 new teachers. What does your budget do for the 1.2 million men and women who are domestic defenders, our fire and emergency services personnel? What statement does your budget make about the 32,000 fire and EMS departments that have responded to every flood, every tornado, every earthquake, every disaster our country has? Your budget has zilch, zero, nada, nothing. Our budget for the first time ever recognizes the brave heroes of America who respond to our domestic problems, the 1.2 million men and women, 85 percent of whom are volunteers, in every one of your congressional districts, that day in and day out supports the job of protecting our American people. Even though we lose 100 of these people a year, you say nothing. We provide support for them.

For that reason, I say vote for the Republican base budget bill.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself enough time to answer one question the gentleman put to me with respect to fire personnel and emergency personnel. This budget, the base budget, cuts FEMA, the account in which FEMA is included, function 450, by $2.8 billion between this year and next year, and over 5 years by $18.3 billion. That is what you are cutting out of function Community and Regional Development.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRATT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would know anything about FEMA, none of that money goes to local fire and emergency response. None of it. Not one dime of it. The gentleman needs to get his facts straight.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 90 seconds to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

(Mrs. CLAYTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, the Democratic budget does many things. It is both prudent and caring. Certainly it pays down the debt by the year 2013 and certainly it protects Medicare, it protects Social Security; and yes, it does a sufficient amount of investment in our military and our retirees who have served our country well. But in addition to that, it invests in education. It also does something that the Republican budget does not do. It cares about its most vulnerable people, those people who are left out of the bountiful plenty of prosperity that we are enjoying. It cares about legal immigrants. It cares about the poorest of the poor trying to get day care going to work. It invests in after-school programs. It invests and brings up the shelter and provision caps for food stamps. It makes it even for all States.

Not only is the Democratic budget a prudent one, but it says American prosperity should be for everyone. I invite my colleagues to make sure that everybody is included in this prosperity. The Democratic budget does that.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my great friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA).

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, what does the Republican budget mean for you and your family? It means a debt-free Nation for our children. In education it means more dollars for our classrooms and more dollars for our children instead of dollars for bureaucracy and redtape.

□ 2320

The distinction could not be more clear. The Democratic alternative wants to force on our local schools programs and mandates that do not work. They want to build our schools, hire our teachers, buy the technology, feed our kids breakfast, dictate the curriculum, teach our kids about sex, teach them about drugs, teach them about art, feed our kids lunch, and then they want to test them. Other than that, they believe in local control.

And then they are going to move all of those programs and move those decisions for each one of those areas into a department in Washington that for 2 years has failed its financial audits, has told the American people give us $35 billion per year, but we are not going to take the time or the energy to be able to account where that money is spent. That is wrong.

The alternative is providing resources to local schools to tailor solutions to meet the needs of our local school districts, to meet their particular needs, a vision that gives decision-making and discretion to local administrators, to parents and teachers, the people that know our kids' names and know their needs. The differences could not be clearer.

Are we going to move decision-making to the Department of Education here in Washington, or are we going to leave the decision-making at the local level? It is time to support the Republican budget. It increases spending and investment in education, but it preserves and builds educational excellence through local decision-making, not through decision-making based here in Washington.

Support this budget. It is the right thing to do. It builds on what we know works and walks away from that which we know that does not work.

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

I ask the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) if I could borrow one of his charts.

This is the chart I wanted to hold and borrow, because I think throughout this debate the gentleman sort of indirectly unwittingly complimented us. The only thing the gentleman got wrong on this whole chart is a GOP plan, because if the gentleman goes down the items on this chart, the gentleman will see that our budget resolution does everything the gentleman says, except we do it better.

It protects 100 percent of the Social Security surplus. I just explained that. We have a $48 billion cushion that keeps you out of Social Security, strengthens Medicare with prescription drugs. We have reconciliation. We do not say report a bill that has structure reforms and then you can have the $40 billion. We say just do prescription drugs, get it done. Retire the public debt by 2013, we do it. Promote tax fairness, give us a break. We have got a $50 billion net tax cut. Read the language of it.

We have the AMT correction in it. We have mitigation of the marital penalty in it. We have deductibility of college tuition in it. We have tax fairness and tax relief for families. Restore America's defense? Come on. There is one-tenth of 1 percent over the 5 years difference between what the gentleman is providing for defense than what we are providing for defense.

Add in the $16.3 billion that we are providing for retiree health care, and we are way ahead of the gentleman. Finally, strength and support for education and science. We match you in science. And we are $20.5 billion ahead of you in education. You ought to vote for us.

I rest my case and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Ohio has 3 minutes remaining to close.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to make sure we have another one of these charts made so we can present it to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) tomorrow.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP) for his closing comments.

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

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding the time. It is an honor to come and close this debate today. I know later tonight as we close up this great debate on the budget this year that we are going to give proper recognition to the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman KASICH), but I think over the last 15 years, as many have labored in the fields for a more responsible approach on the Federal level, there is not a person in the United States Congress that deserves more credit for bringing us to a balanced budget than the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH).

He is a genuine man, and everyone in this institution I think respects and appreciates the gentleman. Do not take too much of my time. We are going to do this again a little later on. We are going to do that again.

I admire the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), but I have to tell you, I spent the first half of my life as a Democrat for 20 years. And I spent the second half of my life as a Republican, and I joined the Republican party in 1980 because I felt like the Federal Government was growing too big and out of control in some respects, and we needed to restore more accountability to Washington, D.C.

I would say as a member of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations that this majority has hit its stride in balance, fairness. And I think this budget is the best product that we have come up with in the 5½ years that we have had an opportunity to present our way.

My 13-year-old son is in the Chamber tonight. He will be 13 Sunday. And I really believe that this issue, I have heard reckless tax cuts all night long, but let me tell you when I was in born in 1957, the American people paid less than 10 percent to the Government at all level combined. And today it is almost half.

When my son is at my age, at the current pace, three-fourths of what he makes is going to go to the Government at some level, and that is reckless. That is the truth.

We need to bring more accountability to this process of where we are going to restrain government growth. That is what this budget does. Greenspan knows it. He says it, the economy is the goose laying its golden egg. And we have to restrain the growth of spending.

The Democratic substitute here actually grows discretionary spending at twice inflation. We cannot continue to do that. Tax fairness, ladies and gentlemen, time has come, and Democrats and Republicans are agreeing that we need to reduce the tax burden on working families in this country. And I am proud of this budget, because it is fair and reasonable.

I come from sort of the center here to say that it is time that we all come together around this budget, live within our means, fuel the economy, save Social Security, protect 100 percent of it, strengthen Medicare, do all we can with that prescription drug benefit, retire that public debt in a bipartisan way, give some tax relief to the American families while we can. If we do not do it now, with unprecedented surpluses, we will never do it. We have to do it now. Let us come together.

Yes, we are not restoring America's defense. We need to do more, I say to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT). We need do a lot more, because we got people spread all over the world overdeployed, underpaid, ill-equipped. We need to do more, but a billion dollars is at least a step in the right direction and invest in education and science.

Let us pass this budget tonight.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Democratic substitute to the budget resolution.

I want to commend the ranking member, Mr. SPRATT for working to make the Democratic substitute a plan that pays down the debt, protects the future of Social Security and Medicare, and helps our low-income families.

During this period of economic good times, it may be difficult to comprehend that across America, 28 percent of families with three or more children are living in poverty.

But the fact is, poverty rates for families with three or more children are much higher than for smaller families.

By providing them with an increased tax credit, this expansion of the EITC for families with three or more children recognizes the economic difficulties of raising a large family today.

Expanding the earned income tax credit for these larger families is a common-sense tax policy; a policy that will directly benefit 7.7 million kids whose hard-working parents are struggling to climb the economic ladder out of poverty.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, today we have a choice between the Republican budget, which gambles away the surplus on risky tax cuts and jeopardizes crucial programs such as Social Security and Medicare, or the Democratic substitute, which protects these programs and gives a boost to millions of hard-working American families.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the Democratic substitute and invest in the future of all Americans.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, as the Ranking Democrat on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I rise to express my strong support for the substitute budget resolution offered by the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. SPRATT, the Ranking Democratic Member of our House Budget Committee. The Spratt budget resolution for fiscal year 2001 is a strong pro-veteran proposal. It deserves the support of every Member of the House.

The budget authored by Congressman SPRATT provides more discretionary spending in fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) than either the budget proposed by the President or the budget resolution reported by the Committee. With these additional funds, VA can better meet the medical care needs of our nation's aging veterans population. Specifically for fiscal year 2001, the Spratt alternative provides $22.3 billion in appropriations for veterans' programs, $100 million more than the Republican plan and $200 million more than the President's request. Over five years (2001–2005), the Spratt alternative provides $1 billion more than the Republican proposal.

Significantly, the Spratt proposal also increases the basic monthly education benefit veterans will receive under the Montgomery GI Bill (MGIB). Educational benefits provided under the MGIB are mandatory spending. This increase in the basic monthly education benefit for veterans who have honorably served our nation in uniform and then pursue post-secondary education is an important first step in restoring our commitment to provide veterans a readjustment benefit for education which is worthy of their service to our nation.

Under the Spratt proposal the basic educational benefit for veterans will increase from the current $536 per month for 36 months to nearly $700 per month. This is a well-deserved and much needed 25 percent increase in MGIB education readjustment benefit for veterans. As the gentleman from South Carolina knows, I believe the MGIB benefit should be increased more than has been proposed in the resolution which he has authored. This proposed increase, however, is a strong, positive step to achieving the goal of providing a more meaningful education benefit for our nation's veterans than is provided today.

MIGB enhancements are long overdue. I strongly agree with the report of the Congressional Commission on Servicemembers and Veterans Transition Assistance, which concluded ". . . an opportunity to obtain the best education for which they qualify is the most valuable benefit our Nation can offer the men and women whose military service preserves our liberty." I applaud the Commission's bold, new plan for the MGIB. This proposal, however, must be further strengthened and enhanced if the MGIB is to fulfill its purposes as a meaningful readjustment benefit and as an effective recruitment incentive for our Armed Forces. Since the implementation of the Montgomery GI Bill on July 1, 1985, there have been significant economic and societal changes in America that mandate revisions in the structure and benefit level of this program.

In the House, MGIB legislation has been introduced by Mr. STUMP, Chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, and together with Mr. DINGELL, I introduced my own bill, H.R. 1071, the Montgomery GI Bill Improvements Act of 1999, to provide benefits for two tiers of service members, those who enlist for a minimum of 4 years (Tier I) and those who enlist for less than 4 years (Tier II). Benefits for Tier I would pay for full cost of tuition, fees, books and supplies, plus provide a subsistence allowance of $800 per month of full-time college studies for up to 36 months. Tier II would increase the basic benefit under the MGIB to $900 per month.

According to an analysis performed by the Congressional Research Service last year, the mean earnings of workers 18 years or older in 1998 were $23,320 for high school graduates, $27,618 for those with some college or an Associate's degree and $43,255 for those with a Bachelor's degree. The analysis then calculated the average federal income tax for these workers, using 1999 tax rates for single taxpayers, and using the standard deduction of $4,300 and the personal exemption of $2,750. These figures are listed in the table below.

This information confirms our common sense understanding of the importance of education. Education is of benefit to individual servicemembers and veterans and to American society in general. Servicemembers and veterans who have earned through their honorable military service a meaningful readjustment benefit which provides the opportunity to obtain a higher education will be more productive, earn more and based on their increased earnings pay higher taxes.

	High school graduate	Some college or associate's degree	Bachelor's degree only
Average Annual Earnings	$23,320	$27,618	$43,255
Average Federal Income Tax	2,441	3,086	6,796

The economic impacts are compelling. Servicemembers and veterans who attain a Bachelor's degree pay back 36 percent more in federal tax revenues each year. If the policy rationale for an MGIB benefit increase is not a strong enough argument on its own, it is obvious that an increase would, in essence, be self-funded as well. These calculations, unfortunately, are not given commensurate weight when Congress evaluates cost under pay-as-you-go requirements.

As illustrated by the Congressional Research Service, the amount of education that individuals receive has an important influence on their experience in the labor market. For example, those who have completed more years of schooling typically experience less unemployment than other workers do. In addition, workers' earnings generally increase as their level of education increases. These relationships have held up over time, and in some instances, have intensified. Workers with a bachelor's degree are much better off today, compared to less-educated workers, than they were some two decades ago. The average male college graduate earned about 50 percent more than the average male high school graduate during the latter half of the 1970s. In contrast, the premium paid to males with college degrees in 1998 was 92 percent. The average wage advantage of female college graduates over female high school graduates grew from about 41 to 76 percent.

Of immediate concern is the ineffectiveness of the MGIB as a readjustment program for servicemembers making the transition from military service to a civilian society and workforce. While costs of higher education have soared, nearly doubling since 1980. GI Bill benefits have not kept pace. In fact, during the 1995–96 school year, the basic benefit paid under the MGIB offset only a paltry 36 percent of average total education costs. A disappointingly low usage rate of 51 percent for 1998 confirms the inadequacy of the current program's benefit levels.

Young men and women who serve in our Armed Forces have the option of enrolling in the MGIB when they enter the military. This includes their agreement to a $100 per month pay reduction during the first twelve months of service, for a total contribution of $1,200. Once their initial term of service has been honorably served, a veteran is eligible to receive the basic monthly educational benefit of $536 each month he or she is enrolled in full-time college study. The benefit continues for up to 36 months. Assuming he or she is enrolled for a typical nine-month academic year, the veteran's total benefit for that year is $4,824. With this modest amount he or she is expected to pay for tuition, fees, room and board.

The average annual cost of tuition and basic expenses at a four-year public college is $8,774 for commuter students and $10,909 for students who live on campus according to the College Board. Not surprisingly, the same annual costs for four-year private colleges are even higher: $20,500 for commuter students and $23,651 for residents. The disparity between these ever-increasing costs and a veteran's ability to pay for them is clear. This disparity recently prompted key military and veteran organizations to join together with organizations representing colleges to form the ''Partnership for Veterans' Education.'' The coalition launched an energetic campaign calling for Congress to at least increase the basic benefit under the MGIB to $975 per month, enough to cover the $8,774 average annual cost of attending a four-year public college as a commuter student.

HIGHER EDUCATION ANNUAL COSTS: 1999–2000 SCHOOL YEAR

	4 year private institutions resident students	4 year private institutions commuter students	4 year public institution resident students	4 year public institution commuter students
Tuition and Fees	$15,380	$15,380	$3,356	$3,356
Books and Supplies	700	700	681	681
Room and Board	5,959		4,730	
Board Only		2,324		2,213
Transportation	558	907	658	1,005
Other	1,054	1,189	1,484	1,519
Annual Cost	23,651	20,500	10,909	8,774
Per Month Cost for Nine Months	2,628	2,278	1,212	975
Four Year Cost (36 months)	94,604	82,000	43,636	35,096
Current Benefit (36 months)	19,296	19,296	19,296	19,296
Current Benefit Percent of Cost	0.20397	0.23532	0.4422	0.5498062

Source: Trends in College Pricing, The College Board, 1999.

In addition to inadequate benefit levels, the unsatisfactory usage rate is also a result of the inflexible structure of the present program. Under today's law, benefits are generally paid only on a monthly basis and may not be used for specialized courses, such as computer training; provided by for-profit and nonprofit entities that do not meet the current definition of ''educational institution.'' As a result, veterans' education and training choices are limited, and they are not permitted to use their GI Bill benefits if they want to take advantage of the many excellent technology-related courses sponsored by companies like Microsoft or Novell. This is precisely the type of training that is important now and will be even more important in the future.

The current structure of the MGIB served the veterans during the second half of the 20th century very well. However, the MGIB must now be re-examined in the context of a January, 1999 report by the Departments of Commerce, Labor, and Education, the Small Business Administration, and the National Institute for Literacy. This report, entitled ''21st Century Skills for 21st Century Jobs,'' has important implications for veterans entering the civilian workforce. Emphasizing the importance to the nation of investing in education and training, the report concluded changes in the economy and workplace are requiring greater levels of skill and education than ever before. It predicted eight of the ten fastest growing jobs in the next decade will require college education or moderate to long-term training, and jobs requiring a bachelor's degree will increase by 25 percent. The report also noted workers with more education enjoy greater benefits, experience less unemployment and, if dislocated, re-enter the labor force far more quickly than individuals with less education. It also reports that, on average, college graduates earn 77 percent more than individuals with only a high school diploma. If America's veterans are to successfully compete in the challenging 21st century workforce, they simply have to have the ability to obtain the education and training critical to their success. As noted by the Transition Commission, ''. . . education will be the key to employment in the information age.'' Although the current GI Bill provides some degree of assistance, it is a key that opens very few doors, and it is my belief that all the doors of educational opportunity must be open to our veterans.

According to the 1997 Department of Defense report entitled ''Population Representation in the Military Services,'' 20 percent of the new enlisted recruits for that year were African American, 10 percent were Hispanic, 6 percent were other minorities, including Native Americans, Asians, and Pacific Islanders, and 18 percent were women. The report further notes that, although members of the military come from backgrounds somewhat lower in socioeconomic status than the U.S. average, these young men and women have higher levels of education, measured aptitudes, and reading skills than their civilian counterparts. These young people, most of whom do not enter military service with financial or socioeconomic advantages, have enormous potential, and it is in the best interests of the nation they be given every opportunity to achieve their highest potential. Access to education is the key to achieving that potential. It is also important to remember that, through the sacrifices required of them through their military service, this group of young Americans—more than any other—earns the benefits provided for them by a grateful nation.

Of equal concern to me as a member of the Armed Services Committee is the MGIB's failure to fulfill its purpose as a recruitment incentive for the Armed Forces. Findings of the 1998 Youth Attitude Tracking Study (YATS) confirm that recruiters are faced with serious challenges, and these challenges are likely to continue. This survey of young men and women, conducted annually by the Department of Defense, provides information on the propensity, attitudes and motivations of young people toward military service. The latest YATS shows the propensity to enlist among young males has fallen from 34 percent in 1991 to 26 percent in 1998, in spite of a generally favorable view of the military. In addition to a thriving civilian economy, which inevitably results in recruiting challenges, the percentage of American youth going to college is increasing and the young people most likely to go to college express little interest in joining our Armed Forces. Interestingly, these same youth note that if they were to serve in the military, their primary reason for enlisting would be to earn educational assistance benefits.

The study concluded the propensity to enlist is substantially below pre-drawdown levels and, as result, the services would probably not succeed in recruiting the number of young, high-ability young men and women they needed in FY 1999. High-ability youth, defined as those who have a high school diploma and who have at least average scores on tests measuring mathematical and verbal skills. The Department of Defense tells us about 80 percent of these recruits will complete their first three years of active duty while only 50 percent of recruits with a GED will complete their enlistment. GAO notes that it costs at least $35,000 to replace a recruit who leaves the service prematurely. The report states these findings underscore the need for education benefits that will attract college-bound youth who need money for school, a segment of American young people we conclude are now opting to take advantage of the many other sources of federal education assistance. The current structure and benefit level of the MGIB must be significantly amended if these high quality young men and women are to be attracted to service in our Armed Forces.

The Army missed its enlistment goals in FY 1998 and 1999. Additionally, for the first time since 1979, the Air Force missed its goal in FY 1999, and will likely miss again this year. Although the Navy and Marine Corps are currently meeting their objectives, it is getting more difficult each year. The continuing recruiting and retention challenges necessitate our taking quick and effective action. Even though the Army and Navy are recruiting more GED holders than in the early 1990s, all Services are meeting or exceeding the DoD recruit quality benchmarks of 90 percent high school diploma graduates and 60 percent scoring above average on the enlistment test. But this quality does not come inexpensively. The Services have increased their enlistment bonus and advertising budgets and added additional recruiters to meet the challenge. The cost to recruit has grown by over 50 percent in just the last five years.

Percent of Objective

Service	1998			1999		
	Actual	Objective	Percent	Actual	Objective	Percent
Army	71.8	72.6	99	68.2	74.5	92
Navy	48.4	55.3	88	52.6	52.5	100
Marine Corps	34.3	34.3	100	33.7	33.7	100
Air Force	31.7	30.2	105	32.7	34.4	94
DoD Total	186.2	192.3	97	187.2	195.1	96

Many factors have come together to create what may soon become a recruiting emergency. First, our thriving national economy is generating employment opportunities for our young people. Additionally, young Americans increasingly understand a college education as the key to success and prosperity. In 1980, 74 percent of high school graduates went to college but, by 1992, that percentage has risen to 81 percent and is increasing. As a result, the military must compete head-to-head with colleges for high-ability youth. As I have mentioned already, the percentage of young Americans who are interested in serving in the Armed Forces is also shrinking. Make no mistake about it—the strength of our Armed Forces begins and ends with the men and women who serve our nation. Just as education is the key to a society's success or failure, it is also key to the quality and effectiveness of our military forces—and the MGIB increases included in this substitute budget resolution are a step in the right direction toward providing that key.

Veterans are not using the MGIB benefits they have earned through honorable military service, and high-ability, college-bound young Americans are choosing not to serve in the Armed Forces. Significant changes in the MGIB readjustment program will increase program usage and will enable the military services to recruit the smart young people they need. Accordingly, several bills have been introduced in both the House and the Senate during the 106th Congress that would significantly improve the MGIB. The Senate has twice passed legislation that included numerous changes designed to enhance educational opportunities under the MGIB. In the House, MGIB legislation has been introduced by Mr. Stump, Chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. Together with Mr. DINGELL, I introduced H.R. 1071, the Montgomery GI Bill Improvements Act of 1999.

The brave men and women who serve in America's Armed Forces deserve, and have indeed earned, far better than the inadequate educational assistance program now available to them. I strongly urge my fellow colleagues to support this substitute budget resolution and the policy it represents of demonstrating a continued national commitment to our veterans.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Democratic Substitute to the Budget Resolution for FY 2001.

Once again, the Republicans have presented a budget that would betray middle-class working families. Instead of supporting our communities, their proposal would make deep cuts in investments in education, healthcare and veterans programs. They even fail to include a Medicare prescription drug plan for all seniors.

At a time when America's farm economy is suffering, the Republicans have cut discretionary spending for agriculture, making the agriculture programs impossible to administer. If the field office staff cannot do their jobs, farmers do not get their money. The Republican plan, if adopted, could mean that fewer and fewer farmers will actually get the help they need and that Congress has approved in a timely fashion. The Democratic Substitute does not forget the farmers who work so hard to keep America prosperous.

The Democratic Substitute also extends Social Security and Medicare solvency while paying down the national debt. We care about the future of these important programs not just for the present, well into the future. Instead of ignoring a growing need in our country, Democrats also include a prescription drug benefit for all Medicare recipients beginning in FY 2001.

The Republican proposal would provide Pell Grants to 316,000 fewer low-income students by 2005 and eliminate Head Start for 40,000 children and their families by 2005. Why are the Republicans giving tax breaks to the wealthy and penalizing families who need help the most?

As the Ranking Member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I am appalled that the Republican resolution does not provide any funding over the next five years to improve health care for military retirees over the age of 65, not even funds to pay for prescription drug coverage. However, the Democratic Substitute provides funds to improve health care for military retirees and directs the Armed Services Committee to provide prescription drug coverage and better access to the DoD health system for Medicare-eligible military retirees. It also includes a well deserved increase in funding for the Montgomery G.I. Bill, which will help us recruit and retain high quality personnel for our armed forces. I applaud Ranking Member SPRATT for including this at my urging.

I ask my colleagues to reject the misguided Republican proposal. Vote for the substitute that helps working families—vote for the Democratic substitute.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, just about a month ago, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Henry Shelton, testified that guaranteeing life-time health care is not only important to keeping the promises made to those who have dedicated their careers to military service, but also to attract and retain quality personnel today. This issue is tied to the readiness of our Armed Forces, and will be one of the top defense issues Congress will have to address this year. In truth, I was surprised to see that the Republican budget resolution does not provide any funding over the next five years to improve health care for military retirees over the age of 65, not even funds to pay for prescription drug coverage. The Democratic alternative budget, however, does not dodge this issue.

Currently, military retirees 65 or older lose guaranteed access to the Department of Defense (DOD) health care system. The Democratic budget funds two major initiatives the Republican resolution ignores: a permanent and nationwide expansion of Medicare Subvention, and a guarantee that these retirees have access to the Department of Defense's prescription drug plans. These are the major provisions of H.R. 3655 that are geared to Medicare-eligible military retirees. H.R. 3655 is a comprehensive military health care bill introduced by Representatives NEIL ABERCROMBIE, IKE SKELTON, and GENE TAYLOR.

The Democratic alternative directs the Armed Services Committee to write legislation to improve health care benefits for Medicare-eligible military retirees, and includes mandatory funding for both initiatives: $10.9 billion over ten years for Medicare Subvention, and $5.4 billion over ten years for prescription drug coverage. The prescription drug initiative is treated as an entitlement so it will not have to compete every year with other defense priorities for discretionary funds.

The Military Coalition, which represents many different uniformed services and veterans' organizations and more than 5.5 million current and former members of the Armed Forces and their families, supports H.R. 3655 and has commended the Democratic budget for including this funding. The Military Coalition states that the military retiree health care provisions of the Democratic Alternative ''are important steps toward fulfilling the commitment of health care for life that was promised uniformed services retirees as an inducement to dedicate themselves to careers in uniforms.'' The entire text of their letter is included for the record.

If the Democratic budget resolution is passed by the House, the following is the report language which will accompany our reconciliation directive to the Armed Services Committee:

REPORT LANGUAGE TO ACCOMPANY SEC. 104 OF THE DEMOCRATIC ALTERNATIVE BUDGET RESOLUTION

Section 104 issues a reconciliation directive to the Armed Services Committee for $16.3 billion for the 2001–2010 period. The Budget Committee assumes that the additional funding made available will be used to extend and improve the Department of Defense health care system to Medicare-eligible retirees. The year by year amounts are as follows:

For fiscal year 2001, $437,000,000;
For fiscal year 2002, $699,000,000;
For fiscal year 2003, $990,000,000;
For fiscal year 2004, $1,426,000,000;
For fiscal year 2005, $1,848,000,000;
For fiscal year 2006, $2,069,000,000;
For fiscal year 2007, $2,126,000,000;
For fiscal year 2008, $2,184,000,000;
For fiscal year 2009, $2,243,000,000; and
For fiscal year 2010, $2,301,000,000.

The Budget Committee believes these amounts are consistent with the provisions of H.R. 3655 that apply to Medicare-eligible military retirees. H.R. 3655, which was introduced by Reps. Neil Abercrombie, Ike Skelton, and Gene Taylor, is a comprehensive bill that addresses the health care needs of active duty personnel, military retirees, and their families. The active-duty provisions of this legislation that are funded within the President's budget are also accommodated within the budget resolution. Specifically, $10.9 billion is consistent with the funding required to meet the bill's provision to extend Medicare Subvention nationwide by January 1, 2006. In addition, $5.4 billion is to meet the bill's provision to provide access to the Department Defense's prescription drug programs for all retirees, including Medicare-eligible retirees. All of the funds are mandatory expenditures.

The $10.9 billion is displayed in Function 570 (Medicare) and the $5.4 billion is displayed in Function 550 (Health). While the amounts provided by the Budget Committee conform with the major provisions of H.R. 3655, the Armed Services Committee has sole jurisdiction over this legislation, and may provide the benefits in the manner and function(s) it thinks best.

Last year, even though the Democratic alternative did not pass, it provided the impetus to increase funding for veterans' health care by $1.7 billion. Win or lose, the Democratic alternative is a strong message to retirees and a strong step forward for the Abercrombie-Skelton-Taylor legislation. As a cosponsor of H.R. 3655, I hope the Democratic alternative will spur Congress to pass this important legislation.

ALEXANDRIA, VA.
March 23, 2000.

Hon. JOHN SPRATT,
Ranking Minority Member, House Budget Committee, O'Neill House Office Building, Washington DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SPRATT: The Military Coalition, a consortium of nationally prominent uniformed services and veterans organizations, representing more than 5.5 million current and former members of the seven uniformed services, plus their families and survivors, would like to express its gratitude for the proposed budget alternative that you introduced this week. We appreciate your leadership in proposing an additional $16.3 billion over the next ten years to improve access to military health care for the most aggrieved group—Medicare-eligible uniformed services beneficiaries.

Although the Coalition would have preferred the House Budget to completely fund health care for life for retirees as provided for in H.R. 2966, we recognize that your budget proposal will provide for immediate and demonstrable progress toward this goal by providing funding for the TRICARE Senior Prime program and making the military BRAC pharmacy benefit available to all Medicare-eligible retirees. These are important steps toward fulfilling the commitment of health care for life that was promised uniformed services retirees as an inducement to dedicate themselves to careers in uniform.

Again, thank you for your strong support, for which we are most grateful. It's our hope that you and other members of Congress will not stop with these first, substantial steps, but will continue to address this issue next year, and every year thereafter, until full equity is achieved for those retired members who have done so much to protect the democracy that their countrymen enjoy.

Sincerely,

THE MILITARY COALITION.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the alternative budget resolution offered by the Ranking Member of the Budget Committee, Mr. SPRATT, and in opposition to H. Con. Res. 290. The Spratt alternative, in contrast to the majority plan, extends the solvency of Social Security and Medicare; pays down more publicly held debt; provides targeted tax relief for working families; and makes a real commitment to providing prescription drug coverage for senior citizens. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support the Spratt alternative and to oppose H. Con. Res. 290.

The Spratt alternative saves 100 percent of the surplus generated by Social Security for Social Security. The majority plan, if you assume that the so-called reserve funds for additional tax cuts and Medicare are spent, actually drains more than $60 billion of the Social Security surplus over the next ten years. Even if you assume that the reserve funds are not spent and that Social Security surplus is not tapped, the Republican budget still fails to extend the life of either Social Security or Medicare by even one day. In contrast, the Spratt alternative extends Social Security by 15 years by crediting the trust fund with the interest savings generated by the Social Security surplus. With regard to Medicare, the Republican resolution adds nothing to the solvency of the program while the Spratt alternative adds ten years by reserving $300 billion of the on-budget surplus for Medicare.

The Spratt alternative makes debt reduction the top fiscal priority rather than exploding tax cuts. The Chairman of the Federal Reserve and countless other economists have advised Congress that paying down the debt is the best thing we can do to maintain our strong economy. Eliminating the debt and lowering interest rates is also the best thing Congress can do for working families. Lower interest rates cut mortgage payments by $2,000 for families with a $100,000 mortgage. The cost of care loans and student loans would also be reduced. Paying down the debt is effectively a large tax cut that also lifts a financial burden from our children and grandchildren.

In addition paying down the debt and extending the life of Social Security and Medicare, the Spratt alternative provides targeted tax relief for working families. The Spratt budget allocates more than $210 billion for tax cuts that would allow Congress to enact marriage penalty relief, estate tax relief for family farmers and small business people, full deductibility of health insurance for the self-employed, and tax credits for higher education. By targeting resources to families trying to make ends meet, the Spratt alternative is able to deliver significant tax relief while protecting other key priorities.

When it comes to prescription drugs, the Spratt alternative makes a hard commitment of $40 billion over the next five years to provide Medicare prescription drug coverage for all senior citizens. The Spratt alternative will not only allow prescription drug coverage for all senior citizens, it will protect low-income seniors from any cost-sharing requirements. The majority plan, on the other hand, does not actually dedicate resources for a new prescription drug benefit. Rather, the resolution creates a $40 billion reserve fund that depends on improved future budget projections.

Finally, the agriculture function in the Spratt alternative is superior to the majority plan. The Spratt budget provides $6 billion in farmer income assistance for fiscal year 2000 and $7.2 billion to reflect the House-passed crop insurance. Unlike the GOP resolution, which freezes discretionary agriculture spending for the next five years, the Spratt budget provides a responsible increase so that critical agriculture research, trade development and marketing programs may continue. The Spratt budget also ensures that USDA will have sufficient administrative resources to deliver key farm programs such as crop insurance as well as income and disaster assistance.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Spratt alternative and oppose H. Con. Res. 290.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 233, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 74]

AYES—184

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

NOES—233

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

NOT VOTING—17

Ackerman
Archer
Bonilla
Crane
Dixon
Greenwood
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Lowey
Martinez
McCollum
McDermott
McHugh
Porter
Quinn
Royce
Schakowsky
Vento

□ 2348

Mr. PHELPS changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. GEORGE MILLER of California, SANDLIN, and BORSKI changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

□ 2350

(Mr. SPRATT asked and was given permission to speak out of order.)

LAST BUDGET RESOLUTION FOR REPRESENTATIVE JOHN KASICH

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, this is the last budget resolution that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) will bring to the House floor after many years. As he leaves the House, he leaves a large void.

I came here with him in 1983. I can speak from personal experience because I served on the same committee with him from the day we first arrived here. As a matter of fact, the reason I am on the Committee on Armed Services is that, when the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) did not get on it, he went to Bob Michael, raised hell, they went to Tip O'Neill, and Tip and Bob Michael agreed to enlarge the committee by two people. I got one seat. The gentleman from Ohio got the other.

I have enjoyed his company. I have enjoyed his friendship. I have admired his commitment to public service, his energy, his effervescence, that infectious boyish smile that, after all these years, has not gone away. In fact, with the addition of twins, it has really blossomed back again. We are going to miss him on the floor, in the gym, committee room, and everywhere.

I can say this genuinely, no one that I know of in the 18 years I have been here brought more fervor to the support of an issue and yet less spite than the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH). No one in my recollection has been better in the well of the House, somebody one always wanted to have on one's side, better on his feet particularly extemporaneously than the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH). Nobody has been better liked in the 18 years I have been here on both sides of the aisle.

He has made a great contribution to this House, one of the great institutions of the republic, and to this country. I am sorry to see him leave after this term. He is not gone yet. I do not want to write his obituary too soon.

I am sorry to see him leave, and I am assuaged to some extent by the feeling I do not think I have seen the last of him in public office.

It has been a pleasure working with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) and serving with him, and we are going to miss him.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, the hour is late. But on this side of the aisle, there are some of us who remember 1989 and the first budget of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH). He had 29 Members who supported him. But he never gave up. He never gave up. He did it in such a fresh way.

This is the last budget of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH). What a legacy he has left us. What a legacy he has left his wife and his daughters, Emma and Reese. The gentleman from Ohio dealt with a lot of numbers, but numbers were never important to him. It was people, the friends he has here, the people he cares about in this country.

I know the gentleman from Ohio has a dream to transfer the power and the money and the influence out of Washington back home to local communities. I think he set us on our way. We love the gentleman from Ohio a lot.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). A final period of general debate is now in order. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) each will control 5 minutes.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I would waive my time, but I will save 30 seconds just in case I have to answer something that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) may have to say. I have no purpose in using the 5 minutes time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is with a fond memory that I do look back to 1989 when I first announced to my staff, after sitting through one of those contentious budget fights that, yes, I think we have got to write our own budget. We came here to the floor and I offered the budget and we got 30 votes.

I remember walking back to my office, and everybody had their heads down. I walked in, and I said, Can you believe how great we did? We had 29 other people in this House think that we had a budget worth voting for.

Every year, we fought; and we got more and more support. All we were trying to do then was to reduce the deficits, something everybody in this House was concerned about, because we all care about what is going to happen to our children. We want our children to have a great opportunity to have the kind of life that we have.

Tonight is pretty amazing. We spent, what, I guess almost 12 hours fighting. We were fighting about a lot of detail. We should be doing a little bit more celebrating for what we have been able to achieve as Republicans and Democrats alike.

I mean, we are going to bring up a budget tonight, and we are going to pay down over the next 5 years about a trillion dollars of the publicly held debt. That is a trillion dollars that we are not going to have on the backs of our children when we all leave here. It is astounding when we think about it.

Working together, we decided we were going to keep our hands off of Social Security. We struggled to get there. The President laid out his plan. We laid out ours. We fought with one another a little bit. At the end of the day, where are we? We are not raiding Social Security.

I want to give a number of my colleagues on the Democrat side of the aisle some credit for their fight on Medicare prescription drugs. But I also want to give people on my side of the aisle the credit for also developing innovative and creative and imaginative programs on Medicare.

What is going to happen by the end of this year, we will have a prescription drug program for the neediest of our seniors. No senior citizen should be so poor as they get older in life to not be able to get the magic of modern medicine today to extend their lives and so that their children can celebrate their life as they get older. We all deserve a quality life at the end, and we are going to be able to do that.

As much as we squabble about tax cuts, we did pass the earnings test on this floor unanimously, I believe, where we said that seniors should not be punished for working extra hours and trying to have some independence.

I think, frankly, our seniors are perhaps our greatest untapped resource because they have the wisdom. Many of them have the energy to use the wisdom to make for a better country.

Would it not be great to combine our seniors with our young children who are often neglected? We need to think about a program like that.

At the same time, we are also going to make an effort with the gentleman from California (Mr. CONDIT) and his efforts with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) to try to cut the penalty on people who have small businesses and family farms. It is the right thing to do.

At the same time, we are going to spend more money on education and try to rebuild our Nation's defense.

But I hope that all of us will work to better define America's interest throughout the world. The Cold War is over. We have got to be more innovative and creative in foreign policy and with our national defense.

For the future, we are going to have a new President very soon. It is going to be a new President in a new millennium. What an opportunity.

I think we ought to take the opportunity to put aside a lot of our partisan differences for this reason. We have a generational problem, do we not, so many baby boomers getting to retire and not enough children to work to pay all the bills.

We have health care crisis in this country. I believe that we have got to adopt more market-oriented solutions to the problems of health care and Social Security.

I also think we have got to make this government more effective, more efficient so that we can have respect and regard for it so that what it does it can do well, like our National Institutes of Health which are a real gem, and not just in the United States but, frankly, for the whole world.

☐ 2400

I also believe that the greatest civil rights issue of the 21st century is the education of our children, and I think we have to search our hearts to make sure that our children are set free. No child should have to walk through a bunch of drug dealers in this country to get a decent education and to be safe, and we have to do it together.

Then, finally, finally, my colleagues, we have to continue to provide the incentives for savings and investment. And I say to my colleagues that we are on the edge of an incredible revolution, and I hope we will embrace the new economy, not inhibit it.

One final word, my colleagues, and that is this: if you are a Member here and you believe something, and we have a lot of dreamers, we could start with the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), who we just saw not long ago when he recelebrated walking across that bridge in Selma, Alabama, that was his dream. But we are all dreamers here. That is why we are here. I just leave you with one thought. If you dream, if you believe, if you have passion, if you have to stand alone, so be it. If your cause is just, a crowd will form and you can change the world. Go for it.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) having assumed the chair, Mr. LAHOOD, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 290) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2005, pursuant to House Resolution 446, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the concurrent resolution.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 211, nays 207, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 75]

YEAS—211

Aderholt	Bass	Boehner
Armey	Bateman	Bono
Bachus	Bereuter	Brady (TX)
Baker	Biggert	Bryant
Ballenger	Bilbray	Burr
Barr	Bilirakis	Burton
Barrett (NE)	Bliley	Buyer
Bartlett	Blunt	Calvert
Barton	Boehlert	Camp

Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCrery
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—207

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

NOT VOTING—17

Ackerman
Archer
Bonilla
Crane
Dixon
Greenwood
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Lowey
Martinez
McCollum
McDermott
McHugh
Porter
Quinn
Royce
Schakowsky
Vento

☐ 0019

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded:

☐

COMMUNICATION FROM DISTRICT DIRECTOR OF HON. LOIS CAPPS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) laid before the House the following communication from Sharon Siegel, District Director of the Honorable LOIS CAPPS, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
March 14, 2000.

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 of Representatives, that I have been served with a hearing subpoena for testimony issued by the Superior Court for Santa Barbara County, California.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

SHARON SIEGEL,
District Director.

☐

☐ 0020

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 290, the concurrent resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

☐

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT FRIDAY, MARCH 24, 2000 TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 7, EDUCATION SAVINGS AND SCHOOL EXCELLENCE ACT OF 1999

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means have until midnight, Friday, March 24, 2000 to file a report on H.R. 7, the Education Savings and School Excellence Act of 1999.

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

There was no objection.

☐

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 27, 2000

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

☐

HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, MARCH 28, 2000

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, March 27, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, March 28, for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

☐

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

☐

CLINTON-GORE FAILED ENERGY CRISIS

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Companies, or OPEC, in its capacity as an oil cartel or monopoly, has been a