

Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gingrich  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Gordon  
Goss  
Graham  
Granger  
Green  
Greenwood  
Gutierrez  
Gutknecht  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hamilton  
Hansen  
Harman  
Hastert  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Hefner  
Herger  
Hill  
Hilleary  
Hilliard  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Hooley  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Istook  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Jenkins  
John  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (WI)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kasich  
Kelly  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kim  
Kind (WI)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Klecza  
Klink  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
Kucinich  
LaFalce  
LaHood  
Lampson  
Lantos  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Lazio  
Leach  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
Livingston  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Lowe  
Lucas  
Luther  
Maloney (CT)  
Maloney (NY)

Manton  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Martinez  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHale  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntosh  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Menendez  
Metcalf  
Mica  
Millender-  
McDonald  
Miller (CA)  
Miller (FL)  
Minge  
Mink  
Moakley  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Morella  
Murtha  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Neal  
Nethercutt  
Neumann  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Owens  
Oxley  
Packard  
Pallone  
Pappas  
Parker  
Pascrell  
Pastor  
Paul  
Paxon  
Payne  
Pease  
Pelosi  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pickett  
Pitts  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Portman  
Poshard  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Redmond  
Regula  
Reyes  
Riggs  
Riley  
Rivers  
Rodriguez  
Roemer  
Rogan  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Rothman  
Roukema

Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Rush  
Ryun  
Sabo  
Salmon  
Sanchez  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Sanford  
Sawyer  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaefer, Dan  
Schaffer, Bob  
Scott  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
McKeon  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Sisisky  
Skaggs  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (OR)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith, Adam  
Smith, Linda  
Snowbarger  
Snyder  
Solomon  
Souder  
Spence  
Spratt  
Stabenow  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Stokes  
Strickland  
Stump  
Stupak  
Sununu  
Talent  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Thomas  
Thompson  
Thornberry  
Thune  
Thurman  
Tiahrt  
Tierney  
Torres  
Towns  
Traficant  
Turner  
Upton  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Waters  
Watkins  
Watt (NC)  
Watts (OK)  
Waxman  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
Wexler  
Weygand  
White  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wise  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wynn  
Yates  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—12

Furse  
Gejdenson  
Gonzalez  
Houghton

Johnson, E. B.  
Kennedy (MA)  
Largent  
Lewis (GA)

McDade  
Mollohan  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Schumer

□ 1104

Mr. RIGGS changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the bill was not passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOBSON). Pursuant to House Resolution 455 and rule XXIII, 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, House Concurrent Resolution 284.

□ 1105

## 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. 284) revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1998, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1999, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003, with Mr. HEFLEY (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 rose on the legislative day of Thursday, June 4, 1998, all time for general debate had expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 455, the concurrent resolution is considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. The amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part 1 of House Report 105-565 is considered as an original concurrent resolution for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule and is considered read.

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

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

#### SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999.

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998 is hereby revised and replaced and that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1999 and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2000 through 2003 are hereby set forth.

#### SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003:

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

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

Fiscal year 1998: \$1,292,400,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1999: \$1,318,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2000: \$1,331,300,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001: \$1,358,100,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002: \$1,407,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2003: \$1,452,600,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: \$0.  
Fiscal year 1999: —\$4,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2000: —\$21,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001: —\$28,100,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002: —\$37,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2003: —\$37,800,000,000.

(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 1998: \$1,359,500,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1999: \$1,408,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2000: \$1,443,700,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001: \$1,477,500,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002: \$1,502,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2003: \$1,571,200,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: \$1,343,100,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1999: \$1,401,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2000: \$1,435,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001: \$1,463,700,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002: \$1,473,300,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2003: \$1,540,700,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: \$50,700,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1999: \$83,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2000: \$104,600,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001: \$105,600,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002: \$65,500,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2003: \$88,100,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: \$5,436,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1999: \$5,597,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2000: \$5,777,200,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001: \$5,957,200,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002: \$6,102,400,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2003: \$6,269,400,000,000.

#### SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and budget outlays for fiscal years 1998 through 2003 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):  
Fiscal year 1998:  
(A) New budget authority, \$267,400,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$268,100,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1999:  
(A) New budget authority, \$270,500,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$265,500,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$274,300,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$267,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001:  
(A) New budget authority, \$280,800,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$269,600,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002:  
(A) New budget authority, \$288,600,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$272,100,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$296,800,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$279,800,000,000.  
(2) International Affairs (150):  
Fiscal year 1998:  
(A) New budget authority, \$15,200,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$14,100,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1999:  
(A) New budget authority, \$14,200,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$13,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2000:  
(A) New budget authority, \$12,100,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$13,700,000,000.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Blumenauer

Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$12,900,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$11,900,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$11,300,000,000.  
 (3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):  
 Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,000,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$17,700,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,900,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$17,800,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$17,800,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,800,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$17,600,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,800,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$17,700,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,800,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$17,700,000,000.  
 (4) Energy (270):  
 Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$1,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$300,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$200,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$1,300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$1,800,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$6,100,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$6,600,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$1,500,000,000.  
 (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):  
 Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$23,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,800,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,000,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,400,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$21,600,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$20,800,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$20,500,000,000.  
 (6) Agriculture (350):  
 Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,800,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$10,800,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$10,500,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$10,100,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$9,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,400,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$8,800,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$9,100,000,000.  
 (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$700,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,400,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$2,800,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,900,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$9,800,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$10,900,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,800,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$11,400,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$11,000,000,000.  
 (8) Transportation (400):  
 Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,000,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$42,500,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$44,300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$42,100,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$41,600,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$41,300,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,100,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$40,200,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$40,600,000,000.  
 (9) Community and Regional Development (450):  
 Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$11,200,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$10,600,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$9,100,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,800,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$8,200,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$7,400,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,600,000,000.  
 (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):  
 Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$56,100,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,400,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$60,200,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$62,300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$61,300,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$63,300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$62,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$63,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$61,800,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$63,900,000,000.  
 (11) Health (550):  
 Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$136,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$132,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$143,800,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$142,300,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$149,900,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$149,500,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$155,900,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$155,600,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$162,800,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$163,600,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$171,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$172,000,000,000.  
 (12) Medicare (570):  
 Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$199,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$199,700,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$210,400,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$211,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$221,900,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$221,200,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$239,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$242,400,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$251,300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$248,900,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$273,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$273,700,000,000.  
 (13) Income Security (600):  
 Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$229,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$234,700,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$243,100,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$247,400,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$255,300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$257,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$265,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$264,800,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$274,900,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$271,500,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$284,300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$280,400,000,000.  
 (14) Social Security (650):  
 Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,000,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$12,200,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$12,800,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,100,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$13,200,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$12,600,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$14,500,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$15,300,000,000.  
 (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):  
 Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$42,500,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,400,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$42,900,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,000,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$43,300,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$43,700,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,900,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$44,200,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$44,800,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$45,200,000,000.  
 (16) Administration of Justice (750):  
 Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,100,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

- (A) New budget authority, \$25,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$24,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

- (A) New budget authority, \$23,300,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$24,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

- (A) New budget authority, \$22,700,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$23,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

- (A) New budget authority, \$22,600,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$23,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

- (A) New budget authority, \$22,500,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$22,600,000,000.

(17) General Government (800):

Fiscal year 1998:

- (A) New budget authority, \$14,500,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$14,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

- (A) New budget authority, \$14,800,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$14,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

- (A) New budget authority, \$13,600,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$13,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

- (A) New budget authority, \$13,600,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$13,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

- (A) New budget authority, \$13,600,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$13,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

- (A) New budget authority, \$13,300,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$13,100,000,000.

(18) Net Interest (900):

Fiscal year 1998:

- (A) New budget authority, \$290,700,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$290,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

- (A) New budget authority, \$296,800,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$296,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

- (A) New budget authority, \$297,200,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$297,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

- (A) New budget authority, \$296,800,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$296,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

- (A) New budget authority, \$296,600,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$296,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

- (A) New budget authority, \$298,500,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$298,500,000,000.

(19) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 1998:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$14,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$14,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$500,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$2,100,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$3,200,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$2,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$3,200,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$3,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$3,300,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$3,200,000,000.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 1998:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$36,700,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$36,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$36,300,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$36,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$36,100,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$36,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$38,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$38,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$45,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$45,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$35,900,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$35,900,000,000.

#### SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

(a) SUBMISSIONS.—Not later than June 26, 1998, the House committees named in subsection (b) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(b) INSTRUCTIONS TO HOUSE COMMITTEES.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: \$30,400,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1999 and \$157,400,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(2) COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The House Committee on Banking and Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: -\$8,200,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1999 and -\$35,100,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(3) COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: \$417,900,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1999 and \$2,437,900,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(4) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: \$18,700,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1999 and \$100,400,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(5) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT.—The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: \$71,600,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1999 and \$384,000,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(6) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The House Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: \$5,200,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1999 and \$26,500,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(7) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: \$16,200,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1999 and \$78,900,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(8) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: \$23,800,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1999 and \$125,000,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(9) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—(A) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not ex-

ceed: \$411,100,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1999 and \$2,374,800,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(B) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of revenues for that committee is not less than: \$1,278,500,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 1999 and \$6,637,700,000,000 in revenues in fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

#### SEC. 5. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF COMPENSATION AND PAY FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.

In the House, for purposes of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, establishing on a prospective basis compensation or pay for any office or position in the Government at a specified level, the appropriation for which is provided through annual discretionary appropriations, shall not be considered as providing new entitlement authority or new budget authority.

#### SEC. 6. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON SOCIAL SECURITY.

It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the trustees of the social security trust funds, should consider issuing marketable interest-bearing securities to the trust funds for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1998.

#### SEC. 7. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE ASSETS FOR INDEPENDENCE ACT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—  
(1) 33 percent of all American households have no or negative financial assets and 60 percent of African-American households have no or negative financial assets;

(2) 47 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 in lieu of traditional income support and to assist them in becoming more involved in planning their future, new public-private relationships that encourage asset-building should be undertaken;

(4) individual development account programs are successfully demonstrating the ability to assist low-income families in building assets while partnering with community organizations and States in more than 40 public and private experiments nationwide; and

(5) Federal support for a trial demonstration program would greatly assist the creative efforts of existing individual development account experiments.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that legislation should be considered to encourage low-income individuals and families to accumulate assets through contributions to individual development accounts as a means of achieving economic self-sufficiency.

#### SEC. 8. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON A DEMONSTRATION PROJECT ON CLINICAL CANCER TRIALS.

It is the sense of Congress that legislation should be considered that provides medicare coverage for beneficiaries' participation in clinical cancer trials.

#### SEC. 9. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE INTERIM PAYMENT SYSTEM FOR HOME HEALTH BENEFITS UNDER MEDICARE.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) there is concern that the interim payment system for home health service has adversely affected some home health care agencies;

(2) the Administration should ensure that the implementation of the interim payment

system does not adversely affect the availability of home health services for medicare beneficiaries;

(3) Congress should carefully examine the Administration's implementation of the home health payment system and make any necessary changes to ensure that the needs of medicare beneficiaries are being met; and

(4) the Health Care Financing Administration should quickly implement the prospective payment system that was enacted into law last year.

**SEC. 10. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON SPECIAL EDUCATION.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) Federal courts have found that children with disabilities are guaranteed an equal opportunity to an education under the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution;

(2) Congress responded to these court decisions by enacting the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to ensure free and appropriate public education for children with disabilities;

(3) IDEA authorizes the Federal Government to provide 40 percent of the average per pupil expenditure for children with disabilities;

(4) the Federal Government has not fully funded IDEA at its authorized levels; and

(5) if the Federal Government fully funds IDEA, then local school districts will have the flexibility to invest in new technology, hire additional teachers, and purchase books and supplies.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Federal Government should fully fund programs authorized under IDEA and that such funding is of the highest priority among Federal education programs.

**SEC. 11. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON BUDGETARY RULES AND TAX CUTS.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) in 1990, pay-as-you-go (PAYGO) requirements were enacted to prevent Congress and the President from increasing the deficit;

(2) under PAYGO requirements, tax legislation must be offset by legislation increasing revenues or reducing entitlement spending;

(3) these requirements prevent Congress from offsetting tax cuts with discretionary savings or budget surpluses;

(4) the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 will produce the first surplus in the unified budget in 29 years;

(5) under current trends, the Federal Government could run an on-budget surplus (which excludes social security and the postal service) as early as fiscal year 1999; and

(6) while these requirements were useful during a period of chronic deficit spending, they now limit the ability of Congress to allow taxpayers to retain more of their own money.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the reconciliation bill to be considered pursuant to the reconciliation instructions in section 4—

(1) should permit discretionary savings to be used to offset tax cuts; and

(2) may make on-budget surpluses available to offset tax cuts.

**SEC. 12. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON TAX RELIEF.**

It is the sense of Congress that the revenue levels set forth in this resolution are predicated on—

(1) eliminating the marriage penalty over an appropriate period of time; and

(2) providing tax relief targeted at relieving the tax burden on families, estates, and wages, as well as incentives to stimulate job creation and economic growth.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute is in order except the amendments printed in part 2

of that report. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

It is now in order to consider amendment number 1 printed in part 2 of House Report 105-565.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. NEUMANN

Mr. NEUMANN. 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 2 amendment No. 1 in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. NEUMANN:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

**TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS**

**SECTION 101. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999.**

The Congress declares that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1999 and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2000 through 2003 are hereby set forth.

**SEC. 102. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.**

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003:

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

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

- Fiscal year 1999: \$1,304,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000: \$1,314,300,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001: \$1,348,100,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002: \$1,399,900,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003: \$1,452,300,000,000.

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

- Fiscal year 1999: —\$18,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000: —\$27,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001: —\$31,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002: —\$36,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003: —\$38,000,000,000.

(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 1999: \$1,385,200,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000: \$1,409,100,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001: \$1,448,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002: \$1,426,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003: \$1,545,600,000,000.

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

- Fiscal year 1999: \$1,377,700,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000: \$1,401,700,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001: \$1,433,800,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002: \$1,443,400,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003: \$1,513,100,000,000.

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

- Fiscal year 1999: \$73,700,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000: \$87,400,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001: \$85,700,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002: \$43,500,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003: \$60,800,000,000.

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

- Fiscal year 1999: \$5,596,800,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000: \$5,777,100,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001: \$5,957,100,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002: \$6,102,300,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003: \$6,269,300,000,000.

**SEC. 103. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.**

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and budget outlays for fiscal years 1999 through 2003 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

- Fiscal year 1999:
- (A) New budget authority, \$278,100,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$273,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

- (A) New budget authority, \$283,600,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$277,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

- (A) New budget authority, \$301,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$289,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

- (A) New budget authority, \$315,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$297,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

- (A) New budget authority, \$324,600,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$306,000,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

- Fiscal year 1999:
- (A) New budget authority, \$13,500,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$13,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

- (A) New budget authority, \$11,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$12,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

- (A) New budget authority, \$11,600,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$12,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

- (A) New budget authority, \$12,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$11,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

- (A) New budget authority, \$12,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$11,100,000,000.

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

- Fiscal year 1999:
- (A) New budget authority, \$16,900,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$16,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

- (A) New budget authority, \$16,100,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$16,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

- (A) New budget authority, \$16,200,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$16,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

- (A) New budget authority, \$16,100,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$16,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

- (A) New budget authority, \$14,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$3,100,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

- Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,800,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$20,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,900,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,200,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,800,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$17,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$17,200,000,000.
- (6) Agriculture (350):  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$9,600,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$8,800,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,000,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$8,500,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$8,100,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,400,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$8,000,000,000.
- (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,900,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$2,500,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$5,700,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,500,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,100,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$7,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$8,000,000,000.
- (8) Transportation (400):  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$45,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$43,400,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$48,300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$46,100,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$50,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$47,900,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$51,900,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$48,400,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$53,900,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$50,100,000,000.
- (9) Community and Regional Development (450):  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$10,600,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$9,100,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,800,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$8,200,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$7,400,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,600,000,000.
- (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$60,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$58,800,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$60,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$59,200,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$60,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$59,400,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$64,000,000,000.
- (11) Health (550):  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$139,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$137,700,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$141,800,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$141,400,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$144,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$144,200,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$146,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$147,200,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$151,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$152,400,000,000.
- (12) Medicare (570):  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$209,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$210,100,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$220,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$219,800,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$237,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$240,400,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$248,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$246,300,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$270,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$270,400,000,000.
- (13) Income Security (600):  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$236,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$240,400,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$245,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$247,700,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$254,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$254,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$214,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$259,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$271,900,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$268,300,000,000.
- (14) Social Security (650):  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$12,800,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,100,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$13,200,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$12,600,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$14,500,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$15,300,000,000.
- (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,400,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$42,900,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,000,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$43,300,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$43,700,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,900,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$44,200,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$44,800,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$45,200,000,000.
- (16) Administration of Justice (750):  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,800,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$23,800,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$23,500,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$23,500,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,500,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$21,600,000,000.
- (17) General Government (800):  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,400,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$13,800,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,100,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$13,400,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,900,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$12,800,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$11,900,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,800,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$11,600,000,000.
- (18) Net Interest (900):  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$244,000,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$244,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$238,000,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$238,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$230,800,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$230,800,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$223,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$223,500,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$217,400,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$217,400,000,000.
- (19) Allowances (920):  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$3,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$3,700,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$4,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$4,600,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$9,100,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$9,100,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$9,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$9,200,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$6,000,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$6,000,000,000.
- (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$44,000,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$44,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$44,400,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$44,400,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$46,900,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$46,900,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$54,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$54,600,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$46,300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$46,300,000,000.

**TITLE II—SENSE OF HOUSE PROVISIONS****SEC. 201. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING SOCIAL SECURITY.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The social security program currently collects more in taxes than it pays out in benefits to our country's senior citizens.

(2) Taxes collected exclusively for the social security program should not be spent on any other program.

(3) Social security benefits are expected to consistently exceed social security payroll taxes starting in 2013.

(4) Congress should avoid increasing taxes, increasing borrowing, raising the retirement age, or cutting social security cost-of-living adjustments to pay social security benefits.

(5) Negotiable treasury bonds are safe, real assets that can be sold for cash when income to the social security trust funds is not sufficient to pay benefits for seniors in 2013.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that—

(1) the amount by which social security payroll taxes exceed social security benefits paid shall be invested in negotiable treasury bonds issued by the United States Government and should not be counted as surplus dollars; and

(2) such negotiable Treasury bonds should be redeemable at any time at the purchase price.

**SEC. 202. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING TAX RELIEF.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that this concurrent resolution dedicates \$150,000,000,000 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) provide across-the-board tax relief by expanding the 15 percent tax bracket by 15 percent for married individuals (whether filing a joint or separate return), heads of households, and unmarried individuals;

(2) eliminate the marriage penalty by making the joint income threshold exactly double that of the individual income threshold in all tax brackets and by making the standard deduction for joint filers exactly double that of individual filers;

(3) restore the 12-month holding period on capital gains; and

(4) eliminate the "death tax".

**SEC. 203. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING THE BUDGET SURPLUS.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The Congressional Budget Office in its Spring projections has underestimated the revenues collected by the Federal Government for the last 3 years.

(2) The United States is experiencing remarkable economic growth with no signs of an economic slowdown because the Federal Government is borrowing less from the private sector.

(3) Revenues to the Federal Government are growing at an annual rate far greater than projected by the Congressional Budget Office in March 1998.

(4) The Federal Government will likely receive significantly more revenues in fiscal years 1999 through 2003 than projected by the Congressional Budget Office in March 1998.

(5) Revenues received above and beyond those projected by the Congressional Budget Office in March 1998 should not be spent to create more ineffective Washington programs.

(6) Additional revenues come from American families who are forced to give far too much of their hard-earned income to the Federal Government.

(7) Working Americans deserve to keep more of their income instead of sending it to Washington, D.C., for Congress to spend.

(8) Congress irresponsibly spent more than it received over the last 30 years, creating \$5,500,000,000,000 Federal debt.

(9) The Congress and the President have a basic moral and ethical responsibility to future generations to repay the Federal debt, including money borrowed from the social security trust funds.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that—

(1) any additional revenues collected by the Federal Government above and beyond the Congressional Budget Office March 1998 projections for fiscal years 1999 through 2003 should be divided equally and used to reduce taxes on American families and to pay off the \$5,500,000,000,000 Federal debt, prioritizing social security;

(2) such tax reductions should be enacted in the following order—

(A) expand education individual retirement accounts;

(B) index capital gains to the rate of inflation;

(C) immediate 100 percent deduction for health insurance premiums for employees and self-employed;

(D) eliminate social security earnings limit;

(E) repeal 1993 tax increase on social security benefits;

(F) repeal the alternative minimum tax for individuals and corporations; and

(G) permanently extend the research and development tax credit; and

(3) efforts to repay the Federal debt should begin by replacing the nonnegotiable Treasury bonds, in the social security trust fund with marketable Treasury bills redeemable at any time for the purchase price.

**SEC. 204. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING TAXES AND DISCRETIONARY SPENDING.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) American taxpayers pay too much in taxes to support a Federal Government which is too large.

(2) Taxpayers should benefit from any changes in law which reduce Federal Government spending.

(3) Current law prohibits savings from reduced discretionary spending from being passed along to the American people through a reduction in their tax burden.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that budget laws should be changed to allow discretionary spending reductions to be dedicated to tax relief.

**SEC. 205. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING PUTTING SOCIAL SECURITY FIRST.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The President has encouraged the Congress to put social security first by not spending expected unified budget surpluses, though the Congressional Budget Office estimates that the President's budget for fiscal year 1999 does spend unified budget surpluses.

(2) The Congress currently has no method for dedicating savings from amendments to appropriation bills for the purpose of putting social security first.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that the Congress should establish a procedure that would allow amendments to appropriation bills to dedicate all budget savings to the President's plan to put social security first.

**SEC. 206. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING EDUCATION.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Children in the United States should be the best students in the world.

(2) Quality education for our children will ensure the United States can compete effectively in the global marketplace.

(3) Today's students must learn the knowledge and skills which will lead the world in the next century.

(4) Involving parents in the education of their children increases children's success at school.

(5) Recent studies by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development show that increased parental involvement in children's lives leads to fewer teen pregnancies, less drug use, lower crime rates, and improved learning.

(6) Education is, and should remain, primarily a State and local responsibility.

(7) It is important to let community members offer suggestions to improve academic achievement within local schools.

(8) The Federal role in education has failed to produce the desired results.

(9) Federal regulations and paperwork consume too much of teachers' and administrators' time and energy, as well as taxpayer dollars which could be used to improve education.

(10) Creating a national testing program would increase the Federal burden on local schools.

(11) State, local, and private schools deserve flexibility which will allow them to meet the educational needs of children.

(12) Increasing the role of parents, teachers, and local community members will improve local schools.

(13) There is not a significant relationship between Federal education spending and academic achievement.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that—

(1) the Department of Education, States, and local educational agencies should spend at least 95 percent of Federal education tax dollars in our children's classrooms;

(2) the Goals 2000 program should be terminated, and funds should be given directly to States and local school districts;

(3) the Congress should enact legislation to prevent the development and administration of a national testing program; and

(4) the Department of Education should limit its role in education to functions which cannot be performed by State or local school officials.

**SEC. 207. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING SCHOOL CHOICE FOR THE CHILDREN OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Children in our Nation's capital deserve to have the best education available.

(2) Many parents in the District of Columbia would prefer to send their children to the school of their choice, whether public, private, religious, or home.

(3) Allowing parents to evaluate and choose the proper school for their children gives them an invested interest in helping their children succeed.

(4) Giving children an opportunity to attend the school which best meets their needs will best prepare them for the future.

(5) Letting parents choose a school which reflects the moral or religious beliefs of their children will enhance the children's character and learning experience.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that there should be a Federal pilot program to provide low-income children in the District of Columbia with the opportunity to attend the public, private, religious, or home school of their parents' choice.

**SEC. 208. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTIONS.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Partial-birth abortions allow a child to be delivered until only its head remains in the birth canal.

(2) Partial-birth abortions involve piercing the child's skull and removing its brain.

(3) A large majority of Americans object to partially delivering a child and then killing it.

(4) Both Houses of Congress have consistently supported legislation to ban partial-birth abortions.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that partial-birth abortions should be banned in the United States unless such a procedure is needed to save the life of the mother.

**SEC. 209. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING FEDERAL GOVERNMENT-SPONSORED PROMOTION OF ABORTION.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Title X of the Public Health Service Act was enacted to help reduce the unplanned pregnancy rate, especially among teenagers.

(2) Title X has not only failed to reduce the teenage pregnancy rate, out-of-wedlock births, and sexually transmitted diseases, it has made these problems worse.

(3) Taxpayer-funded title X family planning clinics are currently required to counsel pregnant girls and women about all of their "pregnancy management options", including abortion.

(4) Title X clinics also require clinic staff, following such "counseling," to refer girls and women who want an abortion to clinics that perform them.

(5) Many of these abortion clinics are operated by the same organizations that operate title X clinics.

(6) The United States Government through title X is using taxpayer dollars to subsidize activities destructive to human life.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that taxpayer dollars should not be used to subsidize abortion or organizations that promote or perform abortions.

**SEC. 210. 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. 211. 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) recently signed a 4-year, \$20,000,000 contract 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. 212. 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.

**SEC. 213. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING HUMAN CLONING.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Scientists around the world are actively participating in experiments which attempt to clone animals.

(2) Several of these experiments have succeeded in creating genetic clones of animals.

(3) The technology used in such experiments could be used to create genetically identical human beings;

(4) It is unethical and immoral to experiment with the creation of human life.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that any research on the cloning of humans should be prohibited by Federal law.

**SEC. 214. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING TRADITIONAL MARRIAGES.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Traditional marriages consist of one man and one woman.

(2) Strong families are the cornerstone of our society and our country.

(3) Children benefit from strong families.

(4) The Congress passed and the President signed into law legislation defining marriage as the union between one man and one woman for purposes of Federal programs.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that future legislation and regulations should recognize the importance of the traditional family in the United States.

**SEC. 215. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The Federal Government's involvement in funding for the arts has become increasingly controversial.

(2) Millions of United States taxpayers have been forced to support both artists and organizations to which they object.

(3) The National Endowment for the Arts, despite congressional instructions to avoid controversial subject matters, continues to subsidize offensive art.

(4) More than 99 percent of funding for the arts is obtained from private sources.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that funding for the National Endowment for the Arts should be eliminated.

**SEC. 216. 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. 217. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) One of the most basic human rights is the right to religious freedom.

(2) The United States has a strong history of protecting individuals' right to religious liberty and encouraging other countries to do the same.

(3) Recent reports indicate that several countries continue to persecute individuals based on their religious beliefs.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that the United States should encourage other countries to protect religious freedom and allow their citizens to practice the faith that they choose without retribution.

Amend the title so as to read: "A concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1999 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 455, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. NEUMANN) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. NEUMANN).

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH).

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, the Conservative Action Team, or CATs, was founded to get this Congress back on track with the agenda the American people sent us to achieve in 1994. Today we bring before this House a budget that does exactly that. In fact the CATs budget proposal which the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. NEUMANN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) and others in CATs have worked so hard on is the only conservative budget before this House today. It is the only budget to hold the line on government spending to at or below inflation. It is the only budget that returns \$150 billion in tax relief to all Americans, to families and to small businesses. It is the only budget which preserves and protects Social Security by putting real assets into the trust fund, and the only budget that strengthens our national defense.

The American people want us to hold the line on spending. In a recent poll conducted by Kellyanne Fitzpatrick, 90 percent of Americans believe that we should hold the rate of growth of government to inflation or below the rate of inflation. The CATs budget, as this chart shows, is the only budget that holds spending below the rate of inflation, the only balanced budget that reflects that priority of 90 percent of Americans.

The CATs budget saves \$280 billion in spending off of the projected levels of spending. Many in Washington call

that a cut. However, when you are increasing by 2.6 percent, although it is below the rate of inflation, only in Washington would that be referred to as a cut.

The CATs budget is the only budget to cut taxes. We have \$150 billion in tax cuts. It is the only budget that will cut it by that amount. President Clinton in his budget raises taxes by \$120 billion. This Congress in the last vote rejected that budget overwhelmingly. The Committee on the Budget cuts taxes by \$100 billion. But the CATs budget would provide \$150 billion in tax cuts, relief for all Americans, including total elimination of the marriage penalty, an across-the-board tax cut for all Americans by increasing the 15 percent bracket, a cut in capital gains, and elimination of the death taxes.

If the economy continues to grow, the CATs budget will be able to have \$480 billion in tax cuts, allowing us full deductibility of health insurance, indexing of capital gains, repealing of the alternative minimum tax, providing for educational savings accounts, and repealing President Clinton's tax increase on Social Security.

The way we do this is by designating 50 percent of any additional revenue collected beyond that projected so that if the economy continues to grow, 50 percent of that extra revenue will go to tax cuts, 50 percent will go to pay off the \$5.5 trillion national debt.

The CATs budget addresses the moral imperative of protecting Social Security. One of Washington's dirty little secrets is that Social Security tax surpluses are being set aside and saved for future generations. In reality, for 20 years they have been spent on government programs. The CATs budget puts real assets into the Social Security trust fund by purchasing negotiable Treasury bonds. We put \$275 billion in real assets into Social Security.

National security is also a priority in the CATs budget. We make our national defense a priority, because today we read about China being given national security secrets so that they can develop nuclear weapons that will hit every State in the union. India and Pakistan are becoming nuclear powers. Saddam Hussein has been able to thumb his nose at President Clinton who cannot re-create the Gulf War to stop him because we have cut our defenses too much. In fact, President Clinton's defense budget request, \$270 billion for next year, represents a 1.1 percent decrease in real terms for defense spending. This is a 39 percent drop from the spending levels of the 1980s. As a result, we hear about jet fighters not able to fly because their parts are being cannibalized, about soldiers training without bullets because there are no supplies, about men and women in our armed forces being sent out on active duty twice as long as during the Cold War because there are not enough ships in our Navy, not enough divisions in our Army, not enough battalions in our Marines and not enough

air wings in our Air Force. So critical is this problem that it is now questionable whether we are able to meet our global responsibilities or counter hostile powers in an increasingly unstable and dangerous world. The CATs budget increases defense spending by 56 percent over the budget agreement. This is the amount equal to inflation and would allow America to continue to be the preeminent superpower.

Mr. Chairman, while all of us are pleased with the committee's budget, specifically its commitment to eliminate the marriage penalty, we can do more and we must do more. The CATs budget demonstrates that this is very possible. We make government smaller, we provide overdue tax relief for Americans, we protect Social Security, and we increase spending on national defense.

I urge all of my colleagues and certainly all of my colleagues who wish to call themselves a conservative, vote for the Conservative Action Team budget so that we can put this Congress back on track the way the American people want us to go in this year, 1998. I commend the members of the CATs team who worked on this budget.

□ 1115

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I have not had the opportunity to read the Neumann substitute, but I have read the Kasich resolution, and I have read the report that accompanied that resolution, dated May 12, which amplified where the cuts he was proposing might come from.

I would like to pose some questions to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. NEUMANN), the sponsor of this substitute, which I will allow him to answer on his time because I do not have enough myself to grant him, but here are the questions:

I am concerned, interested, curious to know if the gentleman's substitute corrects what I view as some serious faults, defects, shortcomings, inequities in the Kasich resolution. Does he correct these problems or in his zeal for a bigger tax cut does he actually make them worse?

First issue raised on the floor last night: The Kasich resolution delivers America's veterans a double whammy. They have already suffered a \$10 to \$17 billion extinguishment of their disability rights when in the transportation bill we wiped out their rights to smoking-related disability benefits. And, Mr. Chairman, I will yield at the end, and I will give the gentleman from Wisconsin a list of these things so he can respond to it because it is a rather lengthy list.

The Kasich resolution, despite the fact that the transportation bill has already extinguished those benefits, the Kasich resolution has reconciliation di-

rections in it to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs which calls on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to cut veterans' benefits by another \$10 billion. I would like to know if the gentleman's resolution does the same thing or does he correct this gross inequity?

Another point: The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) in a last-minute move shifted \$10 billion in cuts from Medicare over to the account known as income security, and we all know where that cut is coming out of. It is coming out of the welfare block grant, the so-called TANF block grant.

The gentleman's governor, Governor Tommy Thompson, wrote a stinging letter yesterday with nine other governors calling that deduction, \$10 billion out of the TANF block grant, a breach of the agreement that the Governors made with the Federal Government when they signed off on welfare reform. He and Governor Tom Ridge and Governor Tom Carper and Governor John Engler, 10 governors altogether, have written opposition to that in a stinging letter. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin correct this problem?

Now just a minute ago, another point, the House voted overwhelmingly to denounce the President of the United States for including user fees of various kinds in his budget. As a matter of fact, if my colleagues read the Kasich budget closely, they will find that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) has seven new user fees in his budget. These user fees altogether cost \$11 billion. Here is a list of them. I will let my colleague look at them, \$11 billion in user fees.

In light of the resolution we just adopted, in light of the motion to recommit, the resolution that we just defeated, does the gentleman include these fees in his budget also, or does he plan to exclude those fees since the House has overwhelmingly said it disapproves of them?

Another point: The Kasich budget cuts energy. It is hard to tell where those cuts are coming from. He wants to abolish the Energy Department. But one of the things he wants to do, according to the May 12 report, is sell at least three power marketing administrations: Southwest and Southeast. And these power marketing administrations have a one-time return to the government of about \$3 billion.

Since the gentleman is seeking an additional \$50 billion in cuts, does he want to sell not just three power marketing administrations but five or six or all of them? Does he want to sell Bonneville? TVA?

The Kasich resolution also cuts law enforcement, incredibly cuts law enforcement. Here we are seeing a reduction in violent crime persistently over the last 3 to 4 years, and the Kasich budget would cut law enforcement by \$8 billion. This would whack the FBI; it would whack the Drug Enforcement Administration. It would mean the end of community policing, a very popular

program that has put 80,000 police on the streets of America.

Crimes rates are coming down. Does my colleague want to pull a bunch on crime? Is he going to take \$8 billion out of the crime program?

Medicaid. Last year one of the greatest things we did in the balanced budget agreement was balance the budget but show that we could still promote a few priorities, and one of those priorities was children's health care. We created the children's health insurance plan at a cost of about \$16 billion.

But the Kasich budget comes along and whacks Medicaid by \$12 billion, whacks the health account by that amount. Does that mean we are not going to have a children's health insurance plan? Does the gentleman correct that? Does he provide for children's health insurance? Does the gentleman also want the acute care under Medicaid to be block granted, as Mr. KASICH would, or has he corrected that in his resolution?

There is a gaping hole, in addition, in the Kasich resolution, a black hole, because he does not specify where the increases in the highway spending bill which this House and the Senate have already enacted \$48.8 billion in budget authority, \$23.3 billion in outlays over the next 5 years. We do not know how that is going to be accommodated. What gets bumped? Displaced? Does the gentleman's resolution clarify this black hole or does he only deepen it? In his zest to go for a \$50 billion tax cut, do we now have a \$75 billion black hole instead of a \$25 billion black hole?

And what about cuts in the environment? That was a protected priority. We listed the amount of money we were spending on environment each year in the balanced budget agreement. Mr. KASICH cuts the environment and natural resources by \$4.6 billion. Does the gentleman restore that, or do we also take that out?

And what about education? That was a protected priority. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) would cut education and training, would cut education by \$5 billion. One of the truly cockamamie ideas, if my colleagues will, in this May 12 document was the notion of taking title I, one of the most successful programs we have got, a program which takes 95 percent of its money and puts it in the classroom, a program that helps individual kids keep pace with other kids in their peer group, would take that program and convert it from a school grant to a student grant, voucherize the title I program. Would the gentleman do that, or does he correct that particular deficiency?

And basically what I would like to know, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) would in effect add about 6 percent of additional cuts to discretionary spending, nondefense discretionary spending, meaning that overall it would be cut by about 18 percent by the year 2003. Since the gentleman is going for an additional \$50 billion in tax cuts,

will that be a 30 percent cut in discretionary spending? A 35 percent cut in discretionary spending? Or has the gentleman somehow figured out a way to mitigate cuts that I do not believe will ever be made?

So the bottom line in my request to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. NEUMANN) is does his resolution improve or correct these problems, these discrepancies, in the Kasich resolution, or does he worsen them?

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond briefly.

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) leveled 8 attacks against the Kasich budget and somehow implied they are about the Neumann budget. First of all, they are not. Let me respond to all eight:

False, false, false, false, false, false, false and false.

And let me respond specifically to the first one as it goes to veterans. The Kasich plan, as written, has \$6.5 billion more for veterans benefits in the spending category than what was called for in last year's budget agreement that passed through the House and was signed into law.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON).

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, if my colleagues believe their constituents are overtaxed, then they ought to vote for this budget. This budget is the only one that we will debate that puts taxpayers first and stops wasting their money in Washington.

Each year the average American works until May of each year just to pay their taxes. If we add State, local and Federal taxes together, and the average family of four pays almost 40 percent of their income in taxes, that is more than we pay for food, clothing and housing combined.

The American people deserve to have that corrected, and this budget does that.

This conservative action team budget will return to the American people more than \$150 billion in their tax money providing across-the-board tax relief, eliminating the marriage penalty, eliminating the estate or death tax and restoring a 12-month holding period on capital gains. The American people need real reform from the crushing burden of taxes, and this budget provides it.

Now we have been talking about defense. This is the only budget that increases our Nation's defense spending by \$56 billion in order to just keep up with inflation. No other budget does it.

Recent events in India and Pakistan remind us what history has taught us. Americans cannot ensure economic security for our families unless we have real security in our defense of the Nation. In order to provide security we have got to invest in our Nation's de-

fense. A strong defense is the only way America can remain the No. 1 leader in the world, and this budget is the only one that just barely maintains the defense at just inflation level. It is our duty, in fact it is our primary function, I believe, in this Congress to ensure the security of these United States. Let us do it. It is imperative to our survival. This budget plan returns the most money to hard-working American families, helps preserve the Social Security and shores up our national defense.

As my colleagues know, Americans want, need and deserve tax relief. This is an all American budget and deserves my colleagues' votes.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

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

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Neumann CAT budget and the Kasich Republican budget and in support of the bipartisan Balanced Budget Act of 1997 which is incorporated in the Spratt substitute.

Last year we worked together, Democrats and Republicans. We produced a balanced budget and a surplus this year, the growth in our economy. Since 1993 we brought the deficits down from \$300 billion to now we have a \$40 billion plus surplus.

The Republican Kasich budget is a partisan blowup of that agreement. It would return us to large deficits and/or irresponsible, extreme budget cuts.

My Republican friends claim this is just a 1 percent cut in the budget, yet when we look at what they are trying to fund, the hundred billion dollars tax cut, the transportation bill that has already been passed, other spending that the Republicans would increase and the fact that 2 out of every \$3 in the Federal budget are exempt from any of these cuts, then most programs are looking at cuts of up to 30 percent and higher. We do not have to guess about that. We have Mr. KASICH's list, which shows us how we need to cut the budget in order to achieve the Kasich budget.

Let me just give my colleagues a sampling of some of the cuts that would be required:

Eliminate the Department of Commerce, and yet at this time when we are trying to increase U.S. products in foreign markets; eliminate the Department of Energy when we are trying to become more energy self-sufficient, and some of us still remember the gasoline lines; jeopardize title I funding for our disabled children, our most vulnerable in our population; cut the Environmental Protection Agency by 15 percent. These are on Mr. KASICH's list. It is not a 1 percent cut.

The welfare-to-work program is jeopardized. Two years ago we successfully worked a partnership with our States and returned the administration of welfare to our States in welfare-to-work, in partnership with the Federal

Government helping provide the dollars so people could get off of welfare to work. This budget reneges on that commitment. It is welfare to nowhere if this budget became law.

To our veterans: Look at the budget document. They take \$10 billion out and they do not fund it. We are not meeting our commitments to our veterans today. We should be doing more, not less. The Kasich budget would take \$10 billion more unaccountable.

The elimination of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. We have already had that battle here. It has not been agreed to, but yet it is on the Kasich list.

Cops on the beat. I have Democrat and Republican county execs in the Baltimore area applauding our efforts to put more cops on the beat. The Kasich budget would decimate that program, a \$6 billion cut in law enforcement, jeopardizing the progress that we have already made in this area.

And the list goes on and on.

This is not a 1 percent cut. If the budget became law, it would destroy many of the programs that are so important. We would be returning to Republican extremism that led to the shutdown of our government.

□ 1130

Do not take my word for it. We have the comments of the Republican leaders in the other body. Chairman DOMENICI said the budget would make a mockery of the process. Chairman STEVENS said Congress could not function under the plan. These are our Republican leaders in the other body.

Fortunately, we have an alternative. We have the Spratt substitute. I urge my colleagues to vote for the Spratt substitute.

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

Mr. Chairman, since my colleagues from the other side seem to have aimed their attacks against the Kasich budget, rather than against our plan, I assume that means they are basically in support of our plan.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, any way they want to try to cook it, they can cook it. But the fact is, think about this for a second, Federal spending is going to go from \$7.8 trillion over the last five years to \$9.1 trillion over the next five years, and we are arguing that we ought to be able to find a penny out of a dollar from this government.

The American family had a chance to vote on whether the Federal Government can live with \$9 trillion, rather than \$9.1 trillion. We could help the families to get more, and not cave in to the Washington culture, and not cave in to all the special interest groups that want to keep taking from families.

Then, you know, you actually have to vote against mine. And I am not surprised that the people who for many years have supported running America from the top down, taking more and more money from families to give to government, would oppose this. But it is patently absurd when you even watch the news at night, "The Fleecing of America," to think that we could not squeeze one penny out of a dollar out of this inefficient government.

Let me further say to my colleague who just spoke and some of them who spoke, the President has a budget that increases taxes by \$130 billion and increases spending by \$150 billion, and they love that plan. They love it, because when the President's man came up to the Committee on the Budget, they supported him.

The fact is, if you think that this biggest, most bloated institution on the face of the earth can save one penny on a dollar and live with only \$9 trillion in spending over the next five years, so we can take those savings and help the family and eliminate the marriage penalty, vote for my resolution. If you cannot, frankly, you are living in the past.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE).

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

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, we have had a great deal of rhetoric this year about the optimistic surplus forecasts for the Federal budget. It is truly a great day if we can say that there is a surplus. But the truth of the matter is that we do not have a surplus, we still have a deficit; we are still in an era of deficit spending.

Why is this? The chart that is right to my right here indicates what is happening. The red line shows the surplus in the Social Security trust account each year. It continues to grow because the baby-boom generation is paying in record amounts for Social Security.

At the same time, that lower line shows the rhetoric, the expectation that we actually have some sort of a surplus in the budget, down here, as much as \$4, \$5, \$8 billion.

The truth of the matter is, this line shows what is actually happening. That is the deficit that we are running.

What does this mean? It means that the attractive, the appealing, and to a certain extent the deceptive promises that we can have new programs, that we can cut taxes, that this will be painless, that somehow the political system will accept these sacrifices that are necessary to achieve these ends, all of this is illusive.

We have worked through the political process here in Congress. We know what the constraints are. We know what our colleagues will accept. Some say we will cut defense; others say we will cut agriculture; others say we will cut education; some say we will just cut waste, fraud and abuse.

But the fact of the matter is, we have to live with the political reality that exists in this Nation, and the fact of the matter is that if we are going to stop deficit spending, if we are going to stop relying on the Social Security Trust Fund to finance other programs of the Federal Government, we are going to have to make some very, very tough decisions.

We are going to have to decide, is it more important to have tax cuts, which all of us want, now, or to defer the gratification? We are going to have to decide, are we going to expand and inaugurate new programs, which almost all of us would like to have, or are we going to defer the gratification?

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that what we need to do is face up to the hard, cold reality that exists. We are still under these budgets borrowing from Social Security, and we are not addressing the very important task of actually bringing our budget into balance.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on National Security.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Neumann substitute, mainly because it is the only budget we are considering today which increases defense spending. Really, it does not increase defense spending; it just barely keeps up with inflation. I want to repeat that. It barely keeps up with inflation. We need more than that.

We are here debating all these various budget proposals, discussing cutting things and increasing things and all the rest, and the very top priority of our government, any Federal Government, protecting our people, the security of our Nation, is the only thing that is left out. We have our priorities mixed up.

Let me remind Members of something. If you are not aware of it, people need to be reminded: We are at this very minute, not tomorrow, not in the future, at this very minute we are faced with devastating threats from all over this world, and we are unprepared to defend against these threats which threaten our people, our constituents, our troops stationed throughout the world, our allies all over the world. At this very minute we are faced with these threats.

We are faced with threats from China, ICBM's, intercontinental ballistic missiles, with nuclear warheads. We cannot defend against one of them. Even one launched accidentally from somewhere in the world, we cannot defend against it. It would destroy millions of lives in this country and puts the very survival of our Nation at risk, and we cannot defend against it.

In this day and time we have the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction throughout the world. They can be put together in laboratories in inexpensive and low-tech ways. They can be used as warheads on short range missiles or cruise missiles. Cruise missiles can be launched from various platforms, bringing everyone within range of weapons of mass destruction, chemical, biological, bacteriological weapons. Can you imagine what it is like to defend against these? We do not have a defense against them.

Can you conceive of what these things mean to the lives of our people and the very survival of our nation?

Can you conceive of losing 1–3 million people in Washington, DC if 200 pounds of anthrax is released in the air above us?

We have cut our military too much—this is already the 14th consecutive year of budget deductions. Spending for defense has been cut 33%—all other spending, however, has increased.

We have done to our own military what no foreign power has been able to do—tear down the greatest defense of freedom to the extent that it cannot properly defend this country.

I will say this, and I mean what I am saying, and I want people to listen to it: The people who put this Kasich budget together that puts our country at risk are guilty of dereliction of duty.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget claims to cut \$100 billion below last year, and this amendment would add \$50 billion to it. Yet I have in my hand a sheet of requests from Members to the Committee on Appropriations asking us to add 7,000 items totaling \$353 billion above the President's request.

In energy and water, for instance, there are at least 120 Members of the Republican Caucus who have written us asking us for spending above the President's request. In transportation, at least 40 Members on that side of the aisle are asking us to spend money above the President's request. Yet in the generic, they pretend they are going to cut \$100 billion here today.

I have just one question, Mr. Chairman. Is that kind of hypocrisy learned, or does it come naturally?

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I come here to support the Conservative Action Team's budget. Let me say, first of all, there are perhaps three reasons why all Members should consider it. First of all, it has the lowest increase relative to inflation of all the budgets. Second of all, for those folks who want higher defense spending, this budget has it. The third reason is it has a lockbox, a lockbox dealing with the Social Security Trust Fund. As I under-

stand it, it is the only one that has the lockbox, which means any savings in this budget are going right back to the Social Security Trust Fund.

Of course, lastly, for those of us concerned about user fees and taxes, this budget has the most amount of reduction in user fees and taxes. For all of those reasons, I urge my colleagues to support the Conservative Action Team.

We have had a lot of rhetoric on this side, but this budget in fact brings it down home. So you have less taxes, higher defense spending, and, at the same time, a lockbox for Social Security.

Mr. Chairman, the debt is going up in this country. Every year the debt is going up. Yet we talk about a balanced budget. How can the debt go up if we are balancing the budget? Because we are not. We are taking funds from the Social Security Trust Fund, and that is not right. A lockbox and the Conservative Action Team will stop that.

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment my colleague from Ohio, Chairman KASICH, for his tremendous efforts in bringing his FY '99 budget to the floor today.

While I agree with him that we need to continue placing restraints on spending and provide additional tax relief, I find that the alternative offered by Representatives NEUMANN, MCINTOSH, and JOHNSON, the conservative action team (CAT substitute) is a better way to achieve these goals.

Thomas Jefferson stated: "The same prudence which in private life would forbid our paying our own money for unexplained projects, forbids it in the dispensation of the public money."

The CAT's budget continues to honor our pledge to reduce Government spending without increasing taxes.

This budget alternative chooses family over big Government spending programs.

If Government were forced to pay its bills in the same manner as the citizens who finance it, the bill collectors would be knocking down our doors.

The CAT's budget offers us the opportunity to continue what we started last year by holding down spending and cutting taxes. Together, these two components will ensure that our Nation's economy will continue to experience the growth it is currently enjoying well into the next century.

There is one area of the budget that has me particularly perplexed. That is the way in which we use our Social Security trust fund to pay for other programs. The CAT's substitute doesn't just offer rhetoric when it comes to saving the Social Security trust fund, it provides the necessary safeguards to achieve that goal.

The trust fund is projected to be running a surplus of \$100 billion dollars for FY '99, I would hope that we will stop using this fund to mask our Nation's deficit. Instead, let's use a portion of the surplus to replenish the money borrowed from the Social Security trust fund and as the CAT's budget does, let's create a Social Security "lock box" that would prevent any future raiding of the fund.

The Social Security trust fund's surplus shouldn't be used to fund other programs. And it should not be used to mask our Nation's debt.

Mr. Chairman, I am firmly convinced that our Nation's future is tied to the restoration of traditional family values. The Neumann budget addresses this by standing up for human life, increasing the role of the family in education, by cutting taxes, and by increasing our defense budget to keep up with inflation.

There is one additional area that I would like to mention. I want to echo Chairman KASICH's remarks when he stated at the Budget Committee markup that he hoped the appropriators could give the NIH an even bigger boost than the budget recommended. I want to thank him and I appreciate all the excellent efforts of the House Budget Committee members to increase the NIH funding. I respectfully urge them to recede to the Senate Budget resolution on NIH funding for FY '99 when they go to conference. Only progress through health research will truly reduce the costs of programs such as Medicare and Medicaid.

I would be remiss if I didn't mention my commitment to ensuring that our Nation's veterans also receive the necessary funding so that we fulfill the pledge we made to them.

To sum it up, the Neumann budget taxes less, spends less, places restraints on Government growth, provides for a strong defense, restores family values, and dedicates the surpluses to reducing taxes, preserving Social Security and repaying the debt.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman, we keep the surplus intact to save Social Security, and we do not have \$11 billion in user fees, as the Kasich resolution does.

Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Neumann amendment and to the Kasich budget resolution. We would like to talk about the budget resolution offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH).

As has been pointed out already today, without any disagreement to the contrary, there is approximately \$25 billion in the Kasich budget that is unaccounted for because it has already been spent to pay for the transportation bill. This is the same grave omission that caused many Democrats and Republicans to vote against the transportation bill when it left the House, because it threatened to spend the surplus. That is the grave sin we commit here today. The budget resolution offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) takes us down the road of spending the surplus.

Now, the argument has been made this amounts to a 1 percent cut in spending. There has also been an admission that we are going to spare defense and Medicare. There has been absolutely no response to the very specific points made about how deep the cuts will have to be made in Medicaid, education and other important core functions because of the way the budget resolution has been written.

This is not a day for speeches. This is our day to put a very detailed plan on the floor of the House, and those details are not forthcoming. There is a

reason why Republican and Democratic governors are opposing this budget resolution, because those details are missing and because the best work we do here when we are balancing the budget is working with the States. We are ignoring them.

□ 1145

One of the important lessons we should have learned from 1995 is that we are not just talking about numbers here today. We are talking about people's lives, and we are failing to address the impacts these cuts could have on the lives of the people we represent at home.

One thing is perfectly clear, whether this budget resolution passes or not, and that is, it is going to leave us rudderless. We have chosen not to work with the Senate, not to work with the President. As a result, this budget resolution becomes irrelevant.

What is the price we are going to pay for that? The price we are going to pay is, as the pressure begins to rise to spend money and to cut taxes, we are going to do it without regard to protecting the surplus which we should be using to pay off this massive Federal debt and prepare Social Security for the future. We have an opportunity to protect that surplus. We are going to blow it, and that is why we need to defeat the budget resolution.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, could I inquire of the Chair, please, the remaining time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. NEUMANN) has 15½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, for those of us who recognize the constitutional responsibility of the Congress, to protect ourselves against things like India's nuclear capability, Pakistan's nuclear capability, China's ability, not only with nuclear but the ability to deliver a nuclear weapon or weapon of mass destruction, we say to them today, and they will be hearing from most of us who have that specific responsibility, the Neumann substitute is the only proposal before us today that even helps us keep our head level with the water. It does not get us out of the water where we ought to be.

Just yesterday my subcommittee completed the markup on the defense appropriations committee. As we went through that markup, I was convinced more and more of this one thought, that when we talk about national defense, if we have enough national defense, if we have what we need and do

not have to use it, that is good. That is deterrence. But if we do not have enough, that is bad. That is disaster.

I can tell my colleagues that the President's budget does not provide enough, and the only measure before us today is the Neumann substitute because it does give us enough to at least try to keep level with inflation.

We cannot do more with less. I do not care how good we are, we cannot do more with less. We have had more deployments in the last 5 years, other than war, than any other President. It has cost us a lot of money. We are wearing out our troops. We are wearing out our equipment. We are cutting down the size of the force but extending their deployments more and more. We just cannot continue to do more with less.

The Neumann substitute gives us the opportunity to have more, to do more things that we need to do. In 2 minutes it is difficult to talk about this entire problem. Today, the size of our active duty force has been cut by 36 percent in the last 10 years. Army overseas deployments are up 300 percent from the rates that we sustained during the Cold War.

For the Navy today, on any given day 57 percent of our ships are at sea on deployment. In 1992 the figure was only 37 percent. The list goes on and on.

If we have enough, that is good. If we do not have enough, that is disaster.

Mr. Chairman, this member of Congress takes a back seat to no one when it comes to casting the tough votes to balance our federal budget and reduce the size of our federal government. However, this member of Congress also knows that each and every member of this House takes an oath of office to uphold the Constitution of the United States.

One of the principle responsibilities given Congress under our Constitution is to provide for our common defense, to raise and support armies and to maintain a navy. Today I am here to tell you that we are on the verge of abrogating this Constitutional responsibility because we are on the verge of returning to a hollow military.

As the Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on National Security, I visit on a regular basis with officers and enlisted personnel from all branches of the service. From four star flag officers to new recruits, there is widespread concern that we are overextending our troops and wearing out our equipment to the point that our readiness could soon be compromised.

For 13 years in a row, our national security budget has declined in terms of the what we can buy for each dollar we spend. During that time, real spending on our national security has declined by 40 percent.

The budget President Clinton has sent Congress for our national security in Fiscal Year 1999, which is reflected in the budget resolution reported to this House by the Budget Committee, provides for the lowest level of spending in constant dollars in more than 40 years. And over the next five years, the President's budget reduces spending on our national security by \$54 billion.

Already there are 700,000 fewer troops in the field, in the air, and at sea than there were

10 years ago. This is a 36 percent cut in our active duty forces.

Not only are the number of uniformed personnel falling, but so is their morale. Every service chief tells us that they are finding it difficult to retain the best and brightest of our officers and enlisted men and women. The reasons are many. Military pay is not keeping pace with pay in the private sector and as a result I am ashamed to say that we have members of our all volunteer force who need food stamps to try and make ends meet for their families. Base housing is aging to the point where some is virtually uninhabitable.

And we are asking our troops, during a time of peace, to deploy more often and for longer periods of time than at any other peaceful period in our nation's history. Since taking office in 1992, President Clinton has sent our troops on more overseas deployments than any other president. Many of these deployment are for reasons of questionable national importance.

Army overseas deployments are up 300 percent from those rates sustained during the Cold War. This year, on any given day one of every three Army soldiers is deployed abroad.

For the Navy today, on any given day 57 percent of its ships are at sea. This is 25 percent higher than 1992.

For the Air Force, the number of Air Force personnel deployed away from home today is four times higher than in 1989—yet the Air Force is ⅓ smaller.

For too many years now, we have been asking our men and women in uniform to do more with less. Well guess what—the Secretary of Defense estimates the President's five year budget proposal, which further shrinks our nation's defense, will require a reduction in end strength of 54,000 active duty personnel and 49,000 reservists. So while this President continues to deploy our troops on more missions around the world, he continues to shrink the size of our forces, and jeopardizes our overall readiness.

Is it any wonder that pilot retention in the Air Force is down significantly. Just a few years ago, the re-enlistment rate for pilots was 75 percent. Today it is 36 percent, well below the Air Force's target of 58 percent.

Both the Navy and Air Force tell me that they are well below their reenlistment targets for first term sailors and airmen. The Air Force is 18 percent below its re-enlistment goal and the Navy 7 percent. The Navy Times newspaper recently reported that 75 percent of the sailors surveyed plan on leaving the service as early as possible.

Not only are we wearing out our troops and their families, but we are wearing out our equipment. Mission capable rates for our Air Force and Navy aircraft have fallen every year since 1991. There are increasing shortages of spare parts and cannibalization of existing aircraft is on the rise. Remember the hanger queens of the Carter Administration? Well they're back in the Clinton Administration and the situation will only become worse.

Last year my committee had to add \$600 million to the President's budget to pay for the additional need for spare parts. Still, the Commander in Chief for the Pacific region tells me cannibalization rates have doubled in just the past two years.

Stop to consider that our principal Air Force fighter aircraft were designed in the early 1970's. The President's budget calls for the procurement of only two fighters this year.

This would be the lowest number in the history of the Air Force.

Stop to consider that the average age of the Army's medium truck fleet is 25 years old. More than half of those trucks qualify for antique plates. Under the President's budget, this fleet will not be replaced for another 30 years.

Stop to consider that under the President's budget, the Navy proposes to build only six new ships next year. This is far below the 10 ships per year that would be required to sustain the current fleet of 326 ships.

Since Desert Storm, we have cut our active-duty Army from 18 divisions to 10, our combat tactical aircraft by 40 percent, our bomber fleet by 59 percent, and our combat ships by 35 percent.

Don't just take my word for it. Listen to our service chiefs.

The Commandant of the Marine Corps told me he is \$500 million, or half a billion dollars, short of what he needs in the 1999 budget for equipment procurement alone. He said the cumulative effect of year after year of these shortages will be devastating to the Corps.

The Chief of Staff of the Army told me just a few weeks ago that under the current budget scenarios the Army could go under.

A frustrated Navy Commander told a newspaper reporter that his F-14 squadron was a hazard to operations because the unit has only averaged two mission capable aircraft instead of the usual 14.

And Secretary Cohen, who is President Clinton's top civilian adviser on national defense matters, just testified before Congress saying with regard to readiness that "We are starting to see signs of some erosion, certainly on the edges of things."

Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, my wife Beverly and I had the honor of participating in commissioning ceremonies for U.S.S. *Pearl Harbor* (LSD 52). More than 1,500 Pearl Harbor survivors came from all over the nation to be a part of these ceremonies.

As I told all those veterans gathered there in San Diego, as well as the first crew to bring U.S.S. *Pearl Harbor* to life, we can never repay our debt of gratitude to those who have served our nation in uniform and to those who have paid the ultimate price. We can however, dedicate ourselves to ensuring that in their honor and memory we do all within our power as members of Congress to maintain the strongest, most ready national defense.

Mr. Speaker, I close with this thought. When dealing with national defense, to have it and not need it is good. That is deterrence. But to need it and not have it is a disaster.

Every one of us in this Congress today should decide it's time to stop the decline in our commitment to a strong national defense and begin the steady progress to modernize our force, boost the morale of our troops, and prepare for whatever threat may present itself to our nation and our national interests in the coming century. That is our sworn Constitutional responsibility.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW).

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Chairman, I thank our leader who is leading this debate for us.

Mr. Chairman, two years ago I watched this kind of debate on my television set at home in Michigan. Last

night, as I went home and watched the very end of the debate again on my television in my little apartment, I had *deja vu* all over again, as they say.

What I saw was a replay of the 104th Congress talking about the potential for dramatic cuts and threats to Medicare, education, the environment, and a focus on providing tax breaks for the wealthy and trying and essentially to blow up a balanced budget agreement that we came to in historic fashion just a year ago. It was extremely disheartening.

My constituents asked me to come here during this session to do away with that. They do not want the days of possible government shutdowns or threats to those things that affect their lives every day.

Last year we passed a historic balanced budget agreement. I rise today to support that by rejecting the Neumann substitute, the Kasich budget, and supporting the Spratt budget that allows us to continue the balanced budget that we agreed to in a bipartisan way, truly protect Social Security, and stand up for those things that affect our families every day.

We need to focus on those priorities that people care about in the context of balancing the budget. I can assure my colleagues that the only way we truly effect Social Security protection and preserve it is through the Spratt budget.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment and a "yes" vote on the Spratt amendment.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Procurement.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, let me add my strong support to that of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE), and on behalf, I think, of the men and women who wear the uniform of the United States in all the services, for the Neumann budget.

We asked the service leaders to tell us what they needed, what they were short this last year. They were pretty gutsy. Even though their commander in chief, I am sure, was not happy, they came forward and said, "This is the list of things that we need," and they gave us a list of things like ammunition, spare parts, components for systems that cannot fly now. All of those things added up to \$58 billion.

The Neumann substitute stops the slight in national defense. It does not give us a lot of things, no new systems, but at least allows us to have enough ammunition so we can carry out the two-war scenario.

If we really care about the mothers and fathers of this country, the best service we can give to them is to make sure that their youngsters come home alive in the time of a conflict. The Neumann substitute is the only vehicle we have here that keeps, as the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) said,

the head of our military above the water. Please vote for the Neumann substitute.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes and 40 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, these are some mighty strange cats. They offer the opportunity to fatten up the fat cats, and they offer a little cat chow for everybody else. They call it conservative, but when it comes to conserving our resources and seeing that every penny of the budget surplus that was achieved this year in historic terms is allocated to reducing the debt and protecting Social Security, they say no way.

They do not give our public schools very much to meow about either, because they really do not believe in any Federal commitment to public education. What a change it was to go from this Congress home to Texas and to see the enthusiasm for learning of young people, the determination of our professional educators, and the involvement of parents to see their young people graduate this spring. How incredibly contradictory at the very time we are celebrating learning and the struggle of American families that these Republicans in one budget called one thing and one called another do the same thing, and that is, to rip the heart out of American public education.

I had a blue ribbon school winner, the kind of principal who is there turning a gang-infested area around into a success story for young people. I asked her about this Kasich budget to rip out Title I and in her words, she said "We would die without those Federal funds." That is what is at stake here, not just some rhetoric about who can be more conservative than someone else.

In my community we are turning the corner on crime. It has not hurt a bit to have 200 new officers on our streets to help deal with the problem of juvenile violence. These folks say forget that, we want to cut what is there now, not help to do more about juvenile violence.

They say they can do it with just a penny across the board. Well, they could not find one penny, one \$400 hammer out of the Defense Department bureaucracy to cut. Not a penny do they cut there. They say they have got to have more money in order to succeed.

Mr. Chairman, they say there is more than one way to skin a cat, but I maintain that, under either of these Republican budgets, it is only the American people that are going to get skinned.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a point that when the cats are making their case, they are never going to dog it.

Then I would like to correct a couple of the minor misstatements. The budget that we are currently considering that I have presented here puts more

money aside for Social Security than any other budget that has been considered in Washington, D.C. this year. It is offensive for anyone to get on this floor and somehow say this budget is not the best budget for Social Security, because anybody who looks at the numbers will realize that there is more money for Social Security in this budget than anything else under consideration here.

Education. Education has got inflationary increases in spending. We do not increase the role of Federal Government; we leave that to the parents, families and communities.

Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, let me first of all say I am disheartened by what I just heard. The misstatement of fact is inappropriate for this body.

Should the size of this government grow? That is the question we need to ask. Should this government get bigger? There is only one budget that says no, we will grow it right with inflation and not let it get bigger, and that is this budget.

Is there any budget that truly puts teeth in protecting Social Security? There is only one. It is Neumann. We put it in negotiable bonds. It is not paper anymore. It is truly bonds.

Do we really save Social Security? You bet. Is the money that goes into the trust fund really put into something that matters, not just more paperwork that we can flip around with the transportation bill and use?

We heard the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) talk about education. This budget, the Neumann budget, sends the money to the classrooms. It sends 95 percent of the education dollars to the local classrooms and lets them do it: the teachers, the principals, the local school board. So that is another reason that it is better than any proposal.

Number five, it cuts taxes. You bet. It eliminates the marriage penalty. It expands the 15 percent tax bracket, which happens to be where most people are in this country. It eliminates the death tax on the farmers and the ranchers and those that can least afford to pay it.

Finally, yes, it reduces the holding period on capital gains, because for once we now can prove that lowering that actually generates more revenue for the country.

Finally, it dedicates 50 percent of everything that comes in above excess revenues for reduction in the debt.

It is unfortunate that we hear rhetoric that does not match the facts. It is unfortunate that this body is abused in that manner. I am sorry that we have to hear that. But if the American public does not want this government to grow any larger, then they should, in fact, insist on the Neumann budget. It does what the American people ask.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, this is a bad budget. It is a bad amendment to a bad budget. We Democrats are grateful that our Republican colleagues would bring up something like this, because it makes clear the differences between the parties: cuts in education, cuts for senior citizens, cuts in health, cuts for the environment, cuts for the protection of natural resources, cuts for things that are important to the little people of this country. That is what is in the budget that comes from over here, and that is what is in the substitute.

It is only 51 days that we are late bringing this up. I can understand my Republican colleagues were probably ashamed to put this kind of travesty before this body. It is, however, something which makes very clear the difference between the two parties. It shows where our Republican friends are coming from.

They are not interested in maintaining the agreement which we had last time on the budget, which has helped give us perhaps the greatest level of prosperity which we have had. They are not interested in preserving programs which are helpful and of value to the little people of this country. They want to cut the things which are investments in the future of this country, like education, protection of our natural resources, and things of this kind.

We have not worked very hard this session. I think, perhaps, given the way this budget reflects the behavior of my Republican colleagues, that is probably a very good thing.

There are a lot of things that we could be doing which would be helping the people. We could deal with the managed care problem. We could address the problem in Superfund. But, no, we are out here today cutting programs which are important to the people.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER).

□ 1200

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

Mr. Chairman, one fact is very clear today. Two out of three are not bad. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) offers a budget alternative that increases spending and increases taxes. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. NEUMANN) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) offer budgets which spend less and tax less. Clearly the budget of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. NEUMANN) is the budget which is best for Social Security.

Mr. Chairman, let us remember what the number one goal of this year should be. That is to eliminate the marriage tax penalty, because the most

fundamental question we should be answering is, is it right, is it fair, that 21 million married working couples pay on the average \$1,400 more just because they are married? That is wrong. The Neumann budget and the Kasich budget make their centerpiece the elimination of the marriage tax penalty.

We have two opportunities out of three votes today to eliminate the marriage tax penalty. Let us vote aye on Neumann, let us vote aye on Kasich. Mr. Chairman, they both deserve bipartisan support.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I am not here to speak about the CATS' meow. Mr. Chairman, here we go again. To placate the extremists, the Republican leadership has brought to the floor a budget which is so extreme that the Republican Senate Committee on the Budget chairman has called it a mockery. Republican Governors say that this Republican budget violates the agreements that were made with the States. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in the Senate says that Congress cannot function with this Republican budget.

Mr. Chairman, budgets are not just about numbers, budgets are about values. Budgets are about priorities, and they are about who we are as a Nation.

Let us take a look at the Republican values, as illustrated in the Kasich budget, the Republican budget. The budget fails to preserve Social Security. It would cut health services to seniors, to pregnant women and children who cannot afford health insurance. It would cut an additional \$10 billion out of veterans' health care services, and it shortchanges our future by killing investments in child care and in education. I ask the Members, are these the kinds of values that we are about in the United States of America?

This budget eliminates the investment in improving the quality of early childhood education, to help children start school ready to learn. It eliminates child care assistance to the working poor, so they can leave welfare, go to work, and be able to know that their kids are safe. I ask Americans, does this budget reflect their values?

It eliminates Title I funds to help our most disadvantaged children catch up to their peers in school. Does this really reflect our values? It eliminates funds to help teachers update their curriculum, to teach our youngsters to the highest standards. It eliminates funds to modernize schools, and to put computers in every classroom. I ask the Members, does this budget reflect American values?

The budget eliminates funds to increase the number of qualified teachers in the early grades. Mr. Chairman, this does not reflect our values.

The Republican budget walks away from the needs of children, it walks

away from the needs of American families, it walks away from American values. We ought to oppose it. The papers in the last few days have characterized this as budget baloney, budget theatrics, budget mockery. Let us defeat the Kasich budget. It is wrong for the values of the United States of America.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JOHN HOSTETTLER).

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

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Neumann CATs budget, in that it maintains a commitment to our national defense. The United States Constitution declares, "We, the people of the United States, in order to provide for the common defense, do ordain and establish this Constitution."

The Neumann CATs budget merely maintains defense spending at the rate of inflation. It does not even increase defense spending, when we put into account inflation. This budget does what liberal Democrat Congresses have not done in the past. It merely maintains inflation.

If Members agree with the leader of that party who, in his formative years, in a December 3, 1969 letter to a Colonel Holmes said that he "loathes the military," Members will vote against the Neumann CATs budget. If Members believe that we should maintain our commitment to the military, if they love the men and women in uniform and they believe that we should maintain the rate of inflation and they do not loathe the United States military, I suggest Members vote for the Neumann budget and support our men and women in uniform.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HEFNER).

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

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to nobody on my support for the military. On military construction, we have had hundreds of calls for add-ons to the military construction budget, but our allocation is so low we are not able to do it. There were calls from Republicans and Democrats.

We rewrite history around here pretty regularly. I remember when Ronald Reagan was President, a group of us went up to Camp David and we were talking about budgets. I said, Mr. President, what is going to happen to us if the economy does not operate like you think and we get down to the point where we have these tremendous deficits? God bless his heart, he said, we will just have to face that when we get to it. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. CHARLIE STENHOLM) was there.

Our distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget, my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHN KASICH) and the gentleman from

Georgia (Mr. NEWT GINGRICH), the Speaker, this morning, talked about, and the gentleman with the belt last night, talking about we can only cut one penny, one penny.

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

Mr. HEFNER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, that gentleman referred to was the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), my good friend.

Mr. HEFNER. He wears that big a belt?

Mr. NEUMANN. Nine feet.

Mr. HEFNER. He said we can cut one penny, but they do not cut 1 percent. We have two-thirds of the budget that is untouchable. Members know that. We have been around here a long while.

The Speaker asked this morning if Members cannot find 1 percent, but that is not 1 percent they are going to find. In 1993, and one of the gentlemen last night, and I will not call names, he got up and said that was a disaster, that the only thing that got this economy moving again was when we elected the new Republicans. That is not true. In 1993, without one single Republican vote in the House or the Senate, we passed a package that got this economy moving, with interest rates down, low unemployment. Members can talk whatever they like about it, but something made it happen. That is the only thing we did, and that is what made it happen to make this possible for us to even have a surplus to talk about.

But at that time, let me just quote what some of the folks in the Republican Party said about that package that we passed. In fact, when it passed, a woman that voted for it, they stood on that side and said, "Bye-bye, bye-bye, you are going to lose because of that." So they go out and spread the stuff that we had raised taxes on low-income people, which we did not.

Mr. Chairman, we raised taxes on 2 percent of the wealthiest people in this country, and Ronald Reagan said 50 percent of Social Security, that was to be taxed. We raised that, but we also raised the threshold of what people could make before there was a tax, so there was no tax on working people.

Here is what some of the Republicans said when we passed that package. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NEWT GINGRICH) said, "The tax increase will kill jobs and lead to a recession, and the recession will force people off of work and onto unemployment," and the deficit will actually increase.

Our distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget said, "We're going to find out whether we have higher deficits, we're going to find out whether we have a slower economy, we're going to find out what's going to happen to interest rates, and it's our bet that this is a job killer." And the unemployment rate is lower than it has been in decades.

Here is something else our chairman said. "It's like a snake bite. The venom

is going to be injected into the body of this economy, in our judgment, and it's going to spread throughout the body and it's going to begin to kill the jobs that Americans now have."

I maintain that the Republican budget will do exactly that.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

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

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Neumann budget, because it sets the right priorities.

But before I begin my remarks, let me just comment on the mystifying debate on this floor which continues to use the word cut, cut, cut, cut. There is not a single cut in this budget. This budget grows spending. It grows it from \$1,705 billion in the first year to \$1,894 billion in the last year. Over the last 5 years we have grown spending by \$7.8 trillion. In the next we are going to grow it by \$8.9 trillion. There is no cut.

This debate raises the fundamental question, should government grow at 2 to 3 times the rate of the growth in salaries of the American people? Because make no mistake about it, that is what that side wants. Government has an insatiable appetite for more money and more spending, and that is what they want.

What does that mean to the American people? For the last 8 years, the average American has seen his or her salary go up 3.4 percent, a 3.4 percent increase in their compensation. But government, government has grown at almost double that rate. Domestic discretionary spending in 1991 went up by 6.9 percent, in 1992 by 9.6 percent, in 1993 by 6.64 percent, in 1994 by 6.1 percent, in 1995 by 4.6 percent.

Over the period, while Americans have seen their wages go up only 3.4 percent, government has grown at double that rate, 5.2 percent in domestic discretionary spending. But what has happened in mandatory spending? Means-tested entitlements have grown at three times the rate of the growth in the income of the average American family. Total mandatory spending is growing at double the rate, 5.3 percent versus 3.4 percent.

This budget sets the right priorities for Americans. While defense spending is declining, it makes up that. Defense spending has gone down during this time period by 11.6 percent. We must set the right priorities and protect defense spending, and reduce the rate of growth in discretionary spending.

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

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, as we continue to talk about the budget, and I have listened intently, it seems to me that we have some strange priorities in this country. I hear us talking about how well the economy is doing. We are continuing to grow and expand, and then at the same time, I hear us talk about taking away entitlement opportunities for the needy, taking away programs for those who are not a part of the expanding economy; talking about retrenching public housing.

Under this budget, there is a possibility that 1 million low-income families could lose public housing vouchers and certificates over the next 5 years. If this is the budget of priority for the American people, then I certainly hope it can be realigned, changed, and realtered. Let us come with a budget that helps all of the people of America, as opposed to only those who are most affluent and at the top.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that budgets are not only instruments and tools of management; but they are also indicators of direction and priorities. If this is indeed the case, then I have some grave concerns and reservations about the budget resolution which has been put before us by the majority in this House.

At a time when we are experiencing vast economic expansion and growth, the majority resolution seeks to place deep cuts in programs designed to assist the needy and working class in this country. The resolution cuts Medicare by \$10.1 billion, and Medicaid—the program that provides health care for the poor by \$12 billion over five years. In addition, the Republican resolution cuts funding for education and child care, and eliminates direct federal funding to school districts by repealing Title I grants and other non-defense discretionary programs by \$45 billion over a five year period.

The Republican budget turns its back on seniors, children and Social Security, and focuses on cuts, and more cuts to those who need help the most. While at the same time it rewards the rich and more affluent with private retirement accounts at the expense of Social Security, and provides \$101 billion in new tax cuts. Under this proposal, 1 million households could lose federal housing vouchers and certificates by year 2003.

The Democratic alternative on the other hand preserves Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and Education. It invests in the future of our children. The Democratic alternative is good for working families, senior citizens, children, and for the average person. It strengthens America. I urge that we oppose the Republican budget resolution and support the democratic alternative. It is better for all America.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to yield 30 seconds to my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, very briefly, each one of these bars represents how much money has been spent by the Federal Government for each one of these years, 1994 through 2003.

In 1994 we started out at \$1.4 trillion. We are ending up in the committee's budget at \$1.9 trillion. What happens? I am going to draw a line here. The budget of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. MARK NEUMANN) suggests that we stay with inflation, and we actually reduce very slightly the spending over the next 5 years. The Democrat or the Spratt budget actually suggests that we increase spending. It is important to know that we have to live within inflation.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD).

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

Mr. Chairman, Senator DOMENICI has called it a mockery, and Senator STEVENS has asked us where will we get the \$45 billion in discretionary cuts. My Republican colleagues, many in the Committee on the Budget, have all said these cuts are not desirable or attainable.

I say to my friends in Memphis, in Cummings and Winchester and Goodland, and at Idlewilde Elementary who are graduating today, I apologize for not being there, but I assure the Members my Republican colleagues who raised this budget resolution issue last night, at 11:30 last night, is the reason I am not home.

With schools crumbling around our Nation, our Republican colleagues and, I might add, even some of my Democratic colleagues are to blame as well, but we have to point the finger where the finger ought to be pointed. Republican friends of mine in the Congress, despite the fact that a Democratic President balanced the budget, lowered interest rates, lowered inflation, and lowered unemployment, instead of working together to save Social Security, to preserve those initiatives, which many of my colleagues, I look at the gentleman from California (Mr. DUKE CUNNINGHAM), who serves so ably, he will move on from this Congress one day and benefit from Medicaid and Social Security. Let us preserve that first.

□ 1215

I say to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) who said that we spend too much here in Washington on education, 95 percent of the funding and policy decisions in education in America are made at the local level. Let us do more at the Federal level to rebuild our schools, hire teachers, develop after-school programs, and prepare the next generation of Americans.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS).

(Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support a budget that will provide America's families with \$150 billion in tax cuts and also take a

big whack out of our national debt. I also rise today to support a budget that will make national defense once again a national priority by taking less of families' hard-earned income and paychecks, taking a bite out of our national debt and strengthening our national defense.

The Neumann budget will strengthen our families, our economy, and our Nation. I appeal to my colleagues to support this legislation because America's families deserve nothing less.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support a budget that will provide America's families with \$150 billion in tax cuts and also take a big whack out of the national debt. I also rise today to support a budget that will make national defense, once again, a national priority. That legislation is the substitute budget offered by my friend from Wisconsin, Rep. MARK NEUMANN, and I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. Chairman, last year, the average income for a family in which both parents worked was \$55,000 a year. Of that money, roughly half of that family's income went to pay federal, state and local taxes. My friends, how can we expect a family to take care of themselves and their children when the government takes half of what they earn? It just doesn't make any sense.

That's why I support the Neumann substitute budget, because it would provide America's families with \$150 billion in tax relief, so families can keep more of their hard-earned paychecks. The Neumann budget would also eliminate the so-called marriage penalty, which is basically a tax increase couples must pay once they become married.

But that's not all. The Neumann budget realizes that we can't give our kids a \$5.5 trillion national debt and expect them to have a better future. So it calls for 50 percent of any remaining budget surplus to go towards reducing the national debt, so we can give our kids a clean financial slate for the future.

The Neumann budget also seeks to increase defense spending by an additional \$56 billion over last year's budget. With threats to our national security in Iraq and all across the world, we cannot afford to be lax in the maintenance of our military. The Neumann budget gives our troops the resources they need to be successful in any mission they might undertake.

By taking less of families' hard-earned paychecks, taking a bite out of the national debt and strengthening our national defense, the Neumann budget will strengthen our families, our economy and our nation. I appeal to my colleagues to support this legislation, because the families of America deserve nothing less.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking member, very much for yielding me this time, and I rise to vigorously oppose this budget which destroys our commitment to the families of America and the children of America.

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

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

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

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to set this discussion in proper perspective today. Recently one of the polling companies from here in Washington, D.C., asked 2,000 American adults, "Do you think the United States Government should increase faster than the rate of inflation, faster than the family budget; at the same rate as the family budget; or slower than the family budget?" It was a 90-to-3 answer. Ninety percent of Americans believe that the United States Government should not increase faster than the family budget or faster than the rate of inflation.

So we decided we were going to put together a proposal that met the wishes and the demands of the American people. This black line on this chart that I have here shows inflation. That is how fast the family budgets are going up across America.

The farthest column, that shows how fast the CAT's budget is increasing spending out here in the government. And I would point out that it is the only proposal that we are considering, the President's, the Senate, the House, the Democrat alternative, it is the only proposal that we are considering out here today that allows government spending to go up at a slower rate than the rate of inflation.

Mr. Chairman, 90 percent of the American people believe that the Federal Government should not increase its spending faster than the family budget, and this is the only opportunity we have today to keep that and to meet that wish.

The House budget, the Kasich budget, if we take Social Security out of the picture, it also meets that. With Social Security in the picture, it goes up slightly faster than the rate of inflation but it is the second closest to meeting the wishes of the American people.

I have heard a lot of rhetoric about preserving Social Security. Baloney. The only budget out here that puts more money aside for Social Security is the budget we are about to vote on. The CAT's budget puts \$275 billion aside to preserve and protect Social Security.

I believe every senior citizen in the United States of America has a right to get up tomorrow morning knowing that their Social Security is safe and secure. So in the CAT's budget we put more money aside for Social Security than any other budget being considered.

So let us cut through the rhetoric out here and let us get down to the facts of what is actually being considered. The CAT's budget puts aside \$275 billion for Social Security; the House budget, \$223 billion; the Senate pro-

posal, \$149 billion; and the President's proposal just under \$100 billion.

So if Members are serious about preserving Social Security for our senior citizens in this country, the CAT's budget is the right vote.

What about the tax burden on American workers? The tax burden is too high. A generation ago 25 cents out of every dollar that workers earned went to taxes. Today that number is 37 cents out of every dollar they earned. Let us translate that into what it means. It means that American workers have to take second and third jobs in order to pay that extra tax burden from this government. That is wrong.

That is why the CAT's budget proposes \$150 billion in additional tax reductions. Eliminate the marriage tax penalty. Across-the-board tax cuts. And, shoot, the inheritance tax, we have already paid taxes on it once. I believe every American in this country after working hard should have the opportunity to pass their inheritance on to their children, not to the United States Government. That is why we have proposed extensive tax relief.

How are we able to set aside for money for Social Security and provide additional tax relief? That really goes back to the first chart, and again this first chart shows it emphatically. This is the only budget that holds spending increases in this government at or below the rate of inflation. These others that are going up faster than the rate of inflation will say good-bye to the tax cuts, will say good-bye to that money is that supposed to be set aside for Social Security, because every nickel over the rate of inflation, that is money that should be set aside to preserve and protect Social Security and reduce the tax burden on our American families.

Let me close with what I believe the priorities of this Nation are, because we have been hearing about these priorities and where we place our priorities in this country. I believe our priorities should be to defend our Nation. I believe it is the number one role of this government, to make sure that this Nation is safe and secure for our children.

I think our responsibility is to return the control of education back to the parents and the teachers and the community. Control of education should not be out here at the United States Government. And just for the record, this budget allows inflationary increases in education.

Preserve Social Security and reduce the tax burden. Those are the priorities of the CAT's budget.

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

Mr. Chairman, the Neumann substitute is an amendment and its main failing is that it fails to amend, correct, fix the many defects that are in the Kasich budget. In fact, it worsens them.

At the outset I read a long bill of particulars to ask the gentleman from

Wisconsin (Mr. NEUMANN) if any of these problems in the Kasich budget had been cured or corrected in his substitute, and I have yet to hear an answer.

He wants to go 50 percent further with spending reduction beyond Mr. KASICH. In income security, where the Kasich resolution would take \$10 billion out of TANF, we already have a letter from the gentleman's governor, the governor of Wisconsin, a stinging rebuke saying this is a repudiation of the governors' agreement with respect to welfare reform. Presumably the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. NEUMANN) would go further, \$15 billion out of the TANF block grant.

Law enforcement, Kasich cuts law enforcement by \$8 billion. If the gentleman from Wisconsin wants to go 50 percent further, presumably he will take \$12 billion out of law enforcement.

Section 8 housing, which has just been raised by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), the Kasich budget claims to provide the outlays to renew 1 million section 8 contracts. Presumably the gentleman from Wisconsin would put 1.5 million people out of housing. Kasich is bad enough. Neumann is worse. It is ultrabad. Vote it down.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. NEUMANN).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the ayes 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 158, noes 262, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 208]

AYES—158

Aderholt	Cunningham	Hostettler
Archer	Deal	Hulshof
Armey	DeLay	Hunter
Bachus	Dickey	Hutchinson
Baker	Doolittle	Hyde
Barr	Dreier	Inglis
Bartlett	Duncan	Istook
Barton	Dunn	Jenkins
Bateman	Ehrlich	Johnson, Sam
Bliley	Emerson	Jones
Blunt	Ensign	Kasich
Boehner	Everett	Kingston
Bonilla	Ewing	Klug
Brady (TX)	Foley	Knollenberg
Bryant	Fowler	LaHood
Burr	Fox	Largent
Burton	Gallegly	Lewis (CA)
Callahan	Gibbons	Lewis (KY)
Calvert	Gillmor	Livingston
Camp	Goode	Lucas
Cannon	Goodlatte	Manzullo
Chabot	Goodling	McCollum
Chambliss	Goss	McCreery
Chenoweth	Graham	McInnis
Christensen	Granger	McIntosh
Coble	Hall (TX)	McKeon
Coburn	Hansen	Metcalf
Collins	Hastert	Mica
Combest	Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)
Cook	Hayworth	Moran (KS)
Cooksey	Hefley	Myrick
Cox	Hergert	Nethercutt
Crane	Hilleary	Neumann
Cubin	Hoekstra	Norwood

Oxley	Royce	Stump
Packard	Ryun	Sununu
Pappas	Salmon	Talent
Parker	Sanford	Taylor (MS)
Paul	Saxton	Taylor (NC)
Paxon	Scarborough	Thomas
Pease	Schaefer, Dan	Thornberry
Peterson (PA)	Schaffer, Bob	Thune
Petri	Sessions	Tiahrt
Pickering	Shadegg	Wamp
Pitts	Shimkus	Watkins
Pombo	Shuster	Watts (OK)
Portman	Smith (MI)	Weldon (PA)
Radanovich	Smith (OR)	Weller
Redmond	Smith (TX)	White
Riggs	Snowbarger	Wicker
Riley	Solomon	Young (AK)
Rogan	Spence	Young (FL)
Rohrabacher	Stearns	

Stenholm	Towns	Waxman
Stokes	Traficant	Weldon (FL)
Strickland	Turner	Wexler
Stupak	Upton	Weygand
Tauscher	Velazquez	Whitfield
Tauzin	Vento	Wise
Thompson	Visclosky	Wolf
Thurman	Walsh	Woolsey
Tierney	Waters	Wynn
Torres	Watt (NC)	Yates

appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1999: \$1,403,700,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2000: \$1,445,600,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001: \$1,484,100,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002: \$1,501,100,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003: \$1,578,300,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1999: \$82,500,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2000: \$104,400,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001: \$104,900,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002: \$64,900,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003: \$87,300,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1999: \$5,582,500,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2000: \$5,756,600,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001: \$5,926,600,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002: \$6,059,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003: \$6,211,100,000,000.

**SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.**

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and budget outlays for fiscal years 1999 through 2003 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$270,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$265,500,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$274,300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$268,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$280,800,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$269,700,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$288,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$272,100,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$296,800,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$279,800,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$14,200,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$14,800,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,100,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$14,500,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$14,400,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$14,500,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$17,900,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,800,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$17,800,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$17,600,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$17,700,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$17,700,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$700,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$100,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$100,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$600,000,000.

**NOES—262**

Abercrombie	Forbes	McHale
Ackerman	Ford	McHugh
Allen	Fossella	McIntyre
Andrews	Frank (MA)	McKinney
Baesler	Franks (NJ)	McNulty
Baldacci	Frelinghuysen	Meehan
Barcia	Frost	Meek (FL)
Barrett (NE)	Ganske	Meeks (NY)
Barrett (WI)	Gekas	Menendez
Bass	Gephardt	Millender-
Becerra	Gilchrist	McDonald
Bentsen	Gilman	Miller (CA)
Bereuter	Gordon	Minge
Berman	Green	Mink
Berry	Greenwood	Moakley
Bilbray	Gutierrez	Moran (VA)
Bilirakis	Gutknecht	Morella
Bishop	Hall (OH)	Murtha
Blagojevich	Hamilton	Nadler
Blumenauer	Harman	Neal
Boehlert	Hastings (FL)	Ney
Bonior	Hefner	Northup
Bono	Hill	Nussle
Borski	Hilliard	Oberstar
Boswell	Hinchee	Obey
Boucher	Hinojosa	Olver
Boyd	Hobson	Ortiz
Brady (PA)	Holden	Owens
Brown (CA)	Hoohey	Pallone
Brown (FL)	Horn	Pascrell
Brown (OH)	Houghton	Pastor
Bunning	Hoyer	Payne
Buyer	Jackson (IL)	Pelosi
Campbell	Jackson-Lee	Peterson (MN)
Canady	(TX)	Pickett
Capps	Jefferson	Pomeroy
Cardin	John	Porter
Carson	Johnson (CT)	Poshard
Castle	Johnson (WI)	Price (NC)
Clay	Kanjorski	Pryce (OH)
Clayton	Kaptur	Quinn
Clement	Kelly	Rahall
Clyburn	Kennedy (RI)	Ramstad
Condit	Kennelly	Rangel
Conyers	Kildee	Regula
Costello	Kilpatrick	Reyes
Coyne	Kim	Rivers
Cramer	Kind (WI)	Rodriguez
Crapo	King (NY)	Roemer
Cummings	Kleczka	Rogers
Danner	Klink	Rothman
Davis (FL)	Kolbe	Roukema
Davis (IL)	Kucinich	Roybal-Allard
Davis (VA)	LaFalce	Rush
DeFazio	Lampson	Sanchez
DeGette	Lantos	Sanders
Delahunt	Latham	Sandlin
DeLauro	LaTourette	Sawyer
Deutsch	Lazio	Schumer
Diaz-Balart	Leach	Scott
Dicks	Lee	Sensenbrenner
Dingell	Levin	Serrano
Dixon	Lipinski	Shaw
Doggett	LoBiondo	Shays
Dooley	Lofgren	Sherman
Doyle	Lowey	Sisisky
Edwards	Luther	Skaggs
Ehlers	Maloney (CT)	Skeen
Engel	Maloney (NY)	Skelton
English	Manton	Slaughter
Eshoo	Markey	Smith (NJ)
Etheridge	Martinez	Smith, Adam
Evans	Mascara	Smith, Linda
Farr	Matsui	Snyder
Fattah	McCarthy (MO)	Souder
Fawell	McCarthy (NY)	Spratt
Fazio	McDermott	Stabenow
Filner	McGovern	Stark

**NOT VOTING—13**

Ballenger	Kennedy (MA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Furse	Lewis (GA)	Sabo
Gejdenson	Linder	Tanner
Gonzalez	McDade	
Johnson, E.B.	Mollohan	

□ 1242

Mr. NEY changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. BARR of Georgia 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. HEFLEY). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part 2 of House Report 105-565.

**AMENDMENT 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 2 amendment No. 2 in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. SPRATT of South Carolina:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

**SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999.**

The Congress declares that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1999 and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2000 through 2003 are hereby set forth.

**SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.**

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003:

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

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:  
 Fiscal year 1999: \$1,321,200,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2000: \$1,341,200,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001: \$1,379,200,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002: \$1,436,200,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003: \$1,491,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1999: -\$900,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2000: -\$200,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001: \$100,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002: \$300,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003: \$700,000,000.

(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 1999: \$1,420,200,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2000: \$1,463,600,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001: \$1,503,800,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002: \$1,537,200,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2003: \$1,611,200,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appro-

- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$1,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$100,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$1,000,000,000.
- (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$23,300,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,000,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$23,400,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,800,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$23,200,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,700,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,700,000,000.
- (6) Agriculture (350):  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$10,600,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,900,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$10,300,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,800,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$9,100,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$9,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,900,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$9,300,000,000.
- (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,100,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$3,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$9,800,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,900,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$10,800,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$11,600,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$11,500,000,000.
- (8) Transportation (400):  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$51,100,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$42,500,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$52,100,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$44,700,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$53,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$46,400,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$54,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$46,700,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$56,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$48,900,000,000.
- (9) Community and Regional Development (450):  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$10,900,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$9,700,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$8,900,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,400,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$8,100,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$8,100,000,000.
- (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$63,900,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$61,100,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$64,100,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$63,400,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$64,800,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$66,100,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$64,900,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$69,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$68,700,000,000.
- (11) Health (550):  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$145,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$143,600,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$151,900,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$151,900,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$159,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$159,500,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$166,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$167,600,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$177,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$178,600,000,000.
- (12) Medicare (570):  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$209,800,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$210,400,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$221,510,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$220,900,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$239,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$242,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$251,000,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$248,600,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$273,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$273,400,000,000.
- (13) Income Security (600):  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$246,000,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$247,700,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$259,300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$258,300,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$270,200,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$268,600,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$280,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$278,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$291,400,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$288,900,000,000.
- (14) Social Security (650):  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$12,800,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,100,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$13,100,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$12,500,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$14,500,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$15,300,000,000.
- (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,100,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$43,600,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$44,300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$44,600,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$45,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$45,700,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,100,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$46,100,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$47,100,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$47,100,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$47,100,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$47,100,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,400,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$49,800,000,000.
- (16) Administration of Justice (750):  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,400,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$24,600,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,400,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$24,900,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$25,100,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$24,500,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$24,600,000,000.
- (17) General Government (800):  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,100,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$13,400,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$13,600,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$13,500,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,400,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$13,400,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,400,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$13,400,000,000.
- (18) Net Interest (900):  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$296,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$296,700,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$297,000,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$297,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$296,400,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$296,400,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$296,100,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$296,100,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$297,800,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$297,800,000,000.
- (19) Allowances (920):  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$2,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$600,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$1,800,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$1,100,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$2,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$600,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$3,300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$3,900,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$800,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$1,000,000,000.
- (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$37,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$37,700,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$39,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$39,500,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$43,400,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$43,300,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$51,300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$51,300,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2003:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$42,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$42,700,000,000.

#### SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

(a) SUBMISSIONS.—Not later than 30 days after the date of adoption of this resolution, the House committees named in subsection (b) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(b) INSTRUCTIONS TO HOUSE COMMITTEES.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to decrease outlays by \$0 for fiscal year 1999 and decrease outlays by \$40,000,000 for fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(2) COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The House Committee on Banking and Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to decrease outlays by \$212,000,000 for fiscal year 1999 and decrease outlays by \$1,045,000,000 for fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(3) COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to decrease outlays by \$707,000,000 for fiscal year 1999 and decrease outlays by \$2,765,000,000 for fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(4) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to decrease outlays by \$86,000,000 for fiscal year 1999 and increase outlays by \$3,443,000,000 for fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(5) COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES.—The House Committee on Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to decrease outlays by \$3,000,000 for fiscal year 1999 and decrease outlays by \$381,000,000 for fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(6) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to decrease outlays by \$437,000,000 for fiscal year 1999 and decrease outlays by \$892,000,000 for fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

#### SEC. 5. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF COMPENSATION AND PAY FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.

In the House, for purposes of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, establishing on a prospective basis compensation or pay for any office or position in the Government at a specified level, the appropriation for which is provided through annual discretionary appropriations, shall not be considered as providing new entitlement authority or new budget authority.

#### SEC. 6. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON TOTAL BUDGET SURPLUSES AND SOCIAL SECURITY.

It is the sense of Congress that:

(1) The total budget surplus should be reserved until the Congress and the President enact comprehensive measures providing for the long-term solvency of Social Security, while preserving its core protections for present and future generations of American families.

(2) There should be established within the Treasury a "Save Social Security First Reserve Fund" to be used to save budget surpluses until a reform measure is enacted to ensure the long-term solvency of the Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance

Trust Funds. The Secretary of the Treasury should pay into the account at the end of each fiscal year an amount equal to the surplus, if any, in the total budget of the United States Government for that fiscal year. Balances in that account should be invested in Treasury securities and interest earnings should be credited to the account.

#### SEC. 7. RESERVE FUND FOR POTENTIAL TOBACCO LEGISLATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Budget authority and outlays may be allocated to a committee or committees for legislation that increases funding to promote smoking prevention and cessation, curbs cigarette smoking among teenagers, makes payments to the States to mitigate the costs incurred of treating smoking-related illnesses, provides support to tobacco farmers, makes payments to other claimants against tobacco companies, or funds Federal medical research, within such a committee's jurisdiction, if such a committee or the committee of conference on such legislation reports such legislation, and if, to the extent that the costs of such legislation are not included in this concurrent resolution on the budget, the enactment of such legislation will not increase (by virtue of either contemporaneous or previously passed legislation) the deficits in this resolution for—

(1) fiscal year 1999; and

(2) the period of fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

(b) REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—Upon the reporting of legislation pursuant to subsection (a), and again upon the submission of a conference report on such legislation (if a conference report is submitted), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives may file with the House appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this subsection. Such revised allocations, functional levels, and aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates contained in this concurrent resolution on the budget.

(c) FEDERAL HOSPITAL INSURANCE TRUST FUND (MEDICARE PART A TRUST FUND).—Congress intends that any tobacco proceeds not used for increased funding under subsection (a) should be deposited in the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund (established under section 1817 of the Social Security Act).

#### SEC. 8. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE ASSETS FOR INDEPENDENCE ACT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

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

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

(3) in order to provide low-income families with more tools for empowerment in lieu of traditional income support and to assist them in becoming more involved in planning their future, new public-private relationships that encourage asset-building should be undertaken;

(4) individual development account programs are successfully demonstrating the ability to assist low-income families in building assets while partnering with community organizations and States in more than 40 public and private experiments nationwide; and

(5) Federal support for a trial demonstration program would greatly assist the creative efforts of existing individual development account experiments.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that, in carrying out its reconciliation instructions pursuant to this concurrent resolution, the Committee on Ways and Means should include the text of H.R. 2849 (the Assets for Independence Act) in its submission to the House Committee on the Budget.

#### SEC. 9. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON A DEMONSTRATION PROJECT ON CLINICAL CANCER TRIALS.

It is the sense of Congress that the committees of jurisdiction should consider legislation this session that would establish a 3-year demonstration project providing Medicare coverage for beneficiaries' participation in clinical cancer trials.

#### SEC. 10. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE INTERIM PAYMENT SYSTEM FOR HOME HEALTH BENEFITS UNDER MEDICARE.

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

(1) the interim payment system for home health service has adversely affected some home health care agencies and Medicare beneficiaries;

(2) if home health care is threatened and further reduced, health care costs to Federal and State governments, as well as families, may rise to cover more expensive post-hospital and long-term care;

(3) the committees of jurisdiction should initiate a revision of the interim payment system, paying particular attention to providing a more gradual reduction in home health care costs and additional time for home health care agencies to adjust to lower rates and reimbursements;

(4) due to the critical nature of this issue, Congress should enact an equitable and fair revision of the interim payment system before the adjournment of the 105th Congress; and

(5) the Health Care Financing Administration should fully implement by October 1, 1999, the prospective payment system that was enacted into law last year.

#### SEC. 11. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON TAX RELIEF.

It is the sense of Congress that the committees of jurisdiction should accommodate high priority tax relief of approximately \$30,000,000,000 over 5 years within legislation that fully offsets revenues lost by closing or restricting unwarranted tax benefits. Such tax relief should—

(1) accommodate the revenue effects of improving rights for medical patients and providers in managed care health plans;

(2) expand tax credits to alleviate the costs of child care for families;

(3) reduce financing costs for primary and secondary public school modernization;

(4) extend long-supported and previously renewed tax benefits that will soon expire such as the Work Opportunity and Research and Experimentation credits; and

(5) mitigate tax code "marriage penalties" in a manner at least equal in scope to the 1995 tax relief provision of H.R. 2491.

Amend the title so as to read: "A concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1999 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003."

□ 1245

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). Pursuant to House Resolution 455, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the minority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, when I finally got a good look at this Republican budget, it reminded me of a country song that I once heard entitled *My Daddy Took a Back-Hoe and Built Me a Sand-Castle of Sludge*.

Mr. Chairman, what a mess. After a long wait, with lots of noise, lots of rumbling and too much slip-sliding around the details, my colleagues across the aisle have come up with a budget that just will not stand up. I think we would all be lucky if a big wave just came along and washed it all out to sea.

Fortunately, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, has developed a budget plan that is both solid and sensible. I want to congratulate him on his work. The Democratic budget is a responsible budget, it shows fiscal restraint, and it harnesses this Nation's potential to help move this country forward.

The Democratic budget invests in education. It includes funding to modernize our schools, to reduce class size, to improve discipline and to help our students excel.

From Head Start to Pell grants, this budget says that the strength of our Nation tomorrow depends on the education we give our children today.

In addition to education, the Democratic budget invests in better health care. It expands Medicare, it protects Medicaid, it funds medical research and moves to establish a Patients' Bill of Rights so that doctors and patients and nurses can make medical decisions and not insurance companies.

The Democratic budget protects the environment. On this I want to pay particular compliment to my friend from South Carolina and the Democrats on the Committee on the Budget, because they provide vital resources to clean up our rivers and our lakes, to get rid of toxic waste sites and to preserve our great natural inheritance for generations to come.

The Democratic budget proposal protects Social Security. It sets aside the budget surplus until we can reach a bipartisan plan to fund it for the long term. Our parents, Mr. Chairman, should not have to worry about their retirement and neither should their children.

The Democratic budget also offers working families \$30 billion in tax relief. It cuts the marriage penalty, it expands the child care tax credit, it helps small businesses, and it makes health care more affordable.

All in all, it is a good budget. It is a balanced budget. It is a budget that invests in people and creates opportunity. It stands, I sadly say here this afternoon, in stark contrast to the Republican budget.

The budget was due on the 15th of April. We have waited, patiently, and

we have waited. This budget that they submitted is the latest budget in the history of the United States Congress. What did they finally come up with? They came up with the same old bilge that Americans have rejected time and time again.

The Republican budget begins to dismantle Social Security, it slashes Medicaid, it cheats education, it bulldozes the environment, it squanders the surplus. Even Senator DOMENICI, excuse me for mentioning the other body, Mr. Chairman, distinguished gentleman from New Mexico, a Republican, he called the Republican House budget, and I quote, a mockery.

This budget that they have proposed moves us backward. That is the wrong direction. We cannot afford to backslide. We need better schools. We need a cleaner environment and more affordable health care, not the same old slash-and-burn tactics of the Contract on America.

The Democratic budget plan builds on our current successes, it keeps the budget in balance, it helps working families, and it invests in the future of this great country.

I urge my colleagues to support the Spratt budget and oppose the Republican budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON), my colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I will make this very brief. I am going to have to vote against the Spratt substitute budget since it suggests a variety of policy changes that I do not think are appropriate. But I will support the Kasich budget. I feel we need to keep the process moving.

Having said that, in all honesty, I do this with a great reluctance. Let me tell my colleagues why in three reasons.

First of all, the premise of long-term tax cuts partially paid for by short-term expense reductions violates the pay-go principles that we so hard fought for several years ago. This is like taking out a 30-day note to pay for your dream house which you hope to live in for the rest of your life. It does not make any sense at all.

Secondly, I worry about putting expense numbers on a piece of paper which are important, impact the future but which are totally unrealistic. This does not represent profiles in courage.

Thirdly, I have lived long enough that a tree does not grow to heaven. We are enjoying a strong economy, maybe even a bubble economy. I do not think we should do anything to do something untoward at this particular time, so we really understand what we are going through now.

So one can ask, why do I feel and why am I going to vote for this budget at all? I feel it is important for the body

to send a document, imperfect as it may be, to conference with the Senate. I stand behind the process. I want to keep it moving. However, as a parting shot, if the numbers come back to us after the conference as they are set out before us now, I am going to vote the other way.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

(Mrs. LOWEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Spratt substitute.

Let's be honest: the Republican budget resolution is a political document that fails even the most basic test of mathematics and fiscal reality. Its authors know it, I know it, we all know it. Even their party's most respected budget expert in the Senate, Senator DOMENICI, called this GOP budget "a mockery."

The National Conference on State Legislators, the National League of Cities, and many Governors—of both parties—have also expressed their opposition to the resolution.

Instead of keeping faith with last year's Balanced Budget Agreement, the Republican leadership's budget requires cuts in domestic programs that are so draconian that its authors don't even have the courage to tell the American people what they are. What we do know is that \$100 billion dollars—in addition to the reductions adopted last year—would have to be cut from Medicare, Medicaid, education, environment, veterans and other domestic programs over the next five years.

As has been the case time and time again, these budget cuts will hurt low- and moderate-income working—and tax-paying—families the hardest. If this budget is adopted, it also will force us to turn a blind eye to serious national problems such as crumbling and overcrowded schools.

Because of the restrictive rule governing this debate, the only responsible budget plan before us is this substitute offered by the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. SPRATT. This resolution keeps faith with last year's bipartisan budget agreement, includes \$30 billion in carefully targeted tax cuts, and will provide funding to fix school buildings, provide affordable child care, hire 75,000 new teachers, and boost investments in medical research. It also protects Americans' retirement income by reserving all budget surpluses for Social Security until a long-term plan for preserving Social Security is adopted.

For the sake of our children, our veterans, and the future of our Nation, I urge support of the Spratt substitute and opposition to the underlying bill.

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

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Spratt substitute because I think the gentleman from South Carolina, with his years of experience in the budget process, has put together a substitute that makes sense and does not repeat failures of the past, such as in 1981 when we made promises to cut taxes, to increase defense spending, and to cut discretionary spending to pay for

those things, which of course, never happened.

When I look at the budget resolution that is before us today, I see that same thing happening. I see it in a particular area of great interest to me, and an area that I have put a great deal of time into, and that area is the marriage penalty, something that affects millions of families. I do think our budget should move in that direction, to help the working families of America.

I have worked for years to fix the marriage penalty. In fact, I called for the CBO report which is now the definitive study and which we can look to to help us get where we want to go. I am the leading Democrat on a bill to reinstate the two-earner deduction which is I think the best way we should go, and it has the bipartisan support of 182 cosponsors.

But when I look at the budget resolution before us today, I see a suggestion that we address the marriage penalty with a \$100 billion solution. That is the top of the mark. We may like that solution, we would like to address the marriage penalty, but to pay for it by cutting other programs, I wonder if that will ever happen. I think some of us have seen some polling, and perhaps this is an issue that has become very popular. I say that because back in 1995, the majority had an opportunity to fix the marriage penalty, tried to fix it in a very small way and in a very intricate way that was very, very difficult to administer.

I stand here today saying to the chairman of the Committee on the Budget that his efforts have always been good in the past, but that right now I see him not doing what he should do to help American families. He says he is going to fix the marriage penalty. I do not know from where he is going to get the \$100 billion. I hope this question, of the marriage penalty, goes to the Committee on Ways and Means and that the Committee gets back to resolving it in the way we should, in a fair way that does not penalize others while getting rid of the penalty for some. Fixing the marriage penalty is a good idea, but we should do it with some common sense.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO).

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

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Spratt substitute.

Mr. Chairman, every year since I began serving in this body, I have sponsored a Constitutional amendment to balance the federal budget. This year's balanced budget reflects that hard work which allowed us to achieve that goal. I am proud of the way Members of Congress and the Administration worked together last year to responsibly improve the efficiency of government programs and cut taxes. It is these values that should govern our future budgets.

Unfortunately, the budget document before us today does not adhere to these principles. This resolution includes \$101 billion in unspecified cuts. It repudiates last year's bipartisan agreement, and conjures memories of 1995, when the same House leadership shut the government down twice with an equally illogical budget proposal. This budget threatens the solvency of Social Security, and makes deep cuts to non-discretionary domestic spending. The American people deserve better than this, Mr. Speaker. This budget is not a blueprint to govern.

This budget does not adequately protect the surplus. Earlier this year, the President stated that the surplus should be used to guarantee the future of Social Security. There is no doubt that the Social Security Trust Fund has long-range financing problems. Insolvency of the Disability Insurance portion of Social Security is projected to occur in 2015, with the retirement survivors account reaching insolvency in 2031. That is why the budget surplus should be reserved until a bipartisan Social Security Commission, the President and Congress can address the long term requirements of the system. This resolution, however, already falls short of funding current programs and it depends too much on unspecified future cuts to offset proposed tax cuts. This irresponsibility will siphon off the surplus before it can be used to protect Social Security.

The resolution also cuts another \$45 billion from discretionary spending over five years—well beyond the tight limits imposed by the Balanced Budget Agreement. We have heard many people today claim that this is just a 1% across the board cut, which seems very minor. The truth is far more disturbing. In this proposal, three-fifths of the budget is exempt from any cuts. That means all of these cuts will come from 40% of the total federal budget, which hardly qualifies as an "across the board cut." Under this plan, non-defense discretionary programs will suffer a 19% loss in purchasing power by 2003. While this document does not contain cuts to specific programs. Republicans have made some of their cuts known in an earlier budget document. The Economic Development Administration, Legal Services Corporation, AmeriCorps, and the Airport Improvement Program are all targets for cuts under this resolution.

The Economic Development Administration has offered assistance to many disadvantaged communities in my congressional district. Working with the Southwestern Illinois Development Agency, the EDA has helped communities attract employers and create jobs in areas where unemployment is well above the national and state average, areas that have been affected by the closing of coal mines and the migration of industrial plants which employed thousands of people. This is not a program that benefits bureaucrats, it helps real people find jobs and improve their communities.

The Legal Services Corporation is another good example of a federal program that is effectively being administered at the local level. The creators of the LSC recognized that decisions about how legal services should be allocated are best made not by officials in Washington, but at a local level, by the people who understand the problems that face their communities.

Today, the LSC provides funds to operate programs in approximately 1,100 communities

nationwide, providing services to more than a million clients per year, benefitting approximately five million individuals, the majority of them children living in poverty. Family law makes up one-third of all of the cases handled by LSC programs each year. In 1995, legal services programs handled over 9,300 cases involving abused and neglected women and children.

AmeriCorps is another valuable program enabling estimated 50,000 students to earn funds for college while performing community service in tasks ranging from assisting teachers to working on environmental clean-up. There are two highly successful AmeriCorps sites in my congressional district. The program in Belleville, Illinois places 34 participants in the disadvantaged Abraham Lincoln and Franklin neighborhoods to clean up damage from the flood of 1993, and offer conflict management training. The 24 participants in the AmeriCorps program in East St. Louis have developed a successful tutoring program in schools where resources are scarce.

The Airport Improvement Program is another critical federal initiative that is jeopardized by this budget. With airline passenger traffic expected to continue to grow, we need to ensure that airports across the country are equipped to handle future capacity. MidAmerica Airport in my district was recently opened to address the congestion program in the St. Louis and MetroEast community. This airport was completed in part through the Airport Improvement Program. Without the development of MidAmerica Airport, the region would face considerable capacity limits in the near future. The AIP is a critical component of safe and efficient air travel.

In addition to these severe cuts, the assumptions addressing transportation spending in this resolution are nothing short of fantasy. On May 22, the House and Senate overwhelmingly passed a six-year transportation bill including funding for highways, highway safety, and mass transit. The budget resolution before us today falls short of paying for this legislation by over \$20 billion! Mr. Speaker, it is completely ludicrous that this budget does not include funding to pay for this legislation which has already passed overwhelmingly in Congress.

Congress realized this funding is vital because our infrastructure is crumbling around us. In my home state of Illinois, for example, a quarter of all the bridges are structurally deficient. Forty-three percent of roads in Illinois are in poor or mediocre condition. Driving on these roads costs Illinois motorist \$1 billion a year in extra vehicle operating costs. That is \$144 per driver. These statistics are shameful. As we enter the next millennium, we cannot allow our nation's infrastructure to languish in the past.

In my district in Southwestern Illinois projects funded in TEA21 are critical to meet the transportation needs of many communities. For example, the MetroLink light rail system provides a vital transportation link for commuters and travelers in the St. Louis-MetroEast area. MetroLink, whose ridership has surpassed all expectations, has had an enormous impact on the environment, transportation efficiency and economic development in my district and the entire St. Louis metropolitan region.

This budget also fails to identify ways we may improve the use of our resources. In his

budget for this year, the President included funding to modernize and improve our public schools. I strongly believe this program should be included in the House budget resolution. It provides incentives to communities to invest in local school facilities through the use of leveraged bonds. The program targets the 100 poorest school districts in the nation, while providing money for the state's to use on poor districts within their jurisdiction.

Often we dedicate our resources to the disadvantaged schools in large urban areas, overlooking the many needy schools in rural areas. My congressional district in Southern Illinois has many schools which would benefit from this program. Many of the schools in my area are dilapidated and over 50 years old. When the school buildings are warm, safe, and comfortable, children are free to concentrate on learning. That is something that will benefit us all.

This resolution does not save the surplus, it does not adequately protect Social Security, it does not allow vital programs to continue, it does not pay for programs already passed into law, and it does not recognize ways in which government can improve its service to people. I cannot support a resolution that violates the Balanced Budget Agreement and threatens the solvency of Social Security. That is why I will support the Spratt Amendment to save Social Security and honor the Balanced Budget Agreement, and why I cannot support the Kasich budget plan.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Spratt amendment. I would much preferred to have been supporting the Blue Dog budget, but as we know that was not to be.

Let me make certain that all of my colleagues understand what the Spratt budget does and does not do. The reason I can support it, it stays within the balanced budget agreement of last year. It does not spend any more money than what we agreed to last year, nor does it raise any more taxes than what we agreed to last year. No matter how many other people say it differently, they should know that is not true.

In addition, the Spratt budget is honest with the BESTEA, ISTEAL, the TEA 21 bill by fully funding the additional amounts needed for highways and transit. If we look carefully at what the gentleman from South Carolina has done, we will see that in all aspects he is totally honest in the manner in which he pays for those additional spending proposals that he calls for, within the confines of the balanced budget agreement.

I think that that is so important for us today, because I have listened to the previous debate regarding the so-called CATs bill, and I am reminded of Yogi Berra. That was *deja vu* all over again. Anybody that believed that that would have worked as was proposed has got to be smoking something.

This bill that is before us in the amendment today will keep us on the

track of the economy that we are now on. It lives within the agreement that we made last year. It certainly deserves our support.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his leadership on the Committee on the Budget. On fiscal matters generally, I think in my own view, he is probably the most credible spokesperson in this House in either party on these issues. I am pleased to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. STENHOLM. I thank the gentleman for that and I commend the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT). He has done a great job in putting forth a budget that all of us, hopefully a few on the other side of the aisle, can be supportive of.

If you agree that we set the country on the right track with the balanced budget agreement, if you agree that our economy is moving in the right direction, if you agree that we have the lowest unemployment in 25 years, if you agree that we have the lowest inflation, then let us stay with that game plan. Let us not change it. Let us not go for a budget like the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) puts out here today that is back end loaded, that promises spending cuts but only in 2002 and 2003.

□ 1300

Mr. NUSSLE. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Miller), my colleague on the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the time to discuss this, the budget from the Democrats today.

Last night we debated the budget that was presented by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) of the Committee on the Budget, and one of the earlier speakers on the other side said the two budgets stand in stark contrast to each other, and I would have to agree with my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), on that issue because this is a contrast that shows a vision of whether we believe in more government or less government, whether we believe in more taxes or less taxes and whether we want to keep more power in Washington or if we want to shift power back to the States and individuals. And that is exactly what this is.

Fortunately, the Spratt budget, I have to admit, is a lot better than President Clinton's budget; so that is one good thing I can say about it, because it does not have as many new programs and as much new taxes, but it does have more taxes, and it does create many new programs, and that is the problem of creating more government here in Washington.

This is my sixth year on the Committee on the Budget, and the past 3, under the chairmanship of the gen-

tleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), we have had tremendous success. We are now at a stage where we are going to have a surplus in our budget this fiscal year ending September 30 in the total amount of money coming in, the total amount of money going out. We are going to have a surplus for the first time since 1969, and that is because of the budget leadership provided by the Republicans since we took control of this House in 1995. We have cut taxes. We have had significant entitlement reforms such as welfare reform and Medicare reforms, and these reforms will save money in the long term because we are going to save the Medicare program from bankruptcy.

But the thing is it is better for the people in the programs, it is better for the senior citizens in this country under the Medicare program because now they are going to have choices and more options than they have had in the past.

Now what the Spratt budget does, it wants to expand the Medicare program while the Medicare commission is meeting right now and coming up with recommendations. Why not wait? Why do my colleagues want to expand more government and especially with a program that is in the process of going bankrupt?

In the past 3 budgets we have made a significant accomplishment in the area of discretionary spending, especially domestic discretionary. We have gotten rid of over 300 programs in the Federal Government, and actually in 1995 in the 104th Congress we actually had a reduction in discretionary domestic spending. That is a real accomplishment.

We need to stick with the budget presented by the Committee on the Budget, move forward and reduce the size and scope of the government, and I urge defeat of the Spratt amendment.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, our colleagues should vote for this budget, everybody on both sides of the aisle, for 3 reasons.

First, it is a honest budget. No games playing. What we see is what we get.

Secondly, it is a responsible budget. It keeps us on the road to fiscal responsibility, it maintains a budget surplus, it does not get us into the kind of partisan political gamesmanship that ultimately resulted in \$300 billion deficits and a \$5.4 trillion Federal debt. It keeps the momentum going towards fiscal responsibility that was reflected in the Bipartisan Balanced Budget Agreement just a few months ago.

And thirdly and perhaps most importantly, it is doable. We pass this budget, and we get into conference with the Senate, and we can agree to a budget within a matter of weeks. We will get this budget enacted, and then we will get our appropriations bills enacted.

And then we do not have to worry about the government shutting down.

We do not have to worry about this Congress being embarrassed at our lack of inaction or lack of ability to work together in a constructive way.

I want my colleagues to think about this:

The Republican chairman of the Senate Budget Committee called the budget that is the alternative, the Republican budget that is the alternative to this that we are offering, "a mockery". Senator STEVENS, the Republican chairman of the Appropriations Committee, called the majority's budget, a budget that would result in "Congress not being able to function". Why? Because it has got things in it that my colleagues cannot go home and justify to their constituents.

Mr. Chairman, I dare anybody that has Federal employees in their congressional district to go out and explain why they voted to cut the Federal employees health benefits plan down to a 50 percent required contribution on the part of employees. Go ahead and explain it, justify it.

My colleagues should not do this to themselves. Vote for the Spratt budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), who just spoke, said do not worry, do not worry, this is a doable budget, do not worry, this is a doable budget.

Do my colleagues know why it is a doable budget, know why the Spratt substitute is a doable budget? Because it does nothing. It basically is a status quo, do nothing budget. It does nothing to suggest that the government is already too big and spends still too much. It does nothing to the number of programs that need to be consolidated. It does nothing with regard to suggesting to families and individuals and farmers and small business people that they pay enough in taxes. It does nothing for some of the waste that has been rooted out through a number of hearings, everything from \$800 outhouses in the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area to \$584,000 homes built for park employees in Yosemite National Park to 26, and here is a do nothing, here is a let us keep the status quo: 26,000 people in 4 States receiving food stamps who are dead.

So, yes, let us do nothing, let us keep the status quo, let us vote for a budget that basically says we cannot do better than that. We cannot find a penny on the dollar. We cannot say to the American people that what they earn and what they make and what they save is more important than what happens out here in Washington, D.C. on a daily regular basis. That is do nothing.

Mr. Chairman, we do not have to worry because we have got the IRS. We can take their money out here. We do not have to worry, as the gentleman says from Virginia. Well, okay, I guess they do not want to worry.

I guess most of us on this side, and the reason why the Republicans put this budget together, was because we

are worried. We are worried about the future for our kids, we are worried about the future for Social Security, we are worried about the future for health care, we want to make sure that the welfare reforms continue to progress in a responsible and a positive way, we want to make sure our kids get a decent education, controlled at home.

We are worried; that is why you need to vote for the Republican budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) to respond.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, let me respond to the gentleman. I am worried. I am worried that we will not maintain this momentum of fiscal responsibility.

Does the gentleman imply that the Senate is not worried about fiscal responsibility? The Spratt budget is very much like the Senate budget. That is why I suggest it is a doable budget. It is very much like the President's budget.

And would the gentleman not agree that the balanced budget agreement of just a few months ago reflected our concerns, was a responsible instrument? The Spratt budget is virtually the same as the balanced budget agreement. It continues the balanced budget agreement, it continues our commit to fiscal responsibility. That is why it is doable, and that is why the Republican budget is not doable, because it departs from the balanced budget agreement that we agreed to just a few months ago.

That was my point, and I think it is a very valid one, and the Senate happens to agree with us. That is why I want my colleagues to vote for this budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond.

Basically what he is saying is, "You don't have to worry. Just keep going. Nothing needs to be changed. There's nothing wrong with what happens in Washington. There isn't one program that wastes money. There isn't one bureaucracy that needs to be changed. There isn't one program that needs to be reformed. There isn't one thing that needs to be done other than what we did last year to continue, just maintain the status quo."

That is what the gentleman is saying.

Oh, last year's agreement was so good, we do not have to change a thing.

Well, go ahead and vote for that, and, as far as the Senate comment, do not make me answer whether or not we can do better than the Senate. We usually do as a body, and we will continue with this budget as well.

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Democratic budget plan. This is really the best budget that we have seen for several years although it certainly does not have everything

that any of us would like to see in a budget, but it has some things that most of us would like to see. The Republican budget lacks details, is mean-spirited because it still takes from the middle class and the poor, and it adds to the silver plate for the rich. The Democratic plan, however, gives \$10 billion in tax cuts through entitlement initiatives, and it does not allow Republican cuts in health care, welfare to work, education, environmental protections, infrastructure, veterans and other programs critical to the health of our Nation.

We are in one of the most prosperous periods, yet in the midst of our celebration of our wealth we are ignoring and passing by a sizeable part of our American family. One-third of our population have less buying power than 20 years ago. Our schools and our cities, countryside and housing are in shambles, yet this House majority acts as if the majority of people in this country are millionaires.

The Democratic budget is a coalition budget which accommodates the values of a broader group of fellow Americans. I urge my colleagues to support the Spratt amendment.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FAZIO).

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, the New York Times calls it budget bologna. The Washington Post dubs it budget theatrics. Even the Senate Budget Chairman PETE DOMENICI, our longtime Republican leader there, calls it a mockery.

But no matter what it is labeled, the budget offered by the Republican leadership even at this late date is another example of their inability to conduct the Nation's business.

As we have heard today, there is little appetite for a budget, even among many Republicans in this House and certainly in the Senate, that would wipe out the Energy and Commerce Departments, privatize the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, eliminate the Legal Services Corporation and AmeriCorps, the national service program, and abolish a tax break for low income couples without children.

Although the outrage from the American public has forced retreat on some of these proposals, the latest offering from the Republican leadership continues to be unrealistic and radical. It deviates from last year's balanced budget plan so much so that Office of Management and Budget Director Frank Raines calls it a rank repudiation of the balanced budget agreement on which we shook hands just 1 year ago. This new plan makes deep cuts of \$101 billion in domestic programs to pay for 101 billion in new tax breaks that primarily help upper income people, and it contradicts legislation that the House just passed to increase transportation spending by \$22 billion by calling for a cut in highways and mass transit of \$5 billion over 5 years.

This is patently ridiculous on its face.

□ 1315

In many ways, this budget is similar to what House Republicans proposed in 1995. As you may remember, President Clinton refused to buckle under to pressures from the House leaders to sign a radical budget, and Republicans shut down the Federal Government twice before relenting. It is possible that that scenario could be repeated, if Speaker GINGRICH and the Republican leadership continue to play politics with this Federal budget and this process.

Last year we had a bipartisan agreement on spending that would keep our Nation's books balanced. We agreed on funding levels that would not put our Nation's neediest senior citizens at risk, and would boost our commitment to transportation, education, health care and the environment. If the Republican leadership walks away from this bipartisan agreement in an attempt to gain political points in this election year, they face a risky confrontation with those of us in Congress who demand that the government meet its needs with an honest budget blueprint.

The Spratt substitute is just that blueprint. It puts Social Security first, it protects Medicaid and Medicare, it allocates money so we can enact the Patient's Bill of Rights that will give Americans in HMOs the kind of care they deserve.

Instead of cutting funds for veterans, the environment and our police, it increases funding for drug enforcement, law enforcement, clean water and national parks. Instead of cutting education and highway funding, it calls for the hiring of 75,000 teachers to reduce class size, and fully funds the bill we passed here a few weeks ago to rebuild the nation's infrastructure.

Let us not repeat the debacle of 1995. Let us approve an honest plan, that keeps our budget balanced and does not put our vibrant economy at risk. We saw today how solid our employment statistics are, with low inflation. We ought not to be experimenting, creating an atmosphere in which we could once again balloon the deficit because we do not have the discipline that the Kasich budget would break.

Let us support the Spratt amendment. Let us reject this political charade. Let us stay the course and keep America moving in the direction that it has been moving under the Clinton Administration.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, first I want to commend the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for all of his work and effort in bringing to this Congress for a vote today a budget that is not only responsible, but also meets the priorities and the needs of the American people. It

meets the needs of our families in the areas of education and health care.

That is a dramatic contrast to the budget that is being served up by the Republican majority. There they failed to set out priorities in education, they failed to set out priorities in health care, and one of the areas where they not only failed to set out priorities, but in fact provide substantial reductions and threats, is to our national environment and the programs provided to protect the environment of this Nation.

With an excessive \$5 billion cut in the area of natural resources, they threaten programs to improve our water quality, to take care of the refuges, to take care of the recreational areas, the national parks and wilderness areas of this country that are visited by millions of Americans every year. They slashed the programs to acquire additional lands. Each and every year we do this, those lands become more expensive and harder to acquire to protect for the use of the American people.

We see that they have refused to provide monies to those agencies that are essential to protecting the revenues that the American people are entitled to for the use of their lands, revenues from mining companies that pay us no rent as they take billions of dollars of gold and platinum off of the public lands, the hundreds of millions of dollars and billions of dollars that the oil companies are underpaying the American taxpayers for the use of those lands as they take off billions of dollars in oil and gas resources from those lands.

The Republicans' answer is to slash the budget of those agencies that have oversight of that. Rather than charge those companies a fair rent, a fair charge for the use of the public resources, they would rather cut nutrition, they would rather cut health care, they would rather threaten Medicaid and Medicare, rather than making people pay their fair share.

The problem with all of this is it threatens the very resources that tens of millions of people in this country will be using this summer, our national parks, refuges and national forests. This budget is devastating to those environmental programs.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, last night when we closed debate on the rule, I was trying to figure out over the weekend an analogy which would demonstrate what this debate is really all about.

There are really two debates going on here. One is inside the Beltway, and one is outside the Beltway. Inside the Beltway we hear people saying we cannot tighten that Federal budget belt one notch.

Let me demonstrate. What I had my staff do was go out and get three belts.

We put them together. What we have here is a nine foot belt. Every foot on this belt represents \$1 trillion worth of Federal spending over the next five years. That is \$9 trillion. That is a nine foot belt. I do not think anybody in this House could actually wear this belt.

All we are asking in the Kasich budget is for our friends on the appropriations committees to tighten this belt one notch, one inch out of a nine foot belt. Yet we hear from some of our friends here inside the Beltway that that cannot be done, that nine feet is not enough, that there is no waste, there is no fat, there is nothing left in the Federal budget that can be trimmed so that we can tighten this belt even one notch.

Now, inside the Beltway, I think to a lot of people on that side of the aisle, that debate makes sense. But I will tell you what, outside the Beltway in that great middle part of America, the places you call "fly-over country," out there I think most Americans would look at this belt and they would think of this analogy, and they would say to me things like, "You mean only one notch?"

But the great news is, if we can get our friends on the appropriations committees to tighten that belt just one notch, guess what? We can eliminate the marriage penalty tax. Every year over 21 million American families pay a penalty of almost \$1,400 per family just because they are married.

My wife and I celebrate our wedding anniversary this week. We have been married 26 years now. I believe she still loves me, but I wish the IRS would stop tempting her to leave me. That is what happens to 21 million American couples. Every year they pay a penalty just for being married.

All we are asking here today is if we can possibly get our friends on the appropriations committees and our friends over in the other body to tighten this budget belt just one notch, so that we can eliminate the marriage penalty tax, so that my wife will not be tempted to leave me, and a lot of other spouses, not only of Members in this body, people all over the United States.

Let us eliminate the marriage penalty tax, let us protect Social Security, let us start paying down some of that debt, and let us eliminate some of the fat, the waste, the fraud and the abuse in the Federal budget so we can do the right thing, not only for American families but for future generations of Americans as well.

Mr. Chairman, I support the Kasich plan. I respect the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and the budget plan they are offering. I think the only plan that can pass is the one offered by Mr. KASICH and the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) for the purpose of a colloquy with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the

chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage in a colloquy with the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH).

Mr. Chairman, as you are well aware, H. Con. Res. 284 as passed out of your committee includes a budget savings allocation of \$1.6 billion to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. This allocation would directly impact Federal workers and retirees.

While the current budget resolution does not detail specific program reduction recommendations, an earlier version specified that reductions should come from the Federal Employees Health Benefit Program, the FEHBP, and through increased retirement contributions past the current expenditure dates. It cannot help but be implicitly perceived as continuing to endorse such reduction in Federal retiree benefits, and, I might add, current employee benefits.

Mr. Chairman, it is I my understanding based on our earlier conversations that the Committee on the Budget will hold harmless the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight in the event the committee does not respond to its savings direction included in this budget resolution.

Could the gentleman comment and clarify this situation?

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman from Virginia is correct. Despite the fact that the budget resolution draft does not include specific assumptions, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight is reconciled for savings of about \$1.6 billion. It is not our intent under this resolution that these savings be achieved by reducing benefits in the FEHBP or any of these other payer benefits of Civil Service or Postal Service employees or retirees.

The Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, notwithstanding these instructions, will not be held accountable for these reconciliation savings in the event the committee is unable to achieve its instructed savings.

Let me further say we would not go around the committee to the Committee on Rules in order to get that done. We will make sure we work with the Senate to make sure that \$1.6 billion does not come out of those programs. But we will figure out a way in which to be able to make our marker without having to do this.

I also know that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) are deeply concerned that when we get about the penny on the dollar, we be very cautious and compassionate about the way we do it, which is exactly how we will proceed. I understand the concerns of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), and want to make it clear that we will be very sensitive.

I also want to say to the gentleman from Virginia, it is our intent out of that one penny on a dollar to be able to get ourselves in a position of where we can make government more effective and more efficient and squeeze out an awful lot of the waste and duplication in order to get this job done.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman. I would just simply add that Federal employees are the greatest asset we have in this government. We need to properly compensate and incentivize this. I am comforted by the remarks of the chairman.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) the minority leader.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, this budget is our common sense vision, our road map for a new century and a new economy. Our budget rejects the misguided and extreme policies and priorities of this Republican slash-and-burn budget and comes up with a moderate and responsible alternative.

The Republican leadership has put forward a budget that is so unfair and unwise that it is already dead on arrival. It is unacceptable, not only to many Democrats, but also to many Republicans as well.

I have been amused to hear the answers to questions about the budget. There is so little specificity because no one seems able to put the specificity behind the budget that it needs. So we hear, "Well, that problem will be handled in conference." Translated, that means we are going to have the Domenici budget, I suppose, because everything is going to get settled in conference.

This Republican budget is expired milk poured into new cartons. It is more of the same fiscal radicalism based on the same irresponsible cuts which the American people specifically rejected in the election of 1996. Do not be fooled. This budget that we are voting on in the next few minutes is the same budget that we had in 1995 from the Contract on America.

The Republican path steers us into a dead end, where American families fend for themselves and are at the mercy of the global marketplace. They want to withdraw from our commitments to education, to health care and the environment, key areas critical to the future of our country and the prosperity of our people.

Democrats are united behind a different vision, the vision contained in the Democratic alternative. We want to build upon the economic success that we currently enjoy, a success that owes a lot to the Democratic budget of 1993, a budget that we passed without one Republican vote in the House or in the Senate. If it were up to the Republicans in Congress, we would not have made the wise and prudent fiscal

choices that have brought about the strongest economy that we have seen in decades in this country.

□ 1330

We have more work that still needs to be done. Democrats want to meet the challenges presented to us by the changing economy and workplace. Government must play a limited, but critical role in ensuring that the growth we currently enjoy continues and its benefits are widely shared by all working families.

While Republicans talk about protecting Americans and their retirement, their budget threatens the safety and integrity of Social Security. The Democratic budget ensures that any surplus will be used to protect the foundation of retirement security for all Americans.

While Republicans talk a lot about the breakdown of the American family, the Democratic budget does something to actually address the problem. The Democratic budget makes a commitment to an act, the Patients Bill of Rights Act, so that families will receive the health care they need and pay for.

Our budget makes the investments in child care, which will enable Americans to balance the needs of their families with their demands from work.

The Democratic budget makes the smart investments in education that we desperately need to modernize and upgrade our public schools so our kids receive the knowledge and the skills they need to compete in a world marketplace.

While the Republicans profess to care about preserving the environment, their budget makes drastic cuts in environmental protection. Democrats are fighting to safeguard our natural heritage by increasing the funding of toxic waste cleanups and expanding parks and open spaces.

The Kasich budget has been repudiated by moderate Republicans. It has been renounced by the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE). It has been ridiculed by PETE DOMENICI, and it should be rejected by this Congress.

I urge my colleagues to support the Spratt substitute, the only honest and responsible budget alternative that has been before us.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make something clear. I have some concerns about this resolution, especially with regard to the provisions which I believe single out Federal employees and retirees for unnecessary and unfair reductions.

I am encouraged by the statement of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) that the \$1.6 billion in savings from the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight will not mean benefit reductions in the Federal employees health benefits program or any

other pay or benefits of civil service or Postal Service employees or retirees.

With that assurance, I will vote for the resolution to move the process forward, but it does not mean that I will vote for it when it comes back in the conference report. I will weigh it then.

One other thing, if I could just get the gentleman's attention. I would urge the gentleman from Ohio that when he looks at the final agreement to remember the poorest and the most vulnerable in our country.

In the Bible, there are 244 references to the poor; 172 in the Old Testament, 72 in the New Testament. The oppressed are mentioned 45 times. I must tell the gentleman, in this whole body, both sides, that the passage of the highway bill, which was laden with pork barrel spending projects, was very troubling to me, especially the full court press lobbying efforts and the hiring of certain lobbyists to get certain projects in that bill.

I just wanted to say that the way the Congress, I believe, has pursued the recent highway bill, which funds \$216 billion over the next 6 years for surface transportation, while transportation funding is necessary, I believe that the Congress got greedy, and we have effectively blown the budget caps and all that for a lot of special pork barrel projects.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH).

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman, I think he knows I started a fight against corporate welfare in this House, which I fight every day. That is because I made the argument that we just cannot take from one group. We cannot reform welfare for the poor without reforming welfare for the rich.

The fact of the matter is government is a final safety net for people who do not have anything. Where I come from, it is a sin not to help people who need help. But I also say it is always a sin to continue to help people who need to learn to help themselves.

I would say to the gentleman that we want to be very sensitive to this and not pick, as one person once said, on the weak clients in our society without having the guts to stand up and take on some of the special interests. As the gentleman knows, I share his concern in a number of areas, and I have worked hard, worked hard to try to ameliorate some of those rough edges and keep at it.

Mr. WOLF. Well, I appreciate the gentleman's comments. Next week, I will send the gentleman a letter on this issue that I would like to share. I know probably no one will read it, and many will think it is too preachy, but it will be a letter to the entire Republican caucus on this issue, which includes the passage of the unfortunate highway bill.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), my colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me. There is much concern in this House on both sides of the aisle with every budget that comes before us. It is a document. It is a political document which can become troublesome, particularly during election times.

However, it is the responsibility of us to pass a budget. It is our responsibility to read these budgets and to come up with the best particular budget that we can.

In reading over the Kasich budget, there was concern and there is concern that has been expressed in this House as to what is going to happen to TANF. That is welfare. It was this Republican Congress that passed welfare reform. We did it in cooperation with the governors in this country, in partnership with the governors of this country. We gave our word to the governors that we were going to hold the funding for 5 years, and that is exactly what we are going to do.

I chair the subcommittee that has jurisdiction over TANF, and I will give my word now to each Member in this Congress that we are not going to cut TANF this year. The final budget that comes out of Congress will exactly back us up on that particular matter. We have given our word. We keep our word.

Let us get on with this. Let us vote down the Spratt budget and vote up the Kasich budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains for both sides, and who has the right to close?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. NEY). The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) has 14 minutes remaining. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) has the right to close.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, let us just go back for a second and think about what we are talking about here. Over the last 5 years, the Federal Government has spent \$7.8 trillion. Over the next 5 years, we are scheduled to grow from \$7.8 trillion to \$9 trillion.

The American family would say, frankly, if we sat down with them and said, do we need to go from \$7.8 trillion to \$9.1 trillion, they probably would not serve us dinner that night.

We are not even asking to make any difficult or serious reduction in government. All we are suggesting is, instead of the government going from \$7.8 trillion to \$9.1 trillion, they go to \$9 trillion.

We save a penny on the dollar. You cannot run away from it. You cannot escape it. You cannot hide from it. It is designed to save one penny on each dollar of Federal spending.

We take those savings, and do you know what we do with them, Mr. Chairman? We help the American fam-

ily. We say that we want to get rid of this marriage penalty. We also want to work with the small business community to make it easier for them to thrive, because, you know, in some ways, the small business community is synonymous with the health of the American people.

So our approach here today is to try to trim some of the excess out of government, to make government more efficient and more effective. We do not see a reason why we need 150 separate job training programs and 340 programs in housing, including 103 that are inactive.

We do not see a reason why we should have an \$800,000 outhouse in the Delaware Water Gap or to spend \$584,000 per home in Yosemite. We certainly do not see a reason to spend \$34 million to do closed captioning of the Jerry Springer Show and Bay Watch.

I mean, the fact is, in an institution that is the largest institution on the face of this globe, it is the one major institution on the face of this globe that has not undergone any downsizing.

What we have to ask ourselves today is can we begin to change the culture of Washington. Any time there has got to be some kind of a change, people jump up and say do not affect me. But we have got a choice. If we cannot affect the culture of Washington, if we cannot save a penny on a dollar, then we are telling the American family the government is more important than they are. That is not a message that any of us want to communicate out of this Chamber.

The fact is we all know intuitively, and of course we know by solid example, that, in fact, we can live under this heavy yoke of only \$9 trillion in spending to be able to help our families.

In terms of the President's budget, folks, look, \$150 billion in new spending and \$130 billion in new taxes. He essentially is trying to reinvent the era of big government. In the Spratt budget, there are no tax cuts. They want to have more tax increases and blow through the spending caps and wreck the discipline that Alan Greenspan told us would hurt this economy.

The bottom line is it is a reasonable proposal. Do you know what I wish? Do you know who I wish was here today to vote on this? All the people outside of this Beltway who go to work for a living and struggle every day to make ends meet.

Members are sitting in their offices, and they are thinking about this vote, and ask yourself, can we save a penny on a dollar and communicate to our constituents that mom and dad and the kids are the most important thing going on in this society today?

In light of all the incidents that we have seen over the last couple of months, I think the answer is unquestionably yes. We just resist some of the culture. We just resist some of the people that are trying to trap us in this city, resist some of the people who say

that America should be run from the top down.

Let us transfer power, money, and influence from this city back to the people so they are in charge in their communities to develop local solutions to local problems, strengthen the family, and strengthen the community, and build America from the bottom up.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes just to point out something. It is interesting, as we actually look through the Spratt proposal, and this is probably something that would surprise many people because of all of the rhetoric that we have heard here today. But interestingly enough, the Democrats cut Medicare.

They cut Medicare from the Republican budget; in fact, \$600 million the first year, \$300 million the second year, \$400 million a third year, \$300 million the fifth year. They cut Medicare.

These are the same folks who were down here in the well just a moment ago talking about how important health care was to them, and, yet, they are running around cutting Medicare. It is one thing to claim that you are cutting, and it is another thing to claim that you are actually being responsible.

I am sure there is a logical explanation for all of these Medicare cuts. I am sure they are going to claim it has something to do with fraud or waste or something like that. If that is what it is, of course I am amazed to find out all the Democrats can find within a Medicare budget is only \$600 million worth of fraud.

But it just points out that sometimes the rhetoric that we hear on the floor does not meet the reality of the words and figures that are on the pages. There are things like that that make it very frustrating.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH).

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman, it is important that we have talked about the Clinton budget, but, frankly, we need to talk about what we are all about, why we took charge in 1995, what we came here to do as a majority party, joined with some of our friends on the other side of the aisle. We came to make the budget, government budget smaller and the family budget bigger.

□ 1345

In order to do that, we are going to create a mechanism in this House that will create the reforms, the common-sense reforms, that the American people really want.

I would say to my Republican colleagues, we do not want to forget the reason why the people sent us here. It was to reduce government. It was to reduce regulation. It was to return power, money, and influence to the people. It was to make government more effective. It was to make government more efficient. It was to reject

the notion that big government can solve our problems.

Do Members want to know something? That is what the people in the neighborhoods are saying today, give me a chance to get up to bat. Give me a chance to have some of my power back. Give me a chance to have some of my money back, and make the Federal Government more effective and more efficient, and stop having to take too much from me. Make it work.

I would say to the gentleman, this is the incentive we need to get this done. I want to suggest to the gentleman, we can change the culture. We can respond to what the people want and we can improve our country.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, who will engage in a colloquy with the chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me for the purposes of a colloquy that I might have with the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, to just put in the RECORD precisely what this budget document intends and what it will permit in the writing of a tax bill, to give relief in the amount of \$101 billion that is provided in the budget document.

Mr. Chairman, I think there has been some degree of misunderstanding about this. It is my understanding, and I would like for this to be confirmed by the chairman, it is my understanding that, number one, this budget is designed to reduce the record tax burden on the American people. That is, we reduce that burden, and that we will have a balanced bill which will include a number of different items.

Certainly we should take action against the marriage penalty, reduce the complexity of the capital gains, pay down the debt, save Social Security, pass additional middle-income tax relief measures, create incentives for growth, savings, and job creation, so that as we have done in the past, we will put forward a bill of comprehensive tax relief in a balanced way.

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

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

Mr. KASICH. Let me just say to the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, I would like to underscore with an exclamation point everything that he has said. That is precisely what our agenda is.

Frankly, I would like to say to the gentleman that I share his great frustration with a lot of the government estimators in this town who we have used for a long period of time to make sure we stay on a path, but frankly, who have been wildly inaccurate in terms of their projections of what was going to happen to this economy.

One interesting thing I would say to the chairman, the chairman of the Fed, Mr. Greenspan, came to the Committee

on the Budget and made an argument at one point that if we zeroed out the capital gains tax it would not cost the government a dime.

What we have seen is by reducing the capital gains rate, it has generated more revenues, like most of us thought it would, the same way that when we repeal a luxury tax, we begin selling boats again in this country.

So I say to the gentleman, we are in sync. Both of us have a commitment to get to the same place: to empower people, be pro-growth, give people a fair shot, limit the growth of government, expand the personal power through tax relief.

I really look forward to the day, and it is coming soon, when we are going to have surpluses even in that general fund, where the gentleman from Texas (Chairman ARCHER) is going to be able to return those big high revenues that float into this city right back into the American people's pockets, rather than let people in this town have any incentive to think about spending them.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

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

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I began this debate by saying that the Kasich resolution is not realistic. I could not have given more graphic proof for my argument than what has just happened before our very eyes here in the House of Representatives, right here in the well of the House. We have seen this budget come unraveled, piece by piece. First of all, we started this morning.

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

Mr. SPRATT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina, did we not hear in the last few minutes the highway bill of \$21 billion has not been accommodated in the budget?

Mr. SPRATT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GEPHARDT. The user fees have been renounced at about \$8 billion to \$10 billion?

Mr. SPRATT. This morning we passed a resolution renouncing the fees, but the Kasich bill has \$8 to \$10 billion in new user fees, \$7 in all, in it. Presumably they are not going to repudiate their principle and impose user fees of their own when they have denounced the President for doing it.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Can I ask the gentleman if the agriculture research money we voted for last night was there?

Mr. SPRATT. Absolutely not. We passed a bill, it costs \$2 billion, and it is not accommodated in this budget.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Can I ask the gentleman about the veterans' expenses,

which was included in the transportation bill?

Mr. SPRATT. When we passed the highway bill we repealed some veteran benefits, and in return, to palliate, we added \$1.6 billion to the Montgomery G.I. bill. It is not in this bill. Instead, this bill still has a remnant that is out of date. It calls on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to reconcile another \$10 billion. They take a double whammy, a double hit.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Did I not hear, can I ask the gentleman, that Federal employee cuts were restored in the last few minutes?

Mr. SPRATT. Right here a few minutes ago the gentleman saw them restore it. It validates what I have said. These cuts are not realistic. They will not happen. They undid them right here on the House floor.

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

Mr. SPRATT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the gentleman quickly about the back and forth on TANF. Does not the budget resolution say that there shall be a \$10 billion reduction in Function 600?

Mr. SPRATT. It does indeed, and I do not know where it will come, except for TANF. This is another example of the budget resolution saying it will, and then Members getting up here and saying it will not, and then voting for a document that says it will; such contradictory statements.

Mr. GEPHARDT. If the gentleman will further yield, Mr. Chairman, I will say that Senator DOMENICI called this budget a mockery. That is what has happened today on the floor with this budget.

Mr. SPRATT. We say it has a \$50 black hole, and it is getting bigger by the minute.

Mr. Chairman, less than a year ago the House approved the balanced budget agreement of 1997. It was a good agreement, a bipartisan agreement. It built on the Clinton budget of 1993, which wiped out the deficit, and paved the road for surpluses as far as the eye can see.

Our resolution, the Spratt resolution, the Democratic resolution, sticks by that agreement. The spending totals, the revenue totals, all of our numbers are in sync with the balanced budget agreement. We save the surpluses because we want to save Social Security. We spare Medicare from further cuts. In fact, we broaden its coverage, because we believe in Medicare.

We protect Medicaid because we believe in Medicaid, and particularly the children's health insurance program, because we are proud of that achievement in the balanced budget agreement last year. We think it would be unconscionable to tell children and their parents that they have coverage at last, only to jerk it away from them the next year.

We fund key initiatives in education, in child care, and call for \$30 billion in

tax relief, tilted towards working families.

There is one thing of particular fiscal importance in this bill, in this resolution. On September 30, when we close the books on fiscal 1998, the Federal Government will show a surplus for the first time in 30 years, a surplus of \$40 to \$60 billion. That surplus was hard-earned, and we think we should husband it.

Sure, we proposed some initiatives in education and child care because these are the things we believe in, but we offer offsets to pay for these initiatives. We do not take a single dollar out of the surplus. We say, instead, that the surplus should be saved, held in a reserve fund, as it were, to save Social Security for the long run.

Over the last several years this government has enjoyed a surge of revenues, but until we know that surge is permanent and recurring, until we have taken the next step, the giant steps necessary to ensure the solvency of Medicare and Social Security for the long run, we are wary of cutting back revenues deeply and drawing down this surplus.

In the balanced budget agreement, we have provided for tax relief. We think there is room for more. We think the tax code is full of deductions, credits, exemptions, and preferences that could stand a scrub. We recommend that the Committee on Ways and Means search the code for \$30 billion in unwarranted tax benefits, call them what we will, and redistribute the tax burden just a bit more in favor of working families.

Surely we can do this much to help hard-working families. Surely we can do this much to help hard-working families afford the cost of child care and to mitigate the so-called marital tax penalty.

We ourselves have scrubbed spending to come up with \$10 billion in cuts over the next 5 years. This is a small sum, but we think the money can do more good if it is used to help school districts, reduce the pupil-teacher ratio in grades 1 through 3, or if it is used to fund the early learning fund.

Here are a few of the other things we propose: broadening the coverage of Medicare so those between 55 and 65 can buy into it. Here are a few of the things we propose in the context of a balanced budget: improving the child care tax credit so it applies to families with incomes up to \$60,000, so that families of four with incomes of \$35,000 or less will have no tax liability if they take full use of the credit, passing a patient's Bill of Rights.

So our budget sounds some new themes, but they are all fully offset and paid for. At bottom, this is a balanced budget agreement which the House passed overwhelmingly last year. If Members ask me to tell them in a sentence what this substitute does, I will tell them. It restores the budget to reality. It restores funds that the Kasich resolution takes.

If they ask me in a sentence to tell them what this budget does, I will tell them, it restores this budget to reality. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) presents this budget as a 1 percent cut in spending, but since the largest accounts in the budget, Social Security and defense and debt service, are not cut, they are increased, the accounts that are cut take heavy hits.

The remaining cuts are far, far greater than 1 percent. By our calculation, the Kasich budget will cut domestic discretionary spending by at least 6 percent, on top of the 12 percent in cuts already dictated by the balanced budget agreement, and still being administered. Bob Reischauer, whom we respect on both sides of the aisle, has pointed out that really about half of discretionary spending is not subject to cuts. It is essential administrative functions of the government, the FBI.

This means that to achieve the cuts the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) is talking about, the cuts will have to go as deep as 36 percent. As one Member, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) on the other side of the aisle, said, this will mean deep cuts in some programs and the extinction of others.

Which programs are in the cross-hairs? Law enforcement gets cut \$8 billion, education nearly \$5 billion, the environment \$5 billion. It goes on and on and on.

□ 1400

Our resolution is not a duplicate of the resolution that passed the other body, but we are close enough to bridge the differences in a concurrent resolution. We give Members a responsible choice. We stick close to the bipartisan Balanced Budget Agreement and we cut the clearest path to a concurrent resolution.

There are many reasons this resolution should be the budget resolution this House passes, but if Members voted for the Balanced Budget Agreement, if they want to see a budget resolution become a concurrent resolution, if they want to save the surplus for Social Security, if they want to protect Medicare and Medicaid, they should vote for this and reject the Kasich budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH), the Speaker of the House.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, let me say that I think that this is in some ways as historic a vote as the votes of the last three or four years. It did not start out this way this year. We had a budget agreement that was going to last for five years. I commend the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) who helped with that last year. It was an historic bipartisan agreement.

But then Washington just could not allow things to go on in a normal implementation. The President, for good and legitimate reasons, sent up a budget that had much higher spending. It

had higher taxes. We just voted a while ago and this entire House, I believe unanimously with the exception of one Member, voted against all the tax increases the President sent up.

But it was clear to us, and I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman KASICH), because he from a very early point sensed what was happening. The pressures in this city for more spending, for higher taxes, the pressures in this city to avoid reforming the system, the pressures to say the bureaucracy is perfect, we cannot find any money, we cannot change anything, just give us more of the American people's money, let us have more power in Washington, those pressures were building.

I am told that today, and I do not know if they have done it, but I am told that today the Federal Communications Commission may vote a tax, something which in all of American history has never occurred. A constitutional abrogation of power to a group of bureaucrats, appointed figures, who will tax every telephone line in America. Because in this city if we do not tame it, if we do not get it under control, if we do not fight for the taxpayers, this city grows every day and it takes more money and more power and it says, "Come to Washington and beg the bureaucrats to get your own money back."

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) came to us and said, "You know, we ought to make a big effort to establish the principle that we are going to be for lower taxes and lower spending. That Washington is not tamed yet."

Some might say why would we listen to the gentleman? The fact is, and it is one of the great stories that is not covered very much in this city because it makes this city so comfortable, that 3 years of our effort is working.

We passed welfare reform and my good friends on the left got up and opposed it. We passed it three times. It was vetoed twice. Guess what? Welfare reform is working and in 49 States welfare rolls are lower. In New York City welfare rolls are the lowest they have been since 1967 because reforms are working.

Then we said let us cut domestic discretionary spending. And let me say that the Committee on Appropriations led by the gentleman from Louisiana (Chairman LIVINGSTON) was brilliant. And while everybody on the left yelled and screamed, we cut out \$103 billion, we closed down over 300 small programs and we saved the American people money.

And then we said let us get to a balanced budget. And I remember how the people on the left and the news media laughed at the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) when he said let us get to a balanced budget. And then we said let us get to it by 2002 and we were told, oh, that is too soon.

Then we said let us get to it and cut taxes. Let us save enough money by reforming enough government to cut

taxes and balance the budget, and we were told that was impossible. Guess what we did? We passed a balanced budget with smaller government and lower taxes, and what was the result? We cut capital gains tax and, as we predicted, we raised more revenue because more people cashed in their capital gains, and in April alone there was \$12 billion more from capital gains that came into this city at a lower tax rate, which I would argue means we ought to go to a 15 percent capital gains rate and get even more money. So my liberal friends could actually get more money out of the rich with lower capital gains because we have real proof, but their ideology would not permit that.

Then we said what if we were to balance the budget and lower interest rates? Guess what happened? We balanced the budget and the Federal Reserve has kept interest rates low. What is the result? Chrysler last month sold more cars than in any month in its history. Why? Because interest rates are lower, the economy is growing, taxes have been cut, people are at work. We have the lowest unemployment rate. We have the lowest interest rate. We have cut taxes. We are balancing the budget, not in 2002, we are balancing the budget in 1998, four years ahead of schedule.

Now, one would think with that kind of track record we could come to our friends and we could say to them why do we not work together? Oh, reform the bureaucracy? The unions would not like that. Shrink government in Washington? The liberals would not like that. Return power to the American people? The ideologues would not like that. Reduce the number of lawsuits? The trial lawyers would not want that.

So here is the choice: Is this budget perfect? No, this is a human budget written in a human institution by people working their hearts out. Will it be improved in conference? I suspect it will, because we will meet with our good friends in the Senate who were our partners in welfare reform, which is working; in cutting taxes, which is working; in saving spending, which is working; in lowering interest rates, which is working; and in balancing the budget, which is working. And with our partners, we will write a budget.

We will bring it back to the House and hopefully a few Democrats will have the courage to vote for all the things that are working. Then we will work with the President, and by this September we will get an agreement, I think at the latest in early October, and it will be good for America.

But if Members vote "no" on the Kasich budget, they are voting against the team that reformed welfare. They are voting against the team that cut taxes. They are voting against the team that balanced the budget. They are voting against the team that brought domestic discretionary spending under control, and I think that is wrong.

Let me say one other thing. We need, over time, not only lower taxes and a smaller government in Washington, but contradictory as it will sound to some, we need a stronger defense. We need a stronger defense with a reformed Pentagon. We need to have as much courage at saying yes, our young men and women deserve good equipment; there ought to be enough of them to do everything the President wants without wearing them out; and they ought to have the best training in the world. We should have enough procurement.

Mr. Chairman, we are going to revisit that issue over the next six months. The lesson of Pakistan, the lesson of India is a lesson that the world is dangerous and America has to be strong. The lesson of Bosnia and Kosovo and Iraq and the Middle East and North Korea is that the world is dangerous and the United States has to be strong.

But as we approach defense spending, we are going to be for stronger spending with less bureaucracy, with more accountability. And I believe we can get to that, and I believe in the end the President will work with us to get to a bipartisan consensus that America has to have a big enough defense, with modern enough weapons, with good enough training to be able to lead the entire world.

So I would simply say to my friends, the Democrats, their leadership has to offer a liberal budget. It is okay. They were not with us on welfare reform and it was okay. They were not with us on tax cuts and it was okay. So do not flinch. The same principles that have worked for 3½ years, that have given us the lowest interest rates, the lowest unemployment, the best take-home pay, those principles are going to work again.

Defeat the liberal budget and then help us pass a good workmanlike budget. Let us get to conference and continue to improve it, and let us keep moving this country forward in the right way.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in defense of fiscal responsibility and in support of the Democratic Budget Resolution. The Congress has traveled a long road to restore fiscal discipline to the budget process. This process started in 1990 when the Congress passed the first of three deficit reduction packages and continued in 1993 and 1997. The Democratic Budget Resolution builds on that last agreement that we worked so hard to achieve.

The Balanced Budget Agreement of 1997, reached just nine months ago, made some very tough cuts. We agreed then to cut spending by \$300 billion over five years and \$1 trillion over 10 years. We cut \$115 billion from Medicare, \$13 billion from Medicaid, and \$172 billion from other programs. At the same time, we met our national security needs and made critical investments in education, children's health care, and environmental protection in order to keep our economy strong and address challenges facing our families. It also provided for \$95 billion in tax cuts over five years, including education tax initiatives to help families afford college costs, a child tax

credit, and reductions in the capital gains and estate taxes.

Building on the Balanced Budget Agreement of 1997 is still the responsible course of action. The Spratt substitute does just that. It is an honest blueprint for the nation's fiscal policy, which conforms with the spending levels set in Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

As I said very early this morning, the Republican budget resolution diverges from the path of fiscal responsibility and does not acknowledge reality. It underscores the Republicans inability to govern, hence their desire to debate their resolution at a time when most of the country is asleep.

The Democratic Budget Resolution does not play games. It does not hide draconian spending cuts in blue smoke and mirrors. It is not built on a pithy slogan that is misleading and inaccurate.

It is built on making crucial investments in education, medical research, health care for children, environmental protection and other vital programs. This budget resolution spells out how to pay for these investments and a \$30 billion dollar marriage penalty tax cut. Most importantly, this budget resolution saves future surpluses to shore up the solvency of the Social Security Trust Fund.

Our budget resolution recognizes the fact that we have a \$5.4 trillion debt and that we spend \$250 billion on interest annually. Today, 3.1 percent of GDP goes toward paying the interest on our debt. Under the Democratic Budget Resolution, interest payments on the debt will fall to 2.1 percent of GDP in the year 2003. According to the GAO, if we spend the surpluses as the Republican Budget Resolution does, the debt will rise by \$890 billion dollars over the next 15 years.

If we abandon fiscal discipline, CBO projects that federal debt will exceed 100 percent of GDP by 2040. That is about twice as high as the current ratio and is a level previously reached only at the end of World War II. Maintaining the status quo without spending the surpluses would save us nearly one trillion dollars over 15 years.

These facts fly in the face of the math that the Majority has been peddling. Three quarters of the budget is exempt from cuts including interest payments, federal military and civilian retirement, Social Security, defense spending and other portions of the budget. Promising a tax cut is unaffordable, disingenuous and will result in long term structural budget deficits.

In fact, \$100 billion tax cut requires an 18.9 percent real cut in non-defense discretionary spending. The Balanced Budget Agreement of 1997 already requires similar cuts. The Majority's cuts on top of last year's cuts are just unrealistic. As a result, tax cuts will be enacted first, spending cuts that should come later will never materialize, and in effect, the surpluses will have been wasted.

Included in our \$5.4 trillion debt is \$600 billion of Treasury bonds owned by the Social Security trust fund that will have to be retired after 2013. The Democratic budget resolution pays down the debt, which in turn reduces interest and principal costs to ultimately strengthen the Social Security Trust Fund.

If we squander the surplus without beginning to retire the national debt to a more manageable level, in the long run, we may have to borrow more to pay off bonds as they come due, including to Social Security, and we will

be shortchanging the American people. Without maintaining a course of fiscal discipline, the Congress' hard work since 1990 will be compromised. Federal budget surpluses will be short lived and we will return to deficit spending.

Given the impending retirement boom, that's not the direction in which we want to move. I urge my colleagues to support the Spratt substitute.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Alternative Budget proposal offered by my colleague Representative SPRATT. This Democratic budget alternative is faithful to the fiscally responsible, bipartisan Balanced Budget Act passed by the House last year. This alternative budget does not make drastic new cuts in Medicaid, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, the Earned Income Tax Credit, education and other vital priorities, as the Republican Budget Resolution does. The Democratic alternative does not focus new cuts on working families, the poor, the young and the old, as the Republican Budget Resolution does.

The Democratic alternative offered by Representative SPRATT respects the agreement this House reached with the Senate last year, and it addresses critical priorities in our nation. The Democratic alternative dedicates the budget surplus to Social Security to protect our seniors; it funds additional public school teachers and school construction initiatives for our young people. These are widely supported programs, and they answer the crucial needs of seniors and young people. The Democratic alternative is responsible and invests in our future. I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic alternative budget proposal.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Kasich budget and in strong support of the substitute amendment offered by the Ranking Member of the Budget Committee, Mr. SPRATT.

When the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee called the House Republican budget "a mockery" he not only described the substance of the Kasich budget but also the procedure by which it is being considered. Today the House is considering the budget resolution 51 days after the April 15 statutory deadline—the most delinquent budget process in 16 years. The appropriations committees of the House and Senate have long since dismissed the budget resolution as irrelevant and are already busily marking up legislation for the coming fiscal year. Against that backdrop, a reasonable person might conclude that the Budget Committee would propose a resolution that stood a reasonable chance of being expeditiously adopted.

Sadly, this is not the case. By radically departing from last year's bipartisan budget accord, the House Republican leadership has managed to totally isolate itself not just from the President and the Democrats in Congress but also from their Senate counterparts and even many House Republicans. Indeed, some of the harshest criticism of this budget has come not from Democrats but from Republicans. In addition to Senator DOMENICI's comments, Senator STEVENS said that under the cuts proposed in the Kasich budget, "I don't think Congress could function." A group of House Republicans wrote that the cuts proposed in the Kasich budget are "neither desirable nor attainable."

Fortunately, there is a constructive alternative. Like the budget passed by the Senate

last month, the Spratt budget keeps faith with the bipartisan Balanced Budget Act of 1997. The Spratt budget adheres to the discretionary budget caps, offsets tax cuts within the revenue code and pays for priority initiatives with reductions in entitlement programs. Most importantly, by continuing to steer the path of fiscal responsibility. The Spratt alternative fully safeguards the budget surplus until Congress and the President enact legislation to ensure the long term future of Social Security.

I say to my colleagues—especially on the other side of the aisle—who wish to build upon the work of the 1997 budget agreement, to reserve the surplus for Social Security, and to support a budget that can be reconciled with the Senate and adopted, I urge you to support the Spratt alternative.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Spratt Amendment because it is a rational approach to meeting the needs of our society. For example, it provides for 75,000 new teachers, it allows people under 65 to buy into Medicare, \$1.2 billion for child care and early childhood education, \$600 million for Medicaid, including an outreach program for children and provides an option to cover all legal immigrant children.

It provides for a patient Bill of Rights Act and tax credits for businesses that provide child care services to their employees. It saves all the budget surpluses for five years until a comprehensive Social Security Financial Plan is agreed upon.

The Spratt Amendment is honest, responsible and addresses the needs of the American People.

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of Mr. SPRATT's substitute to the misguided Republican budget resolution. Unlike the Republican proposal, the Spratt substitute meets the requirements of last year's balanced budget agreement without calling for the deep and drastic cuts to critical programs, both mandatory and discretionary, that the majority has included in its plan.

The Spratt substitute ensures that the needs of America's children and working men and women will continue to be met, by providing for billions more in education and training funding than the Republican proposal. In addition, the Spratt budget provides health care funding that will protect maternal and child health, enable the continuation of important research at the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control, and provide grants under the Ryan White AIDS program. Mr. Spratt's plan calls for law enforcement spending that will help keep drugs off our streets and out of our communities, and that will fund important crime reduction initiatives. And the substitute provides increased funding for programs that will protect our precious environment and natural resources.

Furthermore, the Spratt substitute includes several major initiatives that will benefit our nation's children. The proposal provides funding which would allow the hiring of 75,000 new teachers to reduce classroom size, sets aside substantial funds for child care and early learning, and includes a Medicaid outreach program for children. There is no more important task than ensuring that the health and education needs of our children are met, and I am pleased that the Spratt budget recognizes this priority.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of the Spratt substitute. It is not a perfect proposal, but it is one which will enable us to

move on with the budget process. This substitute, because of its close similarities to the Senate budget resolution, its the best vehicle with which to reach an agreement with the other body that will allow our respective appropriations subcommittees to continue their difficult tasks with a framework to guide them. Let us adopt this substitute, keeping within the boundaries of last year's balanced budget agreement and ensuring that our children, our working families, and our most vulnerable citizens are protected rather than abandoned.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. NEY). 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 164, noes 257, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 209]

AYES—164

Abercrombie	Green	Oberstar
Ackerman	Gutierrez	Obey
Allen	Hall (OH)	Olver
Andrews	Hamilton	Ortiz
Baldacci	Harman	Owens
Barcia	Hastings (FL)	Pallone
Barrett (WI)	Hefner	Pascrell
Becerra	Hilliard	Pastor
Bentsen	Hinchey	Payne
Berman	Hinojosa	Pelosi
Bishop	Holden	Pomeroy
Blagojevich	Hoolley	Poshard
Blumenauer	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Bonior	Jackson-Lee	Rangel
Borski	(TX)	Reyes
Boswell	Jefferson	Rivers
Brady (PA)	Johnson (WI)	Rodriguez
Brown (CA)	Kanjorski	Rothman
Brown (FL)	Kaptur	Royal-Allard
Brown (OH)	Kennedy (RI)	Sanchez
Capps	Kennelly	Sawyer
Cardin	Kildee	Schumer
Carson	Kilpatrick	Scott
Clay	Kind (WI)	Serrano
Clayton	Klecicka	Sherman
Clement	Klink	Sisisky
Clyburn	LaFalce	Skaggs
Conyers	Lampson	Skelton
Costello	Lantos	Slaughter
Coyne	Lee	Smith, Adam
Cummings	Levin	Snyder
Davis (IL)	Lofgren	Spratt
DeGette	Lowey	Stabenow
Delahunt	Luther	Stark
DeLauro	Maloney (CT)	Stenholm
Deutsch	Maloney (NY)	Stokes
Dicks	Manton	Strickland
Dingell	Markey	Tauscher
Dixon	Martinez	Thompson
Doggett	Matsui	Thurman
Dooley	McCarthy (MO)	Tierney
Edwards	McCarthy (NY)	Torres
Engel	McDermott	Towns
Eshoo	McGovern	Velazquez
Etheridge	McHale	Vento
Evans	McIntyre	Waters
Farr	McNulty	Watt (NC)
Fattah	Menendez	Waxman
Fazio	Millender-	Wexler
Filner	McDonald	Weygand
Ford	Miller (CA)	Wise
Frank (MA)	Mink	Woolsey
Frost	Moakley	Wynn
Gejdenson	Moran (VA)	Yates
Gephardt	Nadler	
Gordon	Neal	

NOES—257

Aderholt	Army	Baesler
Archer	Bachus	Baker

Barr	Goodlatte	Paul
Barrett (NE)	Goodling	Paxon
Bartlett	Goss	Pease
Barton	Graham	Peterson (MN)
Bass	Granger	Peterson (PA)
Bateman	Greenwood	Petri
Bereuter	Gutknecht	Pickering
Berry	Hall (TX)	Pickett
Bilirakis	Hansen	Pitts
Bliley	Hastert	Pombo
Blunt	Hastings (WA)	Porter
Boehlert	Hayworth	Portman
Boehner	Hefley	Pryce (OH)
Bonilla	Herger	Quinn
Bono	Hill	Radanovich
Boucher	Hillery	Rahall
Boyd	Hobson	Ramstad
Brady (TX)	Hoekstra	Redmond
Bryant	Horn	Regula
Bunning	Hostettler	Riggs
Burr	Houghton	Riley
Burton	Hulshof	Roemer
Buyer	Hunter	Rogan
Callahan	Hutchinson	Rogers
Calvert	Hyde	Rohrabacher
Camp	Inglis	Roukema
Campbell	Istook	Royce
Canady	Jackson (IL)	Rush
Cannon	Jenkins	Ryun
Castle	John	Salmon
Chabot	Johnson (CT)	Sanders
Chambliss	Johnson, Sam	Sandlin
Chenoweth	Jones	Sanford
Christensen	Kasich	Saxton
Coble	Kelly	Scarborough
Coburn	Kim	Schaefer, Dan
Collins	King (NY)	Schaffer, Bob
Combest	Kingston	Sensenbrenner
Condit	Klug	Sessions
Cook	Knollenberg	Shadegg
Cooksey	Kolbe	Shaw
Cox	Kucinich	Shays
Cramer	LaHood	Shimkus
Crane	Largent	Shuster
Crapo	Latham	Skeen
Cubin	LaTourrette	Smith (MI)
Cunningham	Lazio	Smith (NJ)
Danner	Leach	Smith (OR)
Davis (FL)	Lewis (CA)	Smith (TX)
Davis (VA)	Lewis (KY)	Smith, Linda
Deal	Linder	Snowbarger
DeFazio	Lipinski	Solomon
DeLay	Livingston	Souder
Diaz-Balart	LoBiondo	Spence
Dickey	Lucas	Stearns
Doolittle	Manzullo	Stump
Doyle	Mascara	Stupak
Dreier	McCollum	Sununu
Duncan	McCrery	Talent
Dunn	McHugh	Tauzin
Ehlers	McInnis	Taylor (MS)
Ehrlich	McIntosh	Taylor (NC)
Emerson	McKeon	Thomas
English	McKinney	Thornberry
Ensign	Meehan	Thune
Everett	Meeke (NY)	Tiahrt
Eyburn	Metcalf	Traficant
Fawell	Mica	Turner
Foley	Miller (FL)	Upton
Forbes	Minge	Visclosky
Fossella	Moran (KS)	Walsh
Fowler	Morella	Wamp
Fox	Murtha	Watkins
Franks (NJ)	Myrick	Watts (OK)
Frelinghuysen	Nethercutt	Weldon (FL)
Galleghy	Neumann	Weldon (PA)
Ganske	Ney	Weller
Gekas	Northup	White
Gibbons	Norwood	Whitfield
Gilchrest	Nussle	Wicker
Gillmor	Oxley	Wolf
Gilman	Packard	Young (AK)
Gingrich	Pappas	Young (FL)
Goode	Parker	

NOT VOTING—13

Ballenger	Kennedy (MA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Billbray	Lewis (GA)	Sabo
Furse	McDade	Tanner
Gonzalez	Meeke (FL)	
Johnson, E. B.	Mollohan	

□ 1427

Mr. DAVIS of Florida, and Mr. RUSH changed their vote from "aye" to "no." Mr. WISE, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island 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. NEY). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, it is with great regret that I rise today to oppose the Republican budget resolution and the Democratic substitute. Unfortunately, both of these proposals stray from last year's historic balanced budget agreement, and neither of them does enough to reduce our national debt and ensure Social Security's solvency.

The Republican proposal is fiscally irresponsible and economically unfeasible. Rather than following the guidelines of last year's Balanced Budget Agreement, as did the Senate budget resolution, the House Republicans have chosen to cut discretionary funding to such programs as veterans health, long-term care for the elderly, and anti-crime initiatives by over \$45 billion. These cuts, according to Senate Republicans including Budget Committee Chairman DOMENICI, are unwise and would devastate many important programs for our nation's senior citizens. These cuts, according to Senate Republicans, could derail the budget process. Some—Republicans and Democrats—suggest that they could lead to another government shutdown.

Furthermore, the House Republican budget does not preserve the projected surplus for Social Security. Instead, it actually changes budget rules to allow the surplus to be spent on new programs, including tax cuts. Given our nation's \$5.3 billion in debt (as of May 31, 1998), not allowing the surplus to be spent on paying off our debt is harmful to our economy and to our taxpayers.

The Democratic budget alternative, while it is much more fiscally prudent and sensible, still does not do enough to fit the guidelines of last year's Balanced Budget Agreement. In my view, its new spending should be devoted to deficit reduction.

The one budget proposal that would have met all these objectives—the Blue Dog budget proposal—was not allowed to be considered on the House Floor. Due to concerns that this budget resolution might garner enough votes to defeat other proposals, the House Committee on Rules would not allow this legislation to be brought to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, the Blue Dog Budget Resolution would have been good for this Congress, and good for all Americans. I am proud to support it, and disappointed that the will of Congress was not heard on this important issue.

Outlined below are the specifics of the Blue Dog budget resolution:

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Saves 100% of the projected unified budget surplus (\$24 billion in FY 99 and \$225 billion over five years) for Social Security, and recommends that the unified budget surplus be reserved to fund the costs of Social Security reform legislation.

Reaffirms the principle that budget discipline should be maintained until the budget is balanced without relying on the annual surplus in the Social Security trust fund to mask an on-budget deficit.

Maintains discretionary spending at the levels included in the bipartisan budget agreement. Provides increases in functions for education, veterans, health care, research and other functions that were designated as priority functions in the bipartisan budget agreement. Allows for consideration of tax cuts if they are offset with mandatory spending cuts or increases in other revenues. Does not change budget rules to allow tax cuts to be offset by reductions in discretionary spending.

Identifies mandatory offsets that were not included in the transportation conference report that Congress could use to fund new mandatory investments or deficit reduction.

Incorporates the changes in spending from the TEA-21 Conference Report and conference report on S. 1150, the Agriculture Research, Extension and Education Conference Report, as estimated by CBO, in order to provide a credible budget blueprint that reflects the realities of Congressional action.

Does not reopen Medicare, Medicaid, federal retirement and other mandatory programs for additional reductions.

Does not count on revenues from tobacco legislation that many not materialize, but preserves the flexibility of Congress to consider tobacco legislation that provides funding for programs related to the tobacco settlement.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY

The Blue Dog budget saves 100% of the unified budget surplus for Social Security. The resolution contains a strong statement that Congress and the President should strive to truly balance the budget, without using the surplus from the Social Security Trust Fund. The resolution also states that Congress should use any accumulated or projected unified budget surplus to pay for the transition costs of Social Security reform.

#### TAX CUTS

The Senate Budget Resolution contained a tax cut reserve which would allow—but not require—Congress to enact additional mandatory savings and/or revenue increases for the purpose of tax cuts. The Blue Dog alternative would clarify that Congress could also use additional savings for debt reduction.

#### MANDATORY INVESTMENTS RESERVE

The Senate budget resolution included a transportation spending reserve that identified a variety of spending cuts that could be used to pay for increased spending on highways and mass transit. The highway conference report used most of the offsets identified in the Senate resolution, but there were a few offsets identified in the Senate resolution that were not used in the highway conference. The Blue Dog alternative would change the transportation spending reserve into a mandatory spending reserve that would allow—but not require—Congress to use the unused offsets that Senator DOMENICI identified for transportation (approximately \$3.5 billion) for new mandatory investments. As with the tax cut reserve, the alternative would not spell out which, if any, initiatives Congress should fund with this reserve. The Senate Budget Resolution, with which we concur, identified the following area as key investments: child care, children's health education and research.

#### BUDGETARY IMPACT OF THE TRANSPORTATION AND AGRICULTURE RESEARCH CONFERENCE AGREEMENTS

The Blue Dog resolution incorporates the changes in spending from the TEA-21 Conference Report and conference report on S.

1150, the Agriculture Research, Extension and Education Conference Report, as estimated by CBO. The Blue Dog substitute does not endorse or reject the spending levels of the transportation bill, but incorporates the costs of legislation already enacted by Congress into the budget resolution in order to provide a credible budget blueprint. Likewise, including the budgetary impact of the agriculture research conference report is not an endorsement of the specific policies therein, but simply reflects the budgetary impact of the anticipated passage of that bill by increasing the allocation to Function 350, Agriculture and reducing the allocation for Function 600, Income Security to that would result from the enactment of S. 1150.

#### DISCRETIONARY BUDGET PRIORITIES

The discretionary allocations in the substitute are virtually identical to the Senate-passed resolution, with slight modifications within the discretionary spending limits established by the budget agreement. In response to the cut in spending for Veterans benefits in the TEA-21 conference report, the Blue Dog substitute increases the allocation for spending on discretionary programs in function 700, Veterans Benefits and Compensation, to allow spending on veterans health care to keep up with inflation. The Blue Dog resolution also contains higher discretionary spending in Medicare than the Senate-passed resolution by eliminating proposed fees on hospitals that are in the Senate resolution and has higher funding for discretionary programs in function 350, Agriculture and Rural Development.

These increases in discretionary allocations are offset by reducing the allocations for function 250, Science, Space and Technology and function 300, Natural Resources and the Environment below the allocations in the Senate-passed resolution.

The Senate-passed resolution increased discretionary spending in both of these functions substantially above the allocations in the Balanced Budget Agreement; even with the reductions the Blue Dog substitute still provides more funding in these functions than the budget agreement.

#### TOBACCO RESERVE

The Blue Dog substitute modifies the tobacco revenue reserve from the Domenici resolution to allow for consideration of tobacco legislation that used revenues from a tobacco settlement to fund programs related to the tobacco settlement. The Blue Dog resolution would not make any assumptions about the passage of tobacco legislation. The resolution would simply include language establish a reserve fund that would allow the budget allocations to be adjusted if Congress considers deficit neutral tobacco legislation that uses the revenues from the tobacco settlement to extend the solvency of the Medicare trust fund and address tobacco-related issues, such as providing assistance for tobacco farmers and communities, creating smoking cessation and prevention programs, curbing teenage smoking, assisting States with the costs of treating tobacco-related illnesses, providing health care for veterans with tobacco related illnesses and funding federal medical research.

#### MEDICARE

The Blue Dog substitute includes a Sense of Congress provision encouraging the Ways and Means Committee to consider budget-neutral Medicare provisions that would ad-

dress regional disparities in Medicare reimbursements and to examine the concerns of the home health care and hospital industries regarding implementation of Medicare policies.

#### CPI ACCURACY

The Blue Dog resolution does not include any proposals regarding CPI, but would contain a Sense of Congress provision encouraging BLS to continue to improve the accuracy of the CPI, particular with regard the remaining upper-level substitution bias.

Mr. Speaker, the Blue Dog proposal I have outlined today would have been the sensible middle ground in the budget debate. The legislation had bipartisan support—and its passage would have put an end to the partisan rhetoric and demagoging that we have heard on this issue today.

The American people want a budget—they do not want endless arguments and political posturing. The Blue Dog budget would have provided Congress with a reasonable compromise. It is indeed unfortunate that the Republican majority did not allow its consideration today.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my deep and serious concerns about the budget resolution brought to the floor today by the Republican Leadership.

First, let me say that I have nothing but respect for my colleague from Ohio, Mr. KASICH, and the work he has done during his tenure as Chairman of the Budget Committee. However, I believe the budget resolution produced by his committee follows a misguided set of priorities and would move our country in the wrong direction.

I am particularly concerned about the large tax cuts called for in this resolution. The measure provides for more than \$100 billion in tax cuts over the next five years. I feel that the best tax cut for the American family is a balanced federal budget. Balancing the budget—and keeping it balanced—leads to lower interest rates, more job creation, and strong economic growth. With projections showing the federal budget will be balanced for the first time in almost 30 years, we should not risk returning to the era of deficit spending by enacting massive tax cuts at this time.

I am also concerned about plans to pay for these tax cuts by cutting more than \$45 billion in discretionary spending. While I am tremendously pleased that we have finally managed to balance the budget, and I voted for the spending cuts enacted last year, we must realize that discretionary spending has already absorbed crippling cuts. In 1962, discretionary spending accounted for more than two-thirds of all federal spending. Today, discretionary spending accounts for about one-third of the federal budget, while mandatory spending takes up just under two-thirds of the budget.

The budget resolution asks us to continue this trend by cutting more than can be reasonably expected from discretionary spending programs, while doing virtually nothing to reform the entitlement programs that have grown so fast over the past thirty years.

Therefore, I believe we should resist calls to enact massive tax cuts and focus instead on balancing the federal budget and keeping it balanced. The spending cuts contained in last year's balanced budget agreement kept us squarely on the path to fiscal responsibility, which was begun in 1993. We will be far better off if we do nothing, and stick to that agreement, than if we follow the recommendations contained in the budget resolution we

are considering today. And if, as projected, this year's budget should produce a surplus, I am committed to the following three priorities:

First, we should take steps to reform and provide for the long-term fiscal health of Social Security, Medicare, and other federal retirement programs without increasing the payroll tax.

Second, I believe it is absolutely imperative that we begin paying down the massive federal debt. Since 1980, the gross federal debt has grown more than five times in size to nearly \$5.5 trillion. Today, the debt is two-thirds the size of our nation's Gross Domestic Product, and interest payments on the debt consume 15 cents of every dollar in federal spending.

Think about how much better off we would be if this money did not have to be spent on interest payments. For every \$1 billion in debt we retire, we would save \$55 million each year in interest payments. Most economists say that reducing the debt, and thereby shrinking interest payments, would reduce interest rates, increase savings rates, keep the tax burden down, and make more money available in both the public and private sectors to fuel continued economic growth.

Finally, we should be investing more in this country's economic infrastructure—such as roads, inland waterways, sewage treatment plants, and airports—in order to make American workers and businesses more productive and profitable.

Improving roads, updating sewer systems, modernizing airports, and making sure our communications system is ready for the 21st century enhances our international competitiveness and helps American workers remain the most productive in the world.

Despite the obvious benefits, many infrastructure projects are not receiving adequate funds or are simply being ignored. For instance, a 1995 Department of Transportation study found that nearly one-third of the roads in this country are in poor or mediocre condition. The Department of Defense estimates that it will be at least 12 years before adequate housing can be built for every soldier in the U.S. armed forces. The Environmental Protection Agency estimates the federal government will need to invest more than \$275 billion to meet the nation's water and sewer system needs over the next 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, we have a moral responsibility to provide a solid and fiscally secure future for the generations that will follow us. The Republican budget resolution fails to provide a bright future for our children and grandchildren, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, as I stand here, I can't decide whether people should be laughing or crying. Is it low farce or dark tragedy to spend time doing the people's business debating a budget that virtually everyone knows is already dead? Today we debate the Budget Committee Majority's sorry, no account, buy today-pay tomorrow, credit card budget. In doing so, most Members on both sides of the aisle have been made reluctant participants in the spectacle of arguing over a corpse.

The Republican leadership seems to have concluded that since we have brought the budget deficit under control it is time to engage in the same sort of shenanigans that got us that deficit in the first place. And why not? Budget deficits have been very, very good to the Republican majority.

Mr. Clinton and Mr. GORE have brought us a smaller government and our booming economy and the 1993 budget agreement have led to a balanced budget. As a result, the Republicans don't have much reason for being. They have become the one trick pony of American politics whose sole excuse for political existence is to rail against irresponsible government excess. It is hard to show excess if there isn't a deficit, so Mr. KASICH's budget promises tax cuts today and pays for them with unspecified, politically unpalatable spending reductions somewhere out in the future. His budget would again put us on a path for deficits. I guess the Republican leadership believes that they can slip this by Americans with a lot of arm waving and thin promises of big tax cuts. I think that our citizens are smarter than that.

If this budget were ever to become the official congressional position, and I don't believe there is anyone in this room or in the other body who thinks for a minute that it will, it would require that we make radical cuts in transportation, housing, education and research programs. These are the very programs that improve the quality of life in this country today and promise a brighter life tomorrow. These are the same programs we have been cutting and freezing and cutting again for ten years as we wrestled with the deficit.

In Mr. KASICH's leaked plan his \$100 billion in savings comes from dredging up such tired old turkeys as eliminating the Departments of Commerce and Energy and selling the Power Marketing Administrations—proposals that have been debated and repudiated time and again. Over five years, the Kasich plan would also have us terminate the advanced technology program and manufacturing extension programs at the National Institute of Standards and Technology, cut NASA by one billion dollars, cut energy research by four billion dollars and freeze the National Science Foundation.

Mr. KASICH would cut funding for education and training programs by \$4.4 billion over five years. In housing, the Republicans would freeze Section 8 funding leading to a cumulative \$18.5 billion shortfall in funding for these contracts through 2003. Flood insurance contributions would be cut by \$1.7 billion leading to higher premiums for those living in flood plains and FHA would be cut by \$2.2 billion over five years.

The Kasich plan not only fails to provide for Transportation spending increases this House just endorsed in the Transportation Equity Act, but actually cuts budget authority for these programs by \$23.3 billion compared to the 1997 budget agreement. The image of this House embracing a massive transportation increase before the recess, with Members rushing home to brag about their pork, and then repudiating that policy by voting for this budget when we come back from recess reinforces the old adage that a week is a long time in politics. It makes me wonder if there shouldn't be a media warning for C-SPAN viewers that they could suffer whiplash from watching this body too closely.

We have been told that the reaction to Mr. KASICH's plan was so negative in his own party that it has been withdrawn. Now, instead of a plan of savings, the House is offered a lame line about giving Appropriators and Authorizers the freedom to find the savings on their own. Our Appropriations Chairman apparently took the Budget Committee at its

word about having freedom. He has already issued his 302b guidance to subcommittees based on last year's budget agreement rather than the Kasich proposal. I guess we know what the Appropriators think of the viability of this budget. Perhaps their view was shaped in part by the public comments of the Chairman of the Budget Committee in the other body, a self-described friend of Mr. KASICH, who has generously described the House Republican proposal as a "mockery."

The Appropriations know what the rest of us know: this budget is an irresponsible package that supporters try to make palatable by coyly repeating that they are simply asking for a cut of one cent on every dollar of federal spending. Mr. KASICH and his friends are not such doe-eyed innocents as all that. They know that 70% of Federal spending is off the table when it comes to talk of cuts. That means the \$100 billion necessary to reach the tax cut goal will have to be concentrated in just a handful of programs and those programs have been the target of cut after cut during the last ten years. There is a consensus, represented by last year's budget agreement, that investment programs such as education, transportation and research cannot bear further deep cuts. If there were the votes to do that, Mr. KASICH wouldn't have been beaten into withdrawing his plan. But he was and he has and for good reason. Instead of a plan, we have a dust storm of platitudes. Well, platitudes won't cover the tab for \$100 billion in tax cuts.

Over the years there has been a lot of talk, especially from the other side of the aisle, about truth in budgeting. If truth in budgeting is more than a slogan, this House should unite in a bipartisan rejection of the Budget Committee proposal. Defeat the Kasich budget, embrace the Spratt alternative and give this House a shred of credibility as we embark upon the appropriations process and enter into budget conference with the Senate.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H. Con. Res. 284, the fiscal year 1999 budget resolution. Last summer, the Congress and the President worked together to reach agreement on a balanced budget for the first time in 30 years. This resolution breaks that agreement. I cannot support this resolution, House Democrats will not support this resolution, and the President will not support this resolution. Even the Republican Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee said this resolution is a "mockery."

This resolution includes drastic cuts in non-defense discretionary spending. Even more outrageous than the magnitude of these cuts is the fact that the resolution does not specify which programs will be cut or by how much. However, the list of suggested cuts distributed by the Budget Committee clearly reveals the intentions of the Republican leadership.

The cuts are so broad and so sweeping that almost every American would feel the impact of this budget resolution. This budget resolution will gut environmental protections, law enforcement, low income housing, and health care for uninsured children. And it does nothing to protect Social Security. I'd like to list just a few examples of just how extreme this resolution really is. The budget resolution:

- Eliminates Americorps;
- Cuts the federal commitment to Mass Transit programs, which we just increased under the ISTEA reauthorization;
- Freezes future spending on law enforcement, at the same time that Republicans

argue that there is a lack of commitment to fight the war on drugs;

Ends the federal commitment under Title I which assists low-income areas meet their education needs;

Ends the work of the Legal Services Corporation;

Ends federal support of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting;

Ends federal land acquisition programs;

Reduces the Children's Health Insurance Program, which was part of last year's Balanced Budget Act, by 40 percent; and

Increases premiums for health insurance for all government employees.

Why are all these cuts necessary? Not to secure the future of Social Security. Not to protect the solvency of Medicare. Not to make the needed investment in our children's education. The cuts are "needed" so we can have another tax cut.

This is not a serious budget resolution. It is a empty political gesture and I urge my colleagues to reject it.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H. Con. Res. 284, the fiscal year 1999 Budget Resolution. This measure would have a chilling effect on mandatory and non-defense discretionary spending, and its proposed \$101 billion tax cut is a poorly timed move as we enjoy a stronger economy and budget surplus resulting from last year's Balanced Budget Act.

Although I am strongly opposed to with H. Con. Res. 284, I want to make clear that I support efforts to address the inequities in our tax code caused by the so-called "marriage penalty." I look forward to being in a position to support legislation that ends the current situation which requires some two-income married couples to pay more in taxes when filing jointly than they would pay if not married.

This is not that legislation.

H. Con. Res. 284 calls for \$101 billion in spending cuts over five years. These reductions are separate and above those enacted in last year's budget agreement, with every dollar of these additional cuts coming from non-defense spending and all of the savings targeted for tax cuts. Of the spending cuts proposed \$56 billion would be slashed from entitlement programs like Medicare and Medicaid and \$45 billion from nondefense discretionary programs.

The \$12 billion Medicaid cut will exacerbate the negative effects of last year's \$10 billion cut in the program. The state of California is still struggling to provide health care to the poor and indigent, especially the many uninsured and Medicaid patients in Los Angeles County. These cuts could jeopardize the health service delivery reforms that the County has struggled to make under its current Medicaid waiver.

The resolution's Medicare cuts may also jeopardize the Health Care Financing Administration's (HCFA) ability to effectively administer the program, particularly since Medicare's administrative budget is already insufficient to meet the Agency's new responsibilities under the Balanced Budget Act.

With respect to the discretionary cuts, the proposed reductions include \$290 million from important programs like the National Health Service Corps, the Agency for Health Care Policy and Research, and health professions' education. The GOP budget cuts \$4.4 billion from crucial education programs like the Title

I program for disadvantaged children, and recommends a voucher program which will only serve to undermine our public educational system.

The GOP budget resolution reneges on last year's budget agreement. While not perfect, the 1997 budget bill was the product of months of very difficult negotiations between the White House and congressional leaders. We must say no to these new cuts which will harm the most vulnerable of our citizens and threaten our current budget surplus by voting down the Kasich bill.

Mr. HILLEARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this budget. However, although this budget makes no recommendation on the funding of the Tennessee Valley Authority's (TVA) non-power programs, I believe that this Congress should carefully review two important new government studies of these programs.

TVA's non-power functions cover dam safety, reservoir management, water quality, and natural resource management, recreation, commercial navigation, environmental cleanup and other programs. Last year, Congress appropriated \$70 million along with the Appropriations Committee issuing report language claiming that TVA ratepayers should be expected to fund the non-power programs beginning in fiscal year 1999.

Recently, however, both the General Accounting Office (GAO) and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) have issued reports within the past month reviewing the nature of TVA's non-power programs. Both of these reports conclude that TVA is performing services that are clearly federal responsibilities.

In many cases, these are services currently performed by the Corps of Engineers elsewhere in the country and paid for out of the federal treasury.

It is simply not fair to the taxpayers of the Tennessee Valley region to ask them to pay for items that are clearly federal stewardship responsibilities in their own area through higher power rates, while at the same time taxing the people of the Tennessee Valley to pay for these same services that the federal government provides everywhere else in the country.

The OMB report concludes that "In the Administration's view, the no-power programs that TVA now operates are essential for prudent stewardship of the resources TVA manages." The report further states that TVA programs continue to be important to the Tennessee Valley region and the country."

It is my hope that in the interest of fairness and equity, this Congress will continue to appropriate funds for the federal stewardship responsibilities performed by TVA just as this Congress accepts and appropriates funds for these same responsibilities elsewhere in the United States.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this budget which will move this nation in the right direction. It provides important tax relief for my constituents, including eliminating the marriage penalty which makes married couples pay higher taxes just because they are married. The marriage penalty is morally wrong and I am pleased that we are moving forward to eliminate this unfair tax.

This budget provides tax relief while funding programs that are very important to the 15th District of Florida. In particular, I am pleased that the budget provides stable funding for

NASA, by funding NASA at least as high as the president's budget. On page 164 of the budget, it states that the budget, "Assumes the administration's funding levels for NASA." This will guarantee stable funding for the Space Shuttle, Space Station and other critical NASA programs important to my constituents who work at Kennedy Space Center (KCS). I thank the Chairman for hearing my request on behalf of my constituents and responding positively.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I, like most Members of the House, strongly oppose the Republican Leadership's budget, because it betrays the values of working American families on several fronts. We have heard of the painful cuts to seniors' and children's programs. But just as devastating are the cuts in environmental protection, in particular the cleanup of our nation's 1,300 toxic waste sites—known as Superfund sites.

As a representative from New Jersey, which has 117 of these 1,300 sites—more than any other state, I am offended by this blatant disregard for the health and safety of those families that are forced to live every day with the threat of a Superfund site in their midst.

One in every four Americans, including 10 million children below the age of 12, now live within 4 miles of a Superfund site. These sites can pose serious health and environmental risks to surrounding communities—and particularly children. Fifty percent of the Superfund sites assessed by the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry in fiscal years 1993 through 1996 were classified as definite public health hazards, and another 30 percent were of indeterminate hazard.

Already this year, cleanup work at up to 171 of these Superfund sites around the country has been delayed due to the Republicans' refusal to provide the funding necessary to expedite cleanups. This includes cleanups at sites in 44 of the 50 states—and three sites in my district alone.

And now with the Kasich budget and its \$5 billion cut in environmental spending, the Republicans are asking 1 in every 4 Americans to hold on—and live with that nearby Superfund site just a little bit longer. The Republicans are telling 1 in every 4 Americans, including 10 million American children, that cleaning up these toxic sites is simply a luxury we can't afford, something that the federal budget simply does not have room for.

Democrats want to speed up the cleanups of these public health threats. We want to fund the Superfund program at a level at which two-thirds of all toxic waste sites in the country will be cleaned up by the year 2001.

I urge my colleagues, on behalf of 1 in every 4 Americans, to vote for a healthy environment for our children and against the Republican Leadership's budget.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, this week, the House considers the Republican Leadership's Budget Resolution for FY '99 (H. Con. Res. 284). The Budget Committee approved a resolution on May 20, 1998 by a margin of 22–16 with every Democratic Member opposing the measure.

While I could not have come to this floor to support the Committee-passed resolution, what is before the House today is even worse than the product that the Republicans voted out of Committee.

Today's Budget resolution is a cruel and direct attack on the least advantaged Americans. It shows the majority party's true colors.

They are willing to make our children pay the price for their politics in three significant ways:

The government infrastructure that benefits the common good and each individual family—our schools, our environment, our park systems, our crime fighting programs—is cut to the bone.

Programs providing a safety net for the neediest families with children are gutted. A \$10 billion cut in the Budget category 600 translates into a 25% cut in budget authority for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families.

The proposal to spend \$100 billion today on tax breaks for the wealthy to please voters at November's polls instead of investing it for Medicare and Social Security solvency will only devastate our future federal budgets—and our children will pay the price.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle say that it is not the role of government to help the downtrodden, the disabled, the children who happened to be born into families without means.

But is it the role of government to hurt them? That's just what this resolution would do.

This budget must be viewed in the context of the economy. We know that this era of prosperity has passed many Americans by. Although we have had a long period of economic recovery, our economy has not been that robust until the last year or two. In fact, during the first three years of the recovery (1991 to 1993), 80% of Americans experienced declines in income.

As the economy grew more robust during the Clinton administration, workers experienced some income gains but, in spite of these more recent gains, the gap between the rich and the poor continues to widen. Improvements in wages were just not enough to erase 20 years of falling and stagnating wages.

Census Bureau data analyzed by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities dramatically demonstrates this growing income inequality in 48 out of 50 states:

Between the late 1970s and the mid-1990s, the incomes of upper-income families with children increased in every state. On average, incomes of the richest fifth of families increased by 30%, or nearly \$27,000, after adjusting for inflation. In sharp contrast, incomes of the poorest families with children decreased in 44 states in this period. The decline in the real incomes of the poorest families with children averaged 21 percent, or \$2,500.

In the U.S. as a whole, Census data shows that the poorest 20% of families with children had an average family income of \$9,250 in the mid-1990s, while the average income of families in the top 20% of income distribution was \$117,500, or 13 times as large.

The income gap is not just between rich and poor. The gap has also increased between middle class and high income families between the late 1970s and the mid-1990s. By the mid-1990s, there were 40 states where the gap between the highest income 20 percent of families and the middle 20 percent of families with children was larger than it had been for any state during the 1970s.

This data is clear: economic prosperity has not been broadly shared in America. The poverty rate for children has not declined. More than one in five children lives in poverty. Although children represent one-fourth of the population, they comprise nearly 40% of the people living in poverty.

Nor has the pain of budget choices been broadly shared. Under this Budget plan, the young and the poor bear the pain, and the rich share the gain.

The Leadership's Budget cuts domestic spending by \$101 billion over the next five years—a 19% reduction below the amount needed to keep up with inflation by the year 2003.

This is a huge cut below the already tight spending levels approved in last year's budget agreement. And, since the Republican budget does not include funding for the highway bill, the actual cuts would be even deeper.

More than 40% of the cuts fall on low-income families, even though these programs make up only 23% of all mandatory spending.

The Republican budget cuts Medicaid and children's health by \$12 billion, and cuts education by \$5.7 billion over five years.

The most insidious cut of all is the cut in the budget category 600. This category includes the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program (TANF).

The TANF block grant replaced AFDC, the JOBS program, and Emergency Assistance.

Cutting TANF reduces the funds states have to spend on providing basic supports for children. It also reduces state funds to pay for caseworkers to assist families making the transition from welfare to work. It reduces the funds to assure needy families with children obtain the education, training and employment assistance they need to help them become self-sufficient and avoid long-term welfare dependence.

If the TANF block grant budget authority is cut from \$16.4 billion to \$12.4 billion each year to achieve \$2 billion in outlay savings, as CBO estimates, and all the cuts came from TANF assistance: Benefits for all TANF families could be reduced by about 25% which would require the "average" welfare family of 3 to live on about \$275 a month; benefits for about one-quarter of TANF families could be eliminated ending assistance for approximately 1.5 million children; and basic education and job skills training needed for parents to become employable could be reduced or eliminated for up to 2.9 million parents trying to get back to work.

States would have \$10.2 billion less over 5 years to make the promote job preparation to get families off of public assistance, to prevent and reduce the incidence of out-of-wedlock pregnancies, and to provide child care for needy children.

In spite of our budget surplus and beyond our targets agreed to in the Balanced Budget Act, this resolution cuts to the quick every way our government works to make life better for Americans.

Why? So we can give \$100 billion in tax cuts and still have a balanced budget?

The Chairman of Ways and Means has floated various tax cuts but they all disproportionately help the upper bracket folks: estate tax relief, deeper capital gains cuts, exclusions for interest and dividends, reductions in the alternative minimum tax and marriage penalty relief. Even the accelerated deductions for health insurance provide more relief for those in the upper brackets than for taxpayers with lower wages.

The tax cuts are unfair and unwise when we know we must address solvency issues in both Medicare and Social Security.

In keeping with our vote today on school prayer, I hope I can reach the hearts and

minds of my colleagues with a story about Moses.

About 3000 years ago, Moses interpreted the Pharaoh's dream of 7 fat cattle and 7 starving cattle as a prediction that Egypt would have 7 years of feast, and then 7 years of famine. Like a wise ruler, the Pharaoh saved some of the surplus of the 7 good years, so that the people of Egypt could survive the 7 years of famine.

That was a pretty big gamble the Pharaoh took, relying on someone else's interpretation of a dream.

He could have made everyone happy for 7 years and seen his approval ratings reach deity levels. He could have abolished the tax code and built a few extra pyramids for his best friends. Instead of the 3 pyramids of Egypt, he could have had 4 or 5. He could have built a dozen sphinxes.

But no, he was wise, and saved for a possible disaster—and the disaster came.

We don't need Moses to analyze the demographics in America.

We know that our current surpluses are temporary and will turn to deficits. We know that Medicare and Social Security will either have to be cut or taxes raised in the next 10 years. We also know that we can make the problem infinitely easier to solve if we save today's surpluses for tomorrow's shortfalls.

God doesn't have to give us a dream for us to figure out the right policy here.

If we don't pass a budget that saves for future needs, our children will wonder if we were so dumb that we could not to see the obvious coming—or just too foolish not to prepare for it.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this budget that guts safety net programs for our children so that it can give tax breaks to the wealthy. I urge my colleagues to reject it as well.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, this budget resolution is an outrage. If it were not for the seriousness of the subject, this proposal would be laughable. Surely no responsible legislator on either side of the aisle can vote for this resolution.

Let's look at just one of the worst things this budget proposes to do: destroy the Medicaid program and cripple the child health program written with such fanfare only last year.

This budget slashes those programs by \$12 billion dollars over the next five years. That's actually \$2 billion more than the Balanced Budget Act took from Medicaid. And every one of the Members in this House—certainly every one on the Commerce Committee—remembers how difficult and painful those cuts were.

Now this budget says let's do it again.

How do they think that can be accomplished? Well, the May 12 document suggested block granting the acute care part of the program; that's the code word for taking away the entitlement to services that elderly and disabled people, pregnant women and kids, rely on to get decent medical care and nursing home services.

And nobody should be fooled into thinking the long term care part of the program would be spared. The actual budget proposal takes more than twice as much money out of Medicaid as the May 12 document assumed—so it is obvious that all the protections in all parts of the program—including nursing home care—are on the chopping block.

Some people must have some pretty short memories around here. Maybe they've forgotten that when you do this to Medicaid, you are

saying to widows that there's no Federal protections to keep spouses from being impoverished when their husband or wife goes into a nursing home. That you are saying to people in nursing homes that the Federal Government washes its hands of any responsibility for decent quality, staffing and services in nursing homes.

Maybe they've forgotten that it means saying to low-income Medicare beneficiaries that they won't be able to rely on help from Medicaid for services like prescription drugs or help with their cost sharing and premiums. Why the May 12 document says specifically that it would "grant Governors the flexibility to determine how best to address provisions for beneficiaries with overlapping benefits." That's shorthand for saying there's no more Federal guarantee that poor Medicare beneficiaries will get any extra help.

Or should we assume that Mr. KASICH and his majority at the Budget Committee think States will just cut services for kids instead?

Is that the policy they want us to endorse?

Let's see, what else could they have in mind. Do they mean to slash the DSH program so there's nothing left? Or just let people be pushed in managed care plans with a totally inadequate capitation rate? That's certainly an effective way to undermine any quality care in those settings.

All this is made more outrageous because we already slashed this program last year. We've already seen such a dramatic slowing of the growth in the numbers of people covered by Medicaid that it's virtually flat.

We've got a surplus, for heaven's sakes. But the philosophy behind this budget seems to be, well let's cut taxes anyway, and let poor people bear the brunt of paying for it. Because in this budget, it's programs for poor people that take the massively disproportionate share of the cuts.

This is idiocy. It's mean spirited, it's indefensible. If you vote for this budget, you might as well just say flat out to poor widows and poor kids in your district and all over the country—forget any guarantee of decent medical care. Forget any protections in Medicaid.

There's lots of other reasons to vote against this budget. But what it does to Medicaid is reason enough. Vote no.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the GOP Budget Resolution reported out of the Rules Committee. In this Resolution the GOP Majority has turned its back on the commitment and coherent budget agreement Congress crafted last year. The GOP reneges and risks our recent success toward balancing the budget and maintaining investment in areas of critical need to our nation and people. Instead, the GOP Majority has opted to put forth a measure which will force massive cuts in areas important to our nation's future such as health care, child care, education and the environment. This is not governing. This Republican budget clearly demonstrates irresponsibility, abandons the promise to save Social Security first, kills important investments in our children's future and clearly neglects the American people.

The Majority Budget Resolution will cut an additional \$101 billion below last year's budget agreement in people's programs. Although the Republican rhetoric attempts to characterize such cuts as simply being 1 cent out of every dollar over the next 5 years, the reality is much more alarming than their rhetoric would

lead Americans to believe. It takes billions from people's programs, Medicaid, TANF, education, veterans medical benefits, crime fighting efforts and natural resources. Furthermore, the GOP Budget does not add up. At a time when our country is in its greatest period of economic growth, when the budget deficit is on the way to elimination due to the major work done by the Democratic Majority in Congress and President Clinton in 1993—without a single GOP vote—and a surplus of \$40 billion is projected this year 1998, congress should be seizing this opportunity. We should offer a 1999 budget which invests in working families and provides the tools and resources that increase the ability of all people to thrive in our nation's booming economy and has a paramount focus on insuring Social Security and Medicare's long-term viability. Instead, we have a GOP budget that miserably fails this test and our country.

The proposals contained in this Budget Resolution continue the Republican's war against health care. Last year, congress set our Medicare reductions of \$115 billion for five years. Initial provisions in this year's GOP Budget proposal sought more than \$22 billion in yet new cuts to Medicare and Medicaid on top of what is already set out in law. The Republicans planed to use these new cuts to finance a tax cut for America's wealthiest taxpayers. Only after intense criticism from within their own party and Democrats, the GOP Leadership opted to drop the Medicare cuts, but not the cuts which savage Medicaid. And the new children's health care program. This change relays a negative message to the elderly and the low income families and the disabled who were promised and deserve quality health care.

The Republican Budget cuts \$5 billion from natural resources and environmental protection programs. This is money that could be used for the Environmental Protection Agency, Superfund, our National Parks, National Forests and Wildlife Refuges, protecting endangered species and funding important environmental cleanup. Protecting the environment and preserving the earth's natural resources should be a top priority in congress. A close look at this budget leads to the conclusion that the GOP Majority is indifferent to its stewardship responsibilities to this nation and land.

Last year's Balanced Budget Agreement explicitly assumed full funding for all Section 8 Housing expiring contracts through 2002. However, this year's budget fails to maintain the number of households who currently receive assistance by refusing to allocate funding for existing Section 8 contracts as they expire. This simply is a broken promise. Failure to renew expiring contracts will not only reduce the number of assisted households, it could force currently assisted tenants to face sharp rent increases, displacement or eviction.

In response to the concerns of the growing number of people whose Section 8 housing contracts that are scheduled to expire, the Republicans included no outlays for that purpose in their Budget, virtually making the budget authority unusable. Furthermore, according to the Congressional Budget Office, a freeze in renewing Section 8 contracts would ultimately mean one million households would lose federal housing vouchers and certificates by 2003. Today, rental housing assistance provides Section 8 tenant-based and project-based programs to over 3 million households.

Forty-six percent of this total are working class families with children and 32% are elderly. This will force needy persons into the streets and into homelessness.

In addition, the Republican plan slashes education programs by \$5.7 billion over the next 5 years. It eliminates direct federal funding to school district by repealing Title I grants and suggests that such programs be made into some sort of vouchers. These grants are essential in providing supplementary education and related services in low-achieving children attending schools with relatively high concentrations of pupils from low-income families. These additional cuts deprive our elementary and secondary schools of much needed resources that could be used for more teachers in our classrooms and internet access for all schools.

Furthermore, the Republican budget freezes every program it does not cut, specifically veterans' medical care, law enforcement, Superfund and Head Start. This adds up to real cuts when even a lowered inflation rate will depreciate the level support provided in this Budget blueprint. The reality is that 40% of these cuts impact hard working, low-income families that deserve our help and encouragement not the shabby treatment accorded in this GOP budget blueprint.

Moreover, just last night the Republicans dropped a special provision allowing Congress to use the anticipated budget surpluses on a convoluted, untested proposal offered by the Speaker: "private retirement accounts." Such accounts are a unilateral, premature, partisan maneuver that is intended to superimpose this idea in place of a bipartisan agreement to truly strengthen and save Social Security first.

Deciding now to use the surpluses for tax incentive private accounts before addressing Social Security's long-term problems would siphon off resources that will be needed to maintain the solvency of the Social Security Trust Fund. Budget surpluses should be reserved until a Social Security Commission, the President, and the Congress address the long-term requirements of Social Security. This represents just another step in the Republican agenda to eliminate the Social Security Insurance program and squander away the projected budget surplus upon half baked schemes. While abandoning the specifics it is still the intent of this budget to tax expend the dollars, so one bad idea may just be replaced with another and have a similar impact of disregarding the commitment to save Social Security first.

Overall, this budget fails to meet the needs of the American people. The Republicans are a majority in Congress; it is their responsibility to put forward a plan that can actually be implemented and to govern. Because the Republican plan cuts so deeply and unfairly, and because it deviates so markedly from last year's bipartisan budget agreement, it hopefully stands little chance of being implemented. Attempts to implement it will ensure confrontation with the GOP Senate, Presidential opposition and a strong no vote from most Democrats.

After forty five days late without a budget proposal, the nation has a right to expect the GOP Congress to step forward with a sound budget plan—a budget that is not just another political, partisan scheme loaded with the tax break promises for special interest groups, more punitive, punishing cuts on the working

poor and undercutting retirement, health and education programs so vital to our constituents' and nation's future. It seems that this GOP led Congress would blow a free lunch after they were handed a working model crafted by the gutsy votes of 1993 Clinton/Democrat Congress. That proposal has changed the economic path from deficits as far as the eye can see to an economic path based upon sound economics and a surplus this year and hopefully in to the future.

Here we go again. After last year's tax breaks and budget deal the GOP majority reneges in the name of an election issue. The Republicans attempt to break the 1997 Budget agreement and attempt to make a virtue of tax breaks for the special interests and breaking faith with Social Security and Medicare. Make no mistake about it this will break the budget. This is the same old GOP tax break siren song that the band plays when the GOP is asked why the numbers didn't add up—Play it again, Sam!

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H. Con. Res. 284, the budget resolution offered by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee. I believe that this budget plan is seriously flawed.

The proposed budget resolution would cut \$101 billion in federal programs over the next 5 years in order to finance a tax cut of comparable magnitude. I am concerned that spending cuts of such size—in the wake of the budget cuts of recent years—would have a powerful negative impact on my district that would not in any way be justified by the benefits that the proposed tax cut could provide. I am especially concerned about the impact that this level of program cuts would have on the most vulnerable members of our society—children, seniors, the sick, and the poor. Our top priority must be to—at least—maintain the existing federal safety net for those individuals who desperately need it.

Moreover, it is my understanding that while the report on the budget resolution recommends that some or all of the spending cuts be used to eliminate the marriage penalty, the bill does not do that, nor would it take \$101 billion in savings to do so. While the Budget Committee report on H. Con. Res. 284 is rather vague, it seems likely that much of the savings from the \$101 billion in proposed spending cuts would be used for the kinds of tax cuts for the rich that usually characterize Republican tax legislation. In fact, H. Con. Res. 284 would not actually eliminate the marriage penalty in the tax code. The report only urges the Ways and Means Committee to use the savings produced by the resolution to eliminate the marriage penalty. The Committee—and Congress—would in no way be bound to do so.

I want to make it completely clear that I support efforts to address the marriage penalty in the tax code—I am a cosponsor of legislation that would make just such a change—but that the proposed level of spending cuts are not necessary to address the marriage penalty.

Nor do I believe that we should pay for tax cuts for the rich by cutting important federal education programs, infrastructure programs, environmental protection programs, research programs, anti-poverty programs, and health care programs. Some of the cuts assumed by this budget resolution would harm the most needy members of our society and rapidly reduce the quality of life in many of our commu-

nities. Other assumed cuts—like those eliminating critical investments in federal research, education, and infrastructure programs—would in the long run prove to be counterproductive; such federal programs are necessary in order to maximize our nation's future economic growth. Moreover, many of the program cuts and eliminations assumed in this budget resolution have been considered and rejected repeatedly by Congress in previous years. If the Members consider the implications of this budget carefully, I am certain that a majority of them will reject it.

I have a number of other serious concerns about this budget resolution. It is back-loaded—all the painful cuts would take place in the out-years after the November elections. It would change the pay-as-you-go provisions of the Budget Act that have helped to impose the necessary fiscal discipline on Congress. And, finally, it contains none of the President's important initiatives on education, child care, health care, and the environment.

In short, this bill has a number of major flaws. The bill does too little to preserve Social Security. The spending cuts in this budget resolution are excessive and unwise. Many of the specific spending cuts that are assumed in the resolution have been rejected before. And, finally, while Congress should address the marriage penalty, it could do so without the level of spending and tax cuts proposed in this budget resolution. For these and the other reasons described above, I oppose this bill. I urge my colleagues to join me in defeating this unwise, irresponsible legislation.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, it is highly likely that there will be a budget surplus of no less than 50 billion dollars for the coming budget year. For the first time in many decades there will be a window of opportunity to make meaningful federal investments in education. Unfortunately, the federal share of the overall expenditures for education is merely seven percent at present. This budget surplus offers an opportunity to bolster our national security by increasing the pool of brainpower to operate our increasingly complex society. I propose that the new budget surplus be divided in accordance with clear national priorities. One fourth of the surplus should be set aside for social security; one fourth should be used to give tax relief to families earning less than 50,000 dollars a year; one fourth should be allocated for direct emergency funding for school construction; and one fourth should be invested in other education priorities such as smaller class sizes, education technology, books, equipment, etc. This represents a worthy budget deal which should immediately be placed on the table for discussion and debate. We need an open debate on the best use for the surplus. What American voters should fear is a closed door, smoke-filled room deal in October with only representatives of the Republican controlled Appropriations Committees (House and Senate) and the White House present. A multibillion dollar deal is going to be made. Let this deal be done in the sunshine. Let's do a deal for the children of America.

DO THE BUDGET DEAL NOW

Start acting real  
Right now do a democratic deal  
Do this magic surplus deal  
Upfront right away  
Chase infected cynics  
Off the political highway

Make humane rules  
Build safe schools  
Start acting real  
Right now do the deal  
Sunshine is now okay  
Act fast in the light of day  
Invest in the people's way  
Stop pushing the no touch lie  
In four pieces cut the pie  
Start acting real  
Right now do the deal  
Vote for children's justice fast  
Make up for the stupid past  
The budget is on even keel  
Upfront right away  
Do this magic surplus deal.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOEHNER) having assumed the chair, Mr. NEY, 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. 284) revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1998, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1999, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003, pursuant to House Resolution 455, he reported the concurrent resolution 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, as amended.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were— yeas 216, nays 204, answered "present" 1, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 210]  
YEAS—216

Aderholt	Camp	Dunn
Archer	Canady	Ehlers
Armey	Cannon	Ehrlich
Bachus	Chabot	Emerson
Baker	Chambliss	English
Barr	Chenoweth	Ensign
Barrett (NE)	Christensen	Everett
Bartlett	Coble	Ewing
Barton	Coburn	Fawell
Bass	Collins	Foley
Bateman	Combest	Forbes
Bereuter	Condit	Fossella
Bilirakis	Cook	Fowler
Bliley	Cooksey	Fox
Blunt	Cox	Franks (NJ)
Boehlert	Crane	Frelinghuysen
Boehner	Crapo	Gallegly
Bonilla	Cubin	Gekas
Bono	Cunningham	Gibbons
Brady (TX)	Davis (VA)	Gilchrist
Bryant	Deal	Gillmor
Bunning	DeLay	Gilman
Burr	Diaz-Balart	Gingrich
Burton	Dickey	Goode
Buyer	Doolittle	Goodlatte
Callahan	Dreier	Goodling
Calvert	Duncan	Goss

Graham  
Granger  
Greenwood  
Gutknecht  
Hall (TX)  
Hansen  
Hastert  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Herger  
Hill  
Hilleary  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Istook  
Jenkins  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Kasich  
Kelly  
Kim  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaHood  
Largent  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Lazio  
Leach  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Livingston  
LoBiondo

Lucas  
Manzullo  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntosh  
McKeon  
Metcalf  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Moran (KS)  
Myrick  
Nethercutt  
Neumann  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Oxley  
Packard  
Pappas  
Parker  
Paxon  
Pease  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Pombo  
Porter  
Portman  
Pryce (OH)  
Radanovich  
Ramstad  
Redmond  
Regula  
Riggs  
Riley  
Rogan  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Roukema  
Royce  
Ryun

Salmon  
Sanford  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaefer, Dan  
Schaffer, Bob  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Skeen  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (OR)  
Smith (TX)  
Snowbarger  
Solomon  
Spence  
Stearns  
Stump  
Sununu  
Talent  
Tauzin  
Taylor (NC)  
Thomas  
Thornberry  
Thune  
Tiahrt  
Upton  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Watkins  
Watts (OK)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
White  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wolf  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

Reyes  
Rivers  
Rodriguez  
Roemer  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Sanchez  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Sawyer  
Schumer  
Scott  
Serrano  
Sherman  
Siskisky  
Skaggs

Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith, Adam  
Smith, Linda  
Snyder  
Spratt  
Stabenow  
Stark  
Stenholm  
Stokes  
Strickland  
Stupak  
Tauscher  
Taylor (MS)  
Thompson  
Thurman  
Tierney

Torres  
Towns  
Traficant  
Turner  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Waters  
Watt (NC)  
Waxman  
Wexler  
Weygand  
Wise  
Woolsey  
Wynn  
Yates

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Souder

## NOT VOTING—13

Ballenger  
Furse  
Gonzalez  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kennedy (MA)

LaFalce  
Lewis (GA)  
McDade  
Mollohan  
Paul

Ros-Lehtinen  
Sabo  
Tanner

□ 1446

Mr. HILL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, had I been present for rollcall vote 210, I would have voted "no."

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the concurrent resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOEHNER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, last night I was unavoidably absent and missed Rollcall Votes 203 and 204. Had I been present I would have voted yes on Rollcall Vote 203 and yes on Rollcall Vote 204, a conference report for a bill authorizing agricultural research and extension programs and restoring food stamps benefits to certain legal immigrants.

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1054

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor from H.R. 1054.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request from the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask consent to speak out of order to inquire of the distinguished majority leader the schedule for today, the remainder of the week and next week.

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

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the distinguished majority leader from Texas to give us a little information on where we are headed here, this weekend and next week.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that we have concluded legislative business for the week. The House will next meet on Tuesday, June 9, at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and at 2 o'clock p.m. for legislative business. On Tuesday we will consider a number of bills under suspension of the rules, a list of which will be distributed to Members' offices this afternoon. After suspensions, the House will take up H.R. 2709, the Iran Missile Proliferation Sanctions Act under a closed rule. Members should note that we do not expect any recorded votes before 5 o'clock p.m. on Tuesday, June 9.

On Wednesday, June 10, the House will meet at 9 o'clock a.m. and recess immediately for a joint meeting to receive the President of South Korea. Following the joint meeting on Wednesday and on Thursday, June 11, the House will consider the following legislation:

H.R. 3150, the Bankruptcy Reform Act of 1998 and H.R. 3494, the Child Protection Sexual Predator Punishment Act of 1998. Mr. Speaker, there is also a chance that we may consider H.R. 2888, the Inside Sales Act. The House will also continue consideration of H.R. 2183, the Bipartisan Campaign Integrity Act of 1997.

Mr. Speaker, we hope to conclude legislative business for the week on Thursday, June 11, and I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I would ask of my friend from Texas, and I thank him for his information for next week, and I would just note to the gentleman from Texas that also on the schedule for this week I noted that he had campaign finance on the schedule for next week. It was supposed to be on the schedule for this week, and of course we did not get to debate campaign finance. And in addition to that I note that the Committee on Rules has reported out the second rule making in order hundreds of nongermane amendments, and we are concerned on this side of the aisle that it appears that there is going to be or is in progress right now a filibuster by the majority on this piece of legislation.

And my question to my friend from Texas is are we going to do campaign finance next week?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for his inquiry, and if I may say to the

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Allen  
Andrews  
Baesler  
Baldacci  
Barcia  
Barrett (WI)  
Becerra  
Bentsen  
Berman  
Berry  
Billbray  
Bishop  
Blagojevich  
Blumenauer  
Bonior  
Borski  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (CA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Campbell  
Capps  
Cardin  
Carson  
Castle  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clyburn  
Conyers  
Costello  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Cummings  
Danner  
Davis (FL)  
Davis (IL)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Deutsch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Doggett  
Dooley

Doyle  
Edwards  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Evans  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fazio  
Filner  
Ford  
Frank (MA)  
Frost  
Ganske  
Gejdenson  
Gephardt  
Gordon  
Green  
Gutierrez  
Hall (OH)  
Hamilton  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Hefley  
Hefner  
Hilliard  
Hinchev  
Hinojosa  
Holden  
Hooley  
Hoyer  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee (TX)  
Jefferson  
John  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (WI)  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind (WI)  
Klecza  
Klink  
Kucinich  
Lampson  
Lantos  
Lee  
Levin

Lipinski  
Lofgren  
Lowe  
Luther  
Maloney (CT)  
Maloney (NY)  
Manton  
Markley  
Martinez  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHale  
McIntyre  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Menendez  
Millender-McDonald  
Miller (CA)  
Minge  
Mink  
Moakley  
Moran (VA)  
Morella  
Murtha  
Nadler  
Neal  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Peterson (MN)  
Pickett  
Pomeroy  
Poshard  
Price (NC)  
Quinn  
Rahall  
Rangel

## NAYS—204