PriceWaterhouseCoopers, the population ''undercount'' similar to that which occurred in the 1990 Census would cost 26 states a minimum of $9.1 billion. States with the largest numerical undercounts would be hit the hardest. California would lose more than $5 billion, Texas nearly $2 billion, and Florida $5 million. I am particularly concerned that 120,267 are estimated to be undercounted from Census 2000 in Harris County, Texas.

Moreover, $185 billion in federal funds are allocated each year based on each state's respective share of the population, as determined every 10 years by the Census. The PriceWaterhouseCoopers study examined the 15 programs analyzed by the General Accounting Office in its 1999 report on the funding impact of the 1990 census undercount.

The eight programs most affected by the census are Medicaid, Foster Care, Rehabilitation Services Block Grants, Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Block Grants Adoption Assistance, Child Care and Development Block Grants, and Vocational Education Block Grants.

Our communities cannot afford to squander the opportunity to secure desperately needed resources to make these programs available to everyone. An accurate Census is the only way to assure that local communities receive their 'fair share' of federal spending; an inaccurate count will shortchange the affected communities for an entire decade.

Keeping response rates high must remain a primary purpose in obtaining an accurate census. Recent news stories have only highlighted this need. Texas has a 33 percent return, but the fourth largest city in the nation only has 26 percent return. That is the city of Houston. This is precisely what we must change. Only a high response rate to the Census 2000 questionnaires will enable our community to secure desperately needed funds.

And while some have recently raised concerns about the legality or constitutionality of the long form, those only serve as a distraction. In fact, the Census Bureau has not prosecuted anyone for not sending in their Census form since the 1960s. They are interested in getting complete and reliable data; they do not want to jeopardize the public trust.

The long form is a sound investment—for a relatively small additional cost, information of very high quality about a number of subjects is collected for many geographic areas. The return on this investment is concrete information that serves the basis for sound public policy decisions and that supports the accurate allocation of over billions of dollars.

Community leaders use the long form for planning a wide range of activities, including neighborhood revitalization, economic development and improved facilitates and services.

We need the long form to build highways, roads, bridges and tunnels in areas that need them. And planners need information about where people live and work and the times they leave for work.

Each long form question provides valuable, indeed essential, information for important public policy and business decisions.

For example, data from the question on the number of telephones in the home area is used to help plan local 911 emergency services. They also are used to help implement the Older Americans Act to provide emergency and health-care services to homebound seniors without phone service.

Data from the question on how long it takes to commute to work is used by federal, state, local and private transportation planners to help design new roads, bus routes, and mass transit transportation and to manage traffic congestion, as well as to distribute federal transportation dollars.

Indeed, data from the question on the veteran's status are used to plan the location of veteran's hospitals and to efficiently deliver veterans health-care and nursing services.

Your answers to Census 2000 are absolutely critical to ensure that every possible dollar is made available to the poor, the sick, and the neglected in our communities.

The U.S. Census only comes around once every ten years, but its information is used throughout the decade. Together, let's make sure that everyone is heard.

□

TAX LIMITATION CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity tonight to discuss a very important issue that is going to be on the floor of the House of Representatives this week. It is called the tax limitation amendment. The tax limitation amendment, known as H.J. Res. 37, is a very, very simple amendment that was first brought to life some 10 years ago by the gentleman from the 6th District of Texas (Mr. BARTON).

Last week we had a press conference where we talked about, in essence, the passing of the mantle from the gentleman from Texas to myself, being the lead for the tax limitation amendment where we will bring to the floor of the House of Representatives on Wednesday an opportunity for all Members not only to fully debate but also to vote on something which I believe is very, very important.

The essence of H.J. Res. 37 is that we are going to make it more difficult for Washington to raise taxes on America. That is what this debate is all about. It will be about doing those things that Washington talks about, making it more difficult by requiring a supermajority, a two-thirds vote on the floor of the House of Representatives and in the Senate to raise taxes. Part of what we are talking about today, we would assume, is just a conservative idea, and I think that that would be correct. But it is a bipartisan idea. It is an idea not only that has grassroots all across America, people who are pro-business but it also has people who consider themselves Democrats, Democrats even, who understand that raising taxes should not be easy, because taxes come from people who get up and go to work every day, work diligently, honest people, taxpayers, and then are giving too much money to Washington, D.C.

One of the persons who is the co-chairman of this effort, a coleader in this effort, is the gentleman from the 4th District of Texas (Mr. HALL). This evening I am very honored to have the gentleman from Texas with me to help not only the discussion about the tax limitation amendment but also for an opportunity for us to discuss this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the 4th District of Texas, a lifelong Democrat, a conservative, and a man who understands it is important to make it more difficult to raise taxes on taxpayers.

Mr. HALL of Texas. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am here today, of course, to express my support for the tax limitation amendment. I have been for this amendment from the word go. I really do not understand that it ought to be a Republican or a Democratic thrust or a liberal or conservative thrust because I think it is an American thrust. Requiring a two-thirds vote to raise taxes would force very serious consideration on this legislation at any time that they would attempt to raise taxes; and it would require, as the gentleman from Texas has said, a supermajority vote on any proposal that would impact the pocketbooks of every hard-working American.

The major test of this legislation would be not what class supports it. We are in for at least 5 wonderful years in this country. We now have, rather than the deficits of the 1980s and the 1990s, a surplus; and we are going to have good times for the next 5, maybe for the next 10, years to have money to be that that we ought to be for people who have no lobby, pay a lot of it on our debt. That is tantamount to a tax break for everyone.

I think that if we would go into our district, and I say ''our district'' because the gentleman and I share districts in Texas. I have part of Dallas County in my district. He has a much larger part of it. I have most of Kaufman. He has a part of Kaufman in his district. He has a part of Smith County which is Tyler; Tyler, Texas. We represent the same type of people, people who want less government, people who want to keep the money that they work for, people who want to plan ahead, people who want to have money in September to buy school clothes without having the taxes that are put on them, that have been historically put on them by a 50 percent vote. A lot of those votes like the Tax Reform Act of 1986 would never have happened if it had taken a two-thirds vote.

□ 2030

So I think if they would go out into their district, into any part of our district, and talk to the first 10 people they see and ask them would you like to see it a little bit more difficult for the Congress of the United States to take money out of your left hip pocket, what do you think their answer would be?

Mr. SESSIONS. Let me say this: the gentleman from Texas, whose district

is literally overlaid on my district, the 4th District overlaid on the 5th District, very, very similar, the kind of people, the kind of people's thoughts and ideas, I believe that if you went in the 4th or 5th Districts of Texas, that people would say, I think Washington, D.C. has enough money. First of all, they have got enough money. They don't need to tax us more. They ought to be more efficient.

The second thing I think they would say, as the gentleman has pointed out, is let us make it more difficult. There is no need to go back to the American public to ask for a tax increase, especially when we are in a surplus condition. Right now, today, in America we are working off of a surplus, and yet we know that there are people in Washington, D.C., that want more and more and more money.

I would say to the gentleman from the 4th District of Texas that if we made it more difficult, it would immediately cause this Congress and the administration, whoever is President, to have to go and look within the administration, to go look in these agencies to find where there is waste, fraud and abuse, to find where there was opportunity to save money, rather than going back to the taxpayer.

Mr. HALL of Texas. I think as the gentleman well knows, we represent a conservative area. We both represent a part of the old Rayburn congressional district. We talk about balanced budgets and all that. Mr. Rayburn had a balanced budget the last 8 years of his service here; and as he went back home to Bonham, Texas, to die, he looked back over his shoulder at a balanced budget.

I think we could use some of that good common horse sense now. I think the people of this country want to be able to keep more of the money they are making. I just do not believe the argument that we have a lot more money now, so this amendment is not as important. I think this amendment is more important now than it was during the deficit times, because they have more to lose, and it is going to look like it is easy to put taxes on people.

I just think it is a golden opportunity to raise the bar and protect hard-working Americans from tax increases in the future that are not supported by a majority of two-thirds of the people. I think it is critical that we make a statement that we are committed to controlling government spending, rather than raising taxes, in order to maintain a balanced Federal budget.

I just think that the 10 people that I would talk to on Front Street in Tyler, Texas, or any part of Kaufman County, or any part of the district we share in Dallas County, we would talk to these people and ask this simple question; and I think we ought to invite the rest of the Congress to go home and do the same thing, ask them what do you think about the fact we are trying to make it a little bit more difficult to put taxes on you. What do you think their answer would be?

Mr. SESSIONS. Absolutely. I believe the answer from people, if you talk to people who live in the districts that get up and go to work every day, they would say, We are very pleased. We love America. We support government and the essence of what it does. But today there is more than enough money in Washington, D.C. Make do with what you have. Do not come back to us. We are out producing, meaning the people back home, producing not only in efficiencies, but to the economy, to the local communities and to government, to make it work. This needs to be a bar that gets raised because it is that important of an issue.

You know that there are several parts of the Constitution that put a two-thirds vote that is a requirement to be able to pass something. I believe, and I think the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) agrees, that raising taxes should be one of those things that we make more difficult, that should require a consensus and a two-thirds vote.

I thank the gentleman. I know that the gentleman has got a dinner that he has got to go to, but I thank the gentleman for not only working on behalf of the people of the 4th District of Texas, but also doing it in a national leadership capacity here tonight. I thank him so very much for being a part of what we are doing.

Mr. HALL of Texas. I thank the gentleman for the time, and I certainly am pleased that he has accepted the leadership of this amendment. I pledge that I will work side by side with the gentleman and we will work this floor.

I do not know how we are going to come out, but I do know that we are going to still be swinging at it. I suggest that, no matter how the vote turns out, that we start anew the day we have either won or lost it, to working the other end of the situation and asking those 10 people what they think about it, and asking each Member of Congress here to go home and ask their first 10 people what they think about it. Maybe we are working at the wrong end of the deal here in Washington, D.C. Maybe we ought to be working at home.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the gentleman so very much.

This evening we are also joined by one of the stalwarts of freedom, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), who is not only a very good friend of the taxpayer, but a person who understands whose money this really is we are talking about. At this time I would yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my colleague from Texas, and I thank my colleague from across the aisle from Texas also for joining us here tonight.

Mr. Speaker, observers could not help but note the differing tone of those who preceded us in this Chamber this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I was astounded, but I guess not really surprised, at the level of bile, the venom, the mean-spiritedness and deliberate mischaracterizations that preceded us in this Chamber, and I could not help but notice the difference, Mr. Speaker, as we come here on a bipartisan basis.

Our good friend from Texas asked, what would the people at home say? And, Mr. Speaker, one of the things I hear repeatedly is how sick and tired they are of the endless partisan haranguing and insults and deliberate mischaracterizations of matters of public policy, because, Mr. Speaker, we are involved in dealing with the public trust. All 435 of us in this Chamber are entrusted with an awesome responsibility, to represent the peoples of our districts to the best of our ability, commensurate with full allegiance to the Constitution of the United States.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would just appeal to the American people to understand that we are talking about a bipartisan amendment, and, in the words of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), it really should not be liberal, conservative, Republican or Democrat. It is quintessentially American, because what will take place on this floor, through the leadership of my good friend from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) and many of others of us, we will come to this floor and ask for a supermajority vote, ask for 290 of us to line up to say that it should be harder for Congress to raise taxes on the American people.

We were talking about what folks say at home. The 6th Congressional District of Arizona, in square mileage almost the size of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. From the small hamlet of Franklin in southern Greenlee County, north to Four Corners, west to Flagstaff, south again to Florence, encompassing parts of Phoenix, Mesa, Scottsdale, a fast growing area, where people come from all over the country, a near universal lament has been well, you common sense folks can get some things done, but that is no guarantee that in 2 years if there is a change in the composition of the Congress, if something happens, that your hard work will not be reversed.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, that is precisely why we are bringing this amendment to the floor of the House again, this proposed amendment, because we believe, just as important, just as challenging as it is to amend the Constitution of the United States, to deal with questions such as impeaching a chief executive, or, in the other body, ratifying international treaties, we believe the same standard should apply to the Government reaching into the pockets of everyday, hard-working Americans. That is the key to this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out that, as is often the case, many of our States, often characterized as laboratories of democracy, the places where we apply with our dynamic system of Federalism the principles of our constitutional Republic, 14 of our 50 states

have already adopted State tax limitation provisions, including my home State of Arizona, when in 1992 the legislature and the people decided that a two-thirds vote would be required for any, any, increase in taxation.

Now, it is important, Mr. Speaker, to make this distinction: this does not prohibit tax increases, but it does say to the American people we understand a simple truth. The money does not belong to the Washington bureaucrats; it belongs to you. And we believe that if you work hard, play by the rules, want to provide for your family, want to provide for your children, have an obligation to your parents and other seniors in your community, are glad to shoulder that obligation, since it is your money, it should be tougher for Washington to get to it. It should be a question every bit as important as amending the Constitution of the United States.

So we will come here again seeking a supermajority to enact this notion of a higher standard for tax increases. We are reminded over the last 2 decades, 1980, 1982, 1983, 1990, and, of course, the largest tax increase in American history, which passed in this Chamber and the other body by one vote, which was characterized by some in this town, principally those at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, as an ''investment on our future,'' when in fact it really was an assault on seniors, on children, on Americans who had even left the here-and-now to go to the hereafter, so excessive was that tax increase it was retroactive to the first of the year in the grave, if the Congress or a future administration is tempted again to take the easy way out, to pickpocket hard-working American citizens, Mr. Speaker, this amendment would say, whoa, not so fast. Because we are a government of laws, because we are a government where the first three words of the Constitution talk about ''We the people.''

We are accountable to the people, and we want to make it more difficult, we want to raise the standard, so that the same Americans, whether they are in the 5th or 4th Congressional District of Texas, or the 6th Congressional District of Arizona, or any district across the country, will understand that we are going to think long and hard and have compelling reasons to make a change, should we decide to do so collectively in this body with the support of the American people. But that will take away a temptation that has been too often easily employed.

Let us raise the standard and return to the notion that the money belongs to the people, not to Washington. I know my friend from Texas has a few things to say.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman from Arizona has now clearly laid out is not only the essence of the reason why this is important to people back home, but I now want to add to those reasons and talk about why Washington needs to pay attention to the tax limitation amendment, H.J. Res. 94. I said H.J. Res. 39. That is wrong. That was last year. I have caught up now. H.J. Res. 94.

We must make it harder for Congress to raise taxes on the American people. Now, many people would say, Well, Washington has it down. We have already created a surplus. We are going to have a surplus now for as far as the eye can see.

I would say that, yes, that probably is true, provided we stay in power. But there is so much more that must be understood, and that is that just because the majority party believes that that is the right thing to do, it does not mean that that is what everybody agrees.

Back in 1995, when we were in the midst of the battle, the battle to determine that we would have a balanced budget, that we would be able to work within the confines to balance the budget based upon what the American people have given us before the Committee on Ways and Means, Alice Rivlin, the OMB, Office of Management and Budget, personnel director, said, ''I do not think that adhering to a firm path,'' which means a balanced budget, that you are going to stick to it, ''for a balance by 2002 is very sensible.''

□ 2045

She did not believe it was sensible. It is not always a good policy to have a balanced budget.

Let me say that that was 1995. Here we are, the year 2000, and lo and behold, not only does Alice Rivlin represent her boss, and they said in 1995 the way things would be, but here we see it in print now, this President's budget that he presented, that he took 2 hours to describe to the American public in the State of the Union Address.

We find out that President Clinton and Vice President Gore have more tax increases. Even when we are in the middle of trying to not only take care of and shore up not only social security and Medicare and a lot of other things, but we have a surplus, and what do they want to do? They want to raise taxes, a $96 billion tax increase, President Clinton and Vice President Gore, tax increases.

Yet we know that there was another person, another group of people, who were right there saying, we will not raise taxes. We are in a surplus circumstance.

Now what we have to do, because we recognize that we have people who even when we have a surplus they want more and more and more not only spending but tax increases, we have to go tell the story. We need to make it more difficult.

Mr. HAYWORTH. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, as my friend, the gentleman from Texas, was relating not only the recent history but also the facts and figures amidst the flowery rhetoric that is so often part of what transpires in Washington, I could not help but note the successes that we have had as a commonsense conservative majority, and point out, Mr. Speaker, to the American people that it is very interesting the way Washington has worked heretofore.

We have had some success here, and indeed, we have rolled back taxes, as we were able to enact in the 105th Congress the $500 per child tax credit; as we were able to work to make sure that there was a higher level of tax fairness; when in fact just this past week we were able to procure at long last the signature of the President of the United States on legislation to end the unfair penalty confronting senior citizens who chose to work beyond their assigned retirement age; seniors who, if they were making in excess of $17,000 a year, were taxed to the tune of $1 out of every $3 of their social security benefit, lo and behold, Mr. Speaker, that was finally changed.

But I would note for the record that piece of legislation was first introduced well nigh in excess of two decades ago by the current chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER); that our current speaker, when he first arrived here in 1987, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), introduced the self-same legislation.

While we welcome epiphanies, whether they come in election years or at other times, we are so pleased that at long last those who resisted that fundamental act of fairness finally saw the wisdom in letting seniors hang onto more of their own hard-earned money. Because I think, Mr. Speaker, that truly defines compassion.

The reason I mention it is because it took so long. The anachronistic policies of the mid 1930s that accompanied what at that point was a labor shortage, it took all the way to the dawn of a new century, 70 years, to make that change, the modest but important tax relief we offered in 1997, which came a decade and a half after the tax relief offered in the Reagan years.

So it is extremely difficult here to get this institution, to get those denizens of Washington and those folks in the bureaucracy, focused on actually letting people hang onto more of their own money. We have made some progress, as I have just documented.

One of the reasons is institutionally it has been so easy to raise taxes: A simple majority vote; a chief executive who is of a mind to do that because of previous Congresses and free-spending ways.

Again, this is not a partisan argument. Our friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), was talking about the days of former Speaker Rayburn and the balanced budgets that were formulated with a Republican president, Dwight Eisenhower, and a previous majority in Congress of the other party. But following that time, whether the days of Speaker Martin or the days of Speaker Rayburn, that was then and what followed later was a complete role reversal.

Always, always, always, Mr. Speaker, the notion was, we just need to raise taxes a little bit more. Mr. Speaker, I ask Members to think of what that says to the family in Payson, Arizona, in my district where the husband and wife are doing all they can to establish a fledgling printing business. They are working hard to make that business work, they are creating jobs in their small communities, they are providing a service, and more importantly, they are providing for their children.

I think, Mr. Speaker, one of the key problems we have faced as a people is as follows. For years folks came to this Chamber and asked or told the American people, you have to sacrifice so Washington can supposedly do more. That premise, we understand, in the fullness of time is exactly turned around: Washington bureaucrats should sacrifice, Mr. Speaker, so that American families can have more.

This tax limitation amendment is the right thing to do because it changes constitutionally and institutionally the bias toward always picking the pockets of hard-working Americans. It raises the standard even as we, in a signal both to Wall Street and to Main Street, in a new commonsense conservative Congress have at long last instituted policies of fiscal sanity.

The risky scheme, Mr. Speaker, is to always dip into the pockets of hard-working citizens. The real test of trust and responsibility is to make government more responsive, to make governmental decisions more rational, to reduce the debt and empower everyday hard-working Americans to keep more of what they earn and send less here.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the gentleman from Arizona. Wonderful points. We believe, I believe, that the thing that Congress should focus on is to make sure that we are not putting more debt not only on people who work today, but also for our children and our grandchildren.

This chart so accurately describes this, really, and it goes back to 1941. But as we see, the numbers are small until we head to about 1976. The numbers are astronomical. They go up to $350 billion in debts. This is what happened when Republicans and Independents and people who are from other parties, including Ross Perot, began talking about how America's greatest days are not behind her, America's greatest days are ahead; but that it would require responsibility, it would require, as the gentleman from Arizona said, sanity, the ability to balance and to comprehend what was happening to America.

So what happened is that a different vision was given. That was, we should not spend more than what we make. We should take the power that comes with the money to Washington, D.C. and put it back home. That is exactly what happened.

We now see where there has been a debt reduction directly as a result of what we have now accomplished. This did not happen overnight. It was based on a set of principles which we believe, as Republicans, are critical to the country. They include that we are going to protect 100 percent of social security. We have now done that.

Lo and behold, 30 years after spending not just some of social security but all of the surplus from social security, Republicans said that not only will we not do that, but we are going to make sure that we lock it away into a lockbox.

Strengthen Medicare with prescription drug coverage, that is what this marvelous House will be debating in a few short weeks. Forty billion dollars has been set aside, that is the Republican plan, $40 billion to make sure that citizens, not just like the people in the Fifth District of Texas, but like people that the gentleman has in Arizona, who live better lives today because of technology, because of investment that has been made by the private sector.

Yes, we have great doctors, but we have great drugs. Here is one thing we know. We understand and know that for every $1 that is spent on drugs, prescription drugs, we save $4 in hospital stay. It makes sense. It is the right thing to do.

We made sure that we are going to retire the debt by 2013; not add to it, not just let it stay out there, but we are going to pay it off a little at a time. It did not happen overnight, it took 40 years of Democrat-controlled Congresses to do that. We will get it done by 2013.

We are going to support and strengthen education, technology, research. We are going to make sure that education and science work together. That is why we are trying to double, and sticking to it, a commitment that was made by former Speaker Newt Gingrich that we would send double funding to NIH, the National Institutes of Health. Because we understood, and we still get it today, that if we invest in research and development, if we do the things by letting scientists and others who can make breakthroughs in not only prescription drugs and techniques, that what we can do is we can save lives and make life better.

We will promote fairness for families, farmers, and seniors. Half of the Fifth District of Texas is rural. Half of the Fifth District of Texas went through, in an agricultural setting, a terrible drought the last few years. We need to pay attention to rural America.

Restoring America's defenses. We have been able to accomplish so much because we were able to put on a sheet of paper the things that are important to America and Americans. People in the Fifth District of Texas, like the people in the Sixth District of Arizona, represent the topsoil of America. It is not the dirt, it is the people. They are the topsoil of our country. We are paying attention to people. We are going to get it right, and we are going to balance out the things that are important in America.

I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague the gentleman from Texas, for yielding to me.

In listening to the people of Arizona, as the gentleman so eloquently stated some of the goals there, we look at prescription coverage for seniors as we try to strengthen Medicare.

I think it is important to make this distinction. Almost two-thirds of the senior community currently enjoys some prescription drug benefit through current insurance plans. But I think of the lady in Apache Junction, Arizona, who works not by choice but out of necessity at a fast food restaurant because she and her husband are not in a financial circumstance that enables them to have a complete insurance plan.

So what we say is for the truly needy seniors, for those one-third of the senior community that have somehow eluded this opportunity at prescription drug benefits, we want to provide them. But we are being very careful, because as another one of my constituents reminded me, she came up one day, Mr. Speaker, and said, J.D., I don't want to end up seeing my Medicare premiums rise so that I have the honor and opportunity to pay the prescription bills of Ross Perot.

□ 2100

I think that is a valid point. We want reasonable, rational reforms that strengthen Medicare and help those truly needy seniors.

Mr. SESSIONS. It sounds like that part of this debate is now into the two plans, essentially the two plans that are floating in Washington; one which would tax all seniors, and as I described in the Fifth District of Texas where all the seniors in the room would please take $20 out of their pocket, place them on the table, and then those people who placed the money, everybody placed the money, then if they did not need it, based upon their poverty level, if they did not qualify for prescription drug coverage, just please get up and walk outside the room. It is about 75 to 80 percent of senior citizens who would be paying $20 more out of their own pocket.

I would say to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), here is a $20; $20 out of their own pocket every month for about 15 percent of the seniors who could not afford it. Why did we not come up with a plan, oh but there is one, the Republican plan, that will say, senior citizens, all senior citizens, put that money back in their pocket, put it back in their pocket; we have a budget surplus in Washington, D.C. We will take care of those people who need it most. We are not going to tax every senior citizen to help 15 percent of them. Sounds like a better idea to me.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), for again very eloquently

and practically pointing out the difference.

There is something else we should note. Even as we turn to the subjects of Medicare and Social Security, the institutional bias that always asks for tax increases, even as we celebrate in bipartisan fashion the fact that the President signed into law the end of the earnings penalty on seniors who chose to work past retirement age and we restored fairness that had been 70 years in the making, or should I say 70 years in the waiting, it is worth noting, the gentleman spoke about the largest tax increase in American history, it disproportionately affected seniors. It jacked up Social Security taxes. It hit Americans all across the board but it nailed seniors, and while we have taken this first step to restore tax fairness, it was born of another important step that was taken as the President of the United States was kind enough to come down a couple of years ago and stand at the podium behind my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), and he said something that was a wonderful rhetorical flourish, but once we took away the bells and the whistles and the theatrics it was a shot across the bow and a warning to all American seniors, and my colleague from Texas I think he has more on that topic right here as we look at this chart.

Mr. SESSIONS. We do, and I thank the gentleman for mentioning that. The President of the United States, just a few short years ago, said Social Security first, Social Security first.

It took the Republican Party and a plan to get that done. We ended the raid of Social Security because it was the right thing to do. 1998 was the last year that the Congress of the United States will allow the surplus in Social Security, the hard-earned money that people have put into it, to then be spent for general budgetary items.

There, as always, are at least two different views. Let us role back the tape. Let us remember just a year ago, when we talked about the year 2000, the Republican plan said 100 percent of Social Security, meaning that if people gave that money for Social Security, it should only be used for Social Security. It should not be used for something else. That is what savings plans are about. That is what the government took it for. The government took the money, it is required by law, and we believe that 100 percent of it, that is the way it should go.

There was another side. There is another story. The other story in Washington, D.C. is, the President has his own plan. We understand that. We are willing to debate it, even on the floor. Of all of the surplus, the President said 62 percent of the surplus goes to Social Security, but 38 percent of Social Security goes to new government spending. How much money are we talking about? We are talking about, in fact, a lot of money. The surplus in the year 2000, $137 billion. That is $137 billion that instead of going to general revenue will be put directly into Social Security.

Now, one would say that is exactly what the gentleman from Arizona said, and I say, yes, that is close, except that the Democrats are still holding back our lockbox. They will not allow us to designate it. So the best we can say is, no money should be spent. The President still has $85 billion of the $137 billion.

In fact, the gentleman from Arizona and I are getting very good at this. If I can find my penny, every single penny that is given by an American for Social Security should only be used for Social Security, and that is what this is all about.

Mr. HAYWORTH. The gentleman has heard it in his district. One of the first things I heard, when I was honored and entrusted with this responsibility of service in the Congress of the United States, at innumerable townhall meetings across the width and breadth of my district, was a concern that funds were commingled. There was a fancy Washington term for it, of course there always is; the bureaucrats spoke of a unified budget. Well, that is a nice word, but what we really should have called it, Mr. Speaker, was a commingled budget, where Social Security money was not set aside and preserved for Social Security and to the point even now would we have those who lead the executive branch always talk about these plans for spending and trusting government more, it is very interesting that they forget about the basics.

Thank goodness, Mr. Speaker, that a common sense Congress reminds Washington's bureaucrats and big spenders, no, we need to restore that firewall. It has been our intent since day one and now we have done it in our budgetary plans, not a single dime, not a single cent of Social Security money spent on any other program; all of it, all of it, going to save and strengthen Social Security. That is the difference, is it not, Mr. Speaker? Because as I mentioned at the outset, we are entrusted with this constitutional responsibility. We take an oath of office and we are given a responsibility, a role, a mandate, an oath, not to deceive the American people, either by pandering to foreign governments to solicit campaign donations in what is a cynical, sad and macabre twist on the notion of having political opponents, and somehow confusing political opponents with enemies to the point where in a free society those in the highest offices in our land, who took, presumably the same oaths of office, entrusted with those responsibilities, would live up to them. In the same sort of rhetoric here on this House floor, in a speech two years ago, it was said, let us set aside 62 percent of the Social Security surplus for Social Security. What was left unsaid, when we do the math as my colleague pointed out, 38 percent of that money is set aside for Social Security to go to new government programs.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said of those who head up the other branch of government by columnists from their own State, do not listen so much to what they say; watch what they do.

We best secure America's future by restoring trust, by resurrecting that firewall, by putting Social Security funds in a lockbox to be used exclusively for Social Security, by making it more difficult to raise taxes. Rather than having Washington succumb always to the siren song of picking the pockets of hard working Americans, we reaffirm the truth that the money, when all is said and done, does not belong to the Federal Government or the Washington bureaucrats. It belongs to hard working Americans and they ought to hang on to more of it and send less of it here.

Mr. SESSIONS. The gentleman has led directly to the point that I believe is the essence of the tax limitation amendment, and that is in the era of surpluses, when the government has effectively, as a result of the Republican Congress, made sure that Social Security and Medicare will not be spent, it was given for a reason. It will be used for that reason. Then lo and behold, we have extra money called a surplus, that came about, the very essence of it came about because we cut taxes. We encouraged America not only to go work harder but to work smarter. We encouraged America to invest in America.

Just a few short years ago, we were worried about all the jobs in America going offshore. Ten years ago we were told America's greatest days are behind her. The best education is somewhere else; the best of technology is somewhere else; the best of future is somewhere else. We today and every Member of this body tries to take credit for it and that is okay, of the things that have happened in the last 5 years. It is the right thing to do for us to understand that we had to balance the budget; we had to take Social Security off budget; we had to make sure that we created a surplus.

Now tonight we are talking about making it more difficult to raise taxes, a simple thing. We want to make it more difficult for Washington to take your money. H.J. Res. 94, the tax limitation amendment, will be voted on on Wednesday, will be voted on because it is the right thing for America today. What is going to happen with more of the money, the money that is today a surplus? Here is what we are going to do: We are going to make sure that it goes back to the people who gave it to Washington. I am not sure they gave it because they wanted to necessarily, but they gave it and they expect us to do wise things with it.

Responsibility, here is what we are doing: We want to end the marriage penalty. Just a few short months ago in January, President Clinton stood right behind me and he stated he would be more doing away with the marriage penalty.

We are now talking about repealing the senior earnings limit. The President of the United States signed that

last Friday in the White House garden. It was beautiful. We are now going to have senior citizens who are no longer penalized with an unfair tax. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) worked on that for 30 years.

We want to reduce, eliminate the death taxes. We want to expand education savings accounts. Lo and behold, in my home I have a 6-year-old Down's Syndrome little boy who could use the money. We could also, by spending it efficiently on all sorts of not only educational tools for our baby, our son, our child, but also to help nurture him to where he will be able to be self sufficient.

We have a 10-year-old at home, a 10-year-old who every single day reads every book and takes everything that we can get our hands on, gobbles it in, understands that his future is the same as our country's future. We are going to spend more money on education. My son understands and so does my wife.

We are going to increase health care deductibility. We want every single working American, and especially those today who are not allowed to, by law, to be able to deduct their health care. We want every single person to have health care. Every single person deserves a right to have their own doctor, not just show up at some clinic, not just to have a doctor available but their doctor who they know and understand.

We want to provide tax breaks for communities that do not have as much money as others, and we want to strengthen private pension plans to where people have an opportunity to save for their future.

What we are talking about is the tax limitation amendment that will be the crowning jewel on responsibility, it is the crown jewel of responsibility, to make it more difficult for the Members of Congress to vote for tax increases. We have enough money. We should do the right thing and yet we recognize, I recognize, that in this town we have not flipped everybody.

□ 2115

The real spenders are still out there, people who will take money. This is why we have to have a tax limitation amendment, a two-thirds majority.

Oh, the debate will happen here on the floor, trust me, the debate where people will stand up and talk about we have got to spend more and more and more and more and raise taxes more and more.

I would say that discipline and responsibility is what will make the difference, and the responsibility comes down to what my party stands for. My party deeply believes that, if we want to have America's greatest days ahead of her, then we will empower people back home, men and women, children, small businesses, large businesses, people to invest in America because they know they can do so because the risk is not there to say, when one becomes successful, the government in Washington, D.C. wants their share, too. I think that they would understand fair share is okay. But in Washington, if one is successful, that means Washington wants more and more and more and more.

That is why we offer the tax limitation amendment. That is why this is bipartisan. It is bipartisan. It makes sense, because we want to create wealth and opportunity for generations to come. We want to get away from where Washington, D.C. all of a sudden sees where, oh, there is now an Internet out there, we ought to tax that. There is something else out there, we have got to raise taxes on that.

We still have been paying, for 70 years, a telephone tax that was done, ah, to raise money for the war. By the way, that was World War II.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is even more profound than that. In doing our research, we have crafted, again, bipartisan legislation to end this. But, Mr. Speaker, I am sure the American people will note with interest that a luxury tax was imposed on the telephone really before the advent of the 20th Century. It came in the Spanish American War.

So, Mr. Speaker, Teddy Roosevelt led the charge up San Juan Hill, and patrons of this new technology of the telephone, I guess at that time it was fairly called a luxury, we are paying a luxury tax. Telephone users since that time up until the present day at the advent of the Internet is still paying a luxury tax on telephones instituted in the Spanish American War.

We are taking steps to roll that back. Perhaps that is the most graphic example of the institutional bias in Washington, D.C. toward taxes.

Let us not forget that, in fact, what paved the way for the 16th Amendment to the Constitution that allowed for the direct taxation of personal income was a Supreme Court opinion that said direct taxation of personal income would be constitutional provided it was a temporary measure. That leads to what will transpire in our Committee on Ways and Means this week, hearings on changing our tax system, on offering real reform.

But, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) for shouldering the burden of responsibility and leadership and bringing to the floor the tax limitation amendment. Because real reform starts with this institutional change where we say, if raising taxes is so important to us as a people, let us at least raise the standard, make it difficult, make it more difficult, require a two-thirds majority, a supermajority, as we do on questions of constitutional amendments, as we do on questions of impeachment, of constitutional issues.

If we are willing to take these steps, there should be a standard of accountability and a lack of institutional bias that always favors the bureaucrat. There should be a leveling of responsibility and a higher standard to protect the taxpayer. That is the key, the measure that will be offered by the gentleman from Texas on this floor in the days ahead. It is an important first step.

Mr. Speaker, as I think about Americans who may be within the sound of my voice electronically, who may be there pouring over that Form 1040, maybe succumbing to the EZ Form because the hour grows late or the deadline of April 15, I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that those Americans would take time to write, call, and fax their Members of Congress to let them know where they stand, to let them say to their advocates on Capitol Hill, you should advocate the notion that we should raise the standard and eliminate the institutional bias toward more and more and more taxation and higher and higher spending.

Just one final amendment to the amendment offered, in a friendly rhetorical fashion, to the gentleman from Texas. There is really a better word to use for surplus. Really what we have right now that is widely referred to as a surplus is, in fact, an overcharge of the American people who are now taxed at the highest level in our history parallel only by a period of grave crisis in World War II.

There is no excuse in a time of relative peace, to be assured there are challenges that confront us internationally, and we must provide for the common defense, and we are willing to take those steps to rebuild and restore our national defense, but having said that, there is no excuse for the American people to be taxed at the same level at which they found themselves taxed in World War II.

So with this tremendous overcharge, after setting aside a massive portion for what it was designated for to begin with, strengthening Social Security, strengthening Medicare, we owe it to the people who have placed their trust in us to give that overcharge back.

When one pays for something at a store, if one gives a greater amount of money in that retail exchange, one expects a return, one expects cash back. With this overcharge, we are saying it is time to give that money back to the people to whom it belongs.

That is why I applaud the gentleman from Texas, and that is why I hope Americans, Mr. Speaker, within the sound of my voice will call, write, fax, e-mail, phone their Congressional Representatives and ask them to support this tax limitation amendment.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona, from the 6th District. Tonight we have had my colleagues hear a wonderful debate about the tax limitation amendment from the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), a Democrat from the 4th District of Texas, and the gentleman from the 6th District of Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH). They had the opportunity to talk about, not only their districts,

but their vision of what America is all about, and it should be more difficult to raise taxes.

We heard the story about the senior earnings limit, the earnings limit put on seniors years ago. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, this was the very first bill that he presented upon being a Member of Congress 30 years ago. After years of working on this effort, he finally succeeded in giving the President of the United States, the House, and the Senate, the other body, the opportunity to agree to this bill, what turned out to be unanimous. What 5 years before was impossible, because the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) sat in the chair as the majority party representative to the Committee on Ways and Means, it got signed into law.

The tax limitation amendment, H.J. Res. 94, will be debated on Wednesday. I hope my colleagues will join us to support this.

□

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Reyes (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

□

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of North Carolina) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. EHLERS, for 5 minutes, April 11.

Mr. SWEENEY, for 5 minutes, April 12.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG, for 5 minutes, April 12.

Mr. NORWOOD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes, April 12.

Mr. PEASE, for 5 minutes, April 11.

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today, April 11, 12, and 13.

Mrs. MORELLA, for 5 minutes, April 11.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for 5 minutes, April 11, 12, and 13.

□

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 43. Joint resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President of the United States should encourage free and fair elections and respect for democracy in Peru; to the Committee on International Relations.

□

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 11, 2000, at 9:30 a.m., for morning hour debates.

□

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7001. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—National Poultry Improvement Plan and Auxiliary Provisions [APHIS Docket No. 98–096–2] received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7002. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Revision of the Salable Quantity and Allotment Percentage for Class 3 (Native) Spearmint Oil for the 1999–2000 Marketing Year [Docket No. FV00–985–3 IFR] received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7003. A letter from the Administrator, Risk Management Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—General Administrative Regulations; Reinsurance Agreement-Standards for Approval; Regulations for the 1997 and Subsequent Reinsurance Years—received February 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7004. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Tomatoes Grown in Florida; Partial Exemption From the Handling Regulation for Producer Field-Packed Tomatoes [Docket No. FV98–966–2 FIR] received February 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7005. A letter from the Administrator, Risk Management Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Common Crop Insurance Regulations; Forage Production Crop Provisions; and Forage Seeding Crop Provisions—received February 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7006. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Ports Designated for Exportation of Horses; Dayton, OH [APHIS Docket No. 99–102–1] received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7007. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Polyoxyethylated Sorbitol Fatty Acid Esters; Tolerance Exemption [OPP–300971; FRL–6490–8] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received February 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7008. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Ethoxylated Propoxylated C12–C15 Alcohols; Tolerance Exemption [OPP–300973; FRL–6491–3] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received February 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7009. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Dimethyl Silicone Polymer With Silica; Silane, Dichloromethyl-, Reaction Product With Silica; Hexamethyldisilizane, Reaction Product With Silica; Tolerance Exemptions [OPP–300972; FRL–6490–9] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received February 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7010. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, Department of Defense, transmitting notification of the Department's decision to study certain functions performed by military and civilian personnel in the Deparmtnet of the Navy (DON) for possible performance by private contractors, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2461; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7011. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Selected Acquisition Reports (SARS) for the quarter ending December 31, 1999, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2432; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7012. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Final Flood Elevation Determinations—received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7013. A letter from the Director, Corporate Policy and Research Department, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing Benefits—received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7014. A letter from the General Counsel, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Safety Standard for Multi-Purpose Lighters—received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7015. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Hearings and Appeals, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Criteria and Procedures for DOE Contractor Employee Protection Program (RIN: 1901–AA78) received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7016. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy Management and Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Indirect Food Additives: Adhesives and Components of Coatings and Paper and Paperboard Components [Docket No. 92F–0111] received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7017. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Indirect Food Additives: Adhesives and Components of Coatings [Docket No. 92F–0443] received February 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7018. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Drinking Water