of town. Otherwise, we will spend it. The Democrats say, we will pay down the debt but we have a lot of increased spending we want to do.

The challenge is not whether we cut spending or pay down the debt, the challenge is, are we going to hold down spending in this country? Can we get this money out of town in some way?

The first choice would be to continue to pay down the debt held by the public with all of these surpluses that we bring in. We have decided 2 weeks ago, our Republican majority, that we were going to draw a line in the sand. Like last year, we drew a line in the sand saying, here is the social security lockbox. We are not going to spend any of the social security surplus for any government programs.

We held to it, we did it. That was good. This year we went further. We said, of all of the social security surplus, of all of the surplus coming into all of the other 120 trust funds, where most of the money is coming from, of all of the surplus, on-budget and off-budget, we are going to take 90 percent of that and use that money to pay down the debt held by the public.

Good. Good policy. That leaves 10 percent that we are arguing about, and that we hope to conclude this budget and this spending this year as we argue about that remaining 10 percent. But I think we have the edge now in the support of public opinion that we at least take 90 percent of all that surplus and use it to pay down the public debt.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 114, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules (during the special order of Mr. SMITH of Michigan), submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–989) on the resolution (H. Res. 637) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 114) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4635, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules (during the special order of Mr. SMITH of Michigan), submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–990) on the resolution (H. Res. 638) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 4635) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 2796, WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2000

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules (during the special order of Mr. SMITH of Michigan), submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–991) on the resolution (H. Res. 639) providing for consideration of the Senate bill (S. 2796) to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules (during the special order of Mr. SMITH of Michigan) submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–992) on the resolution (H. Res. 640) providing for the consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ACCESS TO HEALTH INSURANCE

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make reference initially to last night's debate between Vice President AL GORE and Texas Governor Bush, but my focus this evening is on health insurance and the various health care issues that have come into play in this Congress, as well as in the presidential debate last evening.

I have always felt that one of the most important issues that we face and one of the biggest concerns that I have is the inability of many Americans to find health insurance, to be covered by health insurance. The candidates last night presented starkly different views on how to extend coverage to the 42.6 million Americans who currently lack health insurance. That is a large segment of our population, 42.6 million Americans, and it continues to grow.

During their exchange on this issue last night, the Governor said something which I found to be very telling and very disturbing. I wanted to read back what Governor Bush said during the debate. He said, ''There is an issue with uninsured. There sure is. And we have got uninsured in my State. Ours is a big State, a fast-growing State. We share a common border with another nation, but we are providing health care for our people.''

Continuing, the Governor added, ''One thing about insurance, that's a Washington term.''

Mr. Speaker, I was very offended by Governor Bush's referring to insurance, in this context health insurance, as a Washington term. In fact, I consider that remark very elitist and really absurd. All American parents who are out in the real world struggle to find a way to provide insurance for their children. I think they should be very alarmed when the Governor views health insurance as a Washington thing.

Really, all Americans should be alarmed because of his statement that somehow this is a Washington thing. Does that mean that Governor Bush thinks it is okay, for example, that my colleagues here, I will use the opposition, the Republican Members of Congress, the fact that they have health insurance and 42.6 million Americans do not?

And really, I would like to look at Governor Bush's record on the issue of health insurance, because I think that by referring to it as a Washington thing, he belittles it and shows that he really does not have much concern about the 42 million Americans that do not have health insurance.

If we look at the Governor's record in Texas, it shows that Texas has the highest number of uninsured children in the country. When setting up the State's Child Health Insurance Program, which we adopted as a Federal program in this House and was signed into law by President Clinton, but when setting up the State's Child Health Insurance Program pursuant to and with Federal money, Governor Bush wanted to set the eligibility threshold at only 150 percent of the Federal poverty level.

I say that by way of contrast to my own State of New Jersey, which also has a Republican Governor, but set 350 percent of the Federal poverty level for that CHIP Federal kids' health insurance program, or more than twice the level that Governor Bush proposed in Texas.

Now, what happened eventually is the Texas legislature came forward and said they wanted to push this eligibility threshold up to 200 percent, which Governor Bush eventually signed. But the point of the matter, the fact of the matter is that it was possible under the Federal law to push this eligibility higher and to include more children under the Texas child health care program, and Governor Bush did not do it.

So when he says that insurance is a Washington thing, does that mean that he does not really care that much about the kids in Texas, that they should not be able to take advantage of