for the efforts they are willing to undertake. We wish to promote economic growth by reducing the tax burden on hard-working Americans and essentially telling the American people, we believe in you, we trust you, and we want you to keep more of your hard-earned money in your pockets, so you are allowed to spend that on your families, on your education, on your vacations, on your car, making that mortgage payment, buying the new washing machine.

Because ultimately it is not about well, we are going to destroy this program or destroy that program. No. It is about reminding folks what is important: to protect and strengthen social security and Medicare, to strengthen our national defense, and so many other vital programs that are critical to our Nation.

But when we are confronted with a projected $3 trillion budget surplus generated by the American people, who are working hard every single day. I do not believe, nor do I think it is unfair, unless we give a portion of that money back to the people who earned it.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my 5 minutes at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

THE MEANING OF COMPASSIONATE CONSERVATISM: CUTTING FUNDING FOR AMERICA’S VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I believe I have discovered the meaning of compassionate conservatism, at least as defined by the congressional Republicans. It is conservative to cut funding for the critical needs of our Nation’s veterans, and it is compassionate to use that money for pork projects for congressional people in exchange for their votes.

At least that is the definition implied by the VA–HUD–Independent Agencies appropriations bill which was crafted by the Republican majority in its subcommittee earlier this week.

As the Washington Post reported yesterday, this pending bill is chock full of pork, 215 provisions funding a host of projects and activities that have little or nothing to do with veterans or housing, or the other concerns that this bill is supposed to address.

Madam Speaker, the gentleman just before me spoke of returning the surplus to the people who earned it. What we are doing here is returning that surplus in pork projects to the majority Congresspeople.

As one who has joined our veterans throughout the Nation in advocating for the past many months for additional funding in the veterans budget, I am frustrated, appalled, shocked, and angry at the turn of events.

Our veterans must wait for months to see a doctor, but we fund the pork project of a machine aimed at growing plants in space. A Virginia doctor in Kentucky was authorized to provide care for only 35 of the 500 veterans suffering from Hepatitis C, a disease that is often fatal, but we fund the pork project of ship bottom painting.

Last year we fought to pass legislation to provide health care for Persian Gulf veterans suffering from undiagnosed illnesses. We now have no funding to absorb these additional veterans in VA medical facilities, but we are funding the pork project of researching into windstorms. One-third of our homeless are veterans who served their Nation. We need services to help them get off the streets and back into productive lives. But instead, Madam Speaker, we fund a pork project for studying the impact of temperatures on living organisms.

We are discharging veterans every day who are Alzheimer’s patients, but we fund three separate pork projects worth $11.5 million in the district of our Speaker of the House.

Some of these projects may be worthy, especially in the abstract. But then Congress should fund them openly and honestly and above board. Sneaking them into a bill that should include $2 billion more for veterans just to keep the services we are providing today at that distant, it is an insult to the men and women who served our Nation in battle.

Is that what compassionate conservatism is all about: We cut veterans, but we hand out pork?

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this bill next week, and adequately fund the health needs of our Nation’s veterans. I yield back whatever rationality exists in this House.


Mr. KASCHICH. Madam Speaker, to facilitate application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act giving a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 2000 and for the 10-year period of fiscal year 2000 through fiscal year 2004.

The term “current level” refers to the amounts of spending and revenues for the period of fiscal year 2000 based on laws enacted or awaiting the President’s signature as of July 21, 1999.

The first table in the report compares the current level of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the aggregate levels set by H. Con. Res. 68. This comparison is needed to implement section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution’s aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 2000 because appropriations for those years have not yet been considered.

The second table compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays of each direct-spending committee with the “section 302(a)” allocations for discretionary action made under H. Con. Res. 68 and for fiscal year 2000 and fiscal years 2000 through 2004. “Discretionary action” refers to legislation enacted after adoption of the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to implement section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority or entitlement authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2000 with the revised “section 302(b)” sub-locations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. This comparison is also needed to implement section 302(f) of the Budget Act, because the point of order under that section also applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) sub-allocation.