

and choosing where the numbers come from, the Congressional Budget Office at one point, the Office of Management and Budget at another.

This violates a fundamental rule in accounting, not consistently applying the accounting principles; or, in this case, the budget forecasting. Picking and choosing. And we should no more let the White House do that than let Members of our own body do that. We in Congress should stand square behind the principle that we insist that the budget forecasting process have integrity, and that we not claim that no such bill has been on the floor of the House when the Wall Street Journal has already reported that we have done it and when the Congressional Budget Office has already reported that we are \$17 billion into the Social Security surplus.

We must improve our practices if we are going to continue to have any credibility. We cannot have letters of the type that are circulating in this Chamber today. And, Mr. Speaker, I will submit this letter for the RECORD.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, November 8, 1999.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Many of you are asking when we expect the budget negotiations to be completed. We expect budget negotiations to be complete when we have a balanced budget that doesn't raid Social Security, doesn't raise taxes and pays down the debt for the third year in a row.

Earlier this year our conference committed to stop the 30-year raid on Social Security—and according to the Congressional Budget Office, we have done that. The President began the budget negotiations by taking a large step our way and joining us in our commitment to lock away every penny of Social Security. We're working with him in a bipartisan fashion to protect retirement security.

The key to the whole puzzle is protecting Social Security and paying down debt. We will not schedule any piece of legislation on the House floor that spends one penny of Social Security. That said, we expect to adjourn for the year when we've ensured that every penny of Social Security is locked away.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact us personally.

Sincerely,

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House.
DICK ARMEY,
Majority Leader.
TOM DELAY,
Majority Whip.
J.C. WATTS,
Conference Chairman.

ONE PENNY ON A DOLLAR WILL SAVE SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLETCHER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to start off by just kind of rebutting my distinguished colleague. The Wall Street Journal is a great newspaper,

but, tell me, have my colleagues ever read a newspaper that does not sometimes get it wrong; does not stretch the truth?

Here is a report from the Congressional Budget Office. Now, I know the good folks at the Wall Street Journal know everything there is about Congress and spending and so forth, but these people are actually hired to do this job, they are the ones who are in the room. CBO stands for Congressional Budget Office, and they have certified that the Republican budget does not raid the Social Security Trust Fund, as have the Democrat budgets for the past 40 years. Here is what it says: Projected on-budget surplus under the congressional scoring, the way it is done, \$1 billion, and this is as of October 27, 1999.

Now, it is real odd to me that people who have been voting against every single appropriations bill because they do not spend enough money are now coming in here in the 11th hour and trying to rewrite the rules. Where was this fiscal austerity back during the September and October debates? All we heard from the liberal side of the aisle was, "You don't spend enough money, so we are going to vote no."

Well, hello, where does the money come from? Social Security. We have held the line on it, we have passed the appropriation bills, 13 of them on Republican votes, because we could not get our Democrat colleagues to join us because it did not spend enough money for them.

Yes, there have been a few defectors, and we appreciate them, but we started this year taking the President on. He said from the well of the House let us spend 40 percent, actually I think it was 38 percent, of the Social Security surplus on a whole line of new entitlement programs. But the Republicans' key goal is to not spend the Social Security surplus. That is a quote. That is a direct quote from the White House Chief of Staff John Podesta, and that was as of October 20.

Now, that is coming from the folks who do not exactly like Republicans down on 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. We are not going to spend the Social Security surplus.

Now, what have we proposed doing? We have proposed reducing the size of the government budget. For every \$1 we have asked the bureaucracies in Washington to cut out a penny, and they can do it. Here is an example of one place they could do it. Now, we have heard there is absolutely no waste, but this is the President's trip to Africa. He went on a number of trips this year. He went to China and spent \$18.8 million, took 500 people; went to Chile, spent \$10.5 million; went to Africa and spent \$42.8 million, and took 1300 of his dearest and closest Federal Government friends. Now, there were other people. This does not include Se-

cret Service or Peace Corps, this only includes Federal Government employees.

Now, under our radical budget, the President next year would say 13 of those friends will have to stay home. One example would be the mayor of Denver. The mayor of Denver goes to Africa with the President. Why? Is Colorado so important to our African policy? If so, why not let the good people of Denver pass a hat and pay his freight? Thirteen hundred people went to Africa for \$42.8 million. There is not a Member of this House who would say that was a wise expenditure of money, and there is not a member of this White House who would say he could not cut some of that out.

Or what about the \$3 million ducks in Hawaii? The U.S. Department of Interior bought an island off of Hawaii for \$30 million. The purpose was so ducks could breed on it. The only problem was only 10 ducks took advantage of this new honeymoon package. So what we have are ducks, \$3 million each, over there having a big time. Now, we need to find a Hugh Hefner kind of duck who can promote this thing a little bit and maybe we can get it down to \$1 million or \$2 million a duck.

I think back in South Georgia we would probably call this a waste of money, and I suspect the folks would in Kansas, New York, and all over the place.

What is this really about? This is about trying to get Washington on line with the American people, the people who drive an extra two blocks to fill up their tank for \$1.07 a gallon instead of \$1.15 a gallon; the people who do not buy a new suit until the clothes are on sale; the people who go out to eat when they have a coupon and order chicken instead of steak; and the people who do not buy any running shoes unless they are the discontinued brand or marked down 50 percent; and the parents who raise their kids to turn off the light when they leave a room, and do not run the water when they brush their teeth.

We are saying to Washington that they should live their lives like the American people. If we can, we can find a lot more than a penny on a dollar and we can save Social Security.

NEW SENSE OF HOPE AND RE- NEWAL TO EASTERN NORTH CAROLINIANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I will leave a response to that very comical presentation to a later time.

I have a more serious and also a very jovial and happy announcement to make, and that is to thank Members of Congress and to thank their staffs in particular for joining with 11 Members

of Congress going to my district and participating in real work and giving a sense of hope and renewal to the people of eastern North Carolina.

I have pictures here that show us indeed some of the scenes wherein we were flooded. Now that we are not with the water, somehow it is forgotten that our citizens are still dealing with this. If my colleagues could begin to think of the area which was devastated, they might think of a State about the size of Maryland, because we are involved in some 66 counties, but 33 of them have serious flooding.

The devastation in farm life is almost unimaginable. We have \$1.7 billion that has been lost in the erosion of land, the loss of wildlife, the loss of various livestock, whether it be cows or pigs or chickens. In fact, 2.5 million chickens were lost, 120,000 hogs, 900,000 turkeys were lost. The loss was just devastating.

The housing will be our greatest problem. In eastern North Carolina we had a housing problem before Hurricane Floyd, and then with the housing being devastated by the rains, we now have even a more severe problem. Forty-six homes have either been damaged or completely destroyed. Ten thousand must be destroyed because they are either in harm's way, they are in the floodplain, or they have been completely destroyed.

Many of these people are older citizens. The home ownership is high there, because many of them bought their homes years ago and they are senior citizens and their income is not as robust as the economy would suggest in other areas, so we really have an area of great devastation.

So this was reason that we wanted to bring people who would bring hope and renewal, and I just want to thank Members of Congress for encouraging their staff and thank those staff members for doing this. This was actually the Congressional Black Caucus, under the leadership of the chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), who thought it was a good way of showing we wanted to be the conscience of Congress by organizing this. But this really became a congressional response. It was a bipartisan response. We had many Members from the Republican side in the House who sent their staff, if their staff wanted to go, and we had members, at least three or four, of the offices from the Senate. So it was bicameral as well.

And I just wanted to thank the Members who came. They came back with different experiences, but I can tell all my colleagues what the objective was. The objective was to allow Members of Congress and their staff to see firsthand the devastation so they could be advocates as the TVs left our scenes and we no longer saw the water, as we see here; or we no longer could see the scenes from this second one, the houses

in Tarboro, which is East Tarboro, which was flooded, or the fact that Princeton, the first historical black town to be in America was completely flooded, or Trenton, North Carolina, was completely flooded; Greenville, East Carolina University, 12,000 students had to be relocated because of the flood.

Well, the objectives of this was simply to put a face onto this; that we can look at the human beings that were suffering and see their pain, their anguish, but also their hope. So it was to raise the sensitivity and the awareness and the knowledge of staff members and Members of Congress so they would be advocates so they could help us respond to this in a meaningful way.

□ 1945

The second objective was to bring hope itself, to bring hope and renewal to the people who are now suffering. You go through stages in this. The first people are so grateful that they have survived the flood and their adrenaline is flowing with the outpouring of generosity there. But later on despair sets in and anger and confusion and frustration, and that is where many of them are.

But on Saturday, those who came from Washington, at least for a day, brought hope and renewal. For they were actually cleaning up various homes, removing the debris, cleaning up a business or cleaning out a church or cleaning out a senior citizen facility. They went to six different counties and 13 different sites, including a farm, removing debris from a farm.

We thought we would have 10 buses. We ended up with 12 buses. More than 550 individuals came from the capital to be engaged with the people in eastern North Carolina, and I just want to thank them. I think it gives a new face for the capital. It says that people do care.

Mr. Speaker, I think we do best as Americans when we respond to others to show that we are neighbors. Yes, we are legislators, but also we are human beings in America.

EDUCATION SPENDING BILL

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

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I am joined tonight by a couple of colleagues and others that I know are expecting to come over to the floor to help in this discussion.

What we want to focus on this evening is our efforts to pass a series of appropriations bills that bring this country in under the budget caps that both the Congress and the White House had agreed to previously and, also, to

alert our colleagues as to some of the real challenges that confront us as a Congress tonight and over the weekend and over the next couple of days that we are here in Washington as we move toward this deadline of Wednesday that we have set for ourselves, an expectation and anticipation that we will be able to arrive at a compromise with the White House.

Because it is very clear, Mr. Speaker, that compromising with the White House is an expensive proposition.

The Congressional Budget Office, as had been pointed out by colleague the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) who spoke just a few moments ago, had certified that the proposal that Republicans had put forward does balance the budget without raiding the Social Security trust fund and dip into Social Security funds to pay for Government, as has been the tradition over a great many years. And we are very proud of that, and we want to stick as closely as possible to that ultimate goal.

But things are getting a little more challenging in these negotiations with the White House. And I want to talk specifically about the budget as it relates to the topic of education.

The United States Department of Education is an agency that controls approximately \$120 billion in assets and expenditures, about \$35 billion in annual expenditures, at least according to the dollar amounts that we have set for the Department of Education; and the balance being the loan portfolio that the Department of Education maintains.

Well, the President believes that we need to spend more. We have in fact, as I mentioned, budgeted \$35 billion for the Department in the current spending bill, including \$1.2 billion for the process of teaching to help appeal to the professional senses of our educators and classroom professionals throughout the country, to provide for more training for more teachers for those districts that wish to hire them and to do so within a framework of flexibility, not constraints but flexibility, in exchange for accountability.

We believe there is a legitimate role for the Federal Government to be concerned about local schools but not to run them. We want to send the dollars back to local school districts, back to classrooms, and appeal to the professional sensibilities and the care and compassion and concern of qualified superintendents, school principals, locally elected school board members, and so on.

Therein lies the difference, Mr. Speaker, that I want to zero in on tonight. Because the President's plan and the reason he vetoed the education spending bill, the reason he is holding that particular bill up at this very moment is a matter of philosophy. You see, we really do believe on the Republican side in our philosophy and our