

Mr. OSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Dr. Uzelac who is retiring today after serving as the principal of my alma mater, Rio Americano High School for the past 15 years and has worked in education for the past 38 years.

□ 2100

Dr. Uzelac's roles and accomplishments are many. Let me highlight just a few. Not only was he an elementary school vice principal and principal, but he was also a junior high school teacher and principal as well as a high school principal.

His accomplishments are many, and they include playing an instrumental role in Rio Americano becoming a National Blue Ribbon School as well as a four-time California distinguished school. Dr. Uzelac was the administrator of the year in 1983. He has been recognized by many, including the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI), former State Senator Leroy Greene, current State Senator Patrick Johnson for his tremendous leadership in education back in February of 1996. He has received the Honorary Service Award as the administrator of the year from the San Juan Parent and Teachers Association in April of 1996. During his tenure of acting principal, Rio Americano High School was the winner of Redbook's American Best Schools award. That was in April of 1996.

Dr. Uzelac and his wife Virginia will be spending more time with their three children and grandchildren at their home in Capitola, California. His devoted service epitomizes selflessness and devotion. He will be truly missed, and I applaud him for his willingness to better the lives of our youth. Godspeed to Dr. Uzelac.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLETCHER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

REVISIONS TO ALLOCATION FOR HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

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

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Sec. 314 of the Congressional Budget Act, I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record revisions to the allocations for the House Committee on Appropriations. For fiscal year 2000, the allocation established by H. Con. Res. 290 is increased to reflect \$350,000,000 in additional new budget authority and \$290,000,000 in additional outlays. This will change the fiscal year 2000 allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations to

\$575,151,000,000 in budget authority and \$611,940,000,000 in outlays. Budgetary aggregates will increase to \$1,471,750,000,000 in budget authority and \$1,453,390,000,000 in outlays.

Outlays from that additional budget authority continue in fiscal year 2001. The allocation for the House Committee on Appropriations printed in House Report 106-656 is therefore increased to reflect \$60,000,000 in additional outlays. This will establish a fiscal year 2001 allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations of \$601,681,000,000 in budget authority and \$625,975,000,000 in outlays. Budgetary aggregates become \$1,529,886,000,000 in budget authority and \$1,495,196,000,000 in outlays.

As reported to the House, H.R. 4578, the bill making fiscal year 2001 appropriations for the Department of Interior and Related Agencies, includes \$350,000,000 in fiscal year 2000 budget authority for emergencies. Outlays flowing from that budget authority are \$290,000,000 in fiscal year 2000 and \$60,000,000 in fiscal year 2001.

These adjustments shall apply while the legislation is under consideration and shall take effect upon final enactment of the legislation. Questions may be directed to Dan Kowalski or Jim Bates at 67270.

DISADVANTAGES OF ESTATE TAX REPEAL BILL

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, last night, I spoke for 5 minutes to try to list the disadvantages of the estate tax repeal bill that we will deal with tomorrow. Unfortunately, 5 minutes, or perhaps not even an hour, is sufficient to list all those disadvantages.

First, let us put this bill in context. Once it is fully phased in, it will cost this country \$50 billion a year. All of that tax relief will go to the richest 1 percent to 1½ percent of American families. Basically all of the tax relief goes to those with assets of \$10 million and more.

Mr. Speaker, this bill provides \$50 billion of tax relief basically for families with assets of more than \$10 million and provides not a penny of tax relief for people who make \$10 an hour.

Mr. Speaker, we tried to add an amendment to this bill to say that its provisions would become applicable only upon certification, that the debt will be paid off by 2013, and that Medicare and Social Security will remain solvent.

The supporters of this bill on the Committee on Rules refused to even allow the House to debate that Sherman-Stenholm amendment. So we have before us a bill that makes no attempt at all to provide tax relief for working American families.

It costs us \$50 billion whether or not that drives Social Security and Medi-

care into the red or not. But the disadvantages continue.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will dramatically cut charitable giving. Now, I am not talking about charitable giving when somebody puts \$5 or \$10 in a collection plate. But if one goes to any college campus or major hospital in this country and one sees the buildings named after the multimillion-dollar donors, those are the donors who have consulted with their estate planning lawyers before they made that gift. Those are donors who decided to give only knowing that they would save 50 to 75 cents out of every dollar on their taxes for what they gave to the universities.

Those universities, not getting those charitable contributions will come to this House and ask us for money; and we will say, sorry, we cut Federal revenues by \$50 billion in the estate tax bill. We cannot help you.

Mr. Speaker, when one goes to the universities in the future, the buildings will not have names, because the charitable contributions justifying naming a building after someone will not be made.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, however, actually increases taxes on one group of people: widows and widowers. It takes away from them most of the step-up in basis which reduces income taxes on the sale of assets that they acquire from their deceased spouse. So while providing \$50 billion of tax cuts, it increases taxes on widows and widowers.

The bill is supposed to make it easier for family businesses to stay in the family; yet not a single statistic has been put forward as to how much the estate tax is driving families who choose to sell their businesses nor whether it is better for the economy to sell businesses to those who really want to be in that business rather than those who inherit them.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this bill is certain to be vetoed. So it is a show, a show of where we stand in terms of our values; but mostly, it is delay. Because if instead this House worked together, we could provide reasonable estate tax relief for upper middle-class families who are currently caught either paying the tax or caught having to draw long estate planning documents bypass trusts, extra tax returns every year for widows and widowers, all in an effort to escape a tax that was never designed to be applied to them anyway.

So I have introduced a bill that would say that, if someone inherits assets, they also inherit the unified credit. So that every husband and wife could pass to their children \$2 million in assets without paying a single penny of estate tax and without having to deal with bypass trusts, Form 1041 special income tax returns, and all of the complication the present law afflicts them with.