



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 26, 1999

No. 77

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

May 26, 1999.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN E. SUNUNU to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Reverend James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We learn from the book of Psalms that we should make a joyful noise to You, O God, and that we should break forth into joyous song and sing praises. With all of the suffering and pain in the world, let us begin our day by giving thanks to You, gracious God, for Your goodness and Your love to us and to all people. You lead us when we are lost; You comfort us when we are weak; You forgive us when we have missed the mark, and You show us the path of good will and peace. With gratefulness and praise we laud Your name and ask for Your blessing. This is our earnest prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr.

SHOWS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SHOWS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1183. An act to amend the Fastener Quality Act to strengthen the protection against the sale of mismarked, misrepresented, and counterfeit fasteners and eliminate unnecessary requirements, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 254. An act to reduce violent juvenile crime, promote accountability by and rehabilitation of juvenile criminals, punish and deter violent gang crime, and for other purposes.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain 15 one-minute speeches on each side.

AMERICANS DESERVE ANSWERS, NOT QUESTIONS

(Mr. BURR of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to tell a story, an entertaining story of spies and secrets. Some may even think it sounds like a James Bond movie, but unfortunately, it is not a fictional tale.

I am, of course, referring to the Select Committee's report that was released yesterday, a report that details acts of espionage compromising our most precious military secrets. These findings frightened me months ago when I was briefed and they disgust me today.

What is the difference between a Bond movie and the Select Committee's report? In the Bond movie, the Department of Justice would have allowed wiretaps. In a Bond movie, we would have gotten the bad guy.

All the American people have gotten out of this process are questions. Why did the Department of Justice limit the investigation? Why did the Department of Justice drag their feet? Why was not the President told and, if he was, why did he not do anything? Why, why, why?

The American people, Mr. Speaker, deserve answers, not questions.

CONSUMER SAFETY WITH GUNS

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as we move toward Memorial Day to honor this Nation's heroes who have given their lives to save us and to give us liberty and freedom, I want to rise today to say that I am serious about our children, serious about the violence, the death, the pain, the anguish. Serious about Americans who wish that we would act in honor of our children, in honor of those who we have lost, and yes, in honor of those who gave their lives for our freedom.

Mr. Speaker, is it not interesting that this little toy with its plastic eyes is regulated by the Consumer Product Safety Commission, and yes, this little fellow is likewise regulated, because we know children who do not understand the danger of putting things in their

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3609

mouth have to be protected. But yet, guns, Mr. Speaker, are allowed to be in the hands of our children. There are no safety locks and, in fact, we do not understand that we must be serious about protecting our children, Mr. Speaker.

Pass the Gun Law Safety Act this week.

U.S. NUCLEAR ARSENAL COMPROMISED

(Mr. SCHAFFER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, people in the White House talk an awful lot about "the children." Well, today, our children are a lot less safe and a lot less secure because our entire nuclear arsenal has been compromised.

Communist China acquired our most sophisticated technology, some by theft but even more right through the front door. This administration has sold the Chinese communists high-speed supercomputers, sophisticated satellite launch technology, state-of-the-art machine tools and ultra sophisticated nuclear energy design technology. Communist China now sells our technology to Iran and other rogue nations, but we do nothing. The White House covers it up and even denies China has done it.

We are discovering now that in 1995 communist China had stolen the crown jewel of our nuclear arsenal and yet this administration did nothing about it. If the President is to be believed, no one even informed the Commander in Chief.

Well, now, communist China has 13 nuclear missiles which are more accurate, more deadly, because of White House actions, aimed at our children.

CONGRATULATIONS TO UNION CARBIDE CORPORATION TECH- NICAL CENTER

(Mr. WISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, this is a noteworthy week in South Charleston, West Virginia, as Union Carbide Technical Center celebrates its 50th anniversary. As an innovator for Union Carbide's activities located worldwide, the Tech Center was located in April 1949 in the original research building. I want to congratulate Union Carbide's CEO, Dr. William Joyce, the employees and the retirees of the Technical Center, as we look forward to continuing a very productive working relationship.

The Tech Center, in addition to being a highly profitable and decorated organization, has also been an excellent corporate citizen in its involvement as volunteers in the area and a good partner for the community.

Since its location 50 years ago, the site has grown to approximately 650 acres, and the technical center offers

worldwide assistance to Union Carbide in its manufacturing businesses and research, development and engineering. It comes as no surprise that Union Carbide has won awards for three of its products and services primarily developed at the technical center.

We want to congratulate again Union Carbide for being a good citizen and its 50th anniversary.

WANG GOT GUNS AND CLINTON GOT CASH

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to my Second Amendment-loathing friend on the liberal side of the aisle. If the administration and its defenders in Congress are so concerned about guns, then why did the Clinton administration sign a waiver on February 2, 1996 for a Chinese gun company to import 100,000 additional assault weapons and millions of bullets?

Here is some information that my colleagues on the other side might not want to hear. Four days later, on February 6, 1996, the Chinese arms exporter attended a White House fund-raiser; I mean a coffee, that raised money, but it was not a fund-raiser. That exporter was named Wang Jun.

In obtaining a visa he had filed a letter from Ernest Green, a close Clinton friend and top fund-raiser. The day after he had coffee with the President, Ernest Green's wife contributed \$50,000 to the DNC. Her contribution the year before was \$250.

Can anyone imagine why suddenly Wang got his guns on American streets and Clinton got his campaign cash?

WAR IN KOSOVO

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the headlines read, crisis in Kosovo. Conflict in Kosovo. Spare me, Mr. Speaker. This is war in Kosovo, stone-cold war. And it is time, it is time to support independence for Kosovo. There will be no long-lasting peace without it. It is time to arm the KLA and send Milosevic looking over his shoulder, and it is time to arrest Milosevic for war crimes.

One last point. After it is over, Europe should clean up Kosovo and Europe should pay for the concrete and steel to rebuild Kosovo, not the American people.

REJECT AMENDMENT TO INCREASE MILK TAX

(Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, later today the House is expected to consider an amendment to the agricultural appropriations act that would essentially prevent Secretary Glickman from implementing his proposed very modest milk marketing reforms.

This amendment is terrible public policy. It would reinforce what I call the milk tax, government-imposed costs on dairy products, costs to the tune of \$1 billion annually.

In a recent letter, Citizens Against Government Waste said it "opposes any effort to artificially mandate higher milk prices and will score the vote for such an amendment as a vote against the U.S. taxpayer." Against the U.S. taxpayer.

This amendment is bad for taxpayers, it is bad for consumers, and yes, it is bad for family farms. I urge my colleagues to join me later today in rejecting this amendment to increase the milk tax.

GUN VIOLENCE IN OUR SCHOOLS

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, as a school nurse I rise today to address a national crisis in our schools: gun violence. I spent last weekend with my two grandchildren. Hugging them, my heart ached for the parents and grandparents whose kids attend Heritage and Columbine High School.

Something is terribly wrong when school shootings become commonplace in our society. There is no simple solution to youth violence, but common sense gun control is an important place to start.

Mr. Speaker, we worry about the safety of our children's toys, but we do not have child safety locks on guns. Let us get real.

Last week, the Senate passed sensible legislation that will save lives. Now the House must act. Not next month, today. Each day, 13 children under age 19 are killed because of guns.

Mr. Speaker, Congress should listen to parents, grandparents and students everywhere and act now to stop this national epidemic.

DOD AUTHORIZATION BILL

(Mr. RYUN of Kansas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the United States military has been stretched to the point of breaking. Congress has had to increase the President's defense budget by \$50 billion over the last five years just to add to important unfunded requirements. While operational commitments around the world have increased by 300 percent since 1989, the Air Force and Army have been reduced by 45 percent, the Navy, 36 percent, and the Marines,

12 percent. Mr. Speaker, these are frightening numbers.

The conflict in Kosovo has revealed to the world the questionable readiness state of the United States military. Readiness of our military equipment goes beyond the state of hardware and encompasses the quality of life of our soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, the United States military has been operationally deployed 30 times in the last 8 years. To retain our skilled military personnel, operation tempos must be reduced and readiness accounts must be increased.

H.R. 1401, the Fiscal Year 2000 National Defense Authorization Act, adds much-needed funds to vital military readiness, personnel, procurement, construction and research accounts. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 1401.

THE WAR IN KOSOVO

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times headline points out that the United States or NATO is preparing to send 50,000 troops to Kosovo, to the Kosovo border. They call them peacekeepers. Sure. And the White House says we are not at war.

Mr. Speaker, 50,000 heavily armed troops to the Kosovo border. The Rambouillet Peace Agreement called for 28,000 troops, but we are sending 50,000 armed troops to the Kosovo border.

□ 1015

The air strikes have not worked. Twenty thousand sorties, and the White House says we are not at war. There has been no resistance from the air, but Milosevic's troops are preparing for a ground war. There has been no progress in peace talks because the U.S. is not letting the Russians help, and there is no real effort to find an agreement. There is an insistence on total NATO occupation of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

America, we are headed towards a ground war in Kosovo. Congress voted against declaring war, and we are at war. Congress voted against an air war, and we are at war. We have an air war. Congress voted against a ground war, and we are headed towards a ground war.

This war violates the U.S. Constitution, a violation of the War Powers Act. We need to respect the Constitution. Pursue peace, not war. Pursue peace through negotiation and mediation. Do not escalate this war.

PRICE-SETTING PRACTICES ON MILK CONSTITUTE INTERNAL TRADE BARRIERS

(Mr. GUTKNECHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I want to engage in a little visualization quiz with my colleagues this morning. If all the Members would just close their eyes, relax, and think.

Think of all the things that our Federal Government artificially sets prices on based on their distance from a specific geographic location. Think hard. There is only one correct answer.

Here is a hint: It is the only product where we allow States to set up artificial trade barriers. Here is another hint: It gives you a white mustache, and it is actually good for you. That is right, milk, only milk.

Here is another interesting factoid. At the very time when we are trying to break down trade barriers around the world, some Members are actually trying to construct trade barriers here in the United States when it comes to milk.

INTRODUCING THE NAFTA IMPACT RELIEF ACT

(Mr. SHOWS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the NAFTA Impact Relief Act. Since NAFTA was introduced in 1994, factories across the country and in my district, Centreville, Prentiss, Collins and Magee, have shut down and lost thousands of jobs, exploiting cheap foreign labor.

The NAFTA job retraining program is sorely underfunded and really not very complete. It misses the point. When people in the rural area lose a factory, there is not a job to be retrained for. They need actual jobs.

The NAFTA Impact Relief Act creates new jobs by authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to designate NAFTA-impacted communities similar to enterprise zones. Businesses would receive tax incentives to locate and hire workers in these communities.

The NAFTA Impact Relief Act is a win-win for business and labor, and needs to become law. I urge my colleagues to get behind the bill, because there are many, many unemployed Americans in this country because of NAFTA. Please help us.

THE ADMINISTRATION HAS FAILED IN PROTECTING AMERICA'S NUCLEAR WEAPONS SECRETS

(Mr. HEFLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, in 1995 the person in charge of counterintelligence at the Department of Energy discovered some devastating information. It appeared that the Communist Chinese had obtained our most important nuclear secrets.

The most advanced nuclear weapon in our arsenal, the W-88, had somehow

been given to the Communist Chinese. It was so horrific he could hardly believe his ears; the worst possible case, the ultimate national security disaster.

Communist China was the same country that was selling weapons of mass destruction technology to Iran and other rogue regimes, the same country that imprisoned citizens for their political beliefs, the same country that massacred a thousand in Tiananmen Square for believing in freedom.

That Energy Department official then sounded the alarm, but no one listened. The Justice Department unbelievably turned down the FBI's request twice to wiretap the scientist suspected of giving away the most important secret the United States owned, and political appointees at the White House downplayed the disaster. This administration has utterly failed us.

CALLING FOR SENSIBLE GUN SAFETY LEGISLATION THIS WEEK

(Mr. WYNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to support sensible gun safety legislation to protect our young people. We have a lot of problems in this country and espionage is one of them, but the most pressing problem we have today is gun violence. We need to pass sensible gun safety legislation now.

First, we need to pass child safety locks, so that babies and young people cannot get ready access to guns and have accidents of tragic consequences.

Second, we need background checks at pawn shops and at gun shows, so thugs cannot buy guns off the market and then sell them in our communities to our young people.

Third, we need to ban these high-capacity ammunition clips that are imported into our country. This is not the movie Matrix. We are not having gun-fights with drug lords on the streets. The average citizen has a right to have a gun, and I believe that, but we in Congress have a responsibility to enact sensible gun control.

The second point I want to make this morning is we need to do it now. This is not rocket science. We need to move on gun control legislation this week, before we go home.

THE BEST SECURITY IS A BRIGHT LIGHT

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, my parents told me that the best security is a bright light. Americans want to know if the Chinese nuclear arsenal was built on the genius of American scientists and on the backs of the American taxpayers.

Our counterintelligence at the Department of Energy has been a specific concern of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence for some time, and we all deserve answers.

This Congress must pursue investigative public hearings based on information provided by the Cox Committee that examines Chinese-directed espionage against the United States, including efforts to steal nuclear and military secrets; that will examine Chinese-directed covert action type activities conducted against the United States, such as the use of agents to influence and efforts to subvert or otherwise manipulate the U.S. political process.

Mr. Speaker, Motel 6, I think, has a motto: We'll keep the lights on." Unfortunately, the White House has turned the lights off, and now our national security is at stake.

America deserves answers, and that is what they shall get. I yield back to America all the lights they may need and any national security we have left.

CONGRESS SHOULD ENACT GUN SAFETY LEGISLATION NOW

(Mr. CUMMINGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, when manufactured products injure our children, we must act. When manufactured products play a role in the death of our children, we must act. This concept is simple and is not new. For years safety regulations have been promulgated aimed at protecting our children from certain products.

I hold in my hand a product that is small but has maimed or taken the lives of thousands, a firecracker. Forty percent of its victims have been children under 15 years of age. Fortunately, however, injury rates from this product are at an all-time low, dropping 30 percent from 1995 to 1996 alone. Why? Federal safety regulations. In other words, we took action.

It took decades of tragic experience to teach us this lesson. We are now facing a similar situation. Thirteen of our Nation's youth are dying each day from a manufactured product, guns.

I submit that we learn our lesson now. Again, this concept is simple. It is not new. Let us act this week to ensure the safety of our children.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE RELIEF FOR THE MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY

(Mr. KNOLLENBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, with Federal taxes at an all-time high, Congress has, I think, a moral obligation to provide some relief to the American people. While there are several tax cut proposals that are being

debated in the House, I believe one deserves immediate attention. That issue is the marriage penalty.

Under current law, 21 million couples, 21 million couples are required to pay an additional \$1,400 a year in taxes simply because they are married. This ridiculous policy is undermining the institution of marriage, and making it harder for working families to get ahead.

I have introduced legislation that addresses this problem by increasing the standard deduction provided to married couples so that it equals twice the amount of the deduction provided to single taxpayers. It should make sense.

This commonsense proposal would provide some relief from the marriage penalty, inject some fairness into the Tax Code, and strengthen working families. I urge my colleagues to support it.

ASKING THE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP TO TAKE UP GUN SAFETY LEGISLATION NOW

(Mr. MENENDEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, this week we are taking up a bill that will fund congressional salaries, fund the cleaning of the marble and the brass in the Capitol, and pay for the furniture in our offices.

Apparently we have time for that, but we do not have time to take up legislation to fund more counselors and after school programs for our children. While it seems we can find the time to regulate the manufacture of toys, it seems we cannot find the time to put some modest safety regulations on guns, regulations to keep our children safe.

Mr. Speaker, where are Republican priorities? Is it the guns or our children? Is it the marble and the brass, or our schools and our communities?

It is time to make a choice. It is no use passing a bill to keep our Capitol marble and brass gleaming if we cannot pass a bill to keep our children safe in school.

The true glory of this Capitol is what we do in this Chamber, so I ask the Republican leadership to let us take up legislation to keep our children safe today; not tomorrow, not next month, but today, before we lose another life.

SAVING LIVES CAN RESULT WHEN PEOPLE START OBEYING EXISTING LAWS

(Mr. HAYWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ). I would say this, this does become a matter of priorities. We need to reach out and save American lives.

One way we can do that is by taking a careful, considered look at the problem of domestic violence and school violence, but also at the very real threat the Chinese now present to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, nuclear weapons are really big guns. They are not firecrackers. The grim reality is that this administration, the Clinton-Gore gang, took hundreds of thousands of dollars of campaign contributions from the Communist Chinese, and an arms dealer by the name of Wang Jun provided some of that money. Curiously, the Justice Department waived any restrictions. The result was, 100,000 assault weapons were turned loose in the city of Los Angeles, adding to the violence.

Mr. Speaker, it is one thing to talk about laws, and it is one thing to preen and posture on convictions, but the fact is, serious results come when people start by obeying existing laws.

INTERNATIONAL CODE-SHARING AGREEMENTS

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting. I have listened to all the speeches, and I can tell the Members that we do have a number of issues that are pressing that we need to address. Gun violence certainly is one we need to address, and not just talk about the issue, but also talk about what it takes to correct it.

We are correcting the Chinese situation because it was discovered, and it is being addressed in this administration. It has been going on for 20 years.

I rise today to talk about another issue of great concern to the flying public. We hope we can address it soon, and not look up 20 years and find all of these planes are crashing that are connecting with ours. It is called international code-sharing agreements.

Code sharing agreements are agreements between air carriers, most often a U.S. carrier and a foreign flag carrier, whereby the U.S. carrier can sell seats on the other carrier's flight while identifying it as their own.

What this means in an international market is that while the passenger's ticket may say he or she is flying on a U.S. carrier overseas, in reality it is an overseas flight, and they do not meet the same safety standards.

I will continue to work to get this issue addressed.

BLAME AND THE CHINESE ESPIONAGE SCANDAL

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Chinese espionage scandal, I have heard the other side say over

and over again; let us not overreact; let us not politicize this; there is plenty of blame to go around; it is Ronald Reagan's fault, and, of course, the "everybody does it" defense that we hear every single time wrongdoing by this administration is discovered. It is almost as though they have no interest in the real problem, our national security.

This administration's real attention, its real interest, was raising campaign cash, avoiding blame, avoiding embarrassment, getting reelected. Change the subject, talk about guns, cigarettes, school uniforms. Let us do it for the children.

If the Clinton administration had really wanted to do something to make the children of this Nation safer, they would have protected them from potential nuclear annihilation some day. That is what they should have been doing. Instead, they were raising campaign cash.

WHY WAIT TO DEBATE GUN SAFETY LEGISLATION?

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Republican leadership announced that it was willing to bring gun safety legislation to the floor of the House in mid June.

After a week of wrangling and stalling, I applaud their decision to join the Democrats to discuss fair and sensible measures that will in fact save children's lives. But why are we waiting? There is not a reason to put off until tomorrow actions that will reduce the chances of tragedy today.

□ 1030

Why do American parents have to wait, when they are so scared? I quote to my colleagues from USA Today. "Slightly more than half of parents with school-aged children say they fear for their children's safety when they are at school, up from 37 percent 1 year ago."

Parents in this country need to know that this body is willing to act, willing to act quickly to allay their fears and not make them fearful to send their children to school every single day. That is not what the United States is all about.

Why are we stalling the American public? Do we want the additional time to give the NRA the opportunity to twist arms? Measures like this will pass this House in a heartbeat. Let us do it, let us do it in the next 2 days.

ARMING OF COMMUNIST CHINA

(Mr. TANCREDO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, the mantra of the Democrats this day has

been gun control. But Mr. Speaker, it is very, very difficult to entrust this administration and that side of the aisle with gun control when they have been so unsuccessful with arms control.

Many are calling the information revealed in the Cox Report the scandal of the century. There are two major scandals detailed in this impressive bipartisan report. There was a national security breakdown in the Energy Department labs, a breakdown that started in the 1970s and became nearly total beginning in 1993 under an administration that has never taken national security issues seriously.

And there is an even bigger scandal, the effort to downplay, to cover up and to thwart investigations into the first scandal when it became known in 1995. I repeat, the bigger of the two scandals is not that China successfully spied on the U.S., but the almost incomprehensible reaction to that fact when it was discovered in 1995.

The biggest scandal of all is the arming of the communist Chinese after hundreds of thousands of dollars of campaign contributions to the Democratic Party.

HOUSE SHOULD PASS GUN SAFETY LEGISLATION BEFORE MEMORIAL DAY BREAK

(Ms. DEGETTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, the recent spate of school shootings has left us all saddened, stunned and determined to do something. It is time for all of us to respond to the outrage of the American people. The public wants us to protect children from random gun violence, and they want action on child gun safety legislation. We need to act and we need to act now. Every day we wait, another 13 children die at the hands of a gun.

I do not believe that legislation is the only solution to this complex problem of youth violence, but I do believe that the easy availability of firearms is a clear contributing problem. That is why my Democratic colleagues and I urge the leadership to bring three reasonable gun safety bills to the House floor this week. These three bills are similar to the legislation enacted in the Senate and are commonsense solutions to some of the problems we face.

First is a bill that requires background checks for all firearms sales at gun shows. Second, a bill that requires all handguns to be fitted with child safety locks. And, finally, banning large ammunition magazines. Let us do it this week.

SOCIAL SECURITY

(Mr. HOEKSTRA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, it is time to review a little history. Just last year Republicans put forward a commonsense proposal to save 90 percent of the budget surplus for Social Security. Simply, it was called the 90-10 Plan, 90 percent for Social Security, 10 percent for tax cuts.

That proposal was vilified every day for months by Democrats as a raid on the Social Security Trust Fund. Let me repeat that. Democrats repeated day in and day out that because only 90 percent of the surplus was designated to go to Social Security, that proposal was a raid on the Social Security Trust Fund.

Now this year the President has proposed to set aside 68 percent of the surplus for Social Security, which last time I checked was less than the 90 percent which the Republican proposal set, and yet the President claims that his proposal saved Social Security while ours was a raid on the Social Security Trust Fund.

Now, there is some reasoning that I just do not trust.

PROTECTING CHILDREN FROM GUN VIOLENCE

(Mr. CROWLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, with horror we have watched a string of school shooting tragedies over the last 2 years: Littleton, Colorado; Springfield, Oregon; Fayetteville, Tennessee; Edinboro, Pennsylvania; Jonesboro, Arkansas; West Paducah, Kentucky; Pearl, Mississippi; and just last week in Conyers, Georgia.

Thirteen children under the age of 19 are killed each and every day because of guns. Families are so afraid of school violence that children are kept home. This is a serious crisis and we need to act now. Our colleagues in the other body took action last week. The House can and should begin debate on how to reduce youth violence before this Memorial weekend break.

Addressing the issue of school gun safety and media violence alone will not solve the problem. We need to address the broader issue of the quality of our children's education. A real solution must deal with the issues of class size, which is especially important in my District of Queens and the Bronx, but also of discipline, of safety officers and guidance counselors in our schools, both in pre- and after-school programs as well.

We cannot wait for another tragedy to happen before Congress acts, Mr. Speaker. We as Democrats stand ready to force a vote now on a juvenile justice bill so we can get it to the President's desk by the end of this school year.

SECURITY OF OUR NATION DEPENDS ON OUR RESPONSE TO CHINESE ESPIONAGE

(Mr. DEMINT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEMINT. Winston Churchill once said, "Men occasionally stumble upon the truth, but most of them pick themselves up and hurry off as if nothing happened."

Yesterday, the House Select Committee on U.S. Security and Military/Commercial Concerns with the People's Republic of China released their report on Chinese spying. We now know the truth. The Chinese communists have obtained virtually all of our nuclear secrets. And today, brand new American-designed Chinese missiles are aimed at our homes.

Mr. Speaker, we know the truth and we are not going to hurry off as if nothing had happened. The security of our Nation depends on how we respond to this report of Chinese espionage. It is not too late to pass a Nation that is safe and secure to our children.

Through a strong defense, more decisive leadership, and a renewed vigilance in protecting our secrets and prosecuting spies, we can make sure that every citizen lives in freedom and security.

CONGRESS MUST DEAL WITH PROBLEM OF YOUTH VIOLENCE NOW

(Mr. WEINER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, there has emerged a national consensus that we have to deal with the problem of youth violence. Hollywood must help, parents must be involved, and, yes, I say to my colleagues, Congress must act as well.

There are some commonsense proposals that have reached a national consensus level for good reason. We now have laws in this country to require child-proof caps on aspirin bottles, but we do not have any laws that require trigger locks on handguns.

The Speaker of this House deserves great credit for speaking up this week and saying he agrees we need commonsense gun regulations. The other body has spoken, and overwhelming numbers of us in this body agree we need these changes in the law.

So why the stall? Why not act now, right now, today? We will have an opportunity before the Memorial Day

break to take that national consensus and close the gap that often exists between what people are saying in the country and what we do here in the Congress.

BOTH PARTIES MUST WORK TOGETHER TO ACHIEVE GREATER GOOD FOR AMERICA

(Mr. EWING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I come here today and I listen and I am amazed by the vitriolic rhetoric from the other side of the aisle; accusations that everything wrong in America is the majority party's problem.

It takes both parties to get something done. Gun laws are a good example. Yes, we need to move on gun legislation; and, yes, we need to protect the rights of Americans under the Second Amendment. I believe sometimes, when I listen to the rhetoric, they would throw out the Constitution for the political gain they think they might get on that issue. Or campaign finance reform. Yes, we must do that now, whether it is fair or whether it is not fair.

My colleagues, I am amazed by the attitude, the political rawness that I see here in this House, when only by working together can we achieve what is good for America.

TOYS HAVE CHILD SAFETY MECHANISMS BUT NOT GUNS

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, this silly toy has safety regulations, yet today in the United States, guns, that is right, guns do not have child safety regulations. What is wrong with this picture?

The message we are sending to the American people is that toys, this silly stuffed toy, is more dangerous to children than a gun. That is outrageous. It is outrageous that we do not have child safety locks on guns to protect our children from hurting themselves and hurting others if they get a gun in their hands.

How many more accidents, I ask my colleagues, will it take? How many more school shootings before we do something about this? How many lives will be taken? How many children will be killed before we have safety locks on guns?

We must pass gun safety now. We must prevent senseless tragedies from happening to our children, our families, our communities. We must schedule a vote on gun safety legislation and we must do it immediately.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 1906) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 185 and Rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 1906.

□ 1041

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1906) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, with Mr. PEASE in the Chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, May 25, 1999, the amendment by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) had been disposed of and the bill was open for amendment from page 10, line 1 to page 11, line 24.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I submit for the RECORD tabular material relating to the bill, H.R. 1906:

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 1906)
(Amounts in thousands)**

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS					
Production, Processing, and Marketing					
Office of the Secretary	2,836	2,942	2,836		-106
Executive Operations:					
Chief Economist	5,620	6,622	5,620		-1,002
National Appeals Division	11,718	12,699	11,718		-981
Office of Budget and Program Analysis	6,120	6,583	6,583	+463	
Office of the Chief Information Officer	5,551	7,998	6,051	+500	-1,947
Y2K conversion (emergency appropriations)	46,168			-46,168	
Office of the Chief Financial Officer	4,283	6,288	4,283		-2,005
Total, Executive Operations	79,460	40,190	34,255	-45,205	-5,935
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration	613	636	613		-23
Agriculture buildings and facilities and rental payments	137,184	166,364	166,364	+29,180	
Payments to GSA	(108,057)	(115,542)	(115,542)	(+7,485)	
Building operations and maintenance	(24,127)	(24,822)	(24,822)	(+695)	
Repairs, renovations, and construction	(5,000)	(26,000)	(26,000)	(+21,000)	
Hazardous waste management	15,700	22,700	15,700		-7,000
Departmental administration	32,168	36,117	36,117	+3,949	
Outreach for socially disadvantaged farmers	3,000	10,000	3,000		-7,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations	3,668	3,805	3,668		-137
Office of Communications	8,138	9,300	8,138		-1,162
Office of the Inspector General	65,128	68,246	65,128		-3,118
Office of the General Counsel	29,194	32,675	29,194		-3,481
Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education and Economics	540	2,061	940	+400	-1,121
Economic Research Service	65,757	55,628	70,266	+4,509	+14,638
National Agricultural Statistics Service	103,964	100,559	100,559	-3,405	
Census of Agriculture	(23,599)	(16,490)	(16,490)	(-7,109)	
Agricultural Research Service	785,518	836,868	836,381	+50,863	-487
Buildings and facilities	56,437	44,500	44,500	-11,937	
Total, Agricultural Research Service	841,955	881,368	880,881	+38,926	-487
Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service:					
Research and education activities	481,216	468,965	467,327	-13,889	-1,638
Native American Institutions Endowment Fund	(4,600)	(4,600)	(4,600)		
Extension activities	437,987	401,603	438,587	+1,000	+37,384
Integrated activities		72,844	10,000	+10,000	-62,844
Total, Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service	919,203	943,412	916,314	-2,889	-27,098
Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs	618	641	618		-23
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service:					
Salaries and expenses	425,803	435,445	444,000	+18,197	+8,555
AQI user fees	(88,000)	(95,000)	(87,000)	(-1,000)	(-8,000)
Buildings and facilities	7,700	7,200	7,200	-500	
Total, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	433,503	442,645	451,200	+17,697	+8,555
Agricultural Marketing Service:					
Marketing Services	48,831	60,182	49,152	+321	-11,030
Standardization user fees	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)		
(Limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected)	(60,730)	(60,730)	(60,730)		
Funds for strengthening markets, income, and supply (transfer from section 32)	10,998	12,443	12,443	+1,445	
Payments to states and possessions	1,200	1,200	1,200		
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service	61,029	73,825	62,795	+1,766	-11,030
Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration:					
Salaries and expenses	26,787	26,448	26,448	-339	
Limitation on inspection and weighing services	(42,557)	(42,557)	(42,557)		
Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety	446	469	446		-23
Food Safety and Inspection Service	616,986	652,955	652,955	+35,969	
Lab accreditation fees 1/	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)		
Total, Production, Processing, and Marketing	3,447,877	3,572,986	3,528,435	+80,558	-44,551
Farm Assistance Programs					
Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services	572	595	572		-23
Farm Service Agency:					
Salaries and expenses	714,499	794,839	794,839	+80,340	
(Transfer from export loans)	(589)	(672)	(672)	(+83)	
(Transfer from P.L. 480)	(815)	(845)	(845)	(+30)	
(Transfer from ACIF)	(209,861)	(209,861)	(209,861)		
Subtotal, Transfers from program accounts	(211,265)	(211,378)	(211,378)	(+113)	
Total, salaries and expenses	(925,784)	(1,006,217)	(1,006,217)	(+80,453)	
State mediation grants	2,000	4,000	4,000	+2,000	
Dairy indemnity program	450	450	450		
Subtotal, Farm Service Agency	716,949	799,289	799,289	+82,340	

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 1906)—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)**

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct.....	(85,651)	(128,049)	(128,049)	(+ 42,398)
Guaranteed.....	(425,031)	(431,373)	(431,373)	(+ 6,342)
Subtotal	(510,682)	(559,422)	(559,422)	(+ 48,740)
Farm operating loans:					
Direct.....	(500,000)	(500,000)	(500,000)
Guaranteed unsubsidized.....	(948,276)	(1,697,842)	(1,697,842)	(+ 749,566)
Guaranteed subsidized.....	(200,000)	(97,442)	(97,442)	(-102,558)
Subtotal	(1,648,276)	(2,295,284)	(2,295,284)	(+ 647,008)
Indian tribe land acquisition loans.....	(1,000)	(1,028)	(1,028)	(+ 28)
Emergency disaster loans.....	(25,000)	(53,000)	(53,000)	(+ 28,000)
Boll weevil eradication loans.....	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)
Total, Loan authorizations.....	(2,284,958)	(3,008,734)	(3,008,734)	(+ 723,776)
Loan subsidies:					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct.....	12,822	4,827	4,827	-7,995
Guaranteed.....	6,758	2,416	2,416	-4,342
Subtotal	19,580	7,243	7,243	-12,337
Farm operating loans:					
Direct.....	34,150	29,300	29,300	-4,850
Guaranteed unsubsidized.....	11,000	23,940	23,940	+ 12,940
Guaranteed subsidized.....	17,480	8,585	8,585	-8,895
Subtotal	62,630	61,825	61,825	-805
Indian tribe land acquisition.....	153	21	21	-132
Emergency disaster loans.....	5,900	8,231	8,231	+ 2,331
Boll weevil loans subsidy.....	1,440	-1,440
Total, Loan subsidies.....	89,703	77,320	77,320	-12,383
ACIF expenses:					
Salaries and expense (transfer to FSA).....	209,861	209,861	209,861
Administrative expenses.....	10,000	4,300	4,300	-5,700
Total, ACIF expenses.....	219,861	214,161	214,161	-5,700
Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund	309,564	291,481	291,481	-18,083
(Loan authorization)	(2,284,958)	(3,008,734)	(3,008,734)	(+ 723,776)
Total, Farm Service Agency.....	1,026,513	1,090,770	1,090,770	+ 64,257
Risk Management Agency	64,000	70,716	70,716	+ 6,716
Support Services Bureau.....	74,050	-74,050
Total, Farm Assistance Programs.....	1,091,085	1,236,131	1,162,058	+ 70,973	-74,073
Corporations					
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation:					
Federal crop insurance corporation fund	1,504,036	997,000	997,000	-507,036
Commodity Credit Corporation Fund:					
Reimbursement for net realized losses.....	8,439,000	14,368,000	14,368,000	+ 5,929,000
Operations and maintenance for hazardous waste management (limitation on administrative expenses).....	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)
Total, Corporations.....	9,943,036	15,365,000	15,365,000	+ 5,421,964
Total, title I, Agricultural Programs	14,481,998	20,174,117	20,055,493	+ 5,573,495	-118,624
(By transfer)	(211,265)	(211,378)	(211,378)	(+ 113)
(Loan authorization)	(2,284,958)	(3,008,734)	(3,008,734)	(+ 723,776)
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(108,287)	(108,287)	(108,287)
TITLE II - CONSERVATION PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment.....	693	721	693	-28
Natural Resources Conservation Service:					
Conservation operations	641,243	680,679	654,243	+ 13,000	-26,436
(By transfer)	(44,423)	(-44,423)
Watershed surveys and planning.....	10,368	11,732	10,368	-1,364
Watershed and flood prevention operations.....	99,443	83,423	99,443	+ 16,020
Resource conservation and development	35,000	35,265	35,265	+ 265
Forestry incentives program.....	6,325	-6,325
Debt for nature.....	5,000	-5,000
Farmland protection program	50,000	-50,000
Total, Natural Resources Conservation Service.....	792,379	866,099	799,319	+ 6,940	-66,780
Total, title II, Conservation Programs	793,072	866,820	800,012	+ 6,940	-66,808

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 1906)—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)**

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE III - RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development.....	588	612	588		-24
Rural community advancement program	722,686	670,103	666,103	-56,583	-4,000
Rural Housing Service:					
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Single family (sec. 502)	(985,313)	(1,100,000)	(1,337,632)	(+ 372,319)	(+ 237,632)
Unsubsidized guaranteed	(3,000,000)	(3,200,000)	(3,200,000)	(+ 200,000)	
Housing repair (sec. 504)	(25,001)	(32,396)	(32,400)	(+ 7,399)	(+ 4)
Farm labor (sec. 514)	(20,000)	(25,001)	(25,000)	(+ 5,000)	(-1)
Rental housing (sec. 515)	(114,321)	(100,000)	(120,000)	(+ 5,679)	(+ 20,000)
Multifamily housing guarantees (sec. 538)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)		
Site loans (sec. 524)	(5,152)	(5,152)	(5,152)		
Credit sales of acquired property	(16,930)	(7,503)	(7,503)	(-9,427)	
Self-help housing land development fund.....	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)		
Total, Loan authorizations.....	(4,251,717)	(4,575,052)	(4,832,687)	(+ 580,970)	(+ 257,635)
Loan subsidies:					
Single family (sec. 502)	114,100	93,830	114,100		+20,270
Unsubsidized guaranteed	2,700	19,520	19,520	+ 16,820	
Housing repair (sec. 504)	8,808	9,900	9,900	+ 1,092	
Multifamily housing guarantees (sec. 538)	2,320	480	480	-1,840	
Farm labor (sec. 514)	10,406	11,308	11,308	+ 902	
Rental housing (sec. 515)	55,160	39,680	47,616	-7,544	+ 7,936
Site loans (sec. 524)	17	4	4	-13	
Credit sales of acquired property	3,492	874	874	-2,618	
Self-help housing land development fund.....	282	281	281	-1	
Total, Loan subsidies.....	197,285	175,877	204,083	+ 6,798	+ 28,206
RHIF administrative expenses (transfer to RHS)	360,785	383,879	377,879	+ 17,094	-6,000
Rental assistance program:					
(Sec. 521)	577,497	434,100	577,500	+ 3	+ 143,400
(Sec. 502(c)(5)(D))	5,900	5,900	5,900		
Subtotal	583,397	440,000	583,400	+ 3	+ 143,400
Advance appropriation, FY 2001.....		200,000			-200,000
Total, Rental assistance program.....	583,397	640,000	583,400	+ 3	-56,600
Total, Rural Housing Insurance Fund	1,141,467	1,199,756	1,165,362	+ 23,895	-34,394
(Loan authorization)	(4,251,717)	(4,575,052)	(4,832,687)	(+ 580,970)	(+ 257,635)
Mutual and self-help housing grants	26,000	30,000	28,000	+ 2,000	-2,000
Rural housing assistance grants	41,000	54,000	50,000	+ 9,000	-4,000
Subtotal, grants and payments.....	67,000	84,000	78,000	+ 11,000	-6,000
RHS expenses:					
Salaries and expenses	60,978	61,979	61,979	+ 1,001	
(Transfer from RHIF)	(360,785)	(383,879)	(377,879)	(+ 17,094)	(-6,000)
Total, RHS expenses	(421,763)	(445,858)	(439,858)	(+ 18,095)	(-6,000)
Total, Rural Housing Service	1,269,445	1,345,735	1,305,341	+ 35,896	-40,394
(Loan authorization)	(4,251,717)	(4,575,052)	(4,832,687)	(+ 580,970)	(+ 257,635)
Rural Business-Cooperative Service:					
Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account:					
(Loan authorization)	(33,000)	(52,495)	(52,495)	(+ 19,495)	
Loan subsidy	16,615	22,799	22,799	+ 6,184	
Administrative expenses (transfer to RBCS)	3,482	3,337	3,337	-145	
Total, Rural Development Loan Fund	20,097	26,136	26,136	+ 6,039	
Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account:					
(Loan authorization)	(15,000)	(15,000)	(15,000)		
Direct subsidy	3,783	3,453	3,453	-330	
Rural cooperative development grants	3,300	9,000	6,000	+ 2,700	-3,000
RBCS expenses:					
Salaries and expenses	25,680	24,612	24,612	-1,068	
(Transfer from RDLFP)	(3,482)	(3,337)	(3,337)	(-145)	
Total, RBCS expenses.....	(29,162)	(27,949)	(27,949)	(-1,213)	
Total, Rural Business-Cooperative Service	52,860	63,201	60,201	+ 7,341	-3,000
(By transfer)	(3,482)	(3,337)	(3,337)	(-145)	
(Loan authorization)	(48,000)	(67,495)	(67,495)	(+ 19,495)	

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 1906)—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)**

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Rural Utilities Service:					
Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Direct loans:					
Electric 5%	(71,500)	(50,000)	(121,500)	(+ 50,000)	(+ 71,500)
Telecommunications 5%	(75,000)	(50,000)	(75,000)	(+ 25,000)
Subtotal	(146,500)	(100,000)	(196,500)	(+ 50,000)	(+ 96,500)
Treasury rates: Telecommunications	(300,000)	(300,000)	(300,000)
Muni-rate: Electric	(295,000)	(250,000)	(295,000)	(+ 45,000)
FFB loans:					
Electric, regular	(700,000)	(300,000)	(1,500,000)	(+ 800,000)	(+ 1,200,000)
Telecommunications	(120,000)	(120,000)	(120,000)
Subtotal	(820,000)	(420,000)	(1,620,000)	(+ 800,000)	(+ 1,200,000)
Total, Loan authorizations	(1,561,500)	(1,070,000)	(2,411,500)	(+ 850,000)	(+ 1,341,500)
Loan subsidies:					
Direct loans:					
Electric 5%	9,325	450	1,095	-8,230	+ 645
Telecommunications 5%	7,342	560	840	-6,502	+ 280
Subtotal	16,667	1,010	1,935	-14,732	+ 925
Treasury rates: Telecommunications	810	2,370	2,370	+ 1,560
Muni-rate: Electric	25,842	9,175	10,827	-15,015	+ 1,652
Total, Loan subsidies	43,319	12,555	15,132	-28,187	+ 2,577
RETLP administrative expenses (transfer to RUS)	29,982	31,046	31,046	+ 1,064
Total, Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account	73,301	43,801	46,178	-27,123	+ 2,577
(Loan authorization)	(1,561,500)	(1,070,000)	(2,411,500)	(+ 850,000)	(+ 1,341,500)
Rural Telephone Bank Program Account:					
(Loan authorization)	(157,509)	(175,000)	(175,000)	(+ 17,491)
Direct loan subsidy	4,174	3,290	3,290	-884
RTP administrative expenses (transfer to RUS)	3,000	3,000	3,000
Total	7,174	6,290	6,290	-884
Distance learning and telemedicine program:					
(Loan authorization)	(150,000)	(200,000)	(200,000)	(+ 50,000)
Direct loan subsidy	180	700	700	+ 520
Grants	12,500	20,000	16,000	+ 3,500	-4,000
Total	12,680	20,700	16,700	+ 4,020	-4,000
Alternative Agricultural Research and Commercialization Revolving Fund	3,500	10,000	-3,500	-10,000
RUS expenses:					
Salaries and expenses	33,000	34,107	34,107	+ 1,107
(Transfer from RETLP)	(29,982)	(31,046)	(31,046)	(+ 1,064)
(Transfer from RTP)	(3,000)	(3,000)	(3,000)
Total, RUS expenses	(65,982)	(68,153)	(68,153)	(+ 2,171)
Total, Rural Utilities Service	129,655	114,698	103,275	-26,380	-11,423
(By transfer)	(32,982)	(34,046)	(34,046)	(+ 1,064)
(Loan authorization)	(1,869,009)	(1,445,000)	(2,786,500)	(+ 917,491)	(+ 1,341,500)
Total, title III, Rural Economic and Community Development Programs	2,175,234	2,194,349	2,135,508	-39,726	-58,841
(By transfer)	(397,249)	(421,262)	(415,262)	(+ 18,013)	(-6,000)
(Loan authorization)	(6,168,726)	(6,087,547)	(7,686,682)	(+ 1,517,956)	(+ 1,599,135)
TITLE IV - DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services	554	576	554	-22
Food and Nutrition Service:					
Child nutrition programs	4,128,747	4,620,768	4,611,829	+ 483,082	-8,939
Transfer from section 32	5,048,150	4,929,268	4,935,199	-112,951	+ 5,931
Discretionary spending	15,000	-15,000
Total, Child nutrition programs	9,176,897	9,565,036	9,547,028	+ 370,131	-18,008
Special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children (WIC)	3,924,000	4,105,495	4,005,000	+ 81,000	-100,495
Food stamp program:					
Expenses	21,159,106	20,109,444	20,109,444	-1,049,662
Reserve	100,000	1,000,000	100,000	-900,000
Nutrition assistance for Puerto Rico	1,236,000	1,268,000	1,268,000	+ 32,000
Discretionary spending	7,000	-7,000
The emergency food assistance program	90,000	100,000	100,000	+ 10,000
Advance appropriation, FY 2001	4,800,000	-4,800,000
Total, Food stamp program	22,585,106	27,284,444	21,577,444	-1,007,662	-5,707,000
Commodity assistance program	131,000	155,215	141,000	+ 10,000	-14,215

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 1906)—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)**

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Food donations programs:					
Needy family program.....	1,081	1,081	1,081
Elderly feeding program.....	140,000	150,000	140,000	-10,000
Total, Food donations programs.....	141,081	151,081	141,081	-10,000
Food program administration	108,561	119,841	108,561	-11,280
Total, Food and Nutrition Service.....	36,066,645	41,381,112	35,520,114	-546,531	-5,860,998
Total, title IV, Domestic Food Programs.....	36,067,199	41,381,688	35,520,668	-546,531	-5,861,020
TITLE V - FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS					
Foreign Agricultural Service and General Sales Manager:					
Direct appropriation.....	136,203	137,768	137,768	+1,565
(Transfer from export loans).....	(3,231)	(3,413)	(3,413)	(+182)
(Transfer from P.L. 480).....	(1,035)	(1,093)	(1,093)	(+58)
Total, Program level.....	(140,469)	(142,274)	(142,274)	(+1,805)
Public Law 480 Program and Grant Accounts:					
Title I - Credit sales:					
Program level.....	(219,724)	(150,324)	(214,582)	(-5,142)	(+64,258)
Direct loans.....	(203,475)	(138,324)	(200,582)	(-2,893)	(+62,258)
Ocean freight differential.....	16,249	12,000	14,000	-2,249	+2,000
Title II - Commodities for disposition abroad:					
Program level.....	(837,000)	(787,000)	(837,000)	(+50,000)
Appropriation.....	837,000	787,000	837,000	+50,000
Title III - Commodity grants:					
Program level.....	(25,000)	(-25,000)
Appropriation.....	25,000	-25,000
Loan subsidies.....	176,596	114,062	165,400	-11,196	+51,338
Salaries and expenses:					
General Sales Manager (transfer to FAS).....	1,035	1,093	1,093	+58
Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA)	815	845	845	+30
Subtotal	1,850	1,938	1,938	+88
Total, Public Law 480:					
Program level.....	(1,081,724)	(937,324)	(1,051,582)	(-30,142)	(+114,258)
Appropriation.....	1,056,695	915,000	1,018,338	-38,357	+103,338
CCC Export Loans Program Account (administrative expenses):					
Salaries and expenses (Export Loans):					
General Sales Manager (transfer to FAS).....	3,231	3,413	3,413	+182
Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA)	589	672	672	+83
Total, CCC Export Loans Program Account	3,820	4,085	4,085	+265
Total, title V, Foreign Assistance and Related Programs.....	1,196,718	1,056,853	1,160,191	-36,527	+103,338
(By transfer)	(4,266)	(4,506)	(4,506)	(+240)
TITLE VI - FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES					
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES					
Food and Drug Administration					
Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation	970,867	1,109,950	1,072,950	+102,083	-37,000
Prescription drug user fee act	(132,273)	(145,434)	(145,434)	(+13,161)
Subtotal	1,103,140	1,255,384	1,218,384	+115,244	-37,000
Mammography clinics user fee (outlay savings).....	(14,385)	(14,817)	(14,817)	(+432)
Payments to GSA	(82,866)	(100,180)	(100,180)	(+17,314)
Buildings and facilities	11,350	31,750	31,750	+20,400
Total, Food and Drug Administration.....	982,217	1,141,700	1,104,700	+122,483	-37,000
DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY					
Financial Management Service: Payments to the Farm Credit System	2,565	-2,565
Financial Assistance Corporation
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Commodity Futures Trading Commission.....	61,000	67,655	65,000	+4,000	-2,655
Y2K conversion (emergency appropriations).....	356	-356
Farm Credit Administration (limitation on administrative expenses)	(35,800)	(35,800)	(+35,800)
Total, title VI, Related Agencies and Food and Drug Administration	1,046,138	1,209,355	1,169,700	+123,562	-39,655
TITLE VII - GENERAL PROVISIONS					
Hunger fellowships.....	1,000	+1,000	+1,000

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 1906)—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)**

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE VIII - EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS					
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 105-277) (Title VII and Title VIII).....	5,916,655			-5,916,655	
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority.....	61,677,014	66,883,182	60,842,572	-834,442	-6,040,610
Appropriations	(55,713,835)	(61,883,182)	(60,842,572)	(+ 5,128,737)	(-1,040,610)
Emergency appropriations	(5,963,179)			(-5,963,179)	
Advance appropriations		(5,000,000)			(-5,000,000)
(By transfer)	(612,780)	(681,569)	(631,146)	(+ 18,366)	(-50,423)
(Loan authorization)	(8,453,684)	(9,096,281)	(10,695,416)	(+ 2,241,732)	(+ 1,599,135)
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(144,087)	(108,287)	(144,087)		(+ 35,800)

1/ In addition to appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to this portion of the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KUCINICH

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KUCINICH:

Page 10, line 14 (relating to Agricultural Research Service), after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$100,000) (increased by \$100,000)".

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, a few years ago I visited an elementary school in Cleveland at the start of the school year. The children celebrating the beginning of their school year had released hundreds and hundreds of butterflies into the air.

Now, a butterfly is a powerful symbol in our society. It is a symbol of transformation, transformation from a caterpillar into this beautiful winged being. Butterflies excite the imagination, they enthral us with their possibilities. Yet, the butterfly may become the next casualty of our brave new world.

We are all familiar with the genetically altered crops where pesticides are engineered right into the crop. A recent study indicates that pollen from such crops may have the potential to kill off butterflies, including the majestic and beautiful Monarch butterfly.

Mr. Chairman, my intention with this amendment is to provide the Agricultural Research Service with \$100,000 to study the effects of pollen from genetically modified crops on harmless insects, and to study the effect on other species, including animals and humans, that may come in contact with the pollen.

Corn that has been genetically engineered with the pesticide Bt has been approved and was introduced to farmers' fields in 1996. It now accounts for one-fourth of the Nation's corn crop. Bt is toxic to European and Southwestern corn borers, caterpillars that mine into corn stalks and destroy developing ears of corn.

□ 1045

According to a recent study conducted at Cornell University, it is also deadly to Monarch butterflies. The Cornell study found that after feeding a group of larvae, milkweed leaves dusted with Bt pollen, almost half died. The larvae that did survive were small and lethargic.

The implications of this are very clear. Pollen from Bt-exuding corn spreads to milkweed plants, which grow around the edges of cornfields. Monarch larvae feed exclusively on milkweed. Every year, Monarchs migrate from Mexico and southern States, and many of them grow from caterpillars into beautiful black, orange, and white butterflies in the United States corn belt during the time the corn pollination occurs.

I am sure that millions of Americans have had the experience of taking their children in hand and going into a pasture and watching for beautiful butter-

flies to come by and visiting an arboretum, a zoo, a park and watching the butterflies.

Well, now, if we read the Washington Post, it says that pollen from plants can blow onto nearby milkweed plants, the exclusive food upon which the Monarch larvae feed, and get eaten by the tiger-striped caterpillars.

At laboratory studies at Cornell, the engineered pollen killed nearly half of those young before they transformed into the brilliant orange, black, and white butterflies so well-known throughout North America. Several scientists expressed concern that if the new study results are correct, then monarchs, which already face ecological pressures, but so far have managed to hold their own, may soon find themselves on the Endangered Species list. Other butterflies may soon be at risk.

From the Friends of the Earth we hear, "The failure of Congress and the administration to ensure more careful control over genetically modified organisms has unleashed a frightening experiment on the people and environment of the United States. It is time to look more closely at the flawed review process of the three Federal agencies that regulate genetically modified products: EPA, FDA, and USDA."

"The implications of the Cornell University study go far beyond Monarch butterflies and point to the need for a revamping of our regulatory framework on biotechnology."

Monarchs have already lost much of their habitat when tall-grass prairies were converted to farmland. We now need to protect them and other species that are harmless to farmers' crops, that may be adversely affected by Bt pollen.

It is shocking that more extensive studies like the one performed at Cornell were not done before the crop was approved. It also makes one wonder what effects other genetically altered crops may have on other species, such as birds, bees, and even humans, and if adequate risk assessments are being done on bioengineered products before they are approved and released into the environment.

My fellow colleagues, more research obviously needs to be done on these transgenic crops. I ask my colleagues to support my amendment to protect Monarch butterflies from the harmful effects of genetically modified crops.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, last year I had the opportunity to visit Pelee Island in Canada, which is a migration point for the Monarch butterflies. There is nothing more beautiful than to see hundreds of thousands of these beautiful creatures moving in a migratory pattern. It is an awesome sight. And yet, because of a lack of foresight on the part of our government, there is the possibility that these beautiful creatures may in fact be doomed. That is why this amendment is important.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into a colloquy with the strong, gentle woman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the ranking member of the subcommittee.

I am strongly supportive of this bill because agriculture is an essential part to our country. It is as essential to our country as manufacturing, services, transportation, or any other sector of our economy.

I am concerned, however, about two major programs in particular. These programs are the Agricultural Research Service, which conducts and funds a variety of research projects, including those related to animal and plant sciences, soil, water and air sciences, and agricultural engineering; and the Cooperative State Research Education and Extension Service, which works in partnership with universities to advance research, extension and education in food and agricultural sciences.

My concern, Mr. Chairman, is not so much about how much money is being spent on these programs or what research projects are being done. My concern is what other hands are needed to do this work. In looking over the list of universities that are conducting research in these programs, I am concerned that land grant colleges and universities in general, and historically black colleges and universities in particular, are underrepresented in research and education funding.

There is still a woeful gap between the capacity of majority land grant colleges and historically black land grant colleges, particularly in the amount of research being done and the facilities that are available. Despite this, historically black colleges have consistently outperformed majority institutions in the development of minority scientists and engineers.

The assistance of the government in this effort has been essential. I would hope that as the legislative process moves forward today and in conference with the Senate, my colleague will help voice these concerns and work with the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), in working for a fairer distribution of Federal agriculture research and education funding.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentlewoman that she is correct about the lack of funding for historically black colleges and universities. While the bill contains programmatic funding for these institutions, such as capacity-building grants, we must do more for historically black colleges and universities that can make valuable contributions to agricultural research and really deserve the support of this Nation.

I promise that I will work with the gentlewoman and the chairman, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) of our subcommittee and my

colleagues on the full committee to address this problem as the bill moves through the process and through conference, particularly starting with report language to require the Department to report back to us on what is currently being done, if anything, so we can establish the baseline for the future.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment dealing with research by the Agricultural Research Service for the Monarch butterfly. Let me just say that the Committee on Agriculture, which the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) chairs and of which I am the ranking member, is the chief ecosystem committee of this Congress, and I believe, of this country.

There is an expression: "You can't fool Mother Nature." There are some fundamental questions being raised here by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) that are very important to the future of botanical life and biological life in our country. Because we have never before had these genetically engineered crops, we really do not know their long-term impacts.

I know recent articles in Scientific American and many newspapers indicate that as a result of butterflies, which are essential to pollinating crops so we can produce fruit and corn, and representing the eastern part of the eastern corn belt, we know something about corn and soybeans, and these butterflies are essential to our future. After being impacted by this pollen, 40 percent of them died. 40 percent. This is a profound result. So I think the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) brings to us a very important and current finding that is well deserving of research.

I also would say to the gentleman, I thank him for doing this, because I know he represents the inner part of Cleveland, Ohio; and one of my greatest concerns as another American is that we have the first generation of Americans now that have no connection to the land. We have literally raised the first generation of people in the Nation's history who do not spend the majority of their time raising their food or with any connection to production at all, so they are divorced from the experiences that he is talking about.

I would just say, for someone from Cleveland, Ohio, a major city in this country, to bring this amendment to the floor, to me, in some ways is a modern-day miracle. So I want to thank the gentleman, and I look forward to supporting him.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman's response.

And it is an honor to serve with the gentlewoman in this Congress, serving the people of Ohio.

She raised an interesting point, and that is, what effect do these genetically engineered products have on our natural environment? I mean, sometime in the 20th century there was kind of a disconnection between humanity and the natural environment; and we will spend, I suppose, a good part of the next century trying to reconnect.

The disassociation from the land which the gentlewoman speaks about is a profound disconnection from nature. I think that is why schoolchildren, for example, find it so fascinating to study butterflies. Because in some ways, that primal human sympathy which Wordsworth talked about in his poetry flutters in the heart when we see something so beautiful. And I think that as the schoolchildren, who spend time with their parents and their grandparents going to parks and zoos and arboretums, have the knowledge that this very beautiful butterfly could be impacted by this bioengineering, I think that we are going to see a response nationally. And it would be healthy because this country needs to look for opportunities to reconnect with our natural state.

So I thank the gentlewoman. I would hope that the esteemed chairman, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) would be able to respond.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I will tell the gentleman I am all aflutter. I would like to say that I understand the concern of the gentleman, and I will continue to work with him to address this situation, and I think he has got a good program.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman would continue to yield, I would be more than happy to work with the chair. I need the help of the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) and I need the help of the Chair. We can work together to address this issue, bring it to the committee.

With that kind of assurance, I say to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), I will withdraw the amendment, but look forward to working with both of my colleagues to find the appropriate venue within the committee so that we can start to get these agencies to be aware of this major concern of public policy.

I thank the gentleman again for his work on this matter and for his work on the agricultural bill. And again, my gratitude to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR). It is an honor to be with her in this House.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman from Cleveland, Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) that I thank him very much for bringing this to the Nation's attention. He is a leader on this issue, and I look forward to working with our

chairman to find an answer to this as we move toward the conference.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to speak out of order for 2 minutes.)

THANKS TO THE FOLKS BACK HOME

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I will not take long, but to say I should have said this yesterday as I began my remarks on this Agricultural Appropriations bill for the Year 2000. And that is that I am very indebted to the people from back home who have sent me here to serve on their behalf. A number of them are farmers and have spent their life in production and in agriculture.

I want to recognize a few of them on the floor today, in particular, Ray Zwyer and Thelma Zwyer, who are now, I believe, Social Security recipients. And I know Ray is undergoing kidney dialysis several times a week. I want to thank him and his wife, Thelma, for everything they taught me about agriculture, for taking me out on my first combine, for helping me understand chicken production and poultry production, for helping me to understand direct marketing and how hard it was for the average farm family in this country to make it, to watch their son Tom and his children and their family to try to carry on the family tradition on that farm in Monclova Township.

I want to thank his brother, Howard, and his wife, Eleanor Zwyer, right across the street, for all the hard work they have done to create and keep in our area production agriculture.

I also want to thank Herman and Emma Gase up the street, who have worked so very hard to raise their family. And I notice they had a couple of pieces of equipment for sale in their front yard this past week.

I also want to thank Melva and Pete Plocek. Pete is the one that taught me what it is like to have wet beans and that they do not get as much when they take them to the elevator.

There are so many people like this back in our community who truly represent rural life in this country, the very best traditions of our Nation. And I just want to thank them for letting me try to be their voice here, as well as the one million farm families across our country who expect us to do the job for them in this bill.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COBURN:

Page 10, line 14, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$50,863,000)".

□ 1100

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the chairman and ranking member will bear with me on this amendment. I do intend on withdrawing this amendment at some point in the discussion, but I

think the American people need to know about the increase in agricultural research. I agree with many of the increases that are in there, but I think it is going to do us a good job of informing the American people where we actually spend this money.

This is a \$50 million increase that this committee has put in for agricultural research. I want to put it in light of the real issues of why we are trying to trim this budget back to last year's level.

I am going to say again, for our seniors out there that are watching and for our children that are watching, that are going to pay the bills for the money that we spend above the caps and the Social Security money that ends up getting spent this year despite the fact that we made a commitment to not spend that money: The graph that you see to the left shows what is going to happen to Social Security revenues. The bars that you see in the black are the increase in the number of dollars that are coming in over expenditures, the amount of money that comes in minus the amount of money that goes out for Social Security payments.

In 2014 we see a tremendous change. We start seeing red show up. That money, that red, is indicative of the amount of money that is going to have to come from the general fund, not the Social Security fund, to meet the obligations for Social Security.

Where is that money going to come from? That money is going to come from increased payroll taxes on our children. The Congressional Budget Office and the Social Security Administration estimate that if we stay on the track that we are staying right now, that in fact our children and grandchildren most likely will be paying twice in payroll taxes as they pay today just to meet the requirements of the baby boomers.

I happen to be a baby boomer. I was born in 1948. I was a product of the postwar greatness that came in this country in terms of we came back from the war and were allowed to have children and our material standard of living rose greatly.

Our commitment in this body, both by the budget that the Democrats provided and the Republicans provided, everybody committed that we would not touch one dollar of Social Security money, not one dollar. Yet we are on a track to make sure that we spend about \$45 billion of that money this year. Most people know that but they are not willing to say it. They are not willing to admit that the 302(b) allocations that have been put out will actually in the long run spend Social Security money.

I think that it is unfair to the American public to say that we are going to go through an appropriations process that is going to protect Social Security and protect 100 percent of the dollars in that, when in fact in our heart we know that Washington is not going to

live up to that commitment. That commitment is a secure, honorable commitment to the seniors of this country. But, more importantly, it is a commitment to our children and our grandchildren.

If you ask the seniors in this country, the people that won World War II, do they want to burden their grandchildren with a FICA tax rate that is twice what they paid so that we can meet the mere obligations of Social Security, they are going to say no. And if you ask them what if we just trim spending a little bit more in Washington so that does not happen, they will all say yes.

I am a grandfather. I will do almost anything for my grandchildren. I will make whatever physical, material sacrifice that I need to make for my grandchildren. The question that we have before us and the debates that we have before us today are about whether or not we are going to do that.

Agriculture is a very important part of our country. I have said when we discussed this bill and when we discussed the rule, this is a good bill. My hope is to make it somewhat better so that we are back to last year's level, so that we have a chance to fulfill our commitment to the American people by not spending Social Security money. Just so that everybody can know, here is 1999.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. COBURN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, what we see is 1999 and 2000 estimated numbers for Social Security surplus. Last year there were \$127 billion in excess Social Security payments in over what we paid out. What did we do? We started out, we had a budget that spent \$1 billion of it. This is before we had made a commitment not to do that. Then we had a \$15 billion supplemental. And then at the end of the year we crashed with what was called the omnibus bill at the end of the year.

So what we ended up doing was spending \$29 billion of Social Security payments to run this country last year because the Congress did not have the courage to force the Federal Government to be efficient. It is not a matter of making cuts. It is a matter of demanding efficiency from the Federal Government and living within the budget.

In 1997, we agreed with the President, both bodies of this Congress, that we would live within the 1997 total budget caps. At the time we did that, most of the pain we knew was going to start this year. The actual spending on discretionary programs, programs other than Medicare, Medicaid and mandated programs, has to decline by \$10 billion this year if we are not going to spend Social Security money.

Here is where we are going. Right now the President's numbers that say

that we are going to have \$138 billion in Social Security excess payments, we are on track to spend \$57 billion of that money. If you look at it conservatively, the best we will do if we stay on this track is that we will spend \$45 billion of that money.

This House has a lot of integrity. It is time for us to stand up and meet that integrity. It is time for us to live within the budget dollars that we agreed that we would live with.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment continues the process that began yesterday. The gentleman has demonstrated that he has patience and endurance, and I would say that the committee has no shortage of endurance or patience.

Yesterday the House adopted an amendment by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) which I opposed. It reduced the amount for the Agricultural Research Service by \$13 million in order to provide an increase of \$10 million for the Commodity Assistance Program.

I opposed that amendment because I think that research is absolutely essential if we want the 2 percent of our people who are farmers to continue to feed the other 98 percent of our people and much of the rest of the world, too. I am sure that they would like to contribute to that. And contributing a huge amount to our balance of trade and humanitarian assistance. This simply would not be possible if it were not for our agricultural research efforts which are the envy of the entire world.

The gentleman's amendment would reduce this amount by \$51 million in addition to the \$13 million reduction that the House agreed to yesterday. This would reduce the Agricultural Research Service well below the fiscal year 1999 level and would make it impossible to maintain the base level of activity. I oppose this amendment. I ask all the Members to oppose it and to support the committee.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I also rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. Let me say in terms of Social Security, the most important input to Social Security's Trust Fund is an America that is working and that is productive. Therefore, the reason we have seen the revenues bounce up in Social Security is because the economy has been stronger in the last several years than in past decades. And so the most important thing we can do is help people's incomes rise and help people keep working so that that revenue flow increases.

The Social Security Trust Fund is not a static fund. It is a fund that is very connected to what is happening in production America, whether it is in the industrial plants, whether it is in agriculture or in our service industries.

Rural America, however, right now is in serious crisis. It is in depression.

Our job here should be to be partners with rural America in helping them pull out of the tailspin that they are in so that they again can become productive partners, contributing to the national well-being as well as their own well-being.

And so I would say to the gentleman, I think his efforts to try to be responsible and to deal with the budget issue here are admirable. However, in the context of the way we function as the Congress, we are one of 13 committees. We have been given the budget mark against which we must not go over. When we bump our heads up against it, we know we cannot go over.

As the gentleman admitted on the floor yesterday, we have done our job on this committee. Now, other committees have spending that is cut several hundred million dollars. That is all balanced out by the leadership of your party. Therefore, we on the Committee on Agriculture in some ways are insulted by the fact that you would try to go line item by line item inside our accounts and say, "Well, this isn't important" or "This isn't important" when we have so many tradeoffs that we have had to try to make, especially in Depression level conditions like rural America is facing today.

This agricultural research account is critical, because it is the future. If America is going to have a future in agriculture, it is built on the research that is being done every day by scientists who are not given enough credit here in Congress or in general in the country.

If you look at some of the costs to our economy where we do not have answers, something like soybean nematode which takes 25 percent of our crop, if we could produce 100 percent of the crop or 90 percent rather than 75 percent, how much more wealth and buying power and income that would add to our rural sector. In the South, something like a corn earworm costs farmers over \$1.5 billion annually in losses, in chemical costs. We do not have answers to that problem.

These may seem like funny names to people who do not live in rural America but to people who face this every day, these are vital problems. We had the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) yesterday talk about the Asian Longhorn beetle infecting New York City as well as Illinois. Maple sugar producers in my area are scared to death that that thing is going to come across the State and cause billions of dollars worth of damage and kill all of our hardwoods.

These are not simple issues. We need answers to these questions. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) was just here on the floor talking about the problem with the Monarch butterfly. We do not have an answer to why nearly half the Monarchs in this country are dying, but we better find an answer because if we do not, production agriculture goes down, income goes down and we do not have dollars flowing into that Social Security Trust Fund.

I would just say to the gentleman also in my time here that he keeps looking at the accounts in our overall budget and he says, "Well, this one is going up," but he does not look at the ones that went down. We have a lot of accounts, for instance, our surplus commodities and foreign food shipments account has gone down by over \$25 million, our P.L. 480 title I by over \$11 million, all of our rural community advancement programs by over \$56 million. You look at our Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund by over \$18 million, the Agricultural Research Service buildings and facilities, over \$11 million.

So we feel that we have done what we need to do in each of these accounts, but I would beg the gentleman not to cut America's future, not cut her seed corn for the future by cutting these agricultural research accounts. And also to say to the gentleman, go back to your leadership. If you have got a budget problem, do not put it all on the backs of this subcommittee. We have done our job, we have met our mark. We are proud of the work that we have done.

I rise in strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. Actually, before I begin with my comments, I would yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I want to address a couple of things that the ranking member of the committee said.

First of all, my first comments were that I supported the research, that I planned on withdrawing this amendment, that I thought it was good that the American people knew where we were spending the money. So I want to put some of this in so that they can get some flavor of where we are spending the money.

"Sugarbeet research. The Committee is aware of the need for additional funding to adequately support the ARS sugarbeet research program at Fort Collins, Colorado, to strengthen sugarbeet research at the ARS laboratory. The Committee directs the ARS to fund this project in FY 2000 at least at the same level as in FY 1999."

But in fact what are the prices of sugar in this country and how much are we subsidizing sugar versus what the price is in the rest of the world?

□ 1115

There is no question we should be directing our research to improve our productivity, and I am for that. But now we are directing research to a program where we are subsidizing and falsely charging in this country a higher price for sugar than what the market would ever have us have.

So it is not about not agreeing with the research. It is about sending money into areas where we have a market that is not working today because we have overproduction, and we are spend-

ing research to enhance that overproduction more, which means a lot more money is going to come out of the subsidy programs that are available for sugar beet or sugar.

So the question is, should we not have a discussion about these things? And I am sure there is a defensible position for that. I am not saying there is not, and I am saying that I support without a doubt, and I will make a unanimous consent, and I hope that it is agreed to, to withdraw this amendment.

But we still have a 6.5 percent increase in agricultural research of which most is directed to specific Members' requests and programs, and we ought to talk about what that is. Do we have a coherent, to talk about what that is. Do you have a coherent, cogent policy for research that is directed fundamentally at the basic needs that we have in this country?

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would just like to interrupt for 2 seconds.

For instance, I want to follow up with the brief comment he made on sugar because this issue of sugar makes my blood boil. The idea that we have a research system set up that costs a little guy a lot of money, I think is crazy.

I mean, if we look at the sugar subsidy program that is in place, basically it costs the consumer \$1.4 billion a year in the form of higher sugar prices. Our sugar prices domestically are about double that of world prices, and all that benefit goes down to the hands of truly a few.

I mean, there are about 60 domestic sugar producers in the United States. One of those sugar producers is, for instance, the Fanjul family, who live down in Palm Beach. They are on the Forbes 400 list, they have got yachts, they have got helicopters, and they have got airplanes, and yet they get \$60 million a year of personal benefit as a result of this program.

So the idea of sending taxpayer money from somebody that is struggling in my district to help fund the life-styles of the rich and famous with the Fanjul family is, to me, not sensible.

Now, as I understand it, he may actually withdraw this amendment, but to say there is not another dime that could be cut within ag research I think is a grossly inadequate assumption.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, was the gentleman suggesting that there is one dime in money in the agricultural research account that goes to the family that he is talking about, that he claims receives funds? Is he saying agricultural research funds go, or is he trying to distort this argument?

Mr. SANFORD. The gentlewoman from Ohio is absolutely right; they are apples and oranges. The research goes toward sugar, and our sugar system, as

it is configured in the United States, Mr. Chairman, very much benefits this one particular family and basically about 60 other domestic sugar producers in the United States.

Ms. KAPTUR. If the gentleman would just be kind enough, Mr. Chairman, I have farmers in my district that raise sugar beets. I would challenge the gentleman any day to come and put in the day of work that they do. That is one heck of a dirty job, to raise beets in this country, and if there is a better beet that can get them a little bit more at processing time, I am for them.

Mr. SANFORD. Reclaiming my time, I think there is no question that there are some hard-working, sugar-producing, sugar-beet-producing families throughout the Midwest, but there also happens to be the Fanjul family that controls over 180,000 acres of sugar cane production in south Florida. That is not exactly the family farm, and the fact of the matter is that part of this research will benefit a family like the Fanjuls.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 185, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

None of the funds in the foregoing paragraph shall be available to carry out research related to the production, processing or marketing of tobacco or tobacco products.

In fiscal year 2000, the agency is authorized to charge fees, commensurate with the fair market value, for any permit, easement, lease, or other special use authorization for the occupancy or use of land and facilities (including land and facilities at the Beltsville Agricultural Research Center) issued by the agency, as authorized by law, and such fees shall be credited to this account and shall remain available until expended for authorized purposes.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For acquisition of land, construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities as necessary to carry out the agricultural research programs of the Department of Agriculture, where not otherwise provided, \$44,500,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b): *Provided*, That funds may be received from any State, other political subdivision, organization, or individual for the purpose of establishing any research facility of the Agricultural Research Service, as authorized by law.

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION SERVICE

RESEARCH AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES

For payments to agricultural experiment stations, for cooperative forestry and other research, for facilities, and for other expenses, including \$180,545,000 to carry into effect the provisions of the Hatch Act (7 U.S.C. 361a-i); \$21,932,000 for grants for cooperative forestry research (16 U.S.C. 582a-a7); \$29,676,000 for payments to the 1890 land-grant colleges, including Tuskegee University (7 U.S.C. 3222); \$62,916,000 for special grants for agricultural research (7 U.S.C. 450i(c)); \$15,048,000 for special grants for agricultural research on improved pest control (7 U.S.C. 450i(c)); \$105,411,000 for competitive research grants (7 U.S.C. 450i(b)); \$5,109,000 for the support of animal health and disease programs (7 U.S.C. 3195); \$750,000 for supplemental and alternative crops and products (7 U.S.C. 3319d); \$600,000 for grants for research pursuant to the Critical Agricultural Materials Act of 1984 (7 U.S.C. 178) and section 1472 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3318), to remain available until expended; \$3,000,000 for higher education graduate fellowship grants (7 U.S.C. 3152(b)(6)), to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b); \$4,350,000 for higher education challenge grants (7 U.S.C. 3152(b)(1)); \$1,000,000 for a higher education multicultural scholars program (7 U.S.C. 3152(b)(5)), to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b); \$2,850,000 for an education grants program for Hispanic-serving Institutions (7 U.S.C. 3241); \$500,000 for a secondary agriculture education program and two-year post-secondary education (7 U.S.C. 3152 (h)); \$4,000,000 for aquaculture grants (7 U.S.C. 3322); \$8,000,000 for sustainable agriculture research and education (7 U.S.C. 5811); \$9,200,000 for a program of capacity building grants (7 U.S.C. 3152(b)(4)) to colleges eligible to receive funds under the Act of August 30, 1890 (7 U.S.C. 321-326 and 328), including Tuskegee University, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b); \$1,552,000 for payments to the 1994 Institutions pursuant to section 534(a)(1) of Public Law 103-382; and \$10,888,000 for necessary expenses of Research and Education Activities, of which not to exceed \$100,000 shall be for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109; in all, \$467,327,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COBURN:

Page 13, line 11, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, throughout the Federal Government we have multitudes of agencies and departments and grants and billions of dollars that are being spent on global change and global climate change. We happen to have in this bill a million dollars in an isolated little pocket that is going to go to study, within the Department of Agriculture through a grant, global change.

It makes no sense to appropriate any money for global change through the appropriations process in ag when we have the vast majority, 99.9 percent of the rest of the money, being spent on this issue in other departments.

The question that I would have is, should we be spending a million dollars of Social Security money on global change in such an inefficient way? A million-dollar grant on such a large

area of science and research today can in no way be spent efficiently, and I would pull this back. Is this money that has to be spent, that needs to be spent at this time and in this manner, and is it the best way to spend this million dollars?

As my colleagues know, we recently saw some of the results of some of the research on global change. We have a Kyoto Treaty that is being implemented by the administration that has never been approved by the Senate in direct violation of the Constitution of the United States. We have a Kyoto Treaty that is going to take jobs away from Americans because it is going to make us live at one standard and the rest of the world, developing world, live at a different standard.

We are throwing a million dollars for a favor for somebody on global change, one isolated, small grant program that is going to make no difference whatsoever in the overall study and effect on this issue; and so my question and the reason I have this amendment is that this is not going to accomplish its purpose, this is not going to further our research on global change, it is not going to be a wise use of a million dollars of taxpayers' money, and in fact will encourage us to do the same thing in other areas.

The next time somebody's constituent comes from my area, who wants something for a university for a grant, they are going to say, Well, they did it on this one; why will they not do it here? It is not a wise use of our money.

As my colleagues know, we have a lot of seniors out there. There is no question we are going to provide them with their Social Security checks, and I do not want anybody to be able to say that I am trying to scare the first senior into thinking they are not going to get their Social Security. They are. We are going to meet that commitment. But we cannot say that to our children, and anybody in this body that says they can, they have to come up with a plan to do that, and the first plan to do that is to not spend the revenues that are coming into this country, into the Treasury, for Social Security.

So I would ask the chairman and I would ask the ranking member to consider this amendment as a good amendment. This \$1 million will not ever contribute positively to the situation on global change. What it will do is send a million dollars of taxpayers' money to somebody else, and it will generate some research; but will it in fact have an impact on the very thing that it was directed for? And I would challenge someone to tell me that out of the billions and billions of dollars that we spend in other areas through the EPA and other areas, how \$1 million for one grant system is going to make a difference in terms of global change.

As my colleagues know, in World War II this country recognized that we had an obligation to fight that war, and we downsized every aspect of our Federal

Government because we had an emergency. Now we have a war going on, and it is not near the emergency that World War II was, but we have another emergency. And that emergency is whether or not our children are going to have the same standard of living that we have had the opportunity to have. Unless we address the issue of spending Social Security money, unless we address the issues associated with Medicare and Social Security, and unless we pay attention to that in every dollar that we spend, whether that comes out in one appropriation bill or all of them, or whether it is at the end of the year, unless we are good stewards of that money, that emergency will overwhelm our children. And everybody in this body knows that; they know that the baby boomer bust is coming as far as Social Security and Medicare.

So we cannot deny it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) has expired.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. POMEROY. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the sponsor of the 100-plus amendments that have turned the appropriations bill into such an utter fiasco on the floor of this House has strong convictions. Good for him. I believe they are heartfelt, and he is certainly articulate in advancing his belief on these things.

I have strong convictions, too. In fact, there are 435 of us in this body with strong convictions.

Many of us believe that hijacking the floor of this House is not the appropriate way to advance our strong convictions, work within the process, plug along, and ultimately try and make our beliefs prevail.

But to unilaterally tee off on America's farmers, as is the case with the 100-plus amendments sponsored by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), is fundamentally wrong and utterly unrelated to the concerns that he continues to tell us so much about.

There is a budget. It has been adopted by this body. It provides for spending of general fund dollars. The Committee on Appropriations has made allocations to its subcommittees, and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), dealing with the appropriation made to agriculture, came up with a bill that enjoyed bipartisan support coming out of that committee.

I do not like the bill. I do not think there is enough response to the needs in agriculture funded in the bill brought forward. I believe we needed to do more.

But to have the gentleman tee off on agriculture, slice and dice and try to make his ideological points at the expense of America's farmers is wrong.

It is his prerogative. We all have our own ways of doing things.

Ultimately, the blame for this fiasco falls upon majority leadership. Speaker HASTERT, where is he? Majority Leader ARMEY, where is he? Majority Whip DELAY, where is he? America's farmers need their direction and they need your leadership, and they need it now.

I believe that we need to assess what is taking place on this bill, and if Speaker HASTERT cared about America's farmers, he would put a stop to it, and there are innumerable ways available to the Speaker of the House to get this bill from being eviscerated in the fashion the gentleman is attempting. Give him an opportunity to have his amendment, one amendment, and then let us get on and appropriate the money so our farmers know where they stand.

□ 1130

There is not a component of our economy that is hurting as badly as our family farmers, and we all know that. These are boom times. The Dow flirts with record levels every day it seems like, but in the heartland of American agriculture there is nothing but pain and despair. At a time when our farmers are suffering, and when prices are below the cost of production, to have the agriculture appropriations bill held up for mockery and ridicule and evisceration like the gentleman from Oklahoma, as seemingly endorsed by the majority leadership is doing, is wrong. Rural America needs this Congress to respond to its problems.

Those of us that represent farm country, we cannot do it all on our own. We need the body to work together, Republicans and Democrats standing up for farmers, and ultimately that is going to take some leadership out of the leadership. That is what leadership is all about.

So I wish Speaker HASTERT would think about the farmers in Illinois. I wish Majority Leader ARMEY would think about his North Dakota roots. I wish Majority Whip DELAY would reflect on the pain in rural Texas and put a stop to this process so that we might get on to voting on an agriculture appropriations bill and send some support to our farmers.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman currently has this amendment and 10 other amendments that are pending at the desk. I have no doubt that the gentleman has many more such amendments that he will propose for this account. At this point they are all flawed, as was his amendment yesterday on the Department of Agriculture buildings and facilities.

Each of them proposes to eliminate a single item, but does not reduce the overall total, and so there is no reduc-

tion accomplished by the amendment. In this series of amendments, each amendment proposes to eliminate a single special research grant within the Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service, and in almost all cases these are projects that have been ongoing for many years and were proposed to be eliminated in the administration's budget request, and that were restored by the committee at the same level of funding provided in fiscal year 1999.

The special research grant that this amendment proposes to eliminate is described in detail in part 4 of the committee's hearing record on page 1,432, and the following is a brief description of the research performed under this grant:

"Radiation from the sun occurs in a spectrum of wavelengths with the majority of wavelengths being beneficial to human and other living organisms. A small portion of the short wavelength radiation, what is known as the Ultraviolet or UV-B Region of the spectrum, is harmful to many biological organisms. Fortunately, most of the UV-B radiation from the sun is absorbed by ozone located in the stratosphere and does not reach the surface of the Earth. The discovery of the deterioration of the stratosphere ozone layer and the ozone hole over polar regions has raised concern about the real potential for increased UV-B irradiance reaching the surface of the earth and the significant negative impact that it would have on all biological systems, including man, animals and plants of agricultural importance. There is an urgent need to determine the amount of UV-B radiation reaching the Earth's surface and to learn more about the effect of this changing environmental force. The Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service, CSREES, is in the process of establishing a network for monitoring surface UV-B radiation which will meet the needs of the science community for the United States, and which will be compatible with similar networks being developed throughout the world."

Grants for this kind of work have been reviewed annually and have been awarded each year since 1992, and the work is performed at Colorado State University.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good project and it deserves the support of all Members, and I support the project and I oppose the gentleman's amendment to eliminate it.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I have nothing but the deepest respect and admiration both on a professional and personal level for the distinguished chairman of the agriculture subcommittee, as I do for every other member of the Committee on Appropriations. I have watched with amazement as the gentleman from Oklahoma has withstood the most withering criticism from other Members of Congress,

not so much for the content of the amendments that he has offered, but for his insistence upon exercising his right as a Member of this body to question the product that has been produced by a committee of this House.

I think it is regrettable that Members of Congress get up and imply that a Member's right to debate line items in the budget is somehow an insult to the Committee on Appropriations or any other committee of the House. In fact, in my opinion it is an opportunity for individual Members of Congress to state their views and positions on issues, regardless. They may seem trite and unimportant and wrong to some Members of Congress, but they are important for other Members of Congress.

And it may take a few hours to get through the agriculture appropriations bill, and I have no doubt that we will pass a fine product in the end. But I hope this body will give every Member of Congress the tolerance that we should exercise in allowing everybody the opportunity to debate their amendments. Because remember, you will be the person at some future date that will want to have that same respect shown for you. Scrutiny is painful, but it is good for the process.

So I commend the gentleman from Oklahoma for what he is doing, and I rise in support of this amendment.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BASS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for those words of support.

The gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) said that the purpose of this is to make a mockery and to ridicule and to desecrate the agriculture bill. Far from it. The purpose is to ridicule money that does not go to our farmers.

We had seven votes last night on money that is spent on bureaucracy. This is not going to slow down one penny of money going to our farmers because this bill is going to pass. I said when we first started this debate that this was a good bill. I said that I supported the research.

The fact is we have a rule that allows us to debate these issues, and if one did not like the rule, one had an opportunity to vote against the rule. I voted against the rule because I think we spent money in the wrong ways and I wanted to change it, and I am here exercising my right as a Member of this body to try to change it.

My whole goal is to free agricultural research from the shackles of personal political favors for Members, and to make sure dollars go to the farmers, not political whims to get somebody reelected. So there is nothing wrong with asking questions about how the money goes.

The question of UV light, we are spending hundreds of millions of dollars on ultraviolet radiation in other areas of this government. This is a

pork project, plain and simple, and it has been funded and it continues to be funded. It is \$1 million that is going to do squat. And it is \$1 million that could go to farmers instead of to research for something that is already being researched at a higher level in a much more thorough way in almost every medical university in this country, and to portend that this is a significant research that we cannot do without or not use somewhere else efficiently is not an accurate statement.

I am not testing and going after the integrity of anyone here. It is the process that I object to and the fact that we have a lot of dollars in this agriculture bill that do not go directly to farmers. I come from a farm State. My district is rural. I have the support of my farmers. They do not want money spent in Washington that should be going to farmers. They do not want money paid out in terms of favors to get somebody reelected so that they will not have what they need when they go to farm their land.

So the question is not about whether or not we should do research. The question is about whether or not we should do research in a way that gives us a result that does not pay somebody off for a political favor.

So that may not be very palatable here, but there is a lot of that going on, and what I am saying is, let us free this agriculture bill from that type of thing and let us make sure that our research is directed in such a way that we get a benefit from it in this country.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think this debate is all framed in the sense that we are all here to try to make a better America. Well, a better America is not just the Social Security program, it is the totality of what we try to do here. A lot of that totality is regarded in quality of life. If one wants to have a better quality of life, which requires that one has healthier communities and strong economies, one has to remain competitive in the world, when America remains competitive in its research.

I guess if we go through all of the research projects that we do, we would find that there are some that we like and some that we do not like. Certainly the gentleman from Oklahoma, who is a doctor, would agree that if we cut out medical research, one, we are not going to be competitive with the rest of the world and two, we are not going to provide for a better quality of life.

The same is true with agriculture, this research issue, the ozone issue. It is a big issue in the world. It has become the number one issue for one of our competitive agricultural countries, Australia. They grow the same crops that we grow, only in reverse seasons. They are competitive in markets that we are in. They have made ozone one of the biggest issues in the country. They

have made it a national policy. They have a saying there, slip, slop, slap. Slip on a T-shirt, slap on a hat, and slop on some lotion before you go outside. It is that big and that is everywhere, on billboards and everything.

So the issue about research and quality of life and agriculture is that our bodies are what we eat. If we do better research in agriculture, we are going to be eating healthier foods and living healthier life styles.

So I wish that the gentleman would really not attack agricultural research as some kind of big pork that is in here just for Members. This country was based on land grant colleges, on universities that were based on studying agriculture, training people for agriculture. We still honor those with research programs, and I can tell the gentleman the research that we are doing in our area is really a cutting edge issue.

So I mean there has been a debate here, because this process of bringing in, as the gentleman told the desk, 114 amendments to an appropriations bill after never attending any of the hearings that the Committee on Appropriations had, if each Member offered, I just figured it out, if each Member, 435 of us, if each of us offered 114 amendments on an appropriation, we would have 41,590 amendments offered here. Mr. Chairman, the process does not work when we do it that way.

So yes, there has been criticism of sort of the number of amendments and the style which the gentleman is going about, but in the end this bill, which I was involved in the markup and attended all of those hearings because I am a member of the committee, this bill really is about trying to make for a healthier America, trying to make for a more competitive agriculture, a more environmentally friendly agriculture, a healthier food product, all of the things that make America the great place in which we live and respecting our heritage in that.

So yes, the gentleman is getting some negative responses to his amendments for the same reasons that I have indicated. I stand opposed to this amendment and to the others that the gentleman is offering.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Some of the attacks on my friend from Oklahoma have been downright humorous, the fact that he was accused of unilaterally trying to tee off on America's farmers. I want to speak out for my friend from Oklahoma and say he is willing to tee off on anybody who goes over the budget.

This is not about agriculture. This is about a process of how we are going to try to keep within our budget agreement.

I want to say up front that I support this bill and furthermore, I believe we do not devote enough to agricultural research. Furthermore, I will add that I believe that in the specifics of much

of this agricultural research, much of it can be easily mocked and made fun of, but it is the backbone of the agriculture of this country.

Furthermore, I do not know enough about this particular project to know whether this is indeed real research or whether or not it was put in because some Member of Congress had clout. It is naive for Members of Congress to walk up here and say that we, in fact, have to trust our leadership, trust our Committee on Appropriations. We should at least be willing to challenge occasionally.

If the Members of Congress do not want their projects struck, they should come up here and defend them, as the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), the chairman of this subcommittee, eloquently explained what the intent of this was. Where are the Members who represent this particular university in this particular State explaining what it is? Because this should be an opportunity for those who favor agricultural research to explain why this is in the bill.

A lot of this is a fight about the process. We hear that this is a "filibuster" or that we have had over 100 amendments. We have not had over 100 amendments. We do not know how many amendments there are going to be. But if we are worried that this is going to slow our process down, we should have had more days in session earlier this year; we should not be taking four additional days next week, because this is what Congress is about. We do not presume to know when we go into the appropriations process. There has been a lot of discussion whether we should go to the subcommittee, whether we should offer amendments.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOUDER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

□ 1145

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I took to heart what the gentleman said, that we should not bring bills to the floor in an ill-considered manner.

The gentleman is from the State of Indiana. As I recall, I did not receive any letters from the gentleman regarding projects in the gentleman's State or anywhere in the country relative to this bill.

Did the gentleman come before our committee to testify, or send any correspondence regarding any line item in this bill, yes or no?

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I would tell the gentlewoman, no, I had no line item in this bill.

I reclaim my time because I did put, in fact, a request in to boost agricultural research spending, because I support an increase in agricultural research spending. I support this bill. I believe if there is any part of the overall spending process that we need to be careful not to tinker with, it is agriculture.

I am not fighting with the specifics here, I am fighting on a process; that

all the appropriations bills should be allowed to have amendments and a full-fledged debate.

And whether it is one Member or a group of Members, they should be allowed to come here, because we are not trying to micromanage the subcommittees, but when we see the final report we have a right to say, as Members of Congress, that we do not believe that this full amount of money is legitimate; that we take apart pieces of this bill and say, defend this piece.

In fact, the only way an amendment cannot pass this House is if the majority of this country does not favor that amendment. It is not like some kind of a game here where there is some kind of a trick that can get to a majority.

Quite frankly, at least one of our leaders is threatening about this process, that we should not be allowed to offer amendments because it is uncomfortable. We are Members of Congress. We have a right. Not all of us are on a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, on the full Committee on Appropriations or its subcommittees. Some of us are on authorizing committees or on the Committee on the Budget. We would like to have the ability to come here and at least question.

I will vote for some amendments. I am voting against some amendments. I am going to vote on the end bill. But I do not think it is fair when the attacks come to the floor and they are aimed at a generic, hey, this is an attack on agriculture, this Member is trying to tie up the House.

It sounds to me like, thou dost protest too much. If there are particulars that Members want to defend, come down and defend the particulars, because Members should be able to. There are plenty of reasons; even if it sounds embarrassing on some of these research projects, there are scientific reasons why we are the best agricultural Nation in the world.

If we do not do this research and if we let this get caught up in whether or not somebody had an inside deal, if someone's project cannot stand the light of day, if their research project in their district cannot stand the light of C-Span in this national debate, then it should not be in the bill. Members should be down here defending it, as the subcommittee chairman did.

I commend my friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma, for challenging the structure; for making sure that each part of this bill can either be defended or not defended. I stand with him today because I think it is a healthy process for the United States Congress.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. Let me just say, in reference to something the earlier speaker said, when we do not follow regular order, which means when we do not come to the subcommittee and the full committee and do not make views known, and then try to come to the

floor and repair it, that is not regular order.

Regular order is making Members' wishes known to the committee as we go through the regular process, because we have to deal with 435 Members.

Now let me say, in reference specifically to this amendment, which is global climate change, in terms of global climate change, this is not a project that will be done in this Member's district. I know it will not be done in the chairman's district. But there is no issue more important to agriculture in this country and in the world than climate.

I can remember one time walking into the office of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the ranking member on the Committee on Agriculture, and he was watching television. But what was he watching? He was watching the weather as he was marking up one of the major authorizing bills for agriculture in this country.

I kind of laughed, because the sound was not on. I said, Charlie, what are you really doing? He said, you know how important weather is.

With changes in global climate, just a little bit of melt in any of the poles causes a change in the currents and the water. We have major research going on in terms of genetics, to try to make plants grow in deserts or where there is lack of rainfall.

What about when we have major changes in climate, which happen at the edges, they certainly do, and how we get plant life to survive in those circumstances?

What about the oceans? What about trying to do more in the way of production out of saltwater?

There are all kinds of issues that we deal with relative to the globe and relative to climate. There is nothing more important for us to know about.

Frankly, the Department of Agriculture is the department that farmers trust. They are not going to trust, with all due respect to the Environmental Protection Agency, but it has had a different view of what is in the air and a different perspective on climate.

But in terms of plant life and animal life, the research depository and the intelligence is stored at the Department of Agriculture. We make it available to our farmers in the field through the modern wonders of technology, and frankly, we help the farmers of the world to the best of our ability feed the people of their own country.

So I think to make any recommendation to eliminate this line item is certainly backwards looking.

I would just say, and I am sorry that the gentleman left the floor, but I will bring it up again when he returns, if in fact he has a problem with special grants under the Cooperative State Research Extension and Education Service, I would recommend that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) eliminate the grants that he asked for. In fact, I will list just three of them, totaling over \$691,000.

We have a letter in our possession that was sent to one of the Members in our committee in which the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) asks for assistance to the State of Oklahoma, and asks for targeted line item funding through the agricultural appropriations bill.

We do not have any discrimination against Oklahoma. We want to help Oklahoma. They include the following.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) specifically asked that those be offsets. That is the heart of the matter that he is dealing with here today, and that is the issue of offsetting versus not. So I think every Member of Congress—

Ms. KAPTUR. I would reclaim my time and just say that the point is that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) put three projects in this bill. There are actually five projects he put in the bill, totalling well over \$1 million. My feeling is that if he wants to eliminate \$1 million from the bill, let him eliminate the projects for Oklahoma.

Frankly, this Member would not eliminate projects for Oklahoma, but let me say what the projects are:

Expanding wheat pasture research, \$285,000; integrated production systems for horticulture crops, \$180,000; preservation and processing research for fruits and vegetables, \$226,000. That is just \$691,000 for those three projects alone under the very account that he is now trying to cut for global climate research, which affects every farmer in this country and their future.

So I would just say that I think the gentleman is maybe not quite knowledgeable enough about these accounts, because in fact, why would he add funding to a bill and to a set of accounts that he is trying to cut? Why would he not cut his own projects, rather than trying to cut a project that deals with the entire Nation's needs?

My apologies to the State of Oklahoma, because they deserve a voice here. I would not have recommended that their particular projects be cut. But the fact is the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) sent a letter.

THE CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) has expired.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 30 seconds.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would just pick up on our last conversation. That is, it

seems to me fundamentally that the idea that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and others on this House floor are trying to get at is not the idea of should we disenfranchise people within any of our respective congressional districts, but simply the idea of should we offset spending that takes place in the government.

As the gentleman has consistently stated, his struggle is not so much with the agricultural bill, but the larger process we find ourselves in. That is a process headed towards a train wreck.

I would say this, there was an earlier comment talking about how anybody who would offer amendments to this bill was basically one teeing off on agriculture. I want to associate my words with those of the gentleman from Indiana, because that is absolutely not the case.

If Members simply think about the contrast that exists, when I think about the average farmer back home, he is getting up before sunrise, he is maybe having a cup of coffee in a fairly simple room in the back of his house, he is getting in a pick-up truck, he is going off, getting in a Massey Ferguson or John Deere tractor, and he is spending the day outside in the field. He ends up coming back covered with dust. That is one picture.

We have another picture of somebody getting up and getting, let us say, in a Volkswagen Jetta or a Rabbit, going off to the administration buildings for agriculture here, and spending their day here. Those are very different days.

The bulk of these amendments have been about trying to do something about this huge and bloated bureaucracy that happens to exist within the Department of Agriculture here in Washington, D.C. To me, when we think about the idea of downsizing government, with the Department of Agriculture we have over 100,000 employees, we have 80,000 contract employees. That works out to be one agriculture employee for every 10 farmers.

Most of the farmers that I talk to are real independent folks. They are hard-working folks. The idea of them needing a handholder or a babysitter to sort of accompany them, or at least to report on them, throughout the day is not something that makes common sense.

One of the amendments that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) offered yesterday was in fact a proposal to cut simply 12 percent from an increase in administration here in Washington. That seems to be sensible to farmers that I talked to.

Another had been to cut \$400,000 from the Under Secretary of Agriculture. Mr. Chairman, why the Under Secretary of Agriculture needs another \$400,000 does not quite fit with, again, the hard and simple lives that I see for so many farmers back home.

Another amendment had been to trim \$26 million from space planning; not actually construction of buildings, but just planning on space for the future.

Again, these amendments have made sense when we look at the contrast that exists between the life that the farmer leads and the life that somebody in Washington leads working, for instance, for the Department of Agriculture.

As to this amendment in particular, as has already been indicated, there are a whole number of different projects around this country, and in fact, I sit on the Committee on Science, and there are a number of projects related to ultraviolet research.

So the issue here is this \$1 million is duplication. It represents one 100th of 1 percent of the overall agriculture budget, and to say that it will cripple the agriculture budget is not exactly the case. It goes back to the heart of what these amendments have been all about.

I have here a letter from Ms. Evelyn Alford, born in 1924. She writes me from Johns Island, South Carolina: "It really is frightening when one thinks about what the Federal Government can get away with. If the politicians would keep their hands out of the social security fund and use it for what it was originally intended for there wouldn't be a problem with the fund. The government takes money from us and tells us that the money is designated for one thing and they use it for something else. Isn't there a word for that?"

And a P.S., please read this letter. Ms. Alford, I read the letter.

This is what these amendments have been all about. They have been about trying to prevent a train wreck that is most certainly headed our way if we do not adopt the proposals of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

Because as we all know, while agriculture has stayed within the caps, Labor-HHS, there is no way we are going to come up with \$5 billion worth of trimming in that account; VA-HUD, over \$3 billion worth of trimming in that account.

Unless we come up with savings now, we are headed for a train wreck later on.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I came down to the floor with great respect for my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN). But I would say to the gentleman that I understand that this committee has met its 302(b) allocation; we are on mark, they met their budget.

As I was listening to this debate, I thought that I would come down to discuss with my colleagues one of the programs that my friend's amendment will cut. I think it is important to know that these programs are not just some programs that are out there that no one knows about and that are not having an impact.

The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) is indiscriminately attacking important programs in this bill without much discussion about the impact

of his proposed cuts. I want to take a moment to talk about the program that the gentleman is attacking with this amendment.

The Cornell University Program on Breast Cancer and Environmental Risk Factors was launched in 1995, and responds to the abnormally high incidence of breast cancer in New York.

□ 1200

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that we are on is an amendment on UV research for \$1 million. We have not attacked breast cancer research.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman have a point of order?

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is, the discussion is not about the amendment at hand. It is not germane to the amendment at hand.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, if I may respond to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), it is my understanding that it is the same account, and the gentleman's amendment will cut indiscriminately that account.

Mr. Chairman, if I may proceed, I would like to discuss another item in that account, because it will be impacted.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate must be relevant to the matter before the Committee. The Chair finds that the debate so far has been so.

The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) may continue.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that this will impact the project. I think it is important for my colleagues to know that the Cornell University program on breast cancer and environmental risk factors was launched in 1995 in response to the abnormally high incidence of breast cancer in New York.

The program investigates the link between risk factors in the environment like chemicals and pesticides and breast cancer. The BCERF, which it is called, takes scientific research on breast cancer, translates it into plain English materials that are easy to understand, and disseminates this information to the public.

They have a web site that is filled with information on BCERF's activities, breast cancer statistics, scientific analyses, and environmental risk factors and links to other sources of information. They sponsor discussion groups that provide a public forum to discuss breast cancer. This amendment will destroy our ability to bring the important work of the BCERF program to more people around New York and around the country.

Let me make this very simple, Mr. Chairman, if my colleagues oppose efforts to educate the public about breast cancer, if they think they have done enough to prevent breast cancer in this

country, then vote yes on this amendment.

But if my colleagues agree with me that we need to do more about stopping the terrible scourge of breast cancer in this country, if they agree with me that they cannot sit idly by while one in eight women are diagnosed with breast cancer over the course of their lifetimes, if it outrages them that approximately 43,000 women will die from breast cancer and 175,000 women will be diagnosed with breast cancer this year alone, then join me in voting no on this terribly misguided amendment.

My colleagues, these are just some of the materials that they distribute, avoiding exposure to household pesticides, protective clothing, safe use and storage of hazardous household products, pesticides, and breast cancer risks and evaluations, and on and on and on.

Mr. Chairman, we all want to spend money wisely. We all understand that the hard-earned dollars of taxpayers should not be distributed willy-nilly. But the gentleman from New Mexico (Chairman SKEEN), the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), our ranking member, have worked very hard to keep the numbers in this budget within their budget allocation.

I think it is very important that we not get misled by the desire to cut and balance our budget, because we all want to spend wisely. But we have to look at what these potential cuts will do, what kind of impact they will have on the lives of our constituents.

That is why, as I was sitting in my office, I decided to come down here. This is the kind of impact that this unwise, foolish cut will make.

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Missouri for yielding to me.

What the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) does not know is my sister has breast cancer. My closest cousin just died from breast cancer. If the gentlewoman will look at this amendment, we do not cut total research. We cut a million dollars out of it, as the chairman just said, because we did not cut the total dollars. We redirected the money in there. This \$1 million will say that \$1 million cannot go for this, but the total number was not cut in our amendment. The chairman made that point earlier.

I treat women, as the gentlewoman from New York very much knows. Breast cancer is a great concern for me. I do not believe that the gentlewoman's intention was to say that I was not concerned about breast research, because I am.

If my colleagues will look at the amendment and how it is actually written, it is written to cut this spending, but does not cut the total and allows the committee to spend that money elsewhere.

So the question is, we did not, in fact, attempt to cut that research. We attempted to withdraw an amendment after we had a discussion on total research.

I want to take this time to answer another question that the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) brought up in trying to say that I sought funding. I very carefully worded a letter to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK).

I want to read very carefully the wording in it, because here is what I do with the research universities that come to my office. When they ask for money, I ask them, where are they going to get the money.

Then I sent a letter to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. Istook), and I said, "They wish to receive funding." Then I said, "What support do you plan to give for that funding?"

The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) represents this university as well. My promise to that group of university leaders was, I said, I would ask if he would do it. I did not make a request for funding.

The other thing that most of the chairmen in the Committee on Appropriations will tell my colleagues is that when I make a specific request for something that I want funded, I send with it a request for something that I want cut. If my colleagues would kindly check with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) on the bills, things that I have asked.

So I want to make very clear that I support breast cancer research, that I support NIH research, that I support the research. But I want to make clear again, a million dollar grant on UV research at one university on ultraviolet radiation has little to do with global change, one.

Number two, we are spending millions and millions and millions of dollars on this same subject in other areas. It is my feeling, as a prerogative, as a Member, to say this: I think that money can be spent better and elsewhere.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. EMERSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN). It is my understanding that the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) will cut \$1 million from the research account. This research project for breast cancer is within that account. In fact, if his amendment will not cut from that account, then I am not sure what we are doing here debating it.

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I yield again to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment cuts \$1 million from one specific account, but does not cut it from the total account, because we did

not lower the total amount in the research. Had we done that, we would have intended to cut the total amount. So it still leaves the money there.

Actually what it does is, it offsets \$13 million that was taken last night by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), out of research, which we did not get, we had a voice vote on and not a recorded vote on, and actually makes \$1 million of that go back into general research.

So the gentlewoman from New York misstates the true facts of the amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman from Missouri would yield, based upon the information I have, I believe the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) has distorted the response, or there is a misunderstanding here between people on this committee. But it is my understanding that the gentleman's amendment does come from the special research account and that this breast cancer project is within that special research account.

Therefore, although the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) has supported it, and I thank him, our gracious chairman, and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) has supported it, it will have an impact in this project.

So, Mr. Chairman, there must be a misunderstanding here. Because on the one hand, it will cut; on the other hand, it will not have any impact.

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say very specifically that I believe that they are mistakenly pointing this out. What this amendment really does is it will eliminate the million dollars and allow \$1 million to go back into the general research against the \$13 million losses.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say, in the furtherance of explaining and giving clarity to what is intended and what is written, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me, and I wanted to clarify a couple of matters here for the RECORD in terms of this amendment.

First of all, the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) is to page 13, line 11, which reads: \$62,916,000 for special grants for agricultural research. The gentleman's amendment proposes to eliminate \$1 million from that account. Am I correct in reading the gentleman's amendment? That is exactly what the gentleman's amendment states, page 13 line 11.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CLAYTON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, if my colleagues will turn the page to page 14, they will see that we did not amend the total amount of research. Therefore, the million dollars is reduced in that one area, but the total amount of research is left the same. My colleagues will notice, on line 19, on page 14, that we did not amend \$467,327,000.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman from North Carolina will further yield, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN). That gets to my very point that he amends line 11, page 13, out of the special grant category. The project of the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) is in the special grant category.

I wanted to get back to the letter that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) sent to the committee back on March 4. I am very glad that the gentleman brought it up himself here on the floor, because his letter says that Oklahoma State University met with him. They did not meet with another member of the committee.

Through that meeting, the gentleman learned about the specific projects, and then I quote from the gentleman's letter, "They have targeted to get line item funding through the Agriculture Appropriations bill this coming spring." This is the bill. This is the time we are talking about.

The next paragraph goes through five different projects. The last paragraph the gentleman from Oklahoma says, "They wish to receive funding," this is what he says to another member of the committee, "in a line item form." The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) even tells them how he wants it, for each one; each one of the projects, he means. Then the gentleman says, "And I wanted to inquire as to what support you plan to give them in regards to these projects as they progress through the Committee on Appropriations."

I will tell my colleagues, when I receive a letter from a Member, and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) did not send this particular letter to me, I would take it that when the gentleman lists which projects he wants on behalf of his university, that is a request for funds.

So, therefore, if this is not a request for funds, I go back to my original proposal to the gentleman, because I understand he wants to cut funds, why not take the special grants that he has asked for, \$285,000 for expanded wheat pasture, \$180,000 for integrated production systems for horticulture crops, and \$226,000 for preservation and processing research for fruits and vegetables, which total \$691,000, and let us eliminate those first.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman from North Carolina further yield?

Mrs. CLAYTON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, first of all, this was not sent to the Committee

on Appropriations. This was sent, one letter, to another Member asking his status on those projects.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman from North Carolina will further yield, which committee is that gentleman on?

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will continue to yield, he is on the Committee on Appropriations, but he is also from Oklahoma, and he also would have to support that, should that come.

When I make a request, and please go and look at my request, I specifically request things that I ask for. I mean what I say and say what I mean; I think the gentlewoman knows that. I am very cautious with how I do it.

I want to answer one other point. We made legislative history when I specifically asked this amendment to take \$1 million for a specific amendment. So that means no money is going to come out of breast cancer research; it is going to come out of that one specific amendment.

I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) for yielding to me.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will continue to yield, let me say to the gentleman from Oklahoma, I take it, then, he does not wish to support the Oklahoma State University's request for these ongoing research projects. I think that the gentleman's representative from the Committee on Appropriations should know that from the State of Oklahoma. I hope that the people from the University of Oklahoma also would know that.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman from North Carolina yield? I just want to answer the last statement, if I may.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman, if he can do it briefly.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I will be happy to support Oklahoma State research for that only if they can help me cut some spending from somewhere else.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) has a chance to respond, I hope he will respond as if he has written the amendment, if indeed it is designated not to come off the general special grant, because as it is written, it is not what his intentions are. The gentleman's intentions, as he stated, giving him the benefit of the doubt, he does not plan for it to come from cancer, but the result of his action means it will come from cancer.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

The question was taken; and the chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 185, further proceedings on

the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) will be postponed.

□ 1215

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SANFORD:

Page 13, line 11, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$5,136,000)".

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a very simple amendment. All it does is decrease research in education by \$5,136,000 for wood utilization research. These are specific grants to seven States, basically throughout the Southeast.

The real question that has to be asked with an amendment like this, and with wood utilization overall, is who does it best. If we think that the Federal Government, through grants to universities and private interests, is the best place to figure out where best to utilize wood, then my colleagues will want to vote against this amendment. If, however, we think private enterprise, free enterprise might be more capable at determining where and how wood utilization research ought to take place, then I think my colleagues will want to vote for this amendment.

I happen to have a lot of experience in terms of wood utilization. I grew up on a family farm down south of Charleston. My dad died when I was in college and we converted the farm from basically a row crop and from cattle to pine trees. So over the course of my life, my brothers and I have been out behind a tractor, either mechanically or by hand, planting pine trees, throughout our whole life. And that has given me a lot of experience in this world.

Because with improved loblollies down in the Southeast, a first thin can be had in 12 years. Now, improved loblollies did not come as a result of wood utilization research grants. In fact, \$45 million has been granted in this category since 1985. It came about because people like Westvaco, people like Georgia Pacific, people like Union Camp were going out and doing research on what would create the fastest growing loblolly or slash pine down in the Southeast.

Now, what we have in that part of the world are people like Joe Young. Joe Young is an independent timber producer based in Georgetown, South Carolina. And I would ask somebody like Joe Young if he thinks \$5 million ought to be spent on wood utilization research or does he think that he, with folks running skidders, folks out in the woods, would have a better idea of, for instance, harvesting the woods. We have people at Union Camp or Georgia Pacific, we have a big plant, actually a Westvaco plant in north Charleston, South Carolina, and the people there put literally millions of dollars each year into basically wood utilization research and coming up with the best

ways to mill wood, the best ways to get wood from the stump to the home place.

So this is an amendment that is largely a philosophical amendment about where do we think this kind of research takes place best. If we think it takes place best with government, through a Department of Ag grant, then we will want to vote against the amendment. If we think otherwise, we ought to vote for it.

Going back to what this money would do, because again I go back to the original premise behind this series of amendments that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and others are offering, what this amendment is about is simply saying do we want to borrow from Social Security to pay for \$5 million worth of wood utilization research; or, if we do not want to think about it in terms of Social Security, we can think about it with competing interests in agriculture itself.

This \$5 million would buy 250 tractors for farmers across the country. This \$5 million would pay the taxes for 2,500 farmers for their taxes on a family farm for 1 year. This \$5 million would buy about 500,000 bags of fertilizer for farmers across the country. And what I hear from farmers that I talk to is, if given the choice between an abstract grant that is already being handled by the private sector and money that could actually go to a farmer, they say they would take the second option.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The special research grant that this amendment proposes to eliminate is described in detail in part four of the committee's hearing record on page 1612. The following is a brief description of the research performed under this grant, and I will read from this:

"This research includes developing processes to upgrade low quality wood so it is suitable for higher value structural applications, catalyzing the formation of new business enterprises, and reducing environmental impact while improving systems for timber harvesting and forest products manufacturing."

Grants for this work have been reviewed annually and they have been awarded each year since 1985. There are eight locations where the work is performed: Oregon State University, Mississippi State University, Michigan State University, University of Minnesota-Duluth, North Carolina State University, University of Maine, University of Tennessee, and the University of Idaho.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good project and it deserves the support of all Members. I support the project and I oppose the gentleman's amendment to eliminate it.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COBURN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I just want to follow up again on what I have actually seen in the field, because our family actually grows pine trees. And when I talk to people like Joe Young, they used to go out there with a chain saw and cut the wood. Now they have a thing called a feller-buncher, basically a cutter set up on top of a four wheel drive tractor that moves around through the woods.

But these guys out in the woods, without government research grants, without government money, they are able to figure out how best to cut a tree rather than some researcher from the Department of Agriculture in Washington, D.C. telling them how.

Mr. COBURN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, again I would make the point that the purpose of this amendment does not cut overall research; rather it allows that money to go for something that we would deem to be more productive.

Again, I would come back to something I said earlier. There is no question that our Agriculture Committee on Appropriations came in under the 302(b), and I have heard that thrown up several times. But the people who are bringing that point to the floor have to say if they are going to support the 302(b) for agriculture, they have to support the 302(b) for Labor, HHS and Education. We all want to fund education at a higher level, and we are not one of us are going to tolerate a \$5 billion cut in Labor, HHS.

So to use the claim that we met the 302(b) when it was set at a high level, none of the amendments that have been offered thus far have directly taken money away from America's farmers. Not one. Not one amendment has been offered that takes money away from American farmers. What it does is it takes away money from people who are on the gravy train and on the line, that take money out of this budget.

If we care about American farmers, as the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) said, then we have an obligation to make sure that there is nothing in this bill that could not be spent better elsewhere. Our American farmers know how to do it. And they know if we will get the resources to them, and if we will direct it down to their level, that they will continue to lead the world in terms of research.

I would also make the point that if we make the claim we are within the 302(b), then we are certainly going to support a \$3.8 billion cut to housing and our veterans. There is not going to be a Member in this body that will support a \$3.8 billion cut to veterans and our housing.

So to claim that this process is working because this committee is under the 302(b) or is within the 302(b) is not an honest representation of where we are going with this process. And it is okay, if we all will admit that this process is going to end with us spending \$40 or \$50 billion of Social Security

money. We all voted to say we would not do that, and yet we are on a train that is going that way.

So, yes, it is a process, and it is a process that is going to end up in this body not keeping its word to the American public about their Social Security dollars. That is why I am insistent on these amendments. That is why I am insistent on us persisting and looking at every aspect of this bill that does not do what it is intended to do for our farmers.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, Ohio, my own State, is a very large forested State, and though this particular proposal for wood utilization research does not impact us directly, I think indirectly it impacts us as well as every other State in the Union, and I thought I would read some of the accomplishments of the research that has been done under this program.

Truly, one of the issues we face as a country is a need to provide wood product as well as fibrous product for various building needs and industrial needs, and yet those hardwoods that we used to have are really becoming extinct. In fact, we even have other committees here that deal with ancient forests, trying to save some of the last trees that we have in certain stands, and yet we still have to continue building homes, we have to replace what used to be wood with other products.

I am sure if Members have seen some of the new homes being built around the country, they even use these laminated products where they take wood chips and put glues in it in order to create the fiberboard that is used. In some places we are growing sugar cane and other types of cane products and figuring out how to take the moisture out of them and laminate them and use them for wood construction, or what looks like wood but really is not.

The new knowledge that is gained through this research program has been conducted through six centers around our country. Let me just read some of the new types of products that they have been able to bring to market.

The design of glued laminated beams that are reinforced with plastics saves up to 25 to 40 percent of the wood fiber that would otherwise have to be used in that construction. So even our forests, and our privately-owned forests are not growing fast enough to meet the needs that we have domestically and internationally.

In addition to this, they have been working on technology to apply those wood preservatives, using superfluids to reduce the environmental problems associated with present commercial treatments. When they put on these laminates and these various glues, this is a very difficult industrial process and they have been working on that.

They have been working at better harvesting systems that are efficient

and environmentally acceptable. Easy to say, hard to do.

They have been looking at the increase of wood machining speeds and the reduction of saw blade widths to increase productivity and save raw material itself. The world of the 21st century and the new millennium will be one of shrinking natural resources and trying to use what we have in wiser ways.

They have been working on a patented system to apply pressure and vibration to prevent the enzymatic sap stain which degrades hardwood lumber by \$70 to \$200 million a year. I know that because I have a little coffee table in my house, and I cannot get that sap to stop staining up through the covering that is on it. We need to find scientific answers to that so that wood can be fully utilized.

They have been doing research on the reduction of the quantity of wood bleaching chemicals needed by wood pulp producers. In other words, to try to be more environmentally conscious.

They have been working on the design and strength of wood furniture frames to minimize wood requirements. The wood being used today in furniture, if we were to take everything apart that used to use wood, we would be surprised at how that has been minimized. In States like Michigan, States like Ohio, where many industries use this new research, it has been immediately adapted.

Also, they have been using the adoption of European frame saw technology to composite lumber to provide a new raw material source for industry. It is very interesting to look at some of the layered wood products that have been used across our country. Some of the glues did not work originally. Now they are doing much better at that, where we are using just the top coating is actual wood and what is underneath is various types of composite products.

So I would say that this is extremely important. We are one of the largest forested nations in the world. We are having trouble with many of our softwoods, bringing them to market. People do not just want to live on plastic, they do like the feel and look of wood, and many of these wood utilization scientific studies and undertakings do have a direct commercial market application.

So I just wanted to put that on the record, and I would support the chairman in his opposition to this amendment.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Once again I want to state that I actually favor increased agricultural research, and having grown up in the furniture industry, as well as understanding a lot of this, I am not even sure I am going to vote for this amendment. I am listening to the debate on it.

But I want to make an additional point, and that is there have been a

number of comments about the amendment process and how we, in fact, as Members learn.

□ 1230

I am on seven different subcommittees. The idea that I am going to sit in every single appropriations subcommittee and listen as every single proposal comes up, to hear all the background, is ridiculous.

What we have as a Member, the only option when we get the final bill, unless it is a high-profile event, is to deal with it after we get the appropriations bill, if we are lucky enough to get the appropriations bill before we vote, to look at it and see if there is anything here, if this bill exceeds the budget caps, that we believe should be looked at and debated on the House floor. And that is, in fact, what we are going through.

There are Members who are proposing that we are supposed to sit, as though we do not have other committees, on every single debate item. Now, presumably, if the committee has done its work well, and the subcommittee, they will be able to defend particular things.

But I have another concern and that is that one point that has been made on this floor seems to resonate a lot with me. And that is that agriculture, while I do not believe it is being picked on in the nature of all the bills, guess what the only bill that Members of Congress cannot reduce is? It is our own branch appropriations.

We are not allowed to come to the floor and offer amendments to reduce expenditures on Congress because we might micromanage Congress. Now, we are allowed to come to the floor to micromanage other agencies under House rules. But under the Democrats and under the Republicans, we are not allowed to come to the floor and do our own.

The reason this becomes important is because we keep hearing about these allocations to committee and how agriculture, which in fact has been very reasonable and stayed pretty much on an even keel in the budget, is getting battered in this process here, at least debated. But some, like Labor HHS, where our education and health expenditures are, have a \$5 billion reduction coming.

We all know that that is not going to happen. At a time of school violence and the pressures we have on education in America, we are not going to reduce it by \$5 billion.

And the Department of the Interior, our national parks and environment questions, is getting reduced by 18.7 percent in these great 302(b) allocations we are hearing.

But guess what? The Members of Congress are going to get a 7.3 percent increase for their personal offices. Members of Congress are going to get a 5.6 percent increase for their committees. In fact, the Committee on Appropriations is going to get a 14.9 percent

increase, meaning the committees are going to get a 7 percent increase.

And the leadership is going to get an 8.4 percent increase, plus the 660,000 they got in the supplemental bill, meaning they are going to get an 11.7 percent increase.

When we come with 302(b) allocations that propose unrealistic cuts in environment and education, but have increases in it for this House, for our personal offices, for the committees, for the leadership, and then tell the Members of this House that we can amend everybody else's bills to reduce expenditures, but we cannot reduce the expenditures on ourselves, I believe we have a problem here.

We are starting to act in many ways like the Congresses before us. I ran in 1994 because I wanted to see a change. Part of the debate we are hearing in the appropriations process and the patience we are hearing from the subcommittee chairmen and the committee chairmen have been magnanimous as we worked through Labor HHS and other things over the last few years. And we need to have this debate.

But I am very concerned about double standards being put on the Committee on Appropriations vis-a-vis legislative branch appropriations and letting that go up but telling them they have to meet these unrealistic caps in many of the other subcommittees, particularly when we all know that at the tail end we are likely to bump into this so-called train wreck in the supplemental.

So I think we best not talk about whether somebody is in their 302(b). The subcommittee chairman has no choice but to work with that number. But, in fact, this debate is far beyond the 302(b)s because they are not realistic. And there is no way to illustrate that better than that Members of Congress and their personal offices are getting 5.6 percent, that Members of Congress will get 7.3 percent for their personal offices, the committees will get 7 percent, the leadership gets 11.7 percent, but these same allocations are reducing education by \$5 billion, education and health and Interior, by 18 percent.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOUDER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman made a reference to the point this it is not this subcommittee's fault, because there are unrealistic allocation numbers given through the budget process to each of the committees.

Could the gentleman tell me who produced those numbers, then, that he is objecting to?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SOUDER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman is correct. It was not the Democratic side of the aisle that produced these unrealistic expectations.

Many of us have concerns, as the gentleman from Oklahoma has pointed out, that these things should be done in an independent and bipartisan way. When we think our leadership is wrong, we will speak up, as when we think her leadership is wrong.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOUDER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I guess, as one ranking member on one of the 13 subcommittees, we did our work and we produced a bill under the mark we were given. As my colleague can imagine, we feel somewhat troubled by the fact that we have been dragged out to the floor here, now 2 days, with every line item picked apart when, in fact, we produced a bill under the rules we were told to play by. And I guess we do not really understand why this is being fought out on the House floor.

Mr. Chairman, is this their only measure to bring it to us? Can my colleagues not do it in their own caucus?

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, we in fact have been bringing it up. And our leadership, as my colleague well knows, has a very small majority and it is very difficult to work out. And when we cannot work it out, we have no choice but to bring it to the full Congress and debate it bill by bill.

Agriculture has the misfortune of being the first bill up. My colleagues have basically stayed almost at a flat freeze. And the argument here is not with agriculture in particular, but the process. I believe we ought to air this through the entire process because the numbers are going to be greater variations in the future subcommittees than they are in agriculture.

But agriculture was picked because it was supposed to be the least controversial. And what the American people are seeing and the Speaker is seeing and the Members of the House are, even this bill is controversial because it is a test of where we are going as far as our budget process and how we can try to reach those goals.

But once again, I want to agree with the basic statement of my colleague. The problem is that we have unrealistic 302(b)s and my colleagues did indeed in their subcommittee stay within that, but that the overall category is fallacious and that is what we need to bring out.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am here today to voice my support for the efforts to adhere to a freeze, to not increase spending this year.

I empathize with the comments that my colleague has made and the difficulty that we are having in working some of these issues out through our

own leadership. But I think that, as we have taken a look and heard the rhetoric in Washington this year, the President talking about saving 62 or 68 percent of Social Security, Republicans talking about 100 percent of Social Security, and I think we really believe that this is the year and this is the opportunity where we can move forward and have a surplus not only on the back of Social Security, but taking Social Security out of the equation and have a balance in our general fund, that that is the appropriate and the best way for us to go.

It really then lays the foundation for us to move forward effectively and aggressively into the future, to start addressing some of our real priorities that we need to be looking at as we move into the new millennium.

We need to be taking a look at paying down a portion of our debt. We need to be taking a look at reducing the tax burden on American families. The only way that we are going to be able to address those issues is if we hold the line on spending. And the only place that we can hold the line on spending is through the appropriations process, and that is why we are here and that is why this debate, as well as the 12 other appropriations bills, that is why the debate on each of those issues is so critical, because it sets the foundation for saving Social Security, for reforming Social Security, for saving and reforming Medicare, and then to move forward towards paying down the debt and reducing the tax burden on the American people.

I want to talk a little bit on this issue for just a second. I came out of the furniture business. I worked in the office furniture industry. I worked for the second largest manufacturer of office furniture in America. I have three of the largest office furniture companies either in my district or very close to my district, and I have got a lot of smaller office furniture manufacturers, many of them who use wood products. I am not sure that they need or want the government to direct or fund this research.

As a matter of fact, we were just up in the Committee on Rules, and I told my colleagues what they really want is, they would rather not have us fund this research; what they really want to have is, they want to have the ability to compete.

The amendment that we brought up in the Committee on Rules goes to an industry like this and says they cannot compete for business with the Federal Government. It is kind of interesting that we are saying we are going to give them \$5 to \$6 million to be more competitive, but at the same time, whatever they—earn—learn, they cannot compete for business with the Federal Government.

Why is that? Because their largest competitor in the Federal Government for Federal Government business is Federal prison industries. Federal prison industries make \$200 to \$300 million

worth of office furniture each and every year.

So I am sure that the office furniture business would say, let us not worry about the subsidies, let us move back to free market enterprise; and that they will take care of their own research, they will take care of new developments, new technologies, breakthrough technologies, they will fund that. Just give us the opportunity to compete for Federal Government business. We will more than earn our return in terms of profit and at the same time give the Federal Government a better quality product on a better delivery schedule and at a lower price.

So I think that gets to be a very interesting kind of a trade-off. And I think it just shows us one of the ways that we can actually hold the line on Federal spending here in Washington where everybody can win and nobody really gets cut.

So those are the priorities that I have.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I want to make two points because I think a lot of people have heard the word "302(b)."

When we pass a budget, we give an allocation of a certain amount to each of 13 spending bills, and that amount of money is what can be spent.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to finish the discussion so the people who are watching this debate will understand that that number is arbitrarily assigned, and when it is assigned in such a way that means that we are going to spend Social Security dollars to run the government, when we should not, then it is an inappropriate assignment. So that is an amount of money that is given to each appropriations committee on what they can spend.

The final point that I would make is that 10 hours of debate on \$61 billion worth of the taxpayers' money is not too little debate. As a matter of fact, it is not enough. And I find very peculiar, to use the word of the gentleman from Michigan, that we would be worried about discussing out in front of the American public where we are spending their money. And 10 hours of debate, which is what we have had thus far on this \$61 billion, I think is far too little.

So I find it peculiar that we do not want the light of sunshine to come on what we are doing.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, if I may, I just wanted to come to the floor to discuss all of this because I have some views on this that may be a little bit different than what we have heard. I support the particular amendment, as I have a number of

these amendments, with respect to reductions.

I have a tremendous amount of respect for the chairman of the committee and for the work that the staff has done. I think they have actually worked hard on this. But I have a huge problem with the way that we are managing the finances of the country today. I am not talking about just here in the House. I am not talking about the House and the Senate. I am talking about the House, the Senate, and the White House and the President of the United States.

It is my judgment that there are sufficient revenues on hand today to do virtually everything that I have heard the people think needs to be done; that is, to help rescue the Social Security and/or Medicare systems; to make our expenditures proper, particularly in the areas of defense and education and other areas that we agree need a great deal of help, as well as agriculture, I might add; to live well within a balanced budget circumstance, and probably frankly to be able to have a tax cut.

□ 1245

But somehow we have gotten tied into the 302(a) allocation and the 302(b) allocations. Everyone is unwilling to talk about doing anything different. Nobody is willing to get together to sit down and say, "What are we going to do?"

I can tell you exactly what we are going to do. We might pass this particular bill and a number of the other appropriations bills, but we are going to end up with at least five of these bills, and maybe six or seven of them. We are going to have a train crash, and the train crash is going to be the same as the train crash we have had almost every year since I have been here.

Sometime along about November, we are going to be in a circumstance in which we are not able to get the others passed. We are going to get into an omnibus situation, we are then going to break the budget caps, we are probably going to spend about \$50 billion more than we should have spent otherwise because we did not sit down now and plan how we are going to manage the revenues and the budget of the United States.

A lot has happened in the last 2 years since we came to the balanced agreement. There are a lot more revenues on the table now. I believe that I am fiscally conservative, as are many Members here, but I also believe that we have to make decisions which are astute and which make some sense.

I think the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma is making some very good points here, not just individually on each of the amendments which he is presenting but on the basic concept of what we are doing. For that reason, I think that we have to start to think outside of the box on the finances of the United States.

I intend to take this up directly with the President, at least in the form of a

letter, as well as with our leadership, to stress some of these points and to suggest that we are going down a road that we are not going to be able to complete and we are going to be casting votes here throughout the summer on a series of appropriations bills that are going to end up being very different when it comes to November. In a way it is a shame that somebody as distinguished as the present chairman is sort of at the brunt of the feelings of some of us who do not think the proper decisions are being made.

It is very simple. Why wait until the end, when virtually everybody agrees that probably we are going to break out of these budget caps and the allocations will probably change in some way or another? Why can we not get together now? Why can we not get together with the White House, which has a major voice in this, sit down and make the decisions and go from there?

That is what the people of the country want. They want our country managed well from a financial point of view and in a basically conservative way so that we are able to move forward. That is what I would like to do.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASTLE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Could I ask the gentleman to clarify something for me? I heard what he said and that he wants an honest budget process. Our subcommittee came in exactly as we were told on the mark we were given. He does not like the marks the subcommittees were given?

Mr. CASTLE. That is correct.

Ms. KAPTUR. What would make the gentleman happy? This process cannot make him happy. He is nit-picking a bill apart on the floor. What does he want?

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct. I think that her subcommittee did fine. I have a problem with the allocations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) has expired.

(On request of Ms. KAPTUR, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CASTLE was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I believe that her subcommittee has done just fine based on the allocations which are there. My problem is that I do not think we can live with the budget caps which are there and get everything in that we are ultimately going to have to do in the course of this year.

You might be able to pass your particular appropriation bill, but, as I said, I think there are at least five and probably more than five, maybe six or seven which simply are not going to pass with these caps. You happen to be sort of in the upper end of that if you really look at it. You are not as high as Defense and a couple of others but you are in the top four or five. Therefore, you are probably in the best circumstance in terms of what you can do.

But if you look down through these, VA-HUD and a series of others, Labor-HHS in particular and Interior and some others simply are not going to make it in this circumstance. We are going to come to the end, then it will all get rolled together, we will do it in the form of an emergency bill, taking money away from Social Security and other spending we could do; or we will roll it together in some sort of omnibus bill at the end of the year as we did last year with all kinds of extraneous spending.

Unfortunately, you suffer the brunt of the conclusions of people like me and maybe some others who approach you from a different point of view. But because of that we need to express ourselves and try to get the attention of people all over Washington to try to pull this together and come up with some resolution of the matter.

Ms. KAPTUR. But that is my question to the gentleman. Obviously there is a problem on your side of the aisle. What is the mechanism for you to solve that problem internal to your caucus without dividing us on this floor? You had a budget. You did 13 appropriation allocations. What went wrong?

Mr. CASTLE. Reclaiming my time, it is not, and I say this respectfully—I do not want to pick a political fight today particularly—it is not just on this side of the aisle. For example, the OMB director, Mr. Lew, has said he is going to slam Republicans today for deep, unwarranted cuts in funding, yet he will insist that the GOP resist the temptation to raise the budget caps this year. That is probably a strategy that maybe your side of the aisle will use as well.

The bottom line is it involves all of us. If we are going to resolve this problem, it involves all of us. Yes, I think my side of the aisle should be involved, they should go down to the White House, too, but we should all be talking about this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) has again expired.

(On request of Ms. KAPTUR, and by unanimous consent, Mr. Castle was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Ms. KAPTUR. I do not know what the White House has to do with this. The budget process is for us, the Budget Committee of the House, the Budget Committee of the other body. We do our budget, we get our allocations. What I do not understand, nobody has been able to explain to me in 2 days, if you do not agree with the budget allocations that have been given, why do you not go back and do the budget?

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), they were out here yesterday, they voted with the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) on the amendments that he brought up. And I am standing here thinking, "Wait a minute, they gave us the budget marks that we used in our committee, so now why are they voting against their own

marks?" I do not understand. What is not working? Which committee is not working over there? The Budget Committee? They already did the work. They gave us the marks. How do we avoid what is going on here?

Does the gentleman understand my question?

Mr. CASTLE. I do understand your question. Reclaiming my time, I am going to try to answer your question.

The system of budgeting in this country in general has failed in many ways. I believe that the emergency appropriations, in which the White House was very involved, was a series of expenditures beyond what we should have done, cutting into what could have been used for Social Security and what could have been used for other spending. I believe that the omnibus bill that passed at the end of last year, and the President is involved in that, I am not saying it disrespectfully but the President is involved in that, was a bill which went well beyond any dollars that we should have spent in the course of the year because the President wanted to spend more.

I am cognizant of the fact that the President is going to want to spend more in my judgment by the end of this year. As I said, sometime in October or November, that is going to happen. The executive branch is always involved in decisions such as this. It is a political war going on. The White House is saying, "Don't break the budget caps." And the House and the Senate are saying, "Well, we're not going to break the budget caps."

But we are coming up with a methodology that is ultimately going to lead to that happening and it is going to have to happen at the end of the year. I do not think that is proper. I am not excusing what we are doing here, but I am also not going to say that the White House is not involved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) has again expired.

(On request of Ms. KAPTUR, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CASTLE was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. If the gentleman will yield further, I would forget the White House. My advice to your side of the aisle is: You have the majority. You do the budget you want to do. If you have got a problem with the other side over there, with the S-e-n-a-t-e, then deal with whatever that is. I do not know who is cutting the deals for you, but do not do this to our bill. I do not understand. The gentleman's party has the majority. You can produce whatever bill you want.

Mr. CASTLE. To suggest that the President of the United States should not be involved in the resolution of the spending of the United States, including the budget allocations, as well as all other decisions which are being made on Social Security and Medicare and tax cuts and whatever else we do, is to presume that the President is

powerless. And this President is not powerless. The White House is a major player in this.

It is simply not just the prerogative of the majority here or even a majority and a minority together here. It is something that should be worked out with everybody sitting down to try to make a difference. I say that constructively. I do not say it in a political sense. I say it entirely constructively.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

First of all, having only been here three terms, I do understand, though, the process with the budget, and the budget resolution is a document that is approved by both bodies of Congress and does not need to have the President of the United States' signature on it, and is a blueprint for then how the committees on appropriations should go about doing their work. It is at that point when the committees on appropriations are doing their work and working its way through Congress and approving those bills, they are sent on to the White House, and then the White House determines whether to veto it or sign it into legislation. So I do not want to get too far along in that discussion, but I thought it was appropriate for some of those that may not be as familiar with the process.

I want to thank the gentlewoman and also the chairman of the subcommittee for the work that they have done in achieving the budget resolution and levels that they were given by leadership and by the Committee on the Budget. I appreciate the work that they put into it.

I also appreciate the amendments by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and those that seek to address the issue of the budget overall in agriculture, because I think frankly it gives the agriculture community an opportunity to talk about agriculture. Sometimes in our country we just take agriculture for granted. We think it is a produce aisle at Shop 'N' Save or some large chain, but it is families out there that are working hard, trying to make ends meet and carrying on from one generation to another. A lot are participating in a 4H program and a lot of other activities throughout rural America that I think make the quality of life second to none.

I think though in proposing these amendments, and not being as familiar with the research that goes on at our land grant institutions, I wanted to come to the floor to better explain and to seek your understanding in regards to wood utilization research. Presently the State of Maine has an excess of over 22 million acres. The State of Maine has a small population and does not have a population base to be able to spend as much money on pavement as a lot of other States.

So in the State of Maine we have a very good research and development entity at the University of Maine, and they have been studying wood utilization so that we would be able to use a

lower grade wood with a laminate added to it to be able to be used in bridge construction. We are looking at being able to use an awful lot of that because in the islands and traveling around the State of Maine, it is one thing to make sure the roads are smooth but it is another thing to be able to get from here to there. If you do not have the proper bridge and the stress that goes with all of that, then you are not going to be able to do that. The research at the University of Maine is allowing that to happen.

It is also involved in doing environmental work to reduce the amount of chlorine that is used in processing. A lot of the wood that we do have in our State of Maine is of a higher grade and to be able to add value to that, we are creating a lot more in-State processing. By having a State which has natural resources be able to add value to those natural resources is reducing higher unemployment, which happens to be in more of the rural areas where we see a lot of our natural resources exported and processed elsewhere because of the processing that has been provided. We do not have that within our State and in a lot of rural States.

So by being able to have the technology and the research, now companies are lining up around that research to then add to the construction and reconstruction efforts, to add to the employment and additional employment of better paying jobs in a part of rural America and rural Maine where there is higher unemployment. This research does mean an awful lot to the people who are working in those areas.

At the same time, because of an environmental concern about the number of trees that get cut, by being able to add more value to what you are doing with your natural resources, you find yourself in a situation of not needing as many of those natural resources because of being able to add value on it. So that means that we have people who are not just out there cutting the trees to gain income but they are also working in the in-State processing and value added of that product to get a higher value out of it, better paying jobs and benefits. And more of that is occurring on our side of the border rather than on the other side of the border. So a lot of this research is being done and I think it is important.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCI) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BALDACCI was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BALDACCI. So I think it is important, though, because at first blush it may not have the understanding that it would by reading it. I think it is important that we do explain it, not only for those that may wonder about it but there may be others that have some concern about it. I appreciate the opportunity and the work that has gone into this.

(On request of Mr. SANFORD, and by unanimous consent, Mr. BALDACCI was

allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BALDACCI. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I would agree, there certainly is a lot of valid research in any of the land grant colleges. My particular reason for offering this amendment, though, ties to part of the research goes, for instance, into better harvesting methods. Though Maine does not have the mosquitoes that South Carolina has, I know that you have a few mosquitoes in the summer.

The old saying is, necessity is the mother of invention. I cannot imagine a more resourceful person than that person laying under a logging truck or laying under a skidder, getting bit up by a mosquito—you have those—we call them dog ticks in South Carolina, they will be the size of your thumb coming at you. That person is going to be pretty resourceful in coming up with the quickest way to move a tree from a stump to a mill.

The reason for this amendment was not to in any way discount some of the valuable research that takes place but to say there is also some stuff that is probably extraneous and probably better done by the Joe Youngs of the world in Georgetown, South Carolina.

□ 1300

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Chairman, just gaining back an opportunity, I do appreciate that, and I would just like to say for public relations purposes the mosquitoes in Maine are not that big, even though they are called black flies, and so if my colleague is interested in coming to Maine rather than South Carolina, he can enjoy that.

The second thing is that what the gentleman has helped to do as a Member of Congress, and many other Members, is that now all of a sudden it just does not go out and the research is done through this money, but this money is matched by industry and by private support, and it is actually in collaboration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCI) has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BALDACCI was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Chairman, last year the University of Maine received about 890,000 in Federal funds, matched with 500,000 in programs support, and industry provided in kind support an additional 250. So the collaboration is there, so it is not being just done by the university and by the money that is being provided here, it is a collaborative effort which has been forged, I believe recently, which I think is going to lend more value because there is actually going to also be an economic gain from that.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDACCI. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to state for the record that the gentleman clarified something very important that I would like to put on the RECORD, and that is the industrial fund match in each of these centers: at Mississippi State, an average of \$783,458 for the last 5 years; Oregon State University, over \$670,000; Michigan State University, \$605,000, and the list goes on. We will submit it for the RECORD.

But the point is there are not only industry matches, there are also State matches. So this is truly a Federal, State, private sector cooperative program, and I thank the gentleman for coming to the floor.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) for his leadership on the floor and for holding this colloquy with me to clarify the Agriculture Research Service funding level for rainbow trout research.

Is it correct that the chairman's amendment offered in subcommittee markup provided that within the funds provided to the Agriculture Research Service the committee recommends an increase of \$500,000 for research at the University of Connecticut on developing new aquaculture systems focused on the rainbow trout?

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Ms. DELAURO. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct, and this is a typographical error. The amendment adopted in the subcommittee clearly stated \$500,000. I regret the error, and I do welcome this opportunity to set the record straight.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I just wanted to say for the record there was some references made a little bit earlier to the role of this House and the other body in preparing a budget and approving a budget, the role of the White House. I just wanted to mention that normally the way government at the Federal level works is that the Congress prepares and passes bills.

The President can propose, but it is our job to dispose, and when we finish our work, and it is ours to finish, we send it to the White House, and under the Constitution he has only two options: sign the bill or veto the bill.

So I do not really understand all this extralegal negotiation that may be referenced here on the floor and so forth. We have our job to do, and we ought to do it, and if the President does not like what we do, then let him use his constitutional powers to veto and we will override, or we will come back to the drawing board and do this again.

But truly we are not meeting our constitutional responsibilities through the kind of dilatory tactics that we have experienced now on the floor for over 2 days. I do not remember when I have seen a bill, an appropriations bill for certain, come to the floor with hundreds of amendments filed on one particular subcommittee like this one.

So I just wanted to say to the leadership of this institution, "Do your job, send the bill over to the White House, and if they don't like it, let them veto it. If they like it, let them sign it. But let's not be bound up by some sort of private conversations which none of us here on this floor are party to. Let's do our job. That's our constitutional responsibility."

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. The objection to spending, now 10 hours of debate on a \$61 billion spending bill in the Committee of the Whole, the House, the whole House; that is why we do appropriations, so we can have it in the Committee of the Whole.

So my colleague's objection is that we should not spend this time, or our purpose in trying to keep us under the spending totals that we all made a commitment to? Which of those two does she object to, because I am having trouble understanding.

My colleague knows what my purpose is. My purpose is to not to allow \$1 of Social Security money to be spent when we have all said we would not spend it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, if I might reclaim my time, I think the gentleman's purpose is to bring an interfamily fight within his party on the floor of this Congress. I am still having a little trouble understanding that fight.

But we met the budget numbers our colleagues gave us in the bill we have brought to this floor. We dealt with hundreds of Members. We had all kinds of testimony. We dealt with every Member respectfully. We dealt with all kinds of interests across this country in crafting this bill.

We are happy to have some attention, but it is interesting to me that there is just about a handful of Members with amendments to this bill. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) has hundreds of amendments, and what I cannot figure out from what I have heard, and it is very confusing to me, people on his side saying he does not like the budget that his party prepared, so he is down here now trying to pick it apart and using our bill as the excuse.

I do not understand. If my colleague has the votes, he should go back in his cloakroom and work out his own budget, and bring us back a repaired budget. But what he is doing is, he is making us a victim of some sort of squabble I still do not truly understand inside his party.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. What I find interesting about that is, let us assume it took 20 hours we have been on the floor, what the gentleman from Oklahoma is trying to do is basically save \$200 million. I mean, that is over \$10 million an hour that he would be saving the taxpayer. To me, that would be time well spent.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to say to the gentleman that under the budget they produced, we have done our job. We have met their budget mark. We are not the problem. He is making us a victim. He is anticipating the problem to come with some other bills. Well, if the gentleman does not like the marks on those bills, go fix that, but why is the gentleman making us the victim?

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, would the ranking member please yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. My intention is not to make the gentlewoman a victim, I promise her, and I cannot imagine, as well as I know her, that she would ever be a victim of what we are trying to do.

Ms. KAPTUR. We are today, we were yesterday.

Mr. COBURN. The process is the victim. And I agree with the gentlewoman, I agree that the process is the victim; and our intention is, there is nothing wrong with the budget, there is plenty wrong with the process.

Ms. KAPTUR. What process? The gentleman's process?

Mr. COBURN. The gentlewoman must know that I profess to be an Oklahoman and a conservative before I ever profess to be a Republican, but I will say to this woman the process is, and she has already readily agreed, that there probably are not a lot of these other 302(b) allocations, the amount of money that is allocated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) has expired.

(On request of Mr. COBURN, and by unanimous consent, Ms. KAPTUR was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. They are probably not going to be agreeable to the gentlewoman because we are not going to be able to take care of our veterans under 302(b) allocations.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, within the gentleman's structure, he decided what those levels were. Now he is saying he does not agree. On this side of the aisle we have to act in good faith with the budget the gentleman's party has given us.

I am saying to my colleague, if he does not like what he was given, other than coming down here and doing this,

does he not have some other amending process he can do on his side, inside his caucus, to produce the budget that he wants?

Mr. COBURN. If the gentlewoman would yield, if we had that capability, we would not be here.

Ms. KAPTUR. But they prepared the budget. It is their budget.

Mr. COBURN. The 302(b) allocations are prepared by certain groups within here, and those are the ones we object to. It is not the budget that we object to.

Ms. KAPTUR. Well, which party are they in? Is it the majority party?

Mr. Chairman, I would like the record to show it is the majority party that prepares the budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 185, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COBURN:

Page 13, line 11, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$300,000)".

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, Oklahoma is the leading producer in this country of Spanish peanuts. Last year peanut production in this country coming off the farm generated \$1 billion in revenue. The cost of peanuts in our country and the products that come from there end up being twice as high as they are worldwide.

Now, this amendment asks the question, we have a subsidized peanut program in this country that generates a billion dollars of revenue off the farm each year for peanuts. Why would we want to spend \$300,000 on peanut competitiveness when we already know the reasons why we are not competitive in peanuts? It is because we have an oversupply and that we have tried to manage the problems with this oversupply through a subsidy program.

Again, here is \$300,000 that is directed for research on why we are not competitive worldwide on peanuts when we already know the answer. So I would again go back to the fact that here is \$300,000 that could be better spent, that could be better directed at other areas of research, that could in fact be used to help farmers directly rather than to set up a competitive research program when we already clearly know the answer.

The problem in peanuts is, we have to slowly wean away from this false market, and we all know that; and as my colleagues know, I do not want a peanut producer in my State to have to go out of business.

I understand the friction and the rub associated with these big problems for our farmers, but to turn around and to spend that kind of money in terms of our subsidy programs, and then to turn around, and those are mandatory spending, to turn around and to spend \$300,000 to tell us what we already know makes no sense.

I would rather see that \$300,000 go directly to farmers, corn farmers, wheat farmers, soybean farmers or cattle ranchers who are competing with a market that is coming in from Canada, that ignores any type of testing, any type of standards that the rest of our ranchers have to have.

If we really want our ag research directed to help our farmers, then we will not have \$300,000 set up for competitive peanut research, and instead we will spend that money somewhere else.

We do. We are demonstrating that we trust the committee because we are not taking this total amount out of the research. We are saying put it somewhere else, but do not spend it on a program that keeps us at the seat of political favors rather than at the best efforts for our farmers.

As my colleagues know, the real debate is, we have allocations of money set for agriculture that I think is really a little too much. That is what I have been trying to do, get \$250 million out of this bill because I think that is the only way we are going to meet our commitment to the seniors of not spending their money. But colleagues cannot claim that they did their job for the whole Congress, we as a body and the Committee of the Whole, if we meet a 302(b) here knowing that we have no intentions of meeting those allocations, that 302(b) allocation, on the four biggest bills that are going to come before us. It is not intellectually honest for us to say that.

We know that this committee has worked hard. I am sorry that we are where we are, but the fact is, if we made a commitment when the Democrat budget was offered, the commitment was made not to touch Social Security money. When the Republican budget was offered, the commitment was made not to touch Social Security. When the President's budget was offered, which I offered because nobody from the other side would offer his budget, two Members of this House agreed to spend 38 percent of the Social Security money.

They are the only two people in this body that have the right to have this process go through the way it is setting up, because they already said, "We don't believe you can do that. We believe we ought to spend more money." The rest of us voted to say we would not spend one penny of Social Security surplus.

□ 1315

So for us to be in the position where we are going to allow a process to go forward that we know is going to deny the American people what we want

them to have is the very thing that I am tired of in Washington.

It is my hope that we will return to the American people the confidence they deserve to have in this body. And if we say we are not going to spend their Social Security money, we should not spend it.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am searching in the report for the language that would be stricken by this amendment. I am searching in vain. I wonder if the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) could assist me in finding the line where this item exists. It says, page 13, line 11. However, we cannot seem to find it in the report.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINCHEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, the clerk has actually read the wrong line items. It is actually page 14, line 16. The Clerk read page 13, line 11. Our amendment was actually page 14, line 16. They happen to have the same amount of money, and therefore it was read as an inappropriate amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment and offer the amendment as offered on the right line item.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, if the gentleman chooses to withdraw the amendment, I will not object, but if he is planning to insert it elsewhere, then I will object because right now the amendment is basically void, am I not correct, Mr. Chairman, since it is an inappropriate amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will not interpret the substantive effect of an amendment offered by a Member.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, I would inquire of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), is my good friend planning to offer this amendment elsewhere?

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have every intention of withdrawing this amendment and reoffering it. Whether the gentleman objects or not, I will still have the privilege of reoffering the amendment.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the gentleman is an incessant campaigner for his cause. With that, I will withdraw my reservation of objection and let the gentleman withdraw the amendment.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COBURN:

Page 14, line 16, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$300,000)".

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak to the intent of the gentleman's previous amendment, and I hope the gentleman is about to reoffer it so that I may do so and not move on to another section.

Mr. COBURN. Absolutely, Mr. Chairman. I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) for his courtesies.

Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief in what I have to say about this amendment. We have a \$300,000 expenditure for peanut competitiveness. We have a subsidized peanut program that produces \$1 billion worth of raw peanuts off the farm a year. The prices of peanut-graded products in our country are higher than what they would be if we did not have a subsidized peanut program.

I have voted in the past for the subsidized peanut program. I have lots of peanut farmers. That does not mean in the future that we should not try to change that and wean that to a competitive model where we have the appropriate amount of production and a competitive international model on that.

My point with this amendment is we know why we are not competitive on peanuts; why would we want to fund \$300,000 to answer that question?

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as a representative from the great peanut State of Georgia, I rise to oppose the amendment as offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

This National Competitive Center for Peanuts, one would envision by that title a building of bricks and mortar when it in fact is not. This goes into funding research at the University of Georgia, the purpose being to find out if there are more efficient ways to produce peanuts. It is legitimate agricultural research, as is the type of research that we do on a myriad of other crops and fibers and foodstuffs all over the country.

One of the great challenges that we have on this Subcommittee on Agriculture is funding research which is open to easy ridicule. For example, if this committee funds something that has to do with the mating habits of the screw, it is a great sound bite for Jay Leno and it is a great article for the Reader's Digest to say "Look at what these idiots are doing, they are researching the sex life of bugs."

And it is funny, and we all have a big laugh about it, and somebody from the other body says to the President, veto this obvious pork. Yet, to the families

of America who eat groceries every day, it is very important.

They might not think this immediately benefits them. But I can promise my colleagues that agriculture research benefits every American household. Because, unlike some folks in the media and some folks in the other body, our constituents in this side of the legislature have to eat. And the more one knows about food, the more one can effectively and inexpensively produce it. That is why we do peanut research. That is why we do corn research. That is why we do bug research. This is part of a bigger picture.

Mr. Chairman, we know that the learned and distinguished and conservative gentleman from Oklahoma's real purpose here is to cut spending. But we also know that this bill, while it can be nickled and dimed here and there and questioned here and there, and things can be pulled out for micro inspection and therefore ridiculed, we know that this bill is within the spending budget.

This bill is within the bipartisan agreement that was signed off by the President of the United States, that was signed off by the House leadership: The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Gingrich). It was signed off and adhered to by the ranking member and the chairman of this subcommittee and all of the Democrat and all the Republican members. We have fulfilled our mission. We have come in at goal. We hope that other subcommittees do the same thing.

The objective of the gentleman from Oklahoma is not necessarily to pick on peanuts, but it is to criticize this bill. We are saying, you know what? The bill might not be perfect, but it comes in at the right price, and it is about 80 percent as good as one can get it in a legislative body of 435 people coming from all over the United States representing the great 260 million people in America.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I would strongly urge my colleagues to soundly reject this amendment. Not for the sake of peanuts, not for the sake of peanut competitiveness, but for the bigger future, the bigger purpose of putting food on the family breakfast, lunch and dinner tables across America. Because we, unlike other nations, only spend 11 cents on the dollar on our groceries. Other countries spend 20, 25 cents, 30 cents, 40 cents. Other places even less fortunate than that spend all day long scratching out a living only to get food on their table.

Agriculture research, Mr. Chairman, is very important. It is part of our agriculture picture, and fortunately, we have very few people as a percentage of our population going to bed hungry at night, but it is because of important agriculture research, as well as this farm program.

Now, the gentleman talked about peanut subsidies. I would remind him that peanut subsidies are not there anymore. The peanut program is a pro-

gram, and yes, it is an elaborate program, and no, it is not the model for capitalism and free market. But what it does do, it allows young people to go back home and farm for a living, because they know if they can make a profit on peanuts, then they can also grow corn, soybeans and hogs/pork which they cannot make a living off of.

Protect America's farmers. Vote "no" on this.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The Federal Administration grant that this amendment proposes to eliminate is described in detail in part 4 of the committee's hearing record on page 1701. The following is a brief description of the research performed under the grant.

The grant supports an interdisciplinary research and education program to enhance the competitiveness of the U.S. peanut industry by examining alternative production systems, developing new products and new markets, and improving product safety.

The project helps peanut producers be more competitive in the global market. In the first year of the project, 1998, a computerized expert system was adapted for handheld computers that were used to help farmers reduce pest control costs. In addition, economic factors were added to a computerized disease risk management system which includes a large number of factors involved in the onset of a very destructive wilt. For every one-point improvement in the "wilt index," a farmer's net income is increased by \$9 to \$14 an acre. USDA funds were used to leverage an additional \$124,000 for research by the Center for Peanut Competitiveness.

Thank goodness that they do not use smaller print on this thing, nobody could read it.

Grants for this work have been reviewed annually and have been awarded each year since 1998. This work is performed at the University of Georgia and involves cooperation from Auburn University in Alabama.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good project and it deserves the support of all Members. I support the project, and I oppose the gentleman's amendment to eliminate it.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the Center for Peanut Competitiveness is in its third year for a program that provides critical research addressing several aspects of the peanut industry, including production development, production practices, safety, economics, and other areas that contribute to the competitiveness of the U.S. peanut farmer. At a time when profit margins for farmers are collapsing, at a time when farmers are choosing whether they will sell their family farms or not, it is incomprehensible to take research money from a center that works for the universities in Georgia and in Alabama to help farmers help themselves.

I say to my colleagues, in case we have not noticed, we are in a global economy, a complicated system where information and technology is our key

to survival. In my district alone, information on how to be more competitive or how to market one's product more effectively can be the difference between the bank taking your grandfather's farm or being able to keep it.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on this in support of the American farmer. I would like to point out that I have listened to this debate for over 10 hours, and the lack of knowledge on the part of the people offering these amendments is startling.

First of all, there is no peanut subsidy. There has not been for a number of years. It is a no-cost program. In addition to that, it provides \$83 million in deficit reduction through the year 2002. In 1996, the peanut farm bill made major changes in the program. We have done that. The program supports 30,000 American jobs.

I am just appalled at what has gone on, frankly, in this House for the last few days. People are nitpicking this appropriations process. What for? At the end of the day do they want to say "I told you so"? This is a self-righteous indulgence by a very few people in this House and ought not be happening.

□ 1330

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, if there was ever a sensible amendment, this one is it. I do not know what could be more clear cut.

How many think it would be a good idea to put \$300,000 to efforts to study democracy in Cuba? How many think it would be a good idea to put \$300,000 to study the democracy that exists in Iraq? How many think it would be a good idea to put \$300,000 to study good government in Libya? None of them exist. That is exactly what this amendment is about.

This is a study of \$300,000 for competitiveness in peanuts, which is something which does not exist. We have a market quota system. If you have a quota, you basically get to sell your peanuts for double, more or less double the price of anybody else.

For instance, I grew up on a farm down in Beaufort County, down in South Carolina. I am trying to pass on a few of those traits to my boys.

Can I imagine my boys raising peanuts in the backyard, and then being penalized simply because they do not have a quota? What this quota means, if you happen to live in Los Angeles, if you happen to live in Chicago, if you happen to live in New York and you have a quota, you can sell that quota. So you have fat cat quota owners that basically get double what somebody else does simply because they have the quota.

That is not something that makes sense, but more significantly, what it says is this amendment does make sense, because to spend \$300,000 studying competitiveness in something that is fundamentally not competitive is big government, at best.

That is what this amendment does. It makes common sense. It highlights, I think, the lunacy of some of the quota systems we have in place.

Can Members imagine a watermelon quota system? If you have a quota with watermelons, you can sell your watermelons for what my boys can raise them for in the backyard.

Can Members imagine a cantelope quota system? If you have the quota you can live in New York City, you can sell your right to produce quota cantelopes to somebody who is down struggling on the farm. This is something that penalizes the family farmer.

Again, this is not something that makes sense. It is the equivalent of saying let us spend \$300,000 studying the democracy that exists in Cuba, \$300,000 studying the democracy in Iraq. We do not have competitiveness in the peanut program. This simply says, let us admit that and not spend \$300,000 of taxpayer money on something that does not exist.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of my friend, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EVERETT). Having listened to the last speaker, my friend, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD), I want to reiterate the problem that we have here in many of us not understanding the issues.

Just the instance that my friend, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) talked about with the absentee owners of quotas, he should know that the 1996 farm bill that he voted for changed that system in the peanut program. It was wrong to have it that way, and it was changed.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to say, I have been listening to the debate over the last couple of days of some of the amendments that we have before us. As I went home last night and began to think about the bigger picture, this thought came to my mind.

This country is the greatest country in the world because of the technology that we have developed, the money we have spent on research, in every aspect of our lives, whatever it be.

We are the greatest military power in the world because our research and development has developed technology that enables us to be that. We have the greatest medical community in the world because of the medical research that has been done in this country, mostly in our public universities with public money, to establish us as the greatest provider of medical services in the world.

Our agricultural industry is the greatest in the world because of the research and development, and most all of it has been in our public universities over the years. Our industrial basis the same way.

What we have seen in the last couple of days is an attack on our research and development to develop new technology to continue for us to advance into the 21st century.

I would strongly urge that Members defeat the amendment which is before us as it is simply another attack on research dollars which will enable us to continue to advance and be the greatest Nation in the world.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the last couple of days have been somewhat frustrating for a number of us who find that due to some of our committee responsibilities and some of our interests in agriculture, we are finding ourselves going through this.

I need to make it clear to the gentleman from Oklahoma that I have no qualms whatsoever with his rights to do what it is that he is doing.

I have heard a lot of comments here. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) mentioned earlier, and I do not know if he is on the floor, but that Members need to be sure to come over and support or defend the attacks that were being leveled on various projects in various districts, as if they were all personal and the work would not be done if it was not being done in that particular district.

It has to be done somewhere. I think probably it is done a lot better out in the communities, rather than it is in Washington, always.

I do not have any defense that I need to make of this particular amendment. We do not do any peanut research in my district. But I do want to say that I do not feel terribly comfortable in the fact that if each person came over and did defend an attack that was being made, that that would be sufficient to some of the proponents of some of the amendments to make dramatic cuts.

I was the chairman in the last Congress of the Subcommittee on Risk Management, Research, and Specialty Crops, the first time that that title had been reauthorized in a number of years.

We spent a great deal of time looking at the value and the significance and the importance, not only to American agriculture but to the entire American population that eat, about the strides and about the accomplishments and about the progress and the success that agriculture research has made. I think it probably is some of the best money that is spent.

Now some people have said, well, we could best take this and give it to farmers and buy tractors or whatever. That is not part of the proposal. The proposal is not to take, in this case, \$300,000 and give it to anybody, it is to simply eliminate it. So that argument in itself is somewhat hollow.

I do not believe that intentionally people are trying to do harm to a significant number of very important programs that the chairman of this subcommittee and the ranking member of this subcommittee spent hours deliberating over to try to come up with a balance within what they were told they had to work with.

Some people do not like that, but that is what they were told they had to

work within, and they did it. They did a very good balance of a number of very longtime continuing programs and some new programs. But I hope that we do not totally limit ourselves just to things that have always been done in the past; that we look at how we can do them better, that we look at new programs that ought to be brought into place, that we look at things that should be done on behalf of American agriculture with a very, very limited budget and the very, very small amount that is expended on agriculture.

I would hope that while the gentleman may continue for as long as he can hold out offering his amendments, that this body, that this committee, and that in the full House, we would take a very close look at a very well-defined product, and not let one and two and three here nitpick and pull this thing apart and totally disrupt what it is that we are trying to do, not only on behalf of American agriculture but the American people, who have the best quality food, the safest quality food, and the cheapest food of anybody in the world.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise reluctantly, because I have the greatest respect for my fellow colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), and he is one of the brightest men I have ever met, and one of the men that is committed to a lot of different causes.

But I could not let this debate go by without taking a few moments to make some remarks about agriculture. I grew up on a peanut farm. I have no financial interest in peanuts, except I do like peanut butter and have Oklahoma peanuts in my pocket. I have studied peanuts most of my life and agriculture most of my life. Because I have a couple of degrees in agriculture, I have an emotional tie about the agriculture position in this country, not just a political one.

Years ago our Founding Fathers set the Morrill Act, which established our land grant universities. One of the most important things they did with the land grant universities is they set up research farms, and those research farms were connected with other private sector farms and private sector research facilities.

Those land grant universities, through that research coupled with the extension agents or county agents, and also with our agriculture teachers, allowed us to make agriculture a role model for transferring technology to use on the farm.

What happened was we had the greatest technology transfer ever recorded in the history of our country, as we developed a food production system, unmatched by any country in the world, which is allowing us today to stay somewhat competitive in world trade.

It was caused to happen because of the dollars in research that came about

through our land grant universities, like Oklahoma State University. They have done a tremendous amount of research with peanuts and the peanut program.

The peanut program has changed a great deal in the last few years. If a lot of other of our agriculture programs were set up like the peanut program, it would not be costly to the government at all. But unfortunately, that is not the case.

I predict to the Members that somewhere in the near future in agriculture we will be producing a quota for this country, and then we will have a nonquota amount for the international marketplace.

As an agriculturist I was taught how to grow four blades of grass instead of one. We have done that in production agriculture in America.

On April 9, I had a meeting of the Agriculture Round Table leaders in Oklahoma. We talked about what were the policies we were faced with and what were the problems. It was not production. That was not even scored as a problem. It was not the actual finances that many were confronted with. It was the agricultural policy of our government, and also the marketing. We have got to be able to learn to market through value-added activities, to meet the markets around the world.

We are in a global competitive world. The European Union spends nearly 75 percent of their budget on subsidizing agriculture, in the production of E.U. agriculture and also subsidizing export markets. We do not have free markets in agriculture. We have to be able to market, and research has to allow us to be competitive in those markets around the world.

I stand in support of, agriculture research dealing with peanuts. Probably not too much of peanut research is done with the land grant universities in Oklahoma anymore, but we do a lot of agency interchanging with other land grant universities in order to try to meet the needs of the peanut farmers in Oklahoma and helping them be competitive in the international market.

We have a value-added program at Oklahoma State University today that through research, we are being able to do more and more to allow our farmers and ranchers to benefit with greater profits, instead of just being efficient in production. I wanted to stand in support of this research for peanuts. It is important to Oklahoma agriculture.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I will be brief. I will not take all the time. I think most of us know where we are going to be on this bill or this amendment. It is a lot like a lot of the others. The proponent may have his own agenda, but I think we need to have the agenda for America.

If we did away with all the research in every bill that makes a difference in

America, where would America be today? Where would we be without research for transportation, research in medical technology, research that comes from our science programs, and all the research for our farmers? Where would we be today in terms of opportunity for food and fiber?

I strongly oppose this amendment. The peanut farmers are really the backbone of our economy in some of the poorest counties in the southern and eastern part of this country. For people to come to this floor and say that they are not going to hurt farmers, they just do not understand what they are talking about, or otherwise they are attempting to mislead.

This Congress, this Congress in 1995, when some of the very Members were offering these amendments to distribute to farmers the research to help them stay in business, passed the farm bill, they entered into a contract with the farmers. They said, for 7 years we are going to keep stable prices and they are going to go down. And they said to the peanut farmers, we are going to lower the rates. Where you are getting cut off, quotas are going to be reduced. Number three, the program will be open to new producers. Number four, out-of-State quota holders will be eliminated.

□ 1345

They voted on that, and now they want to come to this floor and eliminate that contract. In my opinion, that is a breach of faith, and this Congress ought not to do it. I do not think we are going to do it.

In return, they gave the farmers a farm bill that had virtually no safety net. We are seeing what is happening now across America; our farmers are in deep trouble.

Let me speak very quickly to peanut farmers and what this research money does. Peanut farmers face many obstacles and should not have to worry about paying the bills the way they do. If we get too much rain, they get soggy peanuts, and there is a loss. If they get a drought, they get dust instead of peanuts. There is no one there to help them.

They are hardworking people. They take great chances. They are the foundation of this country like every other farmer, whether they be in the Midwest, whether it be in the West or whether it be in the East or the South.

As I said yesterday when I took this floor very briefly, I am embarrassed for this Congress that we would take a bill that is here to make a difference for agriculture, and we are talking about research to make a difference in our future and the future of our children, to produce food and fiber at a cheaper price with less disease to help not only our people, but to help the people around the world, and we are saying we are doing it to save money.

I learned a long time ago, we can be penny wise and pound foolish. When my colleagues cut research, they are

penny wise and pound foolish. If they do it in research for medical technology and everything else, we could carry ourselves right back to the Stone Age. I am opposed to this amendment, and I ask every Member in this body to vote against it.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make a few comments. Obviously peanuts are not a big crop in Iowa. But it just struck me, I just spent a half an hour outside on the steps here with a group of FFA students from Ocheyedan, Iowa. We had a good conversation, and they asked a lot of questions about Congress, about the agriculture.

One young lady asked me, "What is the future of agriculture?" It is a difficult question to answer. I have to kind of go back in my own mind and see what has transpired.

When I graduated from high school in 1966, there were 50 kids in my class. When my daughter graduated from that same high school in 1995, there were 17 in her class. We are seeing a huge change in agriculture, in rural America. We are seeing communities shrink. The section where I still live, there used to be four families living on that section; now there is one. It is a huge change.

To try and answer the question of this young lady about what is the future, really the answer is that agriculture today is a business, and it has to be treated that way. The people who will be successful are people who are agribusiness people, not just farmers.

The only way that one can make good, sound decisions is to have adequate information. Mike Earl, the leader from Ocheyedan, Iowa, was talking about how that they are getting computers in their FFA classes, and they are learning how to use those computers, how to manage risk in the future.

But a key part of that is the information that will come in from our universities, unbiased information for these agribusiness people of the future to make sound decisions.

When I looked at that group, I did not just see 36 FFA kids from Ocheyedan, Iowa, I see the youth of America that is looking to us and asking what is agriculture's future for me. Whether it is in Georgia and they want to be a peanut farmer, whether they want to raise rice, whether they want to raise corn or soybeans or hogs or cattle or chickens or emus, whatever they want to do, it is a matter of getting good information, sound information, unbiased information.

The only place that one can find that, that is people believe, is from our university researches. That is why it is extraordinarily critical that we maintain our commitment to agricultural research, that whether it is peanuts, whether it is corn or soybeans or hogs in my district, we have got to maintain our support.

The future of agriculture, the future of sound agricultural policy for our young people, for a future for them, of safe food, ample supply for all Americans and for the rest of the world, depends on a lot on what we do here today.

So I would just ask everyone in the House here, this may look like a good little cutting amendment, but when my colleagues vote today, think about maybe those 36 FFA kids in Georgia who maybe will not have the kind of future that a lot of us hope we have in agriculture.

I am a farmer myself, and this means a great deal to me. But think about all of them; do not just think about one little amendment here. We have lived within our budget constraints. We have done everything to try and focus this research where it should be.

It is about the future of this country. It is about the future of safe food, of the supply that is available. It is for the success of our young people. Please do not do this.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATHAM. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, there is no greater friend of the farmers than the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM). He has been a consistent advocate of farmers; I profoundly respect that.

I think the particular amendment, though, of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) in no way cuts overall research funding, but simply cuts out what seems to be an oxymoron, and that is \$300,000 for competitiveness research in a quota-based system.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, you are going to hurt the future of agriculture with this amendment and all these other amendments.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the preceding speaker, my Republican friend and colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

I think that Members watching this debate ought to pay special attention to the bipartisan nature of the concern we are expressing. The House is, by its very nature, an urban institution, apportionment allocated by population. That means, those of us representing the country side have a particularly difficult task trying to convey why our issues matter.

I do not think anyone watching this spectacle continue to unfold has to have any doubt whatsoever that it is another case of urban interests, this time Republican urban interests, gang-ing up on agriculture. What is so astounding to me is that the majority leadership continues to let this debacle unfold.

I would ask all of my colleagues how they would feel if that which they care

about most in the appropriations bills would be taken apart on the floor, like the agriculture budget is being taken apart here. Bear in mind that this is an appropriations report, brought out by the gentleman from New Mexico (Chairman SKEEN), that is within the allocation. We have a distinguished Member that has done everything right in bringing his appropriations bill forward.

But now we have some Members indulging themselves in trying to play appropriators. They want to turn the floor of the House into an appropriations subcommittee. The thing that is most alarming is, they know not what they do. Will Rogers once said, "It is not what the gentleman does not know that scares me, it is what he knows for sure that just ain't so; that is the problem."

That is the problem with this slew of amendments, however well-intentioned they may be brought by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN). He might be trying to make some point, some broad macro budget point, some highly principled ideological point, but the real fact is, he is tearing apart the budget for agriculture at a time when family farmers are in the deepest hurt I have ever seen.

I have spent all my life in North Dakota. Agriculture is something that has been a part of me from the time I first formed any cognitive impressions of anything. This is not the time for the Congress of the United States to turn its back on the American farmer.

My colleagues can say what they want to about this being the fiscal year 2000 budget. We are talking today about something that is not going to apply for several months. To the American farmer, in their hour of need, my colleagues are playing politics, and they are trivializing that which they care about the most, their bread and butter, agriculture, family farming. This should stop.

As Members come to the House in a few minutes for votes, I hope they will stand with me and express just how they feel about this nonsense. It is our appropriations bill today; it could well be theirs tomorrow. I urge my colleagues to think about that.

To the majority leadership, as they come to the floor to vote, I hope they will sit and take stock of the spectacle that they have turned the floor of the House into. They are the leaders and they control this place.

To the extent that they allow a Member today to totally tie up this institution, they are unleashing a very unpredictable future course for the rest of this Congress, because what is important to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) this afternoon, there will be another issue of equally pressing importance to someone else further; and every appropriations bill about to be considered will be subject to this kind of debacle.

The Nation needs to have its work done. We do not need to turn the floor

of the House into a debating chamber for a very narrow spectrum of interests.

Finally, and for me most importantly, the American farmers need help, and it is wrong for the majority to turn its back on them in their hour of need.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Members are reminded that they are to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to other persons.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WOLF was allowed to speak out of order for 3 minutes.)

DO NOT LIFT EMBARGO ON GUM ARABIC IN
SUDAN

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I apologize to the Members to come, but I have been listening to the debate, and I support the bill, and I support the gentleman's efforts, but I just found out that the administration is getting ready to lift the gum arabic restrictions that are currently on Sudan.

This is a picture of a young boy that I took in 1989 in southern Sudan, and this young boy is probably dead, but if he is not dead, he has had a terrible life because almost two million people have died in Sudan since that time.

I supported this administration's efforts, some of their efforts in Kosovo with them going to the refugees. I voted to increase the amount of money for the refugees. But what about the Christians in Sudan? There is slavery in Sudan. This young boy's parents may have been in slavery and others.

I now find out that this administration and, I understand, John Podesta at the White House and powerful lobbyists that have been hired by special interests, are now trying to get this administration to lift this embargo with regard to gum arabic in Sudan.

So I urge, whenever this administration thinks of doing it today, not to do it on behalf of this boy, who is probably dead, but may be alive. Do not lift the embargo on gum arabic, because it is fundamentally immoral if they do. If they care about Kosovo and do not care about Sudan is doubly immoral.

I apologize to the Members, but I just heard this was coming up. I do rise in support of the bill.

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not represent any universities in this bill.

□ 1400

The gentleman knows where I am from, he used to live there, and we are good friends. The gentleman from Oklahoma, that is. Eighteen years ago when I first ran for Congress, I remember very vividly standing in a debate with my opponent and my opponent saying, "This guy comes out of the business world. What does he know about agriculture?" And I agreed with him, I did not know much about agriculture, but I knew one thing: that anyone who spent a dollar to grow

something that they got 95 cents back on, they were in a rotten business. And I kept saying that over and over again.

Now, I happen to meet with my farmers, and they are very small population-wise. They are very large geographically in my district, but very small as it relates to population. And when I go to meetings, whether it is the Farm Bureau or my farmers' advisory board, or whatever it is, guess what I see? Gray hair. Now, it is better than no hair, but it is gray hair that I see. I see very, very few young people.

Now, whether we knock out \$300,000 from this budget for research, whether that is going to do any harm to peanuts or not, we will just lay that aside. But let me tell my colleagues what it does do harm to, and this is why I came over here to get into this. It does harm to young people and to new people that want to farm.

I have to tell the people in the urban areas when they ask, "Why are you so interested in farming?" I tell them if we do away with the family farm, the people in the urban areas are going to know the real price of food, the real price of food, and that is why I worry. This is a symbol amendment. A symbol amendment, but I think it sends a message, and I would ask my colleagues to please vote against this amendment.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISISKY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. The gentleman does realize that this does not decrease total agricultural research by one penny. It just says we should not spend this money here. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SISISKY. Reclaiming my time, I would still say it sends the wrong message, and that is what I am concerned about.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment and just wish to say that the accumulation of amendments over the last 2 days, and I agree with my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SISISKY), ultimately results in a negative message to agricultural America and questioning whether or not we have made the right decisions.

Any Member has a right to question what any committee has done inside this Congress. However, one after another, after another, it is like, drip, drip, drip, in a situation today where rural America is in depression. The gentleman from Virginia made a good point. People are not getting 95 cents on a dollar. Farmers raising hogs in America today, it costs them 40 cents to break even, and last December they made 9 cents, and last March they made 28 cents; yet we go to buy chops in the store and they are going to run us \$2.26 to \$4 a pound and more. Who is making the money off that?

We end up with an agricultural system in this country where the person

at the bottom of the totem poll, the producer, the farmer, his or her access to market is controlled, if they are trying to sell pork, by six companies; if they are trying to sell beef, it is three companies; if they are trying to get something on the shelves of a supermarket today, they have to pay a slotting fee of \$20,000 or \$50,000.

I ask my colleagues, why when we go down a supermarket aisle and we look at the names of the soda pop on the shelves, why do only certain names reach us right in the eye? If there are local producers, why can they not get on those shelves? It is an interesting system. And why would America be in a condition today where imports are coming in here faster than exports going out? In fact, 25 percent of the market in this country in agricultural products now is comprised of imported goods. Why would that be, in the most productive Nation in the world?

It is because we have not paid enough attention to those who are actually doing the work of producing. All of the weight has gone to the processing and the distribution ends of the equation, but we have not paid attention to those who are really still struggling down on the farm and losing equity every day.

It does not matter whether we are talking about upland cotton or rice or hogs or wheat or oats or cattle or poultry. It really does not matter today because every single sector is hemorrhaging. Farmers are losing equity. Farm values have started to drop. Prices, probably this year they expect to be 27 percent below last year, and here we are nitpicking a bill that has come in within budget, within the allocation that we were given.

So I would just say to my colleagues, please, let us get back to the business of doing the work of this Congress, and particularly for that sector in America which is hemorrhaging today, which is rural America. Let us move this bill.

I understand today we are going to pull the bill and perhaps deal with it later. Further delay, adding to the delay that has contributed to all of the difficulties in rural America today, when the Department of Agriculture cannot get the paperwork properly processed because the supplemental came in so late last year, and the supplemental this year that was just passed came in months late and agriculture got tied up in that, unfortunately.

Let us deal with this bill with dispatch. If there is a budget problem, get rid of it. Deal with it in some other way, but do not make the farmers in America pay any heavier price than they have already paid. The average age of farmers in this country today is 55 and rising. The gentleman from Virginia was right, every young person who is still thinking about farming is saying, is that really worth my time?

So today I rise in opposition to this Coburn amendment. It is just one of many being offered to delay this bill. Why this is in the strategy of the lead-

ership of this Congress to delay this bill is beyond me. They have to power to fix everything. Let them go do it, and let the farmers of America have their presence felt here in this House.

I ask the membership to vote "no" on the Coburn amendment.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, despite all of the protests, this bill will not even go into effect until October 1. So no one is going to miss a payment, no one is going to miss a program, no farmer is going to be injured by delaying this process just a little bit.

And the issue, of course, is not whether or not farmers will ultimately be treated equitably by this Congress. The bipartisan agreement that we see here today means that we all want to help our farmers. But the real question before us is will we live within those spending caps; will we, in fact, balance the budget; will we, for the first time in my memory, perhaps in my lifetime, not actually steal from the Social Security Trust Fund? That is the issue that we are talking about. That is the issue we ought to focus on. And, ultimately, I think that is what a number of us want to see happen.

In fact, I believe that all of us want to see that happen. So if it means this bill is delayed by a day or two, that is regrettable, but I think in the end we will all be happy if we get a better product through the entire appropriation process, that abides by the spending caps, that saves Social Security and for the first time says to our kids, we mean what we say; we are going to try to preserve the Social Security system.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I want to reiterate what was said at the start of this debate; that this is a good bill. We are trying to make it better. That is number one. And that we believe in ag research. We are not trying to cut. Matter of fact, \$13 million was cut from ag research not by me but by the gentleman from Vermont last night. So we believe in those principles.

We also believe in another principle, and that is keeping our word. And keeping our word means we are not going to spend the first dollar of Social Security money anywhere else in this country except on Social Security. And so as we do that, this is a painful process, and I understand that it is not very tasteful for the Members of the Committee on Appropriations, but it is not directed towards them.

There is a benefit, however. There is nothing wrong with the American people finding out what is in these bills. And to say that there is something wrong with us talking about what is in the bills, discussing how we spend their

money, is a little bit arrogant for us as a body. This is the people's House. We should allow them to have all the light that they would like to have on what we do here, how we do it and where we spend our money.

So I want to just say I thank the gentleman for yielding me some time. This is about process and whether or not we are going to keep our word to the American people. We are going to keep our word to the American farmer. We are going to have the bill. We just passed \$12 billion in super, above-budget supplementary spending this last year for the farmers, and I voted for those. We just passed in the last month a comprehensive bill, and I agree with the gentlewoman from Ohio, we did not offset anything except in ag, and that is inappropriate. And when that bill came back to us, I voted against it because of that.

So we are going to do what we need to do by our farmers, but we are also going to do what we need to do for our seniors and for our children.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, and I am sure the gentleman from Oklahoma knows that sunshine is the best antiseptic, and allowing a little sunshine to shine on the appropriations process here in the Congress is not a bad thing. If it takes an extra day or two, so be it. In the end, I think we will all have a product that we can be more proud of, that we can defend when we go home to our constituents, and ultimately will keep that promise all of us have made to our kids, and that is that every penny of Social Security taxes should go only for Social Security.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 185, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) will be postponed.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 185, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) beginning on page 10;

Amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) on page 13;

Amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) on page 13;

Amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) on page 14.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 35, noes 390, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 158]

AYES—35

Barr	Franks (NJ)	Royce
Bass	Hayworth	Salmon
Biggert	Hostettler	Sanford
Bilbray	Luther	Sensenbrenner
Cannon	McInnis	Shadegg
Chabot	Miller (FL)	Shays
Collins	Miller, Gary	Smith (WA)
Cox	Paul	Sununu
Crane	Petri	Tancred
Delahunt	Ramstad	Taylor (MS)
Doggett	Rogan	Toomey
Duncan	Rohrabacher	

NOES—390

Abercrombie	Chambliss	Forbes
Aderholt	Chenoweth	Ford
Allen	Clay	Fossella
Andrews	Clayton	Fowler
Archer	Clement	Frank (MA)
Armey	Clyburn	Frelinghuysen
Bachus	Coble	Frost
Baird	Coburn	Gallegly
Baker	Combest	Ganske
Baldacci	Condit	Gejdenson
Baldwin	Conyers	Gekas
Ballenger	Cook	Gephardt
Barcia	Cooksey	Gibbons
Barrett (NE)	Costello	Gilchrest
Barrett (WI)	Coyne	Gillmor
Bartlett	Cramer	Gilman
Barton	Crowley	Gonzalez
Bateman	Cubin	Goode
Becerra	Cummings	Goodlatte
Bentsen	Cunningham	Goodling
Bereuter	Danner	Gordon
Berkley	Davis (FL)	Goss
Berman	Davis (IL)	Graham
Berry	Davis (VA)	Granger
Bilirakis	Deal	Green (TX)
Bishop	DeFazio	Green (WI)
Blagojevich	DeGette	Greenwood
Bliley	DeLauro	Gutierrez
Blumenauer	DeLay	Gutknecht
Blunt	DeMint	Hall (OH)
Boehler	Deutsch	Hall (TX)
Boehner	Diaz-Balart	Hansen
Bonilla	Dickey	Hastings (FL)
Bonior	Dicks	Hastings (WA)
Bono	Dingell	Hayes
Borski	Dixon	Hefley
Boswell	Dooley	Herger
Boucher	Doolittle	Hill (IN)
Boyd	Doyle	Hill (MT)
Brady (PA)	Dreier	Hilleary
Brady (TX)	Dunn	Hilliard
Brown (FL)	Edwards	Hinchey
Brown (OH)	Ehlers	Hinojosa
Bryant	Ehrlich	Hobson
Burr	Emerson	Hoeffel
Burton	Engel	Hoekstra
Buyer	English	Holden
Callahan	Eshoo	Holt
Calvert	Etheridge	Hooley
Camp	Evans	Horn
Campbell	Everett	Houghton
Canady	Ewing	Hoyer
Capps	Farr	Hulshof
Capuano	Fattah	Hunter
Cardin	Filner	Hutchinson
Carson	Fletcher	Hyde
Castle	Foley	Inslee

Isakson	Millender-McDonald	Sessions
Istook	Miller, George	Shaw
Jackson (IL)	Minge	Sherman
Jackson-Lee (TX)	Mink	Sherwood
Jefferson	Moakley	Shimkus
Jenkins	Mollohan	Shows
John	Moore	Shuster
Johnson (CT)	Moran (KS)	Simpson
Johnson, E. B.	Moran (VA)	Sisisky
Johnson, Sam	Murtha	Skeen
Jones (NC)	Nadler	Skelton
Jones (OH)	Napolitano	Slaughter
Kanjorski	Neal	Smith (MI)
Kaptur	Nethercutt	Smith (NJ)
Kelly	Ney	Smith (TX)
Kennedy	Northup	Snyder
Kildee	Norwood	Souder
Kilpatrick	Nussle	Spence
Kind (WI)	Oberstar	Spratt
King (NY)	Obey	Stabenow
Kingston	Olver	Stark
Klecza	Ortiz	Stearns
Klink	Ose	Stenholm
Knollenberg	Owens	Strickland
Kolbe	Packard	Stump
Kucinich	Pallone	Stupak
Kuykendall	Pascarell	Sweeney
LaFalce	Pastor	Talent
LaHood	Payne	Tanner
Lampson	Pease	Tauscher
Lantos	Pelosi	Tauzin
Largent	Peterson (MN)	Taylor (NC)
Larson	Peterson (PA)	Terry
Latham	Phelps	Thomas
LaTourette	Pickering	Thompson (CA)
Lazio	Pickett	Thompson (MS)
Leach	Pitts	Thornberry
Lee	Pombo	Thune
Levin	Pomeroy	Thurman
Lewis (CA)	Porter	Tiahrt
Lewis (GA)	Portman	Tierney
Lewis (KY)	Price (NC)	Towns
Linder	Pryce (OH)	Traficant
Lipinski	Quinn	Turner
LoBiondo	Radanovich	Udall (CO)
Lofgren	Rahall	Udall (NM)
Lowey	Rangel	Upton
Lucas (KY)	Regula	Velazquez
Lucas (OK)	Reyes	Vento
Maloney (CT)	Reynolds	Visclosky
Maloney (NY)	Riley	Walden
Manzullo	Rivers	Walsh
Markey	Rodriguez	Wamp
Martinez	Roemer	Waters
Mascara	Rogers	Watkins
Matsui	Ros-Lehtinen	Watt (NC)
McCarthy (MO)	Rothman	Watts (OK)
McCarthy (NY)	Roukema	Waxman
McCrery	Roybal-Allard	Weiner
McDermott	Rush	Weldon (FL)
McGovern	Ryan (WI)	Weldon (PA)
McHugh	Ryun (KS)	Weller
McIntosh	Sabo	Wexler
McIntyre	Sanchez	Weygand
McKeon	Sanders	Whitfield
McKinney	Sandlin	Wicker
McNulty	Sawyer	Wilson
Meehan	Saxton	Wise
Meek (FL)	Scarborough	Wolf
Meeks (NY)	Schaffer	Woolsey
Menendez	Schakowsky	Wu
Metcalf	Scott	Wynn
Mica	Serrano	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Ackerman	McCollum	Oxley
Brown (CA)	Morella	Young (AK)
Kasich	Myrick	

□ 1432

Messrs. KINGSTON, WELDON of Florida, LARGENT, BERMAN, SCARBOROUGH, and FOSSELLA changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. GARY MILLER of California and Mr. SUNUMU changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote

on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 93, noes 330, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No 159]

AYES—93

Archer	Goode	Pombo
Bachus	Goodlatte	Ramstad
Ballenger	Gordon	Reynolds
Barr	Graham	Riley
Barrett (WI)	Granger	Rogan
Bartlett	Green (TX)	Rohrabacher
Barton	Green (WI)	Roukema
Bass	Gutknecht	Royce
Biggert	Hall (TX)	Ryun (KS)
Blunt	Hayworth	Salmon
Boehner	Hefley	Sanford
Bono	Herger	Scarborough
Burton	Hilleary	Sensenbrenner
Campbell	Hoekstra	Sessions
Cannon	Hostettler	Shadegg
Chabot	Istook	Shays
Chenoweth	Jenkins	Sherwood
Coburn	Johnson, Sam	Smith (MI)
Collins	Jones (NC)	Spence
Cox	Largent	Sununu
Crane	Linder	Tancredo
Delahunt	Luther	Taylor (MS)
DeLay	Manzullo	Taylor (NC)
DeMint	McInnis	Terry
Doolittle	McIntosh	Thornberry
Duncan	Metcalf	Tiahrt
Dunn	Miller (FL)	Toomey
Fossella	Miller, Gary	Upton
Fowler	Myrick	Wamp
Franks (NJ)	Paul	Watts (OK)
Gibbons	Petri	Weldon (FL)

NOES—330

Abercrombie	Calvert	Dixon
Aderholt	Camp	Doggett
Allen	Canady	Dooley
Andrews	Capps	Doyle
Armey	Capuano	Dreier
Baird	Cardin	Edwards
Baker	Carson	Ehlers
Baldacci	Castle	Ehrlich
Baldwin	Chambliss	Emerson
Barcia	Clay	Engel
Barrett (NE)	Clayton	English
Bateman	Clement	Eshoo
Becerra	Clyburn	Etheridge
Bentsen	Coble	Evans
Bereuter	Combest	Everett
Berkley	Condit	Ewing
Berman	Conyers	Farr
Berry	Cook	Fattah
Bilbray	Cooksey	Filner
Bilirakis	Costello	Fletcher
Bishop	Coyne	Foley
Blagojevich	Cramer	Forbes
Bliley	Crowley	Ford
Blumenauer	Cubin	Frank (MA)
Boehlert	Cummings	Frelinghuysen
Bonilla	Cunningham	Frost
Bonior	Danner	Gallegly
Borski	Ganske	Davis (FL)
Boswell	Gedjenson	Davis (IL)
Boucher	Gekas	Davis (VA)
Boyd	Gephardt	Deal
Brady (PA)	Gilchrist	DeFazio
Brady (TX)	Gillmor	DeGette
Brown (FL)	Gilman	DeLauro
Brown (OH)	Gonzalez	Deutsch
Bryant	Goodling	Diaz-Balart
Burr	Goss	Dickey
Buyer	Greenwood	Dicks
Callahan	Gutierrez	Dingell

Hall (OH)	McCarthy (MO)	Sabo
Hansen	McCarthy (NY)	Sanchez
Hastings (FL)	McCrery	Sanders
Hastings (WA)	McDermott	Sandlin
Hayes	McGovern	Sawyer
Hill (IN)	McHugh	Saxton
Hill (MT)	McIntyre	Schaffer
Hilliard	McKeon	Schakowsky
Hinchey	McKinney	Scott
Hinojosa	McNulty	Serrano
Hobson	Meehan	Shaw
Hoefel	Meek (FL)	Sherman
Holden	Meeks (NY)	Shimkus
Holt	Menendez	Shows
Hoolley	Mica	Shuster
Horn	Millender-	Sisisky
Houghton	McDonald	Skeen
Hoyer	Miller, George	Skelton
Hulshof	Minge	Slaughter
Hunter	Mink	Smith (NJ)
Hyde	Moakley	Smith (TX)
Inslee	Mollohan	Smith (WA)
Isakson	Moore	Snyder
Jackson (IL)	Moran (KS)	Souder
Jackson-Lee	Moran (VA)	Spratt
(TX)	Murtha	Stabenow
Jefferson	Nadler	Stark
John	Napolitano	Stearns
Johnson (CT)	Neal	Stenholm
Johnson, E. B.	Nethercutt	Strickland
Jones (OH)	Ney	Stump
Kanjorski	Northup	Stupak
Kaptur	Norwood	Sweeney
Kelly	Nussle	Talent
Kennedy	Oberstar	Tanner
Kildee	Obey	Tauscher
Kilpatrick	Olver	Tauzin
Kind (WI)	Ortiz	Thomas
King (NY)	Ose	Thompson (CA)
Kingston	Owens	Thompson (MS)
Kleckza	Pallone	Thune
Klink	Pascarell	Thurman
Knollenberg	Pastor	Tierney
Kolbe	Payne	Towns
Kucinich	Pease	Trafficant
Kuykendall	Pelosi	Turner
LaFalce	Peterson (MN)	Udall (CO)
LaHood	Peterson (PA)	Udall (NM)
Lampson	Phelps	Velazquez
Lantos	Pickering	Vento
Larson	Pickett	Visclosky
Latham	Pitts	Walden
LaTourette	Pomeroy	Walsh
Lazio	Porter	Waters
Leach	Portman	Watkins
Lee	Price (NC)	Watt (NC)
Levin	Pryce (OH)	Waxman
Lewis (CA)	Quinn	Weiner
Lewis (GA)	Radanovich	Weldon (PA)
Lewis (KY)	Rahall	Weller
Lipinski	Rangel	Wexler
LoBiondo	Regula	Weygand
Lofgren	Reyes	Whitfield
Lowey	Rivers	Wicker
Lucas (KY)	Rodriguez	Wilson
Lucas (OK)	Roemer	Wise
Maloney (CT)	Rogers	Wolf
Maloney (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen	Woolsey
Markey	Rothman	Wu
Martinez	Roybal-Allard	Wynn
Mascara	Rush	Young (FL)
Matsui	Ryan (WI)	

NOT VOTING—10

Ackerman	McCollum	Simpson
Brown (CA)	Morella	Young (AK)
Hutchinson	Oxley	
Kasich	Packard	

□ 1441

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 79, noes 348, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 160]

AYES—79

Archer	Ganske	Reynolds
Ballenger	Graham	Rohrabacher
Barr	Granger	Roukema
Barrett (WI)	Green (TX)	Royce
Bartlett	Hall (TX)	Ryan (WI)
Barton	Hayworth	Ryun (KS)
Bass	Hefley	Salmon
Biggert	Herger	Sanford
Bilbray	Hoekstra	Scarborough
Burton	Hostettler	Sensenbrenner
Buyer	Istook	Shadegg
Campbell	Johnson, Sam	Shays
Cannon	Kelly	Smith (MI)
Castle	Kind (WI)	Smith (WA)
Chabot	Kleckza	Stark
Coburn	Largent	Stearns
Collins	LoBiondo	Sununu
Cox	Lofgren	Tancredo
Crane	Luther	Terry
Delahunt	Maloney (CT)	Tiahrt
DeMint	Manzullo	Tierney
Doggett	McInnis	Toomey
Ehrlich	McIntosh	Upton
Foley	Miller (FL)	Watts (OK)
Fossella	Myrick	Weldon (FL)
Frank (MA)	Paul	
Franks (NJ)	Petri	

NOES—348

Abercrombie	Coble	Gephardt
Ackerman	Combest	Gibbons
Aderholt	Condit	Gilchrist
Allen	Conyers	Gillmor
Andrews	Cook	Gilman
Armey	Cooksey	Gonzalez
Bachus	Costello	Goode
Baird	Coyne	Goodlatte
Baker	Cramer	Goodling
Baldacci	Crowley	Gordon
Baldwin	Cubin	Goss
Barcia	Cummings	Green (WI)
Barrett (NE)	Cunningham	Greenwood
Bateman	Danner	Gutierrez
Becerra	Davis (FL)	Gutknecht
Bentsen	Davis (IL)	Hall (OH)
Bereuter	Davis (VA)	Hansen
Berkley	Deal	Hastings (FL)
Berman	DeFazio	Hastings (WA)
Berry	DeGette	Hayes
Bilirakis	DeLauro	Hill (IN)
Bishop	DeLay	Hill (MT)
Blagojevich	Deutsch	Hilleary
Bliley	Diaz-Balart	Hilliard
Blumenauer	Dickey	Hinchey
Blunt	Dicks	Hinojosa
Boehlert	Dingell	Hobson
Boehner	Dixon	Hoefel
Bonilla	Dooley	Holden
Bonior	Doolittle	Holt
Bono	Doyle	Hoolley
Borski	Dreier	Horn
Boswell	Duncan	Houghton
Boucher	Dunn	Hoyer
Boyd	Edwards	Hulshof
Brady (PA)	Ehlers	Hunter
Brady (TX)	Emerson	Hutchinson
Brown (FL)	Engel	Hyde
Brown (OH)	English	Inslee
Bryant	Eshoo	Isakson
Burr	Etheridge	Jackson (IL)
Callahan	Evans	Jackson-Lee
Calvert	Everett	(TX)
Camp	Ewing	Jefferson
Canady	Farr	Jenkins
Capps	Fattah	John
Capuano	Filner	Johnson (CT)
Cardin	Fletcher	Johnson, E. B.
Carson	Forbes	Jones (NC)
Chambliss	Ford	Jones (OH)
Chenoweth	Fowler	Kanjorski
Clay	Frelinghuysen	Kaptur
Clayton	Frost	Kennedy
Clement	Gallegly	Kildee
Clyburn	Gekas	Kilpatrick

King (NY) Neal
 Kingston Nethercutt
 Klink Ney
 Knollenberg Northup
 Kolbe Norwood
 Kucinich Nussle
 Kuykendall Oberstar
 LaFalce Obey
 LaHood Oliver
 Lampson Ortiz
 Lantos Ose
 Larson Owens
 Latham Packard
 LaTourette Pallone
 Lazio Pascarell
 Leach Pastor
 Lee Payne
 Levin Pease
 Lewis (CA) Pelosi
 Lewis (GA) Peterson (MN)
 Lewis (KY) Peterson (PA)
 Linder Phelps
 Lipinski Pickering
 Lowey Pickett
 Lucas (KY) Pitts
 Lucas (OK) Pombo
 Maloney (NY) Pomeroy
 Markey Porter
 Martinez Portman
 Mascara Price (NC)
 Matsui Pryce (OH)
 McCarthy (MO) Quinn
 McCarthy (NY) Radanovich
 McCrery Rahall
 McDermott Ramstad
 McGovern Rangel
 McHugh Regula
 McIntyre Reyes
 McKeon Riley
 McKinney Rivers
 McNulty Rodriguez
 Meehan Roemer
 Meek (FL) Rogan
 Meeks (NY) Rogers
 Menendez Ros-Lehtinen
 Metcalf Rothman
 Mica Roybal-Allard
 Millender-
 McDonald Rush
 Miller, Gary Sabo
 Miller, George Sanchez
 Minge Sanders
 Mink Sandlin
 Moakley Sawyer
 Mollohan Saxton
 Moore Schaffer
 Moran (KS) Schakowsky
 Moran (VA) Scott
 Morella Serrano
 Murtha Sessions
 Nadler Shaw
 Napolitano Sherman
 Sherwood

NOT VOTING—6

Brown (CA) Kasich
 Gejdenson McCollum

□ 1449

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 119, noes 308, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 161]
 AYES—119
 Granger
 Green (TX)
 Green (WI)
 Greenwood
 Gutierrez
 Hayworth
 Herger
 Hilleary
 Hoekstra
 Hostettler
 Inslee
 Johnson (CT)
 Johnson, Sam
 Kelly
 Kind (WI)
 Kleczka
 Coburn
 Collins
 Cox
 Crane
 Crowley
 Davis (VA)
 DeFazio
 Delahunt
 DeMint
 Doggett
 Doolittle
 Duncan
 Ehrlich
 English
 Eshoo
 Fossella
 Frank (MA)
 Franks (NJ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Ganske
 Gillmor
 Gordon
 Graham
 Baird
 Ballenger
 Barrett (WI)
 Bartlett
 Barton
 Bass
 Berkley
 Biggert
 Bilbray
 Brown (OH)
 Burton
 Buyer
 Campbell
 Cannon
 Castle
 Chabot
 Coble
 Coburn
 Collins
 Cox
 Crane
 Crowley
 Davis (VA)
 DeFazio
 Delahunt
 DeMint
 Doggett
 Doolittle
 Duncan
 Ehrlich
 English
 Eshoo
 Fossella
 Frank (MA)
 Franks (NJ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Ganske
 Gillmor
 Gordon
 Graham
 Condit
 Conyers
 Cook
 Cooksey
 Costello
 Coyne
 Cramer
 Cubin
 Cummings
 Cunningham
 Danner
 Davis (FL)
 Davis (IL)
 Deal
 DeGette
 DeLauro
 DeLay
 Deutsch
 Diaz-Balart
 Dickey
 Bishop
 Blagojevich
 Bliley
 Blumenauer
 Blunt
 Boehlert
 Boehner
 Bonilla
 Bonior
 Bono
 Borski
 Boswell
 Boucher
 Boyd
 Brady (PA)
 Brady (TX)
 Brown (FL)
 Bryant
 Burr
 Callahan
 Calvert
 Camp
 Canady
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cardin
 Carson
 Chambliss
 Chenoweth
 Clay
 Clayton
 Clement
 Clyburn
 Combust
 Goodling
 Goss
 Gutknecht
 Hall (OH)
 Hall (TX)
 Hansen
 Hastings (FL)
 Hastings (WA)
 Hayes
 Hill (IN)
 Hill (MT)
 Hilliard
 Hinchey
 Hinojosa
 Hobson
 Hoeffel
 Holden
 Holt
 Hooley
 Horn
 Houghton
 Hoyer
 Hulshof
 Hunter
 Hutchinson
 Hyde
 Isakson
 Istook
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson-Lee
 (TX)
 Jefferson
 Jenkins
 John
 Johnson, E. B.
 Jones (NC)
 Jones (OH)
 Kanjorski
 Kaptur
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilpatrick
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Klink
 Knollenberg
 Kolbe
 Kucinich
 Kuykendall
 LaFalce
 LaHood
 Lampson
 Lantos
 Larson
 Porter
 Portman
 Ramstad
 Reynolds
 Roemer
 Rogan
 Rohrabacher
 Rothman
 Roukema
 Royce
 Ryan (WI)
 Ryun (KS)
 Salmon
 Sanford
 Sawyer
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shadegg
 Shays
 Smith (MI)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA)
 Souder
 Spence
 Stark
 Sununu
 Sweeney
 Talent
 Tancredo
 Taylor (MS)
 Taylor (NC)
 Terry
 Tiahrt
 Tierney
 Toomey
 Upton
 Wamp
 Weldon (FL)
 Weldon (PA)
 Noes—308
 Abercrombie
 Ackerman
 Aderholt
 Allen
 Andrews
 Arney
 Bachus
 Baker
 Baldacci
 Baldwin
 Barcia
 Barr
 Barrett (NE)
 Bateman
 Becerra
 Bentsen
 Bereuter
 Berman
 Berry
 Bilirakis
 Bishop
 Blagojevich
 Bliley
 Blumenauer
 Blunt
 Boehlert
 Boehner
 Bonilla
 Bonior
 Bono
 Borski
 Boswell
 Boucher
 Boyd
 Brady (PA)
 Brady (TX)
 Brown (FL)
 Bryant
 Burr
 Callahan
 Calvert
 Camp
 Canady
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cardin
 Carson
 Chambliss
 Chenoweth
 Clay
 Clayton
 Clement
 Clyburn
 Combust
 Goodling
 Goss
 Gutknecht
 Hall (OH)
 Hall (TX)
 Hansen
 Hastings (FL)
 Hastings (WA)
 Hayes
 Hill (IN)
 Hill (MT)
 Hilliard
 Hinchey
 Hinojosa
 Hobson
 Hoeffel
 Holden
 Holt
 Hooley
 Horn
 Houghton
 Hoyer
 Hulshof
 Hunter
 Hutchinson
 Hyde
 Isakson
 Istook
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson-Lee
 (TX)
 Jefferson
 Jenkins
 John
 Johnson, E. B.
 Jones (NC)
 Jones (OH)
 Kanjorski
 Kaptur
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilpatrick
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Klink
 Knollenberg
 Kolbe
 Kucinich
 Kuykendall
 LaFalce
 LaHood
 Lampson
 Lantos
 Larson
 Porter
 Portman
 Ramstad
 Reynolds
 Roemer
 Rogan
 Rohrabacher
 Rothman
 Roukema
 Royce
 Ryan (WI)
 Ryun (KS)
 Salmon
 Sanford
 Sawyer
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shadegg
 Shays
 Smith (MI)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA)
 Souder
 Spence
 Stark
 Sununu
 Sweeney
 Talent
 Tancredo
 Taylor (MS)
 Taylor (NC)
 Terry
 Tiahrt
 Tierney
 Toomey
 Upton
 Wamp
 Weldon (FL)
 Weldon (PA)
 Noes—308
 Condit
 Conyers
 Cook
 Cooksey
 Costello
 Coyne
 Cramer
 Cubin
 Cummings
 Cunningham
 Danner
 Davis (FL)
 Davis (IL)
 Deal
 DeGette
 DeLauro
 DeLay
 Deutsch
 Diaz-Balart
 Dickey
 Bishop
 Blagojevich
 Bliley
 Blumenauer
 Blunt
 Boehlert
 Boehner
 Bonilla
 Bonior
 Bono
 Borski
 Boswell
 Boucher
 Boyd
 Brady (PA)
 Brady (TX)
 Brown (FL)
 Bryant
 Burr
 Callahan
 Calvert
 Camp
 Canady
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cardin
 Carson
 Chambliss
 Chenoweth
 Clay
 Clayton
 Clement
 Clyburn
 Combust
 Goodling
 Goss
 Gutknecht
 Hall (OH)
 Hall (TX)
 Hansen
 Hastings (FL)
 Hastings (WA)
 Hayes
 Hill (IN)
 Hill (MT)
 Hilliard
 Hinchey
 Hinojosa
 Hobson
 Hoeffel
 Holden
 Holt
 Hooley
 Horn
 Houghton
 Hoyer
 Hulshof
 Hunter
 Hutchinson
 Hyde
 Isakson
 Istook
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson-Lee
 (TX)
 Jefferson
 Jenkins
 John
 Johnson, E. B.
 Jones (NC)
 Jones (OH)
 Kanjorski
 Kaptur
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilpatrick
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Klink
 Knollenberg
 Kolbe
 Kucinich
 Kuykendall
 LaFalce
 LaHood
 Lampson
 Lantos
 Larson
 Porter
 Portman
 Ramstad
 Reynolds
 Roemer
 Rogan
 Rohrabacher
 Rothman
 Roukema
 Royce
 Ryan (WI)
 Ryun (KS)
 Salmon
 Sanford
 Sawyer
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shadegg
 Shays
 Smith (MI)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA)
 Souder
 Spence
 Stark
 Sununu
 Sweeney
 Talent
 Tancredo
 Taylor (MS)
 Taylor (NC)
 Terry
 Tiahrt
 Tierney
 Toomey
 Upton
 Wamp
 Weldon (FL)
 Weldon (PA)

NOES—308

Latham
 LaTourette
 Leach
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 Lowey
 Lucas (KY)
 Lucas (OK)
 Maloney (NY)
 Markey
 Martinez
 Mascara
 Matsui
 McCarthy (MO)
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCrery
 McDermott
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McKinney
 McNulty
 Meek (FL)
 Meeks (NY)
 Menendez
 Metcalf
 Mica
 Millender-
 McDonald
 Minge
 Mink
 Moakley
 Mollohan
 Moore
 Moran (KS)
 Moran (VA)
 Morella
 Murtha
 Napolitano
 Nethercutt
 Ney
 Northup
 Norwood
 Nussle
 Oberstar
 Ortiz
 Ose
 Owens
 Packard
 Pallone
 Pascarell
 Pastor
 Payne
 Pease
 Pelosi
 Peterson (MN)
 Peterson (PA)
 Phelps
 Pickering
 Pickett
 Pitts
 Pombo
 Pomeroy
 Price (NC)
 Pryce (OH)
 Quinn
 Radanovich
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Regula
 Reyes
 Riley
 Rivers
 Rodriguez
 Rogers
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roybal-Allard
 Rush
 Sabo
 Sanchez
 Sanders
 Sandlin
 Saxton
 Scarborough
 Schaffer
 Schakowsky
 Scott
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Shaw
 Sherman
 Sherwood
 Shimkus
 Shows
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Siskisky
 Skelton
 Slaughter
 Smith (TX)
 Snyder
 Spratt
 Stabenow
 Stearns
 Stenholm
 Strickland
 Stump
 Stupak
 Tanner
 Tauscher
 Tauzin
 Thomas
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thornberry
 Thune
 Thurman
 Towns
 Traficant
 Turner
 Udall (CO)
 Udall (NM)
 Velazquez
 Vento
 Visclosky
 Walden
 Walsh
 Waters
 Watkins
 Watt (NC)
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Weldon (PA)
 Weller
 Wexler
 Weygand
 Whitfield
 Wicker
 Wilson
 Wise
 Wolf
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Wynn
 Young (FL)
 Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—6

Archer Kasich
 Brown (CA) McCollum

□ 1457

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1500

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to engage in a colloquy with the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) regarding the anticipated schedule on the agriculture appropriations bill. We understand that on our side there are few amendments that remain to be offered, but it is unclear to us what the desire of the majority is in moving this piece of legislation. If the gentleman could clarify for our side, we would greatly appreciate it.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, it is the plan that we would rise at this point on further consideration of the agricultural appropriations bill and go to the lockbox issue. We would anticipate that the lockbox issue, considering the time for the rule, two hours of general debate, there will be no amendments under the rule, so I

would anticipate a vote on final passage and/or possibly a vote on a motion to recommit, should that be the case.

After that, the majority leader will reassess where we are, what time of day it is, and then make an announcement at that time as to what the further activity would be on this bill or any other bill that would come before the House this evening.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the chairman for that clarification. I notice that the majority leader is on the floor and able to engage in this colloquy. I wonder if he would do me the great honor of giving those of us on our side his view of what the schedule for the remaining part of the day will be like and how the agricultural appropriations bill will fit into the schedule later today.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, obviously we are, as often has been the case over the years, the week before a district recess and we have a lot of work that is pending that is important. We obviously have, and have already indicated that we have a high priority for agriculture, and we want to move back to the agricultural appropriations bill as soon as we can, and we still have high hopes of completing that work tonight, or at least perhaps this week.

But I think it is time now for us to make sure that we move on, complete the other work which we know we can complete on the lockbox. We will have a chance to assess everything on the agriculture bill later on in the day, perhaps earlier. As soon as I have a clear picture of things, I will contact the gentlewoman and let her know.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman will let us know perhaps by 5:30 whether or not the agricultural appropriations bill will be coming to the floor later this evening so our Members could be ready?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, as soon as I can know something that would be helpful and reliable, yes; 5:30, 4:30, as soon as possible. But I understand the gentlewoman's point about the time line and I will try to respect that.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

I would just advise our membership that if we do have Members listening or on the floor who have amendments, call our office no later than 6 o'clock and we will try to let our Members know whether there will be additional votes this evening or not on the agricultural appropriations bill.

I would just ask the forbearance of the leadership of the majority to please treat our Members with respect, and I am sure they will, but to allow us the time necessary to prepare our Members for the floor. If we are not going to bring the bill up tonight, if we do not hear by 6 o'clock, I will assume it will not be coming up.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield, as an old economist let me just say we should be careful what we assume, but I will try to keep the gentlewoman as informed as possible.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the leader.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, today I would like to express my support for H.R. 1906, The Agriculture Appropriations Act of 2000. Our nation's farmers are by far the most productive in the world and we should continue to support their efforts.

Our nation's farmers often experience accomplishments reached through the struggles and achievements of past agriculturists. H.R. 1906 will allot the necessary funds to help increase agriculture research which in turn will help our farmers achieve the level of commodities needed to feed a hungry world.

I would like to specifically acknowledge the provision which allots funds for pesticide and crop disease research. This will directly benefit Southern California floriculture and nursery crop producers. With over 20 percent of the total agriculture share, California farmers rank first in the nation in overall production of nursery products. This research can positively impact rural and suburban economies, and increase international competitiveness by helping prevent the spread of pests and diseases among nursery and floriculture crops.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to commend Chairman SKEEN for once again producing an Agriculture Appropriations bill that is beneficial for the American farmer. Farming is still one of the toughest jobs in America, and I share Mr. SKEEN's wish to make sure that is not forgotten here in Washington.

Mr. PHELPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the FY 2000 Agriculture Appropriations bill, but I must also take this opportunity to express my concern that many needs in the agriculture community will remain unmet under this legislation.

I know that all of my colleagues are by now aware that American agriculture is in crisis. We provided some desperately-needed assistance by passing the Emergency Supplemental bill last week, and this appropriations measure will offer still more help. But I caution my colleagues that it will only help so much, and we must not allow ourselves to be lulled into thinking that agriculture's problems are over.

I applaud the House appropriators for crafting a good bill under extremely tight budget constraints. They have the unenviable task of allocating scarce funds in a reasonable manner, all at a time when the needs in the agriculture community are greater than ever. While I plan to support the legislation, it nonetheless falls short in a number of respects, and I would be remiss if I failed to point them out.

First and foremost, the bill does almost nothing to address the farm crisis. It does not provide for any continuation of the emergency assistance provided in last year's Omnibus Appropriations bill or in the recently-passed Supplemental, and it contains no initiatives to support farm incomes or remove surpluses from markets. And although the bill funds farm credit programs and Farm Service Agency staff at the level requested months ago by the President, this package simply does not reflect the economic conditions that face farmers and the current needs that could not have been

accurately anticipated at the beginning of the year.

Furthermore, nutrition programs do not fare well under this bill, particularly the Women, Infants and Children (WIC) program. WIC is one of the most successful and important federal programs ever undertaken and serves millions of pregnant women, nursing mothers, infants and young children. Unfortunately, although H.R. 1906 does include a slight increase over last year's funding for WIC, the bill provides over \$100 million less than the administration's request for this critical program. The legislation also fails to incorporate the requested \$10 million increase for elderly nutrition programs, and other programs receive no funding at all, including the school breakfast pilot program and the Nutrition, Education and Training (NET) program.

I am also disappointed by the funding levels for many conservation programs on which farmers in my district and around the country rely. Unfortunately, in trying to stay within tight budget caps, the bill's authors have included a number of limitation provisions that produce savings from direct spending programs. For example, the bill cuts the Wetlands Reserve Program and the Environmental Quality Incentives Program below authorized levels. These are extremely popular programs which help farmers while protecting our environment, and I am disappointed that they have been sacrificed.

Having said all that, let me point out again that I understand the tough decisions the appropriators were forced to make, and although we all have different priorities, this bill does provide critical funding for a number of very valuable programs. We have to start somewhere, and I cannot emphasize enough how sadly America's farmers need our help and our continued attention. I will support the bill and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I hope my colleagues will join me in strongly opposing the Coburn amendment to eliminate funding for the National Center for Peanut Competitiveness.

It is no secret the peanut is a very important crop to Georgia and Southern agriculture, and this program is critical to ensuring that peanuts hold an attractive, competitive position in the global marketplace of the 21st century.

The 1996 Farm Bill reformed the federal peanut program; it is now a no-net-cost program to the government. It provides consumers with ample supply of one of the safest, most nutritious foods.

The National Center for Peanut Competitiveness is a broad-based research program that includes product development, economics, and the fundamental aspects of reducing production costs; additionally, it enhances consumer appeal and improves product safety. This program also encompasses research into nutrition, biotechnology, peanut allergies, and trade liberalization through the World Trade Organization.

Eliminating funding for the National Center for Peanut Competitiveness would be detrimental for both peanut farmers and the peanut industry.

Mr. Chairman, the FY 2000 Agricultural Appropriations bill contains critical funding for agricultural research, and I urge my colleagues to vote against cuts to the National Center for Peanut Competitiveness.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE) having assumed the chair, Mr. PEASE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1906) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF H.R. 1259, SOCIAL SECURITY
AND MEDICARE SAFE DEPOSIT
BOX ACT OF 1999

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 186 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 186

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1259) to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to protect Social Security surpluses through strengthened budgetary enforcement mechanisms. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The amendment specified in section 2 of this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) two hours of debate equally divided and controlled among the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Committees on the Budget, Rules, and Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. The amendment considered as adopted is as follows: page 3, line 13, strike "cause or increase" and insert "set forth".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 186 provides for consideration of H.R. 1259, the Social Security and Medicare Safe Deposit Box Act of 1999, a bill that will help to protect the Social Security Trust Fund.

House Resolution 186 provides two hours of general debate divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority members of the Committee on Rules, the Committee on the Budget, and the Committee on Ways and Means.

The rule provides that the bill will be considered as read and provides that the amendment printed in section 2 of the resolution be considered as adopted. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions, as is the right of the minority.

Mr. Speaker, let me start by explaining exactly what this bill will do. First, the bill will establish a parliamentary point of order against any budget resolution utilizing the Social Security surpluses in its spending or revenue proposals. Second, the bill establishes a point of order against any legislation, including spending initiatives and tax cuts, that attempts to use any funds from the Social Security surplus. And third, this bill prohibits the Office of Management and Budget, the Congressional Budget Office, or any other Federal Government agency from including Social Security surpluses in Federal budget totals when publishing official documents.

Mr. Speaker, it is dishonest to talk openly about a budget surplus when our operating budget is still in deficit. The government continues to borrow money from Social Security, a fact that does not show up on the government's balance sheet but that has dire consequences for the future. This "lockbox" takes Social Security away from budget calculations so budget decisions are made only on non-Social Security dollars, a vital first step in ensuring retirement programs will be there for this generation and generations to come.

In our response to the President's State of the Union address, the 106th Congress committed itself to saving Social Security. This task has two important components. First, we must ensure that the current system is being managed responsibly by locking away today's contributions and securing the retirement of current beneficiaries. Today, we deliver our first component. Later, we will have to make fundamental reforms to the system to guarantee the program's long-term viability while improving benefits and providing Americans with more control over their retirement savings.

We began to fulfill our promise to the bill on the first component when, two months ago, this Congress passed the budget resolution. That resolution outlined our budget goals for the next 10 years and called for the establishment of a "lockbox" to reserve the \$1.8 trillion in cumulative Social Security surpluses.

Today, we follow through on that original blueprint by taking advantage of this historic opportunity to save Social Security by ensuring that 100 percent of the money destined for the Social Security Trust Fund remain in the trust fund, \$1.8 trillion over the next decade.

Now, we will certainly hear the argument that this legislation is being rushed to the floor. To that I must respond that we have waited far too long for this kind of reform. It is the first time in the history of the program that a Congress will protect Social Security funds.

Would opponents rather continue the practices that since 1969 allowed those who ran this Congress to routinely spend the trust funds in order to pay

for other government programs and mask the Nation's deficits? While other Congresses have chosen to use surplus Social Security revenues for other "spending priorities," this Congress is proud to be the first to preserve the retirement security of all Americans. With this effort today, we are working to ensure that not one dime of America's Social Security tax dollars are spent on big spending programs.

This is also a big improvement over the plan that the President sent to the Congress. His budget only claimed to save 62 percent of the Social Security surplus for Social Security, plainly stating the 38 percent would go to his pet spending initiatives.

However, the truth was even worse than that. The Chairman of the Federal Reserve, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, and the U.S. Comptroller General have all testified before Congress and soundly refuted the notion that the President's plan saves any additional money for Social Security.

Even Democrat Members of Congress have agreed that the President uses a series of fiscal shell games and double-counting schemes to inflate his projected savings for Social Security. In fact, Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan noted that the President's plan actually hurts Social Security by using improper accounting to lend a false sense of security to a program that desperately needs structural reform.

H.R. 1259 strengthens Social Security and ensures that big spenders can no longer raid the fund. This bill continues our determined efforts to provide more security and freedom to the American people. It is part of a common sense plan to provide security for the American people by preserving every penny of the Social Security surplus.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule so that we may proceed with debate and consideration of this historic bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) from yielding me the customary half-hour, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that Social Security and Medicare are not going to last forever, especially if we do not do something about it very soon. And despite all of the fanfare about this bill, I am sorry to say this will not do the trick because, Mr. Speaker, although this bill will probably not make things any worse, it also will not make things any better.

This bill merely recreates the point of order that the Democrats enacted some 14 years ago. It does not protect all of the resources we need to reform Social Security and Medicare. It promises not to use the Social Security Trust Fund, which Congress promised not to touch when it was created back

in the 1930s. Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, it leaves the rest of the budget surplus open for the taking, be it for new spending programs or tax cuts for the rich.

Even the chief actuary of the Social Security Administration says that this proposal, and I quote, this proposal would not have any significant effect on the long-range solvency of the old-age, survivors and disability insurance program.

But it would not be such a problem, Mr. Speaker, if Social Security were not scheduled to fall apart in the year 2034 and Medicare to fall apart in the year 2015. Congress and the White House need to implement major Social Security and Medicare reforms and we need to do it very, very soon.

□ 1515

These are the most important issues we can address this year, and they just cannot be put off for another week, much less another Congress.

But, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, this bill is the only social security bill my Republican colleagues are going to bring up this year. All it does is restate the current policy on surpluses and ensure that social security does go broke on time.

I heard that some Republican pollster said it was a bad idea to tackle social security, despite its looming demise. But Mr. Speaker, polls aside, we have to do something, and we have to do it very soon.

For that reason, I am disappointed my Republican colleagues did not make in order the Rangel-Moakley-Spratt amendment to prevent Congress from spending budget surplus money until, and I say until, we shore up the social security and Medicare.

Our bill says Congress cannot pass any new spending or any new tax cuts that are not completely offset until the social security is secure. Our lockbox contains both social security and on-budget surplus, and unlike the Republican proposal, it actually has a lock.

Our lock consists of the declaration by the trust fund trustees, and only the trust fund trustees, that social security and Medicare are financially sound. Only then can Congress tap into that surplus.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, this bill was referred to not one, not two, but three congressional committees: the Committee on the Budget, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on Rules. But not one single one of them, not one of them, held hearings or marked up the bill. It was sent right to the floor. It has become the norm in this era of Congress without committees, and that, Mr. Speaker, can get very, very dangerous.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule because the problem is not what this bill does for social security, Mr. Speaker, it is what this bill does not do.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am rising in strong support of this bill, the Social Security and Medicare Safe Deposit Box Act. I think it is important that we try to put in place a mechanism to try to establish this lockbox to ensure that social security spending is not spent on other government spending.

The reason I say that is for 40 years in this institution money was spent on other government spending. There were chronic budget deficits.

Just recently we have been able to bring that down and bring this budget into balance, but I think it is important that we protect and set aside \$1.8 trillion in cumulative budget surpluses over the next 10 years for social security and Medicare.

Since social security was first created it has been a pay-as-you-go system, benefits to retirees are paid from tax revenue. Interest is credited to the social security trust fund, and social security tax surpluses become part, unfortunately, in this process, of general government spending.

In reality, there is no cash in the trust fund, merely IOUs. They are printed on an ink jet printer. In fact, they are in three file folders in West Virginia, in a filing cabinet. I think it is important that we set up a mechanism to, frankly, pay back over time the \$359 billion that was borrowed over the last 40 years out of this fund.

If steps are not taken now, in 15 years social security will be insolvent and benefits will have to be funded through either reductions in other spending, or tax increases, or a return to chronic budget deficits.

That is why I will mention that I introduced a bill to pay back the money borrowed from social security and create a real trust fund with real assets. Under my bill, 90 percent of the budget surplus would be used to pay down the debt owed the trust funds. Using the budget surplus in this fashion would continue until all IOUs in the trust fund have been eliminated.

I support this. It is a good first step.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LUCAS).

Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the House will consider legislation to protect the social security trust fund which for too long Washington has treated as a pork barrel slush fund. I am proud that today we will debate this issue. Creating a lockbox for social security just makes common sense.

The legislation offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) is a step in the right direction, but it is really the bare minimum that we can do to preserve social security and Medicare for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to offer, along with my colleagues, the gentleman

from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE), an amendment that would protect the entire budget surplus for social security and Medicare. We intend to offer this proposal as a motion to recommit, and I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it.

The Herger-Shaw legislation does nothing for Medicare. Kentucky seniors know that you cannot talk about social security without talking about Medicare. The health of both these programs is crucial to the health of our elderly population.

Kentucky seniors know that, and Congress ought to have the good sense to protect Medicare, too. H.R. 1259 only addresses the social security surplus. It does not commit us to save the entire Federal surplus for social security and Medicare. It does nothing to secure the long-term solvency of social security and Medicare.

Our proposal would save the social security surplus, the Medicare surplus, and the overall budget surplus to save social security and Medicare, and it would require that we make the solvency of social security our first priority.

I ask my colleagues to vote for the real commitment to social security and Medicare. I urge Members to vote for our motion.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER).

(Mr. WELLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule, as well as strong support of this historic legislation, the Social Security and Medicare Safe Deposit Box Act of 1999.

How many of us over the last 30 years, and I have only been in the House and had the privilege of serving here for the last 4½ years, have been asked in town meetings and senior citizens centers, union halls, VFWs, and other public forums, when is Washington going to stop dipping into, when is Washington going to stop raiding the social security trust fund to spend social security on other things other than social security?

Today we are going to pass legislation that will do that, that will stop the raid on social security.

Let us review the history here. For over 30 years now Washington has been dipping into the social security fund. Regardless of the rhetoric on the other side where they say it has not, it has gone on.

Back when President Johnson and the Democrat-controlled Congress 30 years ago began raiding the social security trust fund, they have run up quite a bill. According to the social security trustees appointed by President Clinton, the social security trust fund has been raided by more than \$730 billion over the last 30 years.

I have a check here written on the social security trust fund. It is a blank check. Washington for the last 30 years has used the social security trust fund as a slush fund and as a blank check to pay for other programs.

This walls off the social security trust fund and puts a stop for those who want to raid it. We set aside those funds for social security and for Medicare. I believe that is an important first step, setting aside 100 percent of social security and locking it away before we consider any other reforms or changes to social security. Let us lock it away first. That is an important first step. We can use those funds to strengthen Medicare and social security. This legislation accomplishes this goal.

I would like to point out, of course, that not only is the social security and Medicare Safe Deposit Box a centerpiece of this year's balanced budget, but there is a big difference between the Clinton-Gore Democratic budget and the Republican budget.

The Republican budget sets aside 100 percent of social security for social security. The \$137 billion social security surplus this year will go to social security. If we compare that with the Clinton-Gore Democrat budget, that only uses 62 percent of social security for social security, and the Clinton-Gore Democrat budget spends \$52 billion of social security money on other things; all good programs: Education, defense, things like that. But the Clinton-Gore Democrat budget raids the social security trust fund. This lockbox will prevent the Clinton-Gore raid on social security.

I would also point out that the social security and Medicare safe deposit box sets aside \$1.8 trillion. The President talks about 62 percent. Sixty-two percent is \$1.3 billion. Over the next 10 years Clinton-Gore will raid the social security trust fund by \$12 billion. Let us put a stop to it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE).

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to support the underlying legislation, not because I feel that it is the last word on what we need to do to protect the social security trust fund, but because it is a humble first step.

I also rise to support this because I am very disappointed in what this body has done this month. We have passed legislation as an emergency supplemental appropriations bill which unfortunately raids the social security trust fund.

I think there is a level of hypocrisy on both sides of the aisle here that is regrettable. We are not facing up to our responsibilities that this trust fund is something that millions and millions of Americans have been counting on to pay their benefits after retirement, and to pay those benefits without putting an added strain on the Fed-

eral budget and on programs that are important to their children and grandchildren.

It is a cruel hoax when they learn that in order to pay for those programs, the Federal Government will either have to cut something in the future or go out and borrow more money.

It is time, and in fact the time is long past, when this lockbox proposal should have been passed. I think the true test of our commitment to this principle will be our willingness to waive points of order in rules that bring bills to the floor. Unfortunately, we have historically done this, and we have undermined our ability to maintain our commitments.

What I would like to urge is that ultimately we take the proposal that is being considered today and turn it into a law so that we do not have the ability to waive these points of order, and instead, we hold ourselves to a very high standard in the House of Representatives of preserving the integrity of the social security trust fund.

I would also like to agree with my colleagues on this side of the aisle that this bill would be stronger if we had had the opportunity for committee consideration and if we had had the opportunity to consider some amendments.

Certainly it could go further. But one of the ironies that I notice is that each time we propose legislation that goes too far, then others in this Chamber or at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue object to it because it goes too far. So it is regrettable that we never seem to quite identify what is an appropriate and acceptable approach, but we are always in disagreement, no matter what proposal comes up.

I would like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) for the work that he has put into this, and emphasize that this is truly a bipartisan gesture. My colleague, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) has supported parallel legislation. The Blue Dog budget had parallel provisions. All of us are committed to this goal.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN).

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support an idea that is long overdue in the Nation's capital, truth in budgeting. For decades the social security surplus has been used by politicians to fund other government spending and mask the scope of our Nation's financial problems. It is time now to put this practice behind us. It is time to build a firewall between the dollars that are used to fund other government programs and the dollars that come to government specifically for social security benefits.

There are three principles that will guide my decisionmaking on budget issues as we move forward through this year. First, 100 percent of the social se-

curity surplus must be preserved for social security. Whether it be using this money to credit the social security trust fund or to help preserve social security or Medicare, we must commit these resources to their intended purposes. This lockbox bill is an important step in fulfilling this part of our commitment.

Secondly, we must stick to the fiscal discipline we decided on when we passed the Balanced Budget Amendment of 1997. In 1997, we agreed to spending limits that we absolutely must stick to. Every Member of this House, Republican and Democrat, supported a budget resolution that maintained these caps. We cannot break our word to the American people. They expect us to keep our promises. They should be able to receive that commitment from us.

Third, we must return the nonsocial security surplus to the people in the form of tax relief. This money represents a direct overpayment for government services. Make no mistake, if it is left in the hands of the politicians, it will be spent. It is the people's money. We should give it back.

Mr. Speaker, Members can describe the budget process as a three-legged stool. Today we are putting the first leg in place.

□ 1530

That stool includes preserving Social Security, maintaining fiscal discipline, and returning the non-Social Security surplus to the people.

Congress' ability to finally control spending has helped create an economy with historically low inflation and low unemployment. It has helped millions of Americans and allowed them to pursue their financial independence, to experience the security of homeownership, and to be in a position to give their children a leg up in the new economy through education.

We must not jeopardize this success by going on a spending spree that destroys fiscal discipline. We can guarantee the security of Social Security by putting 100 percent of the Social Security surplus funds into a lockbox. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, when discussing the issue of expected budget surpluses, we need to ask two questions. First, will we stick to the budget caps on which the budget surpluses are based; and, second, will Congress actually use the projected surpluses to strengthen Medicare and Social Security?

Unfortunately, this bill is a sham as an answer to those two questions. The so-called lockbox is of no value beyond making sure Members of Congress have a press release to show their constituents when they go home this weekend.

The budget caps I did not vote for, but I am willing to stick to them if the

money will be used for Social Security and Medicare. But the fact is the track record in here is that it is not going to happen.

Just a few weeks ago, this Congress passed a spending bill that grew from \$5 billion to \$15 billion in a matter of days, three times what the President asked. So we are on our way to blowing the budget caps, and the result is going to be, there is no surplus.

This bill claims to prevent the use of budget surplus dollars for Social Security. It makes this claim by mumbo-jumbo legislative "magic language" that says we cannot create budget deficits. However, it gives any chairman in this Congress the right to ignore everything as long as they say they have self-designated this as reform.

That raises my question, what is reform? The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) says he has a bill to reform Medicare, a voucher plan that would raise the premium on every senior to \$400 a year. Is that reform? It would make it impossible for one to get Medicare until one is 67. Is that reform?

It would extend the budget amendments of 1997 for 5 years. Do our hospitals and our home health agencies think that is reform? Any of these examples would open the lockbox, the trap door. The money would fall out and, presto, we have money for a tax cut.

If shifting the cost onto Medicare beneficiaries and providers is not what is meant by reform, then we need to have an amendment process. We were denied a hearing in the House, not one single hearing. On this floor, we are denied even one single amendment.

There is no intention to improve this bill. This is a PR gimmick. That is all it is. This has been on the docket for 2 months, and the American people expect us to do something about Medicare and Social Security. This bill does not do it. I urge the Members to vote against this rule.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER), the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), my Democrat friend. In his statements, he was mentioning that this legislation is not tough enough to defend Social Security. I would like to see it tougher.

The legislation that we were originally writing was tougher; but, guess what? We have legislation that is tougher in the Senate, and guess who is opposing it? The President is opposing it. Guess who else is opposing it? The Democrats in the Senate are opposing it.

They say it is too tough. They say it goes too far. They said, in case of an emergency, we do not have enough elbow room, if you will.

So we have worked with the committees involved, with the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on

Budget, both of which I serve on, the Committee on Rules, to try to come up with some legislation that we can get the support of from our friends on the other side of the aisle, the Democrats, and with the President, to try to at least get something out there which is better than nothing.

So I would like to respond to my friend, if he would like it tougher, I would love to get it tougher; but if he could, could he perhaps get some support from your Democrat colleagues in the Senate as well as our Democrat President?

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERGER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the bill that the Senate had would have shut down the government if it had been passed. That is why there was a veto threat. It makes no sense to pass that kind of legislation.

If my colleagues do not want any Social Security checks to go out and they want to shut the government down, then pass what the Senate is proposing. We are never going to get this issue done this way. We have a good proposal from the President to take the money and buy down the public debt, actually reducing the public debt.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the fact is the President promised to save 100 percent. Then he came back with a plan that saved 62 percent. Then he proposed a budget that was only saving 52 percent.

The fact is what the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), my Democrat colleague and good friend, is saying just is not the case. The fact is they wanted it both ways. They say they want it tougher, but then they oppose it. But now they think it is not tough enough, and they oppose it then, too.

Let us vote out what we have today. Let us begin with what we have today which does bring about a point of order both in the House and the Senate, requires 60 votes in the Senate. Let us at least move forward with something now; and perhaps in the future, we can come up with something tougher.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) explained this procedure, because I was a little baffled as to why this bill was so weak. But I understand it now.

It is weak because the gentleman is concerned about my President and he is concerned about the people in the other body. That is a new way to legislate. So I guess it is what we call majority-plus-6, because, in the old days, when we were concerned about strengthening legislation, we took it to

the committee. We have hearings. We have an opportunity for people to amend it. We have debate. We have discussion.

But this new way that we have had the last half dozen years is, we bypass the committees, we bypass the Committee on Ways and Means, we bypass budget, we bypass the Committee on Rules, but we go on the other side and ask, will they toughen it.

We did something like that yesterday. We wanted to, on the other side, reduce the wages of Customs. I would think that we would be able to debate that on the floor. No. My colleagues put that on the Suspension Calendar, and they followed it with antipornography legislation or anti-drug trafficking legislation.

I just do not think that they get it. In the House of Representatives, we legislate. We do not go over there and beg, hat in hand, with the other body for what they would like.

Another thing we do is we give ourselves an opportunity to discuss these things in our committee. I am so proud and honored to be a member of the Committee on Ways and Means. Our jurisdiction, we jealously guard it. But what good is all of it if we go straight to the Committee on Rules when anything concerns Social Security?

We all know that this so-called lockbox, that every Member of this House has a key to unlock it. We all know when my colleagues are saying that they are going to put the Social Security surplus in there, they are doing what Democrats and Republicans should have been doing years ago, and that is putting the current payroll tax in the box.

But my colleagues cannot talk out of both sides of their mouths. My colleagues cannot give a big tax decrease, which I cannot wait for it to come out of my committee, unless they are taking that to the Committee on Rules, too.

But I understand that my colleagues are working on \$300 billion, \$800 billion in 10 years. How my colleagues are going to do that and put Social Security surplus in the lockbox, I do not know. But then again, we may never find out. We may find it on the Suspension Calendar, or it may just come out in the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I am just hoping that someone who understands what happened in the back room will come forward to the mike and explain how much of the Social Security surplus goes into this so-called box. It is my understanding it is only the current payroll tax, and the rest of the surplus we can use for whatever purpose that we would want without violating the spirit and the wording of this law.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) for his long-standing leadership on this bill.

I am a new Member of the House, and I have been working on this issue since getting here. I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) for his leadership.

This debate is getting out of hand. Here is what our budget resolution does, and I am very happy to have been a part of writing the proposal in the budget resolution that said we are going to set a higher standard in this Congress, that we are not going to raid the Social Security Trust Fund, and that we are going to change the rules in Congress to make it tougher to do so.

We want to go all the way to stopping the raid on the Trust Fund. That requires the President signing a bill into law, dedicating every penny of Social Security going toward the Social Security Trust Fund, going to Social Security.

Sadly, the President is against that legislation, in part because his budget proposal continues to raid Social Security by \$341 billion over the next 10 years.

What we are trying to achieve in this bill is the first step in locking away Social Security. We are going to stop the phony accounting, No more smoke and mirrors accounting, hiding the deficit with Social Security surpluses.

We are going to say, when we measure the budget, we are going to put the Social Security budget, the Social Security surplus aside. Then we are going to say, not only for budgets, but for every bill coming to Congress, if it attempts to dip into Social Security, we are going to put a higher vote threshold against it. We are going to say that in the other body, it requires three-fifths of a majority vote to pass a bill that attempts to raid Social Security.

Why are we doing this? Because we are trying to make it tougher for this body and the other body to stop raiding Social Security. We want to make it more difficult for us to pass legislation to raid the Trust Fund.

I am the author of the other lockbox bill, the second stage in this process, the bill that simply puts all of the Social Security dollars into Social Security, to pay down debt when we are not doing so, and to make sure that all of our Social Security dollars go to saving this program.

The problem is that the President is against that. So what can be accomplished here and now when the White House is opposed to saving all of the Social Security surplus? What we can do is stop the phony accounting. What we can do is make it tougher for people in Congress to pass legislation that raids Social Security, and that is what this legislation accomplishes.

Please join us in toughening this legislation. Please join us in making it harder to raid Social Security. This is as much as we can get, we hope, from the White House. We would be happy to entertain additional legislation that would make sure that every penny of Social Security goes to Social Security.

The problem is we cannot get it through the Senate. We cannot get it passed by the White House. We want to pass that legislation. We are going as far as possible right now with this legislation.

On the last point of the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, every penny of the Social Security Trust Fund goes to Social Security. Every penny of the Social Security surplus, including interest, in our budget resolution goes to Social Security.

For those taxpayers who overpay their income taxes, that surplus goes back to the taxpayer. So just as a point of clarification, the budget resolution does not raid Social Security. It saves Social Security surplus for Social Security.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time is remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) has 14½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

□ 1545

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I will vote for the Democrat substitute and, if that fails, I will vote for the Republican bill, but this is not the strongest possible bill that we could bring forth to stabilize and ensure the future of Social Security and Medicare, for several reasons:

Number one, points of order can be waived; and, number two, Congress or a future Congress can simply change the law. The bottom line is it is just too easy to raid this trust fund. And the money coming into this trust fund from one door is already leaving and exiting the other door the next day.

There is an old simple statement from the streets that says, we can do it now or it can do us later, and that is about where we are with Social Security. Both the Democrats and the Republicans want to do the right thing. We are struggling to do the right thing. But neither party, quite frankly, is doing what they say they want to do because there are still the machinations to effect a grab at this money.

I have a little piece of legislation in. We have amended the Constitution to address issues of alcohol, to limit presidential terms, to stop discrimination, to give women the right to vote, and these were the right things to do. And there is only one way to ensure that Social Security money cannot be touched, an amendment to the Constitution of the United States that says the money coming into that trust fund cannot be touched for anything or any reason other than Social Security or Medicare.

Now, we are going to have to tell the truth around here. We cannot come out

with modest caps trying to make everybody look and say, what a nice conservative budget we have, and then go ahead and expand those caps on every appropriation bill we have. There is no money and there is no surplus except in this trust fund.

I was hoping at least to have a debate looking at that process, to see how the States felt. The American people support an amendment to the Constitution that says no person, no President, no Congress, no reason, no cause can jeopardize their trust fund. Social Security has its own revenue measure and, by God, we should not touch it.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY).

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to echo the comments of my dear colleague from the other side of the aisle on the issue of the trust fund being just at that, a trust fund. In California we have had for decades a law that we cannot raid one trust fund and shift it over to other uses.

I guess in Washington it seems very technical on this issue, but I guess I will try to explain it as simply as possible. Social Security is called a trust fund, not a slush fund. It is not a pool of money to be used in any manner that somebody wants to if they can get enough votes.

Maybe that is why the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) is right, a lot of us are looking at the issue that there is not enough lock in the lockbox. Let us be brave enough for us to put it before the Constitution. Let us who really stands for protecting the Social Security Trust Fund in the long run.

But this proposal, Mr. Speaker, is the first step. It is the first step in reforming Social Security. If we are not willing to at least vote for a bill that says we are going to start treating it as a trust fund and not a slush fund, if we are not willing to vote for this proposal, for God's sake, how are we going to find the intestinal fortitude to be able to vote for the other ones we all know are coming down the pike?

This is the statement of credibility and a statement of commitment that we need to start with down the long road towards saving Social Security and Medicare as we know it. I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle not to find excuses to walk away from this first step, but to start this long journey with this first step of voting for this resolution.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE).

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss H.R. 1259, the Social Security and Medicare Safe Deposit Box Act of 1999.

I want to commend the gentleman from California for his leadership in sponsoring this legislation that will take a step toward protecting the Social Security Trust Fund from being raided by the Congress and to tell the

truth to the American people about the Federal budget.

This legislation would tell the American people that in 1998, instead of a \$70 billion surplus we actually had a \$29 billion deficit. This legislation would send a signal to this body that we must continue to exercise fiscal discipline; that we cannot afford a 10 percent across-the-board tax cut or new spending programs.

This legislation would prevent, for example, the \$13 billion appropriation Congress made from the Social Security surplus just last week to pay for a measure that totaled \$15 billion in so-called emergency spending, when we were forced to make a choice between funding our troops and saving the Social Security surplus.

Mr. Speaker, I am committed to the principles underlying this bill. As a Nation, we must adopt and adhere to principles of truth in budgeting and fiscal responsibility. On February 10 I introduced H.R. 685, legislation that would permanently ensure that receipts and expenditures from the Social Security trust funds are not included in the unified budget. That was the idea of our former colleague, Mr. Bob Livingston.

H.R. 685 ensures that the Congressional Budget Office and the OMB stop the practice of publishing confusing aggregate budget numbers that deceive the American people about the true nature of the Federal budget and tempt Congress to continue conducting irresponsible fiscal policy.

Clearly, we all agree that now is the time to keep faith with our constituents, to present Federal budget information in a manner that demonstrates the state of Federal surpluses or deficits without reference to Social Security trust funds. I believed then and I believe now that the honest approach, the correct approach is to permanently sequester the Social Security Trust Fund today, tomorrow and for all time. A trust should be just that, it should not be violated.

While H.R. 1259 is a step in the right direction, it does not get the job done. It permits any spending or tax bill, bills that would be paid for by Social Security Trust Funds, as long as the bill is described as one that would be intended for Social Security reform or Medicare reform. It fails to protect the Social Security Trust Fund from creative legislating. In short, Mr. Speaker, it falls short of the standard of honesty the American people deserve.

I believe that proposals to protect and strengthen Social Security and Medicare deserve careful consideration by this Congress. I oppose this rule because it limits debate. When the time comes today, I urge my colleagues to support the adoption of the Holt-Lucas-Moore language that would protect the on-budget surplus as well as the Social Security surplus from being spent; I repeat, the on-budget surplus as well as the Social Security surplus from being spent. It specifies that only when the trustees' report declares So-

cial Security to be sound for 75 years and Medicare for 30 years can the on-budget surplus be spent.

We will see you, and raise you one. Please join us.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE).

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of the Social Security and Medicare Safe Deposit Box Act. I appreciate the hard work of the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER), and the part the Committee on Rules played in this I am very proud of.

Mr. Speaker, in 1995 when Republicans took control of Congress, it seemed that budget deficits financed by the Social Security Trust Fund would go on as far as the eye could see. But under Republican leadership, a newfound fiscal discipline contained Congress' penchant for spending and turned things around. Today, we are looking forward to realizing the first Federal budget surplus in decades.

This moment in history presents us with a perfect opportunity to set a new standard by which we will define a true budget surplus. This new definition will ensure that no Social Security money is included in that equation.

For more than 30 years big spenders in Washington have been raiding the Social Security Trust Fund to pay for unrelated programs and pet projects. Even after the Congress claimed that it had put a wall between Social Security and general spending by taking the trust fund off-budget, the big spenders continued to dip into our seniors' retirement savings.

Today, with the passage of this legislation, we will stop the big spenders by locking away 100 percent of our seniors' hard-earned retirement dollars for their Social Security and Medicare benefits. Over 10 years' time this legislation will protect \$1.8 trillion, \$1.8 trillion, from the greedy grab of those who thrive on immediate spending satisfaction and ignore the long-term consequences.

The Social Security and Medicare Safe Deposit Box Act prohibits the House and Senate from considering any legislation that spends the Social Security surplus, the one exception being legislation that improves the financial health of the Social Security or Medicare programs. This act would provide honesty in Federal budgeting, fiscal discipline and financial security for our Nation's seniors.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this rule and H.R. 1259, in support of a new era in Federal budgeting that honors the social contract among the Federal Government, America's workers, and our Nation's seniors. Let us restore the public's faith in our government as the trustees of our hard-earned dollars by locking them safely away for their golden years.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KLECZKA).

(Mr. KLECZKA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the previous Member of Congress who spoke indicated that the big spenders continue to dip into the Social Security surplus. I ask her who are these big spenders? Point them out. Ask them to stand. Because I will tell my colleague who they are. They are the Members of the majority party who last week took a bill the President introduced for \$6 billion and parlayed that into a \$15 billion bill. Where does my colleague think that additional \$9 billion came from? It came from the Social Security surplus.

These are the same people today who are telling us, let us protect the Social Security surplus. Why did they not bring this bill up 2 weeks ago so that grab of last week would not have been possible? Because they could not satisfy their special interest friends. The bulk of those \$9 billion went to the defense contractors, big contributors to the Republican Party. But now, after they have taken the dollars, they come to the floor obsessed with this "protect Social Security."

They say for the last 40 years the Democrats have spent it. Where do my colleagues think the dollars came from for the Reagan tax cuts? There was no general revenue surplus during those years. Every dollar of that tax cut came from Social Security surplus. Where do my colleagues think the additional spending during the Bush administration came from for budget purposes? It came from the Social Security surplus.

So let us not go pointing fingers at one side or the other. The Republicans are as good at spending it as we are, as evidenced by their actions last week where they took a \$6 billion administration request, parlayed it into \$15 billion, \$9 billion more, which came from the Social Security surplus.

Now, let us talk about this lockbox. I think the only way we are going to provide solvency to the Social Security System is by a reform bill. Lockboxes, my colleagues, are eyewash. They do not do anything to provide a 75-year window for Social Security recipients in this country.

□ 1600

So take with a grain of salt, my friends, what we hear today, because last week it was okay to raid \$9 billion out of the Social Security surplus; and today they are aghast, my God, what is this Congress doing?

And I say to my colleagues, my God, what did they do last week? That was okay spending, because that was for our favorite programs and our favorite special interest group. That is hushagawa. If my colleagues want to know what hushagawa is, call my office.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to our

friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule.

I would like to congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER), who has worked long and hard on this question, and I believe is on the right track in pursuing this.

Let me state what is our intention as far as management. Based on the proposal that we had from the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules, I have, per usual, acquiesced to his request; and we will, in fact, have the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative and Budget Process join with me in managing the 40 minutes of debate for the Committee on Rules.

Then we will shift, and under the very able management of the author of the legislation, the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER), we will see the 40 minutes of the Committee on the Budget consumed.

Then the Committee on Ways and Means, under the leadership of the Subcommittee on Social Security chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), will manage it from our side. I can only assume that the ranking members on the minority side will proceed with management in that way.

So I just wanted my colleagues to know that, per usual, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) got his way.

Let me say that that measure is, I believe, a very, very important one. If we were to go back to 1937, at the very beginning of Social Security, one has got to look at what its intent was. It was to provide survivors benefits and to supplement retirement. It was never intended to be a sole source of survival for retirement, but it was to provide a supplement.

We have seen the Social Security system grow to some two programs at its high point; and we have, fortunately, made some modifications of it. But the tragedy was that in 1969, and even earlier, we saw this step made towards getting into the Social Security fund for a wide range of other very well-intentioned programs.

That was wrong. It was wrong because American workers are not given any kind of option as to whether or not they pay into Social Security. They are told, very simply, that they have to pay half of that FICA tax and their employer has to pay the other half. Again, it is not an option.

I remember my first job when I was a teenager, and I looked at the amount of money that was being taken out in that FICA tax and I was appalled. And today I continue to be appalled at the high rate of taxation that we have. But then when one looks at the fact that those dollars that were intended to be

put aside to provide assistance to supplement retirement, that they all of a sudden were expended for a wide range of other things, it was wrong. It was wrong.

That is why many of us, being led by the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) on this issue stepped up and said, when people are forced to pay into the Social Security Trust Fund and Medicare, they should in fact be able to count on those dollars going there.

That is exactly what we are trying to do here. We are trying to say to the American people, the Federal Government tells them that they are going to put their dollars there, and so the Federal Government is going to meet its responsibility to ensure that they have those resources when they are counting on them at their retirement.

And so what we are doing is, we are saying that a point of order can be raised if an attempt to raid that fund is taking place.

Now, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), my friend and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, earlier started talking about some back room deal that he said we are going to be getting into. That is not going to happen. Why? Because under the Herger proposal that we have, a point of order must be raised and it takes 218 votes. Every Member of this House will have the opportunity to make a determination as to whether or not we proceed or not.

Now, without getting terribly partisan, and I know we have had finger-pointing, the last speaker talked about the fact that big defense contractors who support the Republican Party were responsible for that \$15 billion bill. Well, the fact of the matter is, the President has only deployed 265,000 troops to 139 countries around the world. It seems to me that maybe we should try to pay for that and prepare for challenges that we have got.

So that was not what motivated us on this thing. It was an absolute emergency that needed to be addressed. But to blur that with the issue of trying to preserve Social Security and Medicare is wrong.

So we are taking what is a very measured, balanced step to do our doggonedest to make sure that the American people who put dollars aside for retirement will in fact be able to count on them.

So I congratulate again my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER), and I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and the manager of this measure for yielding me this time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), the author of the amendment that will be proposed by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1927, legislation that I wrote with my colleagues, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LUCAS) and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE), and which will be offered today by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) as the motion to recommit.

Our legislation will safeguard two of our Nation's most important programs for the elderly: Social Security and Medicare. The Holt-Lucas-Moore Social Security and Medicare lockbox would require that every penny of the entire Federal budget surplus, not just the Social Security surplus, would be saved until legislation is enacted to strengthen and protect Social Security and Medicare first.

This we need to do. We cut into the surplus as recently as last week's spending bill, which brought forward a new definition of the word "emergency." Any new spending increases would have to be offset until solvency has been extended for Social Security by 75 years and for Medicare by 30 years.

These requirements would be enforced by creating new points of order against any budget resolution or legislation violating these conditions.

Spending any projected budget surpluses before protecting and strengthening Social Security and Medicare would be wrong. We are offering this proposal now because we are concerned about the haste with which some Social Security lockbox proposals are being brought to the floor and, I might add, being brought to the floor without possibility of amendment.

The proposals to protect and strengthen Social Security and Medicare deserve thorough examination and careful consideration. Congress should not take shortcuts when considering changes of these hallmark programs for America's seniors.

The Herger-Shaw lockbox bill attempts to protect Social Security surplus. Merely doing this does nothing to extend the solvency of Social Security and it does nothing at all for Medicare.

The Holt-Lucas-Moore bill is superior to the Herger-Shaw lockbox because our lockbox is more secure and has more money in it. The Holt-Lucas-Moore saves the entire surplus, not just the Social Security surplus, by establishing two new points of order under the Congressional Budget Act. A point of order would lie against any budget resolution that would use any projected surplus. This is defined to mean, in effect, reduce a projected surplus or increase a projected deficit.

Further, a point of order would lie against any legislation that would use any projected surplus. In the Senate, 60 votes would be required to waive either of these points of order.

Holt-Lucas-Moore differs from Herger-Shaw in one important respect.

Holt-Lucas-Moore locks up all projected surpluses: Social Security, Medicare and anything else. Herger-Shaw locks up only Social Security surpluses.

Mr. Speaker, Social Security and Medicare are the most important and successful programs of the Federal Government of the 20th century. We must not forget that they provide vitally important protections for America's seniors.

A majority of workers have no pension coverage other than Social Security, and more than three-fifths of seniors receive most of their income from Social Security. Let us put the needs of America's current and future retirees first.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it was the Chinese proverb that says, "A thousand mile journey begins with a single step." This is that step.

For those who say it is not enough, I wonder where they have been for the last 30 years when they could have done more. Nothing like this has been tried before. For those who say it is not enough, I remind them that the Democrats in the Senate killed a tougher one.

We would like it to be more. But it is the first step for doing something that has been long overdue. That is to say, if we make a payment in our payroll taxes for our retirement and our health care in our retirement years, it ought to go there. That is all we are saying. And we are going to see that it does go there.

I expect this to get a very large vote. I urge my colleagues to support this rule, get the debate under way on the lockbox bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 205, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 162]

YEAS—223

Aderholt	Bass	Bonilla
Archer	Bateman	Bono
Army	Bereuter	Brady (TX)
Bachus	Biggert	Bryant
Baker	Bilbray	Burr
Ballenger	Bilirakis	Burton
Barr	Bliley	Buyer
Barrett (NE)	Blunt	Callahan
Bartlett	Boehlert	Calvert
Barton	Boehner	Camp

Campbell	Hobson	Portman
Canady	Hoekstra	Pryce (OH)
Cannon	Horn	Quinn
Castle	Hostettler	Radanovich
Chabot	Houghton	Ramstad
Chambliss	Hulshof	Regula
Chenoweth	Hunter	Reynolds
Coble	Hutchinson	Riley
Coburn	Hyde	Rogan
Collins	Isakson	Rogers
Combest	Istook	Rohrabacher
Cook	Jenkins	Ros-Lehtinen
Cooksey	Johnson (CT)	Roukema
Crane	Johnson, Sam	Royce
Cubin	Jones (NC)	Ryan (WI)
Cunningham	Kelly	Ryun (KS)
Davis (VA)	King (NY)	Salmon
Deal	Kingston	Sanford
DeLay	Knollenberg	Saxton
DeMint	Kolbe	Scarborough
Diaz-Balart	Kuykendall	Schaffer
Dickey	LaHood	Sensenbrenner
Doolittle	Largent	Sessions
Dreier	Latham	Shadegg
Duncan	LaTourette	Shaw
Dunn	Lazio	Shays
Ehlers	Leach	Sherwood
Ehrlich	Lewis (CA)	Shimkus
Emerson	Lewis (KY)	Shuster
English	Linder	Simpson
Eshoo	LoBiondo	Skeen
Everett	Lucas (OK)	Smith (MI)
Ewing	Maloney (NY)	Smith (NJ)
Fletcher	Manzullo	Smith (TX)
Foley	McCollum	Souder
Forbes	McCrery	Spence
Fossella	McHugh	Stearns
Fowler	McInnis	Stump
Franks (NJ)	McIntosh	Sununu
Frelinghuysen	McKeon	Sweeney
Galleghy	Metcalf	Talent
Ganske	Mica	Tancredo
Gekas	Miller (FL)	Tauzin
Gibbons	Miller, Gary	Taylor (NC)
Gilchrest	Minge	Terry
Gillmor	Moran (KS)	Thomas
Gilman	Morella	Thornberry
Goodlatte	Myrick	Thune
Goodling	Nethercutt	Tiahrt
Gordon	Ney	Toomey
Goss	Northup	Upton
Graham	Norwood	Walden
Granger	Nussle	Walsh
Green (WI)	Ose	Wamp
Greenwood	Oxley	Watkins
Gutknecht	Packard	Watts (OK)
Hansen	Paul	Weldon (FL)
Hastert	Pease	Weldon (PA)
Hastings (WA)	Peterson (MN)	Weller
Hayes	Peterson (PA)	Wicker
Hayworth	Petri	Wilson
Hefley	Pickering	Wolf
Herger	Pitts	Young (FL)
Hill (MT)	Pombo	
Hilleary	Porter	

NAYS—205

Abercrombie	Clyburn	Gejdenson
Ackerman	Condit	Gephardt
Allen	Conyers	Gonzalez
Andrews	Costello	Goode
Baird	Coyne	Green (TX)
Baldacci	Cramer	Gutierrez
Baldwin	Crowley	Hall (OH)
Barcia	Cummings	Hall (TX)
Barrett (WI)	Danner	Hastings (FL)
Becerra	Davis (FL)	Hill (IN)
Bentsen	Davis (IL)	Hilliard
Berkley	DeFazio	Hinchey
Berman	DeGette	Hinojosa
Berry	Delahunt	Hoefel
Bishop	DeLauro	Holden
Blagojevich	Deutsch	Holt
Blumenauer	Dicks	Hooley
Bonior	Dingell	Hoyer
Borski	Dixon	Inslee
Boswell	Doggett	Jackson (IL)
Boucher	Dooley	Jackson-Lee
Boyd	Doyle	(TX)
Brady (PA)	Edwards	Jefferson
Brown (FL)	Engel	John
Brown (OH)	Etheridge	Johnson, E. B.
Capps	Evans	Jones (OH)
Capuano	Farr	Kanjorski
Cardin	Fattah	Kaptur
Carson	Filner	Kennedy
Clay	Ford	Kildee
Clayton	Frank (MA)	Kilpatrick
Clement	Frost	Kind (WI)

Klecza	Moore	Shows
Klink	Moran (VA)	Sisisky
Kucinich	Murtha	Skelton
LaFalce	Nadler	Slaughter
Lampson	Napolitano	Smith (WA)
Lantos	Neal	Snyder
Larson	Oberstar	Spratt
Lee	Obey	Stabenow
Levin	Olver	Stark
Lewis (GA)	Ortiz	Stenholm
Lipinski	Owens	Strickland
Lofgren	Pallone	Stupak
Lowey	Pascrell	Tanner
Lucas (KY)	Pastor	Tauscher
Luther	Payne	Taylor (MS)
Maloney (CT)	Phelps	Thompson (CA)
Markey	Pickett	Thompson (MS)
Martinez	Pomeroy	Thurman
Mascara	Price (NC)	Tierney
Matsui	Rahall	Towns
McCarthy (MO)	Rangel	Trafficant
McCarthy (NY)	Reyes	Turner
McDermott	Rivers	Udall (CO)
McGovern	Rodriguez	Udall (NM)
McIntyre	Roemer	Velazquez
McKinney	Rothman	Vento
McNulty	Roybal-Allard	Visclosky
Meehan	Rush	Waters
Meek (FL)	Sabo	Watt (NC)
Meeks (NY)	Sanchez	Waxman
Menendez	Sanders	Weiner
Millender	Sandlin	Wexler
McDonald	Sawyer	Weygand
Miller, George	Schakowsky	Wise
Mink	Scott	Woolsey
Moakley	Serrano	Wu
Mollohan	Sherman	Wynn

NOT VOTING—6

Brown (CA)	Kasich	Whitfield
Cox	Pelosi	Young (AK)

□ 1633

Mr. BERRY and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I understand that S. 254, the Juvenile Justice and Gun Violence bill is at the desk. How would a Member seek to get its immediate consideration?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The answer to the gentleman's parliamentary inquiry is by demonstration of proper clearance from both sides of the aisle, the floor and committee leadership of the House under guidelines of the Speaker.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, could I make a unanimous consent request that S. 254, dealing with juvenile justice and gun violence, be brought up for immediate consideration?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's guidelines, as indicated on page 562 of the Manual, the Chair must decline recognition under unanimous consent for that purpose.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state her inquiry.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, is there not precedent for

holding a bill at the desk such as S. 254 and bringing it up on the floor in the nature or in the case of a national emergency or crisis?

We are presently told by parents all over the Nation that school violence, youth violence, is a national crisis, and S. 254 will respond to that.

Is it possible, Mr. Speaker, then that we would bring this in the name of a national crisis and an emergency?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has failed to state an appropriate parliamentary inquiry.

The answer, however, is, Senate bills may be held at the desk until such time as there is appropriate clearance within the House, which is not the case at the moment, and the Chair is constrained to decline recognition for that purpose.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE SAFE DEPOSIT BOX ACT OF 1999

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 186, I call up the bill (H.R. 1259) to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to protect Social Security surpluses through strengthened budgetary enforcement mechanisms, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 186, the bill is considered read for amendment, and the amendment printed in section 2 of that resolution is adopted.

The text of H.R. 1259, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 1259

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Social Security and Medicare Safe Deposit Box Act of 1999".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the Congress and the President joined together to enact the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 to end decades of deficit spending;

(2) strong economic growth and fiscal discipline have resulted in strong revenue growth into the Treasury;

(3) the combination of these factors is expected to enable the Government to balance its budget without the social security surpluses;

(4) the Congress has chosen to allocate in this Act all social security surpluses toward saving social security and medicare;

(5) amounts so allocated are even greater than those reserved for social security and medicare in the President's budget, will not require an increase in the statutory debt limit, and will reduce debt held by the public until social security and medicare reform is enacted; and

(6) this strict enforcement is needed to lock away the amounts necessary for legislation to save social security and medicare.

(b) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this Act to prohibit the use of social security surpluses for any purpose other than reforming social security and medicare.

SEC. 3. PROTECTION OF SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUSES.

(a) POINTS OF ORDER TO PROTECT SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUSES.—Section 312 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(g) POINTS OF ORDER TO PROTECT SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUSES.—

"(1) CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS ON THE BUDGET.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any concurrent resolution on the budget, or conference report thereon or amendment thereto, that would set forth an on-budget deficit for any fiscal year.

"(2) SUBSEQUENT LEGISLATION.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report if—

"(A) the enactment of that bill or resolution as reported;

"(B) the adoption and enactment of that amendment; or

"(C) the enactment of that bill or resolution in the form recommended in that conference report;

would cause or increase an on-budget deficit for any fiscal year.

"(3) EXCEPTION.—The point of order set forth in paragraph (2) shall not apply to social security reform legislation or medicare reform legislation as defined by section 5(c) of the Social Security and Medicare Safe Deposit Box Act of 1999.

"(4) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term 'on-budget deficit', when applied to a fiscal year, means the deficit in the budget as set forth in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 301(a)(3) for that fiscal year."

(b) CONTENT OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET.—Section 301(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by redesignating paragraphs (6) and (7) as paragraphs (7) and (8), respectively, and by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

"(6) the receipts, outlays, and surplus or deficit in the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, combined, established by title II of the Social Security Act;"

(c) SUPER MAJORITY REQUIREMENT.—(1) Section 904(c)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by inserting "312(g)," after "310(d)(2)."

(2) Section 904(d)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by inserting "312(g)," after "310(d)(2)."

SEC. 4. REMOVING SOCIAL SECURITY FROM BUDGET PRONOUNCEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Any official statement issued by the Office of Management and

Budget, the Congressional Budget Office, or any other agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government of surplus or deficit totals of the budget of the United States Government as submitted by the President or of the surplus or deficit totals of the congressional budget, and any description of, or reference to, such totals in any official publication or material issued by either of such Offices or any other such agency or instrumentality, shall exclude the outlays and receipts of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program under title II of the Social Security Act (including the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund) and the related provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(b) SEPARATE SOCIAL SECURITY BUDGET DOCUMENTS.—The excluded outlays and receipts of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program under title II of the Social Security Act shall be submitted in separate social security budget documents.

SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—This Act shall take effect upon the date of its enactment and the amendments made by this Act shall apply only to fiscal year 2000 and subsequent fiscal years.

(b) EXPIRATION.—Sections 301(a)(6) and 312(g) shall expire upon the enactment of social security reform legislation and medicare reform legislation.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM LEGISLATION.—The term "social security reform legislation" means a bill or a joint resolution that is enacted into law and includes a provision stating the following: "For purposes of the Social Security and Medicare Safe Deposit Box Act of 1999, this Act constitutes social security reform legislation."

(2) The term "medicare reform legislation" means a bill or a joint resolution that is enacted into law and includes a provision stating the following: "For purposes of the Social Security and Medicare Safe Deposit Box Act of 1999, this Act constitutes medicare reform legislation."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER), the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) each will control 20 minutes of debate on the bill.

The Chair will exercise discretion to recognize managers from each committee in the following order to control their entire debate time: the Committee on Rules, the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1259.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I rise first to once again state what you just did so well, and that is that it is

our intention to have the 40 minutes of debate that the Committee on Rules will be handling on this go ahead right now, and then we will have 40 minutes of debate that will be handled by the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) representing the Committee on the Budget, and then 40 minutes of debate handled by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) representing the Committee on Ways and Means and then the ranking minority members on the opposite side, for our colleagues who would be requesting time on this.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Sanibel, Florida, (Mr. GOSS) is chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative and Budget Process of the Committee on Rules and is going to be managing the time for the Committee on Rules here, but I would like to begin by stating that I believe that this is a very important piece of legislation that we are considering. There has consistently been a high level of frustration over the fact that the Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds have been raided for years for a wide range of well-intended programs, but unfortunately it has jeopardized the solvency of those programs, the Social Security and Medicare programs. So we today are making an attempt to put into place a procedure that will help us keep from moving into those funds at all; and I think it is the right thing to do.

I believe it is the right thing to do because, as I said during the debate on the rule, the American people have been not voluntarily, they have been told that they have to pay into the trust funds through payroll tax withdrawal. The employee puts in one-half, the employer the other half, and yet we, since 1969, have seen these funds raided and used for other programs. That is wrong. The American people know that it is wrong, and we are trying to do our doggonedest to make sure that it does not happen.

Our very good friend from California (Mr. HERGER) has spent a great deal of time working among the three committees of jurisdiction, talking with us, getting cosponsors on his legislation, urging Members of the other body, other side of the aisle, at the White House to support this provision, and I think that he has come forward with what is a very balanced approach.

As my colleagues know, there are people who are saying, oh, we are going to be delving into the Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds. The fact of the matter is a point of order under this Herger bill can be raised, and when it is raised, what happens, Mr. Speaker?

What basically happens is that we have to get 218 Members to cast votes to override that, waive that point of order, and so we are going to work very hard to ensure that we do not, in fact, see a raid on those very important trust funds; and it has been Republican leadership that has stepped up to the plate and acknowledged the responsibility

of that under the able direction of the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) here.

So, Mr. Speaker, while I am going to be turning this over, as I said, to my good friend from Sanibel, Florida (Mr. GOSS), at this point I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from the big "D" in Texas (Mr. ARMEY), our majority leader.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, every time we take on a new legislative issue, bring something to the floor, bring it up in committee or discuss it in leadership, I like to stop and ask for a moment, what is this really all about?

We are going to use a lot of technical talk here, we are going to talk about lockboxes and points of order and so forth, but let me talk for a moment about what it is really all about.

Mr. Speaker, what we are about to do today for the first time ever, ever in the history of Social Security, we are going to pass a resolution that commits this Congress to honor our children as they honor their mothers and fathers.

What do I mean by that? Let me illustrate it with a point.

My young adult daughter, Cathy, in her middle 30s, working hard as a young professional woman oftentimes wears a little button on her lapel. The button says: Who the devil is FICA and why is he taking my money? She represents a lot of pain and difficulty that is experienced by these young people as they pay these very, very difficult payroll taxes; and the young people feel the stress in their own budgets, in their own household budgets as they try to buy their homes, they try to buy braces for their children, as they try to think forward about their own retirement, as they think forward to their own youngsters' college. They know the burden of that tax as well as any other tax.

But do my colleagues know what is beautiful about these children, these young 20- and 30-year-olds, worried as they are about their own retirement security, believing more in UFOs than they believe they will ever see a dime out of Social Security?

□ 1645

They are not complaining. They feel the pressure, they feel the burden, but they do not complain. Why do they not complain? Because, Mr. Speaker, they exhibit every day a love for grandma and grandpa. And they will tell us when we talk to these young adults, these payroll taxes are killing me, but this is what pays for grandma and grandpa's retirement security, and they are happy to do it.

We ought to listen to that. We ought to appreciate that, and indeed, Mr. Speaker, we ought to applaud the generosity and the love we find in these young people.

Now, imagine the hurt and the disappointment they feel as they have exhibited that faith and that love, for

them to now realize that for years, for years much of that payroll tax that they have paid so painfully has not been used for grandma and grandpa's retirement security, has not even been set aside for future needs, but has been spent on other social spending programs.

The young people will tell us, I will take the sacrifice for grandma and grandpa, but I really cannot afford it for all of these other programs. I expect you to keep a faith with me; you call it a "trust fund."

So tonight we are going to honor their commitment, we are going to honor their faith and we are going to honor their trust, and we are going to say, Mr. and Mrs. Young Adult, worried as you are about your own retirement security and sacrificing as you do out of love for grandma and grandpa, we honor you, and we make a commitment with this thing called the lockbox to take those payroll taxes that you pay that are not used today for grandma and grandpa's retirement security and lock them away for the future.

So that when we look at that button on my daughter's lapel and it says, "Who the devil is FICA and why is he taking my money?" we can say FICA is a program of the Federal Government called a trust fund for Social Security that asks you to pay your share so we can commit and fulfill a commitment to your grandparents. Watch these young people applaud us. Finally, they will say, finally somebody keeps the faith, honors our parents as we do, respects us, and will keep the trust. And to what degree? To the highest possible degree we can manage, every dime we can, if we can manage it.

They should understand this is a bigger, larger, more solid commitment than what the President asked in his budget. He asked for only 77 percent. We are saying to the absolute very best of our ability, we will set aside every bit of that money.

I have to say, Mr. Speaker, I am proud of us. I oftentimes make this point. Grandma and grandpa and the grandkids love each other most of all. The reason to me is obvious: They have a common enemy. Maybe after this vote it will not be we that is the common enemy.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I understand what the gentleman is saying, so that the surplus would be there. Where would the money go?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, in the interim period the money goes to buying down the national debt, thereby making that burden of debt lower on our children in the future. We, of course, anticipate on our side that the President might make good on his promise to advance a serious legislative proposal to fix Social Security. We have been waiting for two years for the President to take that presidential

leadership. He has not gotten around to doing that yet, but in the meantime that money will, in fact, be committed, as \$75 billion is in this fiscal year, to buying down the debt and making it less burdensome for those children.

Mr. HOYER. So essentially, other than the amount of money, the gentleman would adopt the proposal that the President made in his State of the Union?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, essentially what we would do is do what the President has been talking about for two years.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the question before the Congress today is do we want to fix Social Security or not? Do we want to take the first test toward shoring up one of our most important social programs, or do we just want to pretend to do something?

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it. Social Security will collapse in the year 2034. Today's workers are paying into a program that is going to collapse just 35 years from now, and it is our job to fix it right now.

But instead of making the tough decision to do something substantial, my Republican colleagues are taking a pass. Instead of acting, they are offering this country this point of order which the Democrats already enacted some 14 years ago and which merely restates congressional policy. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it is weaker than the existing law.

In contrast, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), along with the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE), take the first step towards fixing Social Security. The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, will be offering a motion to recommit based on the language of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) to protect all of the resources we need to fix Social Security and Medicare. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) says no new tax cuts for the rich and no new spending programs for anyone that are not paid for until Social Security and Medicare are safe.

Unlike the Republican point of order, our motion locks up not only the Social Security surplus but also the budget surplus. Because, Mr. Speaker, until we set about fixing Social Security and Medicare, there is no telling what tools we will need to get the job done. And we cannot sidestep a point of order by simply calling a proposal Social Security or Medicare reform. Unless the Social Security trustees and the Medicare trustees declare their programs financially sound, no money should be spent that is not offset by simultaneous deficit reductions. If our motion to recommit passes, none will.

Mr. Speaker, this is by far the most important issue facing this Congress,

and we owe it to the American people to address it. There was a time not too long ago when the elderly constituted a large part of our poor population in this country. Millions of senior citizens did not have enough to eat. They could not pay for rent, they could not afford doctors' visits. But since the advent of Social Security and Medicare, those times have changed.

On August 14, 1935, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt signed the Social Security Act into law. The first Social Security monthly check was made out and sent to Ida May Fuller of Vermont for all of \$22.54. Back then there were 7,620 people in the program. This March there are 44,247,000 people on Social Security, which averages over \$781 apiece for the retirees.

Since the Social Security program began, 390 million Social Security numbers have been assigned and, Mr. Speaker, each one of them carries a promise to American workers that once they reach that specific age, they can count on Social Security to take care of their bills and they can count on Medicare to take care of their health problems.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the majority of American seniors get most of their income from Social Security, and nearly every single one of them has health insurance, thanks to Medicare. This program is a very essential part of our country's promise to take care of its citizens, and we need to get serious about ensuring its financial health long into the future.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire as to the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) has 14½ minutes remaining; and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I would be very happy to let the gentleman from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts continue.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I think on occasions like this it is important to ask ourselves, individually and collectively, how did we get to this moment? As we close the pages on this century, I think it is important to reflect upon two very important votes that were cast in this decade in this House.

In 1991, the majority of Members of the Democratic Party voted for George Bush's budget. In retrospect, I think it is kind of sad that not only did we not have a majority of Republicans, we would have had only a small number who would have supported George Bush's budget. In 1993 we voted for President Clinton's budget, and we ask

ourselves tonight, where did we arrive after those two critical votes?

We went from running \$300 billion plus deficits in the early part of this decade to projected surpluses in the area, and I emphasize the word "projected", of \$4.4 trillion. That is what has allowed us to take up this debate.

Now, while I am pleased that the Republican Party has taken this step, I think it is also important to ask, why not tie up or wall off the entire surplus until we fix Social Security and Medicare for the American people?

Mr. Speaker, we sometimes speak in distant terms to our constituents, but we should remind ourselves today that Social Security is not an esoteric issue. It is a lifeline for millions and millions and millions of Americans. And even as I speak and Members sit here today, the ghost of Mr. Roosevelt hovers around this room, because we can take satisfaction from the fact that there has been no greater domestic achievement in this century than Social Security for the American people, and remind ourselves as well that Medicare is but an amendment to the Social Security Act.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say as forcefully as I can that we are headed down the road eventually to another debate over this issue. On the Democratic side, I think our position is fairly clear: Wall off the surplus, do not do anything until we permanently fix Social Security and Medicare.

But I want to predict this evening with certainty that we are going to be back here in the near future voting on a huge tax cut, because that is really where the majority wants to go on this issue. They want to have a massive tax cut for wealthy Americans who, by the way, to their everlasting credit are not even clamoring for a tax cut at this time, and that is where the American people are going to have to watch as to who defends Social Security.

The history of Social Security has been one of initiative by the Democratic Party, and in addition, we have been its chief and sometimes exclusive defenders in this institution, and indeed in this city. We know what Social Security means for millions of widows in this Nation. We know what Social Security means for retirees. It is the difference for many of survival, to have that check from the Federal Government but once a month.

Social Security has worked beyond the expectations of Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Johnson in terms of Social Security and Medicare, beyond the wildest expectations of those who at the time opposed it.

So keep your eyes on what we are going to do about Social Security in this Congress. Follow this debate with great care. Because I am telling my colleagues, we are coming back to a debate in the near future about a massive tax cut that clearly could undo precisely what we are talking about today.

□ 1700

Mr. Speaker, there are many of us here in my age group that have already drawn social security benefits, survivor benefits. We know what social security is about. We know how it kept families intact. We know how it allowed millions of Americans to finish high school and to go to college. Social security is a critical issue. It is intergenerational. It is the best guarantee of the whole notion of community.

What do we mean by community? We mean a place where no one is ever to be abandoned and no one is ever to be left behind.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the Committee on Rules, which shares original jurisdiction over this legislation with the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Ways and Means. Obviously, I very strongly support this bipartisan procedural mechanism to lock away the social security trust fund. That is what we are here for.

The nuts and bolts of what we are doing here today are actually very simple, but their impact is very, very significant and very reassuring, I think, to our senior citizens and to our younger workers.

What this bill says is that we will completely wall off the social security trust fund, so much so that we will not allow a deficit to be created in the rest of the budget. That is a major departure from where the rules leave us currently. It is big progress.

The not-so-secret secret about the Federal budget is that when there is overspending in the nonsocial security part of the budget, then the social security part of the budget is automatically, automatically tapped to cover the shortfall. That is how it is. That is how it is not going to be anymore, because we are going to fix that.

This social security lockbox says that from now on, this activity will be forced out into the open and will be prohibited by our rules. In order to break the lock on the lockbox, Congress is going to have to explicitly vote to do so in a publicly-recorded vote. In the other body, where recent history suggests to some that spending may indeed be out of control, a three-fifths vote will be needed.

This procedural firewall will remain in effect at least until legislation expressly for the purpose of reforming both the social security and the Medicare programs is enacted. It is important to note that we have taken the extra steps of including Medicare reform in the mix. We are opting to err on the side of caution with this added cushion to make sure we take care of both programs crucial to the retirement security of all Americans.

In addition to the new point of order created by this proposal, there is also the new requirement that the Office of Management and Budget, OMB, as we

know it here, the Congressional Budget Office, CBO, and any other government agency must exclude social security receipts in their displays of budget totals.

Currently we allow for two sets of totals to be displayed, one with and one without counting the social security reserves. That current practice in my view and in the view of many others creates the temptation for overlap between the general fund and social security. I must say, that appears to be a temptation that the Democrat majority of the past 40 years could not resist.

This legislation is designed to remove that temptation once and for all. No more raiding social security. Mr. Speaker, to me this is as much about accountability and coming clean with the American people as it is about locking away social security.

For too long the Federal bureaucracy has been able to have its cake and eat it, too; to talk about social security off-budget, but still using the trust fund as a soft landing pillow for the overspending free fall.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules is the keeper of the gate when it comes to our budget process. We manage the points of order that are designed to constrain our actions in the budget process. H.R. 1259 adds an additional restriction and forces Congress and the President to be accountable for locking away the social security trust fund.

When we passed our budget resolution this spring, we pledged that we were going to implement a real lockbox for social security. Now we are here. We are delivering on our promise. That is very good news for our seniors, and frankly, it is about time. This is bipartisan and I think it deserves our support.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

(Mr. BENTSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset that I have nothing but respect for the authors of this legislation, but I do have some problems with it. I am going to vote for it at the end if the Democratic substitute is not adopted, but this bill really should have gone through the committee process, because I think there are a number of things that could have been corrected.

Let me go through just a few points. First of all, this bill, as I said, is part problematic and part semantical as well.

There is one thing we should remember. This bill does not create new obligations to social security. Social security, the social security surplus, is protected in U.S. Treasury bonds backed by the full faith and credit of the government. We have never, the U.S. government has never defaulted on our Treasury bonds since Alexander Ham-

ilton became the first Secretary of the Treasury. God help us in the day that we do default.

I think that is one thing we have to get across. Second of all, I am afraid that this bill sets us up, perhaps inadvertently, for the stage of breaking the pay-go rules and the caps that got us into the better fiscal condition that we are today.

Finally, I am afraid that this bill is not constructed in the way that even the balanced budget amendment that many of the proponents had endorsed would deal with economic downturns.

I know a lot of us think that the economy is so good now that we are not going to see another economic downturn, or that the Clinton recovery is going to continue on for many, many years. But I think at some point in the future we may get to the end of the business cycle and we will see unemployment go up.

But this bill would put us back to where the Congress was in the early 1990s when we were in a deep recession, and the Bush administration was opposing extending the unemployment compensation. This bill would put that opposition in the hands of 41 Members of the other body. I do not think that is something that we really want to do.

Mr. Speaker, let me talk a little bit about the pay-go situation. This bill inadvertently, I believe, while walling off the off-budget, the social security and Medicare surpluses, would I think put the on budget surplus, to the extent it exists, out there for the taking.

We have already seen a budget passed by this Congress that would impose an \$800 billion tax cut on a 10-year projection at great risk to the future stability of the economy, and in fact not pay down nearly as much debt as the Democrats proposed in their budget, which would be probably the best thing we could do for the economy and for social security right now.

So I think this is the first step to getting us back down the road to the failure of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings and more debt and deficit spending. Finally, this budget, this plan, really does not do anything for social security or Medicare.

As I pointed out, the obligation to the trust funds is real. It is backed by the full faith and credit of the government; again, a credit that we have never defaulted on. This does nothing to extend social security. It does nothing to extend Medicare. It creates no legal obligation to the extension of those programs.

What it does do is it creates a huge trap door in the future, because it contains a sentence that says that you can get out of this lockbox. "For purposes of the Social Security and Medicare Safe Deposit Act of 1999, this Act constitutes social security reform legislation."

That is a fairly broad term with no definition, so whoever the majority might be in the future if this were to become law could make anything that

they wanted to be so-called social security reform legislation and get into it.

I presume Members could take a bill that the Republican majority in both the House and Senate, like the supplemental appropriations that started out at about \$6 billion when it came from the White House and ended up at about \$15 billion, and say it included something to do with social security reform, and pass it and eat into the social security trust fund.

This is well-intentioned, it is probably good for press releases, but it does not do a whole lot.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK).

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this commonsense legislation. It is that. This is the effort to protect social security.

We have made a promise to every American that social security is going to be there for them. It is a promise that many of them do not think we will ever keep. My own children are in that group. They say to me every day, sure, mom, give me a break. It is not going to be there for me. I have to take care of myself.

I understand why they think that way, because Congress has continued just over all the years to raise social security to pay for pork barrel projects and even transportation projects, just spending. It has been an easy pot of money to go to whenever we needed a little extra.

It is time to stop the foolishness. We are supposed to be responsible and dependable, and we are supposed to be here to protect the future of our seniors and our kids. This is a real important step in making sure that that happens. It is time that social security taxes are used for social security.

We have not been truthful. We are not being truthful if we say we are balancing the Federal budget, and it is not balanced because we continue to borrow from social security. Let us not pretend that it is. It is time for us to exercise true fiscal discipline. We need to pass the bill and guarantee that this Congress keeps its promises to save social security.

I strongly support the bill offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER), and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN).

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Social Security and Medicare Safe Deposit Box Act of 1999; I like to call it, the "Put the Social Security Money Where Your Mouth is Act."

As I travel through the Second District of Kansas, there is a lot of skepticism that we in Washington will not be able to actually keep our fingers out of the social security cookie jar. They are asking for proof, not just political rhetoric.

That is why I support this bill. It requires us to talk about budget numbers and surpluses without using social security money to balance the ledger. It also goes beyond mere truth in budgeting. The bill puts enforcement mechanisms into place to prevent future Congresses from raiding social security without any accountability.

Mr. Speaker, the debate on this issue cannot be more timely, considering the current debate surrounding the appropriations process.

In April, we passed a budget resolution. We stood in the well of this House, in the very place that I am standing now, and we gave our word to the American people that beginning with next year's appropriations, we would no longer spend social security money.

We must keep our word to the people we represent. There are some very real structural reforms that we can make that will help support and bring about the changes for social security and Medicare. This Congress must exercise the fiscal discipline to set aside this money for requirement security only. We cannot, and I repeat, we cannot commit these scarce dollars to new spending or we will never be able to make the reforms that are necessary.

I trust that the leadership on both sides of the aisle will agree to move forward with the debate on these critical reform issues in the very near future. Mr. Speaker, I encourage each of my colleagues to support the Safe Deposit Box Act, and it is my hope that the other body and the President will do the same.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this very important legislation. We are well beyond the time to think about the future of social security. We are well beyond the time to determine if we can do the very first thing that determines whether we are in fact serious about the future of social security.

We hear about having a plan in place. We hear about the importance of knowing what we are going to do in 2024 or 2035, or whenever it might be.

□ 1715

The key thing we need to be able to do right now is make a commitment to stop spending the Social Security funds that come to the Federal Government. That is pretty easy for us to say, but it is awfully hard for us to do. In fact, it is so hard for us to do, we have not saved a single penny of Social Security until last year for the last 2 years.

If we cannot put the money aside, if we cannot hold on to those resources, it does not matter what kind of reform plan we come up with.

Our first challenge is this challenge. Our first challenge is to stop spending the money. It is to stop calculating the money in the funds available to the

Federal Government for general spending.

An important part of this whole concept is quickly moving away from even calculating the Social Security funds coming in as income, to stop calculating them as income, to stop calculating them as funds available to be spent, to truly take them off the table.

We are not just going to lock them in a box that does not pay interest. We are not going to lock them away and not use them in the way that we should use those funds for the future of Social Security. We are going to lock them away from the spenders in Washington, D.C. who have enjoyed the ability since 1969 to spend this money, who have enjoyed the ability to make the deficit appear that much smaller, who have enjoyed the ability to come up with new programs on top of the programs we have had, to act like we had the money available to pay those, to not be willing to go to the American people and say we are spending your Social Security funds because we were counting those funds just like we count any other funds that come in to the Federal Government.

These are not like any other funds. They are Social Security funds. They are about the future of this system. They need to be set aside for the future of this system. We need to take a critical step to do that today. I urge support of this legislation.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, let us get to the reality here. The majority party has passed a budget resolution that places this Congress in a box, and they do not know how to get out of it.

So what is the tactic today? It is to bring the so-called lockbox here. As to Social Security funds, that is easy to get out of. All anybody has to do is bring a bill up here and put a label on it that it is Social Security reform, and the lockbox is unlocked.

The gentleman before me talked about, we must not spend Social Security surplus monies. What did my colleagues do within the last few weeks? The majority party here loaded onto an emergency bill provisions unrelated to emergencies. Where did the money come from? From Social Security surplus funds.

So why are my colleagues so blatant 1 week and so pious the next week? The public wants some consistency. That is what it wants. What it wants is reform, not a bunch of rhetoric. What it wants is something palpable, not political. They will see through this.

I mean, sure, we are going to vote for this, because this is an effort to try to get us into a position of appearing to be preserving Social Security, though it really does not do it very well. I heard a previous speaker talk about Medicare and how important it was to

preserve Medicare funds. This lockbox does not do it. When we look inside, there is no Medicare money in it, with or without a key.

So this is the challenge to the majority, to try to get out of the box that the resolution on the budget placed us in and to do something real about Social Security reform, get a bill in front of the Committee on Ways and Means that has the support of the majority leadership, not its covert effort to undermine Social Security reform, and let us get with it and let us do the same as to Medicare. Let us get with it.

People do not want devices like boxes, with or without keys. What they want is legislation. Let us get with it. Let us do away with the tricks, and let us get on with concrete legislation, to do what the American people want, preserve Social Security for 75 years, and reform Medicare so that my kid and my grandchildren know it will be there for them.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address some of the misguided criticisms that we have heard from the previous speaker and from speakers prior to that one. One, they mentioned that we passed the budget resolution that places us in a box. We did pass a budget resolution that places us in a box. We did this intentionally. It placed us in a box because we said we did not want to see one penny of Social Security dollars going to other government programs. We wanted to see every penny of Social Security going into Social Security. We passed a budget resolution that said we would do just that.

We are following up now with a lockbox bill, the first step in our lockbox efforts to do just that, to stop the phony accounting here in Congress that hides the budget deficits by masking the size of the budget deficits, by covering it up with the Social Security surpluses.

This lockbox bill also says this: We are going to make it tougher for Congress to pass legislation that raids Social Security. Now we think we can go farther, and we in fact want to go farther with this legislation. Unfortunately, the White House and the members of the other body from the other party are against that. We cannot get it passed into law. So we are going as far as we possibly can.

Another criticism we have been hearing from the other side of the aisle is that there is a trap door in this lockbox, that there are some keys that magically unlock these funds for use for other purposes. The prior speaker also said we need to reform Social Security and Medicare. We need comprehensive language to reform Social Security. But before we do that, we have got to stop raiding the trust fund,

and that is exactly what this legislation does.

So there is no trap door. What this legislation does is say, stop raiding the trust fund, put Social Security dollars aside; then we can use those Social Security dollars for a comprehensive plan to save Social Security. That is the intent of this legislation, stop raiding the trust fund, put the money aside. Then after we have stopped that raid, we can use those dollars to save Social Security. That is not a trap door. That is a lockbox.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this "Lock box" legislation and congratulate my friend from California for his work on this issue. I am a cosponsor of this bill and am glad to be a part of this effort to protect the Social Security Trust Fund.

For years, the Federal government has been raiding Social Security to pay for other government programs and to mask the true size of the federal deficit. Bringing this to an end is one of my highest priorities in Congress.

Earlier this year, I introduced similar "Lock box" legislation that would establish a point of order against any future budget resolutions which would dip into the Social Security Trust Fund to pay for non-Social Security programs. I was pleased that my language was included in the FY 2000 budget resolution.

H.R. 1259 expands this point of order to apply to any bill, considered in either House, which would dip into Social Security. In addition, it prohibits reporting federal budget totals that include Social Security surpluses.

I am committed to exploring every legislative option available to protect Social Security. I, along with the chairman of the House Budget Committee, Mr. KASICH, have introduced additional "Lock box" legislation which would establish even more protections for the Social Security Trust Fund by implementing new enforceable limits on the amount of debt held by the public.

It is important to note that neither the bill we are considering today, nor the bills I just spoke about, will affect current Social Security benefits. These bills simply protect the money each taxpayer pays into the Social Security Trust Fund.

H.R. 1259 has the support of various outside groups including: the Alliance for Worker Retirement Security; the American Conservative Union; the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; and Citizens Against Government Waste.

It is my firm conviction that we must take the first step of protecting the Social Security Trust Fund before we can move to make wholesale improvements to the system. For those of my colleagues who oppose this legislation, I ask you, if we cannot protect the trust fund now, how can we expect to make the necessary reforms to the system for future generations? Join me in voting yes for this "Lock box" legislation.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, let me just say to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) that one of the points he made is, we can then use this money for Social Security. The problem is this money is already obligated to Social Security. So we are not sav-

ing Social Security with something that we already have.

As I think the gentleman knows, virtually every plan that has come out, even the plan by the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Ways and Means, assumes not only the obligated Social Security Trust Fund, but additional funds, general revenues, for their Social Security plan.

So it is a little semantical to say we can use it later to save it, because we are already obligated to pay it. This is a little bit what we would call belts and suspenders. Sounds good. Again, I am going to vote for it, but I do not think it does a whole lot.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I agree with much of what the gentleman just said.

This money is obligated to Social Security. Money coming from FICA taxes is supposed to go to Social Security. The problem is, we spend it on all of these other government programs. We have got to stop Congress and the President from spending FICA tax surpluses on other government programs. That is precisely why we are trying to pass this lockbox legislation.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, two things though, again, as I pointed out, these funds are still obligated. They are still backed by the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government, as the gentleman knows. It is a macroeconomic question of how one constructs fiscal policy and what is the future ability of how one divides the Federal pie as structured.

But the other point that the gentleman raised had to do with the budget that passed. I think our real problem with that is, on the one hand, my colleagues passed a budget that would, in effect, consume through tax cuts all of the on-budget surplus going forward for the next 10 years predicated on 10-year projections, which may well not turn out to be true, and at the same time, block anything to do, if they miss on their projections.

So, my colleagues, you put yourself in a real bind at that point in time and probably drive up publicly held debt, which I do not think, again, is what either party really wants to do.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) each have 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, just to make one final point, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) makes good legitimate points. Our budget achieves this; remember, in Washington, we are about to see two budget surpluses, one coming from Social Security, one coming from a large income tax overpayment.

What our budget achieves is setting all of the Social Security surplus aside for Social Security and, in the meantime, paying down that publicly held debt that we both seek to pay down.

Our budget actually pays down \$450 billion more in publicly held debt than the President's budget. On the on-budget surpluses, the income tax overpayment, we think people should get their money back.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, let me just tell the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), our budget pays down even more debt than their budget by, I think, \$200 billion over time. So it is not really about Republicans versus the President.

The budget is drawn up here in the House and in the other body, and we offered a budget that did more. As the gentleman recalls, in fact, I offered an amendment in the committee that would have given all of the unified surplus, which may be out, we may not be able to say that in the future if this becomes law, but both the on-budget and off-budget surplus to paying down debt, staying within the pay-go rules. That was defeated overwhelmingly in the committee by Members on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. Speaker, first I include for the RECORD the following letter:

COMMITTEE ON RULES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 24, 1999.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I ask that the Committee on Rules be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1259, the Social Security and Medicare Safe Deposit Box Act of 1999. As you know, the bill was sequentially referred to the Rules Committee on March 24, 1999.

Specifically, Section 3 (Protection of Social Security Surpluses), among other things, establishing Budget Act points of order against consideration of a budget resolution, an amendment thereto or any conference report thereon and any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion or conference report that would cause or increase an on-budget deficit for any fiscal year. The provisions of this section fall primarily within the jurisdiction of the Rules Committee.

It is my understanding that the Leadership has scheduled the bill for floor consideration the week of May 24. To accommodate the schedule, I agree to waive the Rules Committee's jurisdiction over consideration of this legislation at this time. However, in order to assist the Chair in any rulings on these new points of order, I will be submitting an analysis of them into the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. I have included a copy of this analysis with this letter.

Although the Rules Committee has not sought to exercise its original jurisdiction

prerogatives on this legislation pursuant to clause 1(m) and 3(i) of House rule X, I reserve the jurisdiction of the Rules Committee over all bills relating to the rules, joint rules and the order of business of the House, including any bills relating to the congressional budget process. Furthermore, it would be my intention to seek to have the Rules Committee represented on any conference committee on this bill.

Sincerely,

DAVID DREIER.

ANALYSIS OF THE PROVISIONS OF H.R. 1259, THE SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE SAFE DEPOSIT BOX ACT OF 1999, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON RULES

For the purposes of section 3(a) relating to "Points of Order to Protect Social Security Surpluses," the Chair should use the following information in interpreting these new points of order.

The new section 312(g)(1) of the Budget Act creates a point of order against consideration of any concurrent resolution or conference report thereon or amendment thereto that would set forth an on-budget deficit for any fiscal year. For the purposes of this section the deficit levels are those set forth in the budget resolution pursuant to section 301(a)(3) of the Budget Act.

The new section 312(g)(2) of the Budget Act creates a point of order against consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report if the enactment of that bill or joint resolution as reported; the adoption and enactment of that amendment; or the enactment of that bill or joint resolution in the form recommended in that conference report; would cause or increase an on-budget deficit for any fiscal year. For the purposes of this section, the Chair should utilize the budget estimates received by the Committee on the Budget (pursuant to section 312(a) of the Budget Act) in determining whether a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment or conference report would cause or increase an on-budget deficit for any fiscal year. This point of order applies to amendments to unreported bills and joint resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, I will just make a couple of closing remarks. I think that what we have heard here in this opening session of the Committee on Rules, to be followed now by the Committee on Budget and then the Committee on Ways and Means, 40-minute blocks on this bill, that we are trying to proceed in good faith to provide the reassurances that is being asked to protect Social Security and Medicare.

We have heard a lot of discussion that there may be a better way to do this, that there are other things that may come down the road. But there are a couple of facts here that are sort of poignant.

First of all, we are living up to the promise that we made to make a good-faith attempt to protect Social Security and Medicare. That is a fact.

Secondly, this is not just a procedure. This is going to be a law; it is going to have to be obeyed. It is not just something that is going to disappear when we want it to.

It is, I think, a serious effort; and I honestly believe that if we look over the past 40 years, the temptations were too great on spending, and Congress overspent. I think we know that. I think in the consequence of that over-

spending, we saw that taxes went up, and there are some who say benefits went down.

So the concern I have as I listen to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) describe a motion to recommit, which we may or may not hear later, is that sometime in the next 75 years, there is going to be reform enacted.

But until that time, in order to get along with the proposal to protect Social Security, they are going to have to raise taxes, or they are going to have to cut benefits.

I cannot honestly believe that anybody on either side of the aisle wants to be involved with programs such as their motion to recommit, if they offer it, will include, raising taxes and cutting benefits.

We are not involved in raising taxes on hardworking Americans, and we certainly are not involved in trying to take away benefits from our seniors. In fact, what we are trying to do is protect them.

So I would suggest that even though my colleagues may not agree this is the most perfect legislation, it is good, bipartisan legislation that protects Social Security and Medicare. It makes it law. It provides the reassurances that people want. I believe that this is a very good-faith effort on both sides of the aisle.

I congratulate again the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE) for the fine work that they have done, and many others, the committee work that has gone on on this subject generally. I urge support for this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time allocated under the rule to the Committee on Rules has expired.

It is now in order to proceed with the time allocated to the Committee on the Budget. The gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER).

□ 1730

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, protecting Social Security is one of the most important challenges this Congress will face. Social Security is facing a crisis. By the year 2014, the amount of benefits provided to our seniors will exceed the amount of payroll taxes taken in.

Mr. Speaker, current and future beneficiaries, after years of hard work, deserve the independence that comes from financial security, and that financial security ought to be the one thing they can count on. Every penny that is taken out of Americans' paychecks for Social Security should be locked up so it can only be used to pay for Social

Security benefits. This legislation will help ensure precisely that.

This legislation represents a continuation of our commitment to save Social Security as outlined in the budget resolutions passed by both the House and the Senate last month. This lockbox legislation that is shown here will protect the Social Security surpluses through several mechanisms.

First, H.R. 159 protects Social Security surpluses by blocking the consideration of any budget resolution or legislation that dips into Social Security. This bill creates a new point of order in the House and requires a supermajority for passage in the Senate for measures that attempt to use Social Security surplus funds.

Secondly, it ends the deceptive practice of masking deficits and inflating surpluses by prohibiting the Congressional Budget Office and the President's Office of Management and Budget from reporting Federal budget totals that include Social Security surpluses. This bill stops this budget shell game and allows only non-Social Security surpluses or deficits to be reported.

Thirdly, H.R. 1259 locks up the Social Security surpluses and only allows them to be used for Social Security and Medicare reform.

The first step toward saving Social Security is to stop spending it on non-related government programs. Once this legislation does that, we as a Congress can continue to move forward on real Social Security and Medicare reform, and may use the money in the Social Security Trust Fund only to accomplish that goal.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has a unique opportunity to help protect Social Security and place ourselves on the path to substantial Social Security and Medicare reform. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this most important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LUCAS).

Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the people sent us here to do a job. They sent us here to preserve Social Security and Medicare, and that is exactly what the Social Security and Medicare Lockbox Act of 1999 seeks to do.

The lockbox raises the bar for protecting Social Security and the Medicare trust funds. The bill requires that all spending be fully offset until solvency has been extended for Social Security by 75 years and Medicare by 30 years. We must save Social Security and Medicare first, before squandering any of the Social Security surplus, the Medicare surplus, and any other government surplus.

The Social Security and Medicare lockbox is the only alternative that seeks to extend the life of the Medicare trust fund. The Holt-Lucas-Moore lockbox is the only measure that locks the safe and throws away the key. The

lockbox requires that all surpluses be reserved until solvency has been extended by 75 years for Social Security and by 30 years for Medicare.

Paying down the Federal debt is the truly greatest gift that we can give our children and our grandchildren. Paying down the Federal debt means lower interest for our working families, more capital available for small businesses and a brighter future for our children.

Social Security and Medicare are vital for protecting the quality of life of our senior citizens. More than three-fifths or 60 percent of senior citizens depend on Social Security for a majority of their income. Social Security is not just retirement. For some families it is insurance that many of the disabled, the widows and the elderly of our community depend on just to get by.

With something this important, we simply cannot afford sleight-of-hand tricks from Washington. For too long we have promised to save Social Security and Medicare. To my colleagues I say it is time we put our money where our mouths are. It is time to support the Social Security and Medicare Lockbox Act of 1999.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY MILLER).

(Mr. GARY MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of H.R. 1259, the Social Security and Medicare Safe Deposit Box Act of 1999.

First, I want to thank my fellow committee member and fellow colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) for his tireless work to protect the Social Security Trust Fund.

One of the previous speakers said people do not want devices like boxes. I disagree. Obviously, some people would prefer to continue using illusion. It is time to stop the campaign rhetoric. We need to make sure no one, I repeat, no one, not the President, not the Congress, not anyone steals the Social Security money in the future.

I urge all the Members of the House to join us in protecting Social Security by supporting this safe deposit box. The safe deposit box follows up on the commitment this House made with the budget resolution by walling off Social Security from the rest of the United States budget.

It prohibits future budget resolutions by allowing spending that would dip into Social Security. It prohibits that. It blocks legislation that would spend Social Security surpluses and requires the Office of Management and Budget and the Congressional Budget Office to report Social Security revenues separate, not included in the budget, as we have done in the past.

If we really want Social Security trust funds to be off budget, if we want the Social Security Trust Fund to be protected, if we want to put aside the

entire \$1.8 trillion for Social Security and Medicare over the next 10 years, if we want Social Security to be there when current and future seniors need it, if we are serious about Social Security reform, then we will pass this Social Security measure, and I encourage everybody to vote for it.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, Social Security is a bedrock on which more than 40 million Americans rely. We have an opportunity in this Congress to make it more secure than ever. It is an opportunity that we have not had in the past because in the past we have had annual deficits, and over the last 10 years we have been able to eradicate those deficits. We have positioned ourselves now to where we can deal finally with the security of Social Security.

We had a proposal in our budget resolution which would have created a lockbox for Social Security, would have required the treasurer to do what he does today; every time he gets excess payroll taxes, to remit those funds to the Social Security administrator in the form of bonds issued by the Treasury, and then to take the proceeds and not spend them, not use them to offset tax cuts, but buy up outstanding public debt so that we buy down the public debt, and therefore make the Treasury more solvent and able in the future to meet the obligations of the Social Security System. It was rejected by the majority when we brought our budget resolution to the floor.

What the other side has brought here is weaker than existing law. It huffs and it puffs. It talks about Social Security, but in the end, the product it presents is weaker than existing law.

What does it provide for enforcement? A point of order. If we send up here something that breaches the provisions of this bill, there is a point of order. We all know in the House, although they may not know in the rest of the country, that points of order are mowed down by the Committee on Rules in this House every week; waived all the time.

Because they are so routinely waived by Rules, when we passed the unfunded mandates bill several years ago we said at least to have a mandate pass that will be incumbent upon local government and will increase their obligations, at least we should have a vote on the House floor, an overt vote. A Member has to go out and declare themselves ready to override the mandate. This rule does not even do that. It allows the rule to include a waiver of the point of order. Nobody will know it. It will be completely swept out of the way.

So this is a sham when it comes to a rule, but it even goes further. As if the overriding of a point of order was too much, it provides in section 5 a waiver. And that waiver says if we get the magic words right, if we say this bill is about the reform of Social Security,

this bill is about the reform of Medicare, abracadabra, all of the restrictions in this bill disappear. This lockbox falls apart. It does not even apply any more.

This is absurd. A lot of us will vote for this because we do not want to explain why we did not vote for something like this, but we can do something better. We offer something better in the form of our motion to recommit. If Members are really serious about a lockbox, vote for the motion to recommit.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is really incredibly misleading, if not completely incorrect, to say that this legislation is weaker than current legislation. That is clearly not the fact. The budget resolution that passed is only for this budget. What we are doing is putting into law the fact that we cannot spend this; that before we do, Members are going to be held accountable in their districts for knowing that they actually spent Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise today as a proud cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, all across Pennsylvania's Lehigh Valley where I come from, I have heard one message loud and clear, and that is to stop spending our Nation's Social Security funds on other programs, and this is the measure that will enable us to do just that.

My constituents are right, and they are right for many reasons but I want to emphasize two. The first is that this is the honest thing to do in budgeting. And let us face it, Congress has been engaged in misleading and deceptive budgeting for decades. The American people are told their payroll tax goes to Social Security. In fact, it goes to many other places as well.

Now, some Members of Congress want to oppose this, and they, like the President, would rather be able to grab some of that Social Security money and spend it on other programs. And I would suggest if these other programs are so important, so vitally important that they are worth spending Social Security for, then I suggest that my colleagues make the case for these programs to the taxpayers and raise the taxes necessary to fund them. If that fails, I would suggest rethinking the programs and the overall level of spending. The American taxpayers deserve honest, transparent, straightforward budgeting, and this helps us to get there.

The second reason, Mr. Speaker, is that the retirement security of baby boomers, my generation, my kids and my grandchildren, absolutely depends on saving this money. Social Security, as currently structured, is simply not sustainable. The system is fundamen-

tally flawed and it will go bankrupt if we do not make fundamental reforms and restructuring.

We need to give workers the freedom to take a portion of their payroll taxes and invest that money so that it will grow and provide a retirement benefit and security greater than what Social Security promises. But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that transition to that system will cost money. The sooner we start, the less it will cost.

But whenever we start, it will cost the Social Security surplus. So we cannot squander those funds on anything other than providing the retirement benefits to the seniors that we have promised and providing for a retirement future for future generations.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KLECZKA), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

□ 1745

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, a lot of my colleagues have come to the floor and indicated that, Well, friends, last week it was okay to spend \$9 billion for an emergency supplemental bill out of the Social Security trust fund. But now we have got religion today and, my Lord, what we did last week, it was wrong. We should have never done it.

But none of the Republicans would admit to that. I have yet to hear one of my colleagues from the majority party say, "Yes, that was wrong. We should not have done it. But now we are going to amend our ways."

The difference there, my friends and colleagues, is last week's \$9 billion was for defense. Okay? And that is not spending. That is okay. But now we have to stop what is going on.

Let me back up and share with the House what the current system is. Right now, and since 1983, we are collecting more in Social Security receipts than we need for benefits. So what do we do with it? Do we give it to the Secretary of the Treasury to put under the mattress? No. Those excess dollars are invested in treasuries, interest-bearing treasuries. The interest income goes back into the trust fund.

It is just like us taking our dollars, our hard-earned dollars, and putting them in a bank. We can go back the next day and say, "I want to see those dollars again that I deposited" and the bank is going to say, "they are not there anymore."

Did they squander them? No. They lent them out. That is what banks do. And anytime we come to withdraw those funds, the bank will have other revenues, other mortgage payments, other loan payments to give us our money back. And that is what the current system is doing.

Should we deficit spend? Clearly not. To say those treasuries that are in the Social Security trust fund are worthless, that is false. If they are worthless, every savings bond this Government has ever issued is worthless, all the public debt held by corporations and

institutions and individuals is worthless. And that is not the case.

The truth of the matter is the full faith and credit is behind that debt to the Social Security trust fund, as well as all other debt.

How does this lock box work? Before I came down here, I went to the Republican side and I said, I need a lock box. Do you have one hanging around? And thank God they did. Here is a Social Security lock box. And here is what this proposal would do.

We are going to collect surplus Social Security trust fund money and we are going to put it into the box. Well, when the majority leader was talking earlier in the debate, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) said, Well, what are they going to do with this money. Just let it sit around? Are they going to invest it. What are they going to do with it? The majority leader indicated, we are going to take this money and pay off a part of the national debt.

So now, after we go through hours of debate how Congress is stealing the money blind, how the administration is spending it, we are going to find out at the end of the day that this is the lock box. My friends, the money is gone. It went back to pay off the national debt.

Mr. Speaker, this is what the lock box is all about. The money is going to come in, the money is going to drop out to go pay the national debt. When we need the money because these folks before me are going to retire, we are going to use other revenues coming into the Government. Hopefully, and I think we all are going to work to that, there are going to be surplus revenues. But the money is not going to sit around under someone's mattress.

This is the lock box we are talking about. Talk about trap doors. Talk about phoney issues. This is one of them, my friends.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I have to take issue with my friend and colleague from the great State of Wisconsin. That is simply not the case. The debt we owe to Social Security is also a part of our national debt.

What our budget resolution does is take Social Security dollars away from Social Security and put it towards Social Security by buying down debt. What happens when those Social Security IOUs come due is that that debt is converted into national publicly held debt.

What our lock box does is pay off the publicly held debt so we can pay the Social Security bills.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the distinguished vice chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

(Mr. CHAMBLISS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, throughout my home State of Georgia and all cross America there is a common concern among many citizens. Apparently, my friend from Wisconsin who just spoke really does not understand this concern. But the concern is that Social Security is not going to be there for them when they retire. And that concern is real. It is not unfounded, as American seniors have witnessed the raiding of Social Security over the last several generations.

I have got two children. One of them is in the workforce as we speak. The other one just graduated from college and is going into the workforce. I also have got the pleasure of having two beautiful grandchildren. I want to make sure that Social Security is going to be there for those children and grandchildren when they become of age.

After years of hard work, the independence that comes from financial security ought to be one thing that our Nation's seniors and our Nation's young people can count on. The Social Security and Medicare safe deposit box to be considered by the House today goes a long ways towards restoring that ideal.

Every penny that is taken from the paychecks of America's hard-working men and women should be locked away and can be locked away in a safe deposit box and used only for retirement benefits. And that is what this bill does. Quite simply stated, it is the right thing to do.

Social Security and Medicare safe deposit boxes before us establishes honesty and accountability in the Federal budget process and takes the next step in securing and ensuring retirement security, not just for this generation but for generations to come.

I congratulate my colleague and friend from California, who is a member of the Committee on the Budget along with me, for his tireless efforts for promoting honest budgeting and encourage my colleagues to support this common sense legislation.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

(Mr. STENHOLM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. This bill before us endorses a position that we have been advocating for years.

I have come to this well many times to argue that we should not even talk about budget surpluses until we truly have taken Social Security off budget and balance the budget without counting the Social Security surplus. For the last several years, I have joined with my Blue Dog colleagues to offer budgets that incorporate that philosophy.

Thus, I congratulate the House leadership for seeing the wisdom of the Blue Dogs' position on this issue today. Although I must say, I wish they had

seen the light a little earlier and supported some of our budgets over the last 2 or 3 years, particularly the last budget a little earlier when we had an opportunity to pass a real budget which would have actually helped us do that which we talk about today.

I am glad, though, to see that we have reached a point where everyone agrees with the principle that we should wall off Social Security. The real test will be whether we can follow through with our rhetoric as we go through appropriations and tax cutting processes. I hope we can do so, but history is not encouraging.

The budget which we passed just a few weeks ago set up a virtual guarantee of failure because of its unrealistic numbers. Already, with this year's first appropriations bill, the Agriculture Appropriation has been on the floor for 2 days and we have seen nothing constructive happening. The victim of this unreasonable budget is not only inadequate agriculture funding but also funding for other programs and ultimately Social Security. The pressure created by an unrealistic budget translates into vulnerability for Social Security.

If the House had shown the foresight to follow a path more along the lines of the Blue Dog budget, we would have invested in priority programs such as defense, agriculture, veterans, education, and health. At the same time, our budget did protect all of the Social Security surplus fund over a 5-year period while using 50 percent of the on-budget surpluses to reduce our debt and 25 percent to provide a tax cut. This plan reflected a reasonable balance, but that is not what we passed.

Last year the majority, though, passed an \$80 billion tax cut that would have been funded entirely from the Social Security trust fund that we lock up today. And just last week, we voted to spend \$15 billion from the Social Security trust fund, we did that, by the same folks that today say this is going to be a magic bullet and is going to save Social Security.

We should not kid ourselves and pretend that this legislation does anything to deal with the long-term problems of Social Security. Walling off Social Security surplus is a good start, and that is why I support it. But it is not a solution. A true solution will require us to roll up our sleeves and do some heavy lifting to deal with the tough choices facing Social Security. It would be a terrible mistake if we let passage of this legislation be the end of the discussion of Social Security. Our vote today should be the beginning of a bipartisan process to honestly address financial problems facing Social Security.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) has 10½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from

Florida (Mr. DAVIS) has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment that while the party of my good friend from Texas was in control for some 40 years before we took over, there was not a single dime of Social Security that was saved. At least now we are taking that first step to begin saving Social Security. And it is something that I would urge all of us to begin doing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. FLETCHER), my good friend, a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of this resolution. I thank the gentleman from California for the work he has done on the Committee on the Budget.

I stand amazed that we hear such criticism from the other side when they have had 40 years previously to do this very thing that we have done here this day. And I find a great deal of hypocrisy when my colleague stands up and talks about a box that came from a Republican that really will not hold the money when we are here to secure with a lock box the Social Security money that has been paid in FICA taxes by the people of the United States.

So finally, after 30 years of spending Social Security for more and bigger Government, we are locking away the Social Security and protecting both Social Security and Medicare. I am proud to play a role in securing and guaranteeing retirement and Medicare security for our seniors.

The Social Security and Medicare lock box law will lock away \$1.8 trillion of the budget surplus to pay down the national publicly held debt. I support this resolution because it really stops the raid on Social Security that puts the burdens of IOUs on our children's and our grandchildren's back. We need to stop that, and this is an important move to begin in that direction.

This lock box provision prohibits the passage of future budgets that will raid Social Security and Medicare fund. It blocks the passage of legislation including spending initiatives or tax cuts that would spend the people's Social Security money. And it requires all budgets from the President and Congresses to include the Social Security surplus from budget totals and it unlocks the funds only for the purpose of Social Security and Medicare preservation legislation.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN).

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS), my colleague, for yielding me the time.

I want to take a little bit of exception to the fact that some people think we are just kind of up here giving them

a hard time about this. Quite frankly, I am going to support this legislation. I do not think it does a whole lot. It does not take a rocket scientist, at least from my standpoint. Every month out of my paycheck my employer and myself send up 12.4 percent into the Federal Government. It is going to be saved for me.

Quite frankly, we have not not paid a Social Security check. We have expanded and extended Social Security to 2034. I mean, everything is kind of going along. It is just that we are getting into this debate over the surplus. The fact of the matter is I am going to support this. I think we ought to lock this up. I think that is what we should have been doing anyway.

But on the other side of this, I want to make it clear that we are doing something I think to this country and scaring people. This floor is talking about, oh, we are going to not pay our debts on Social Security. We are not going to have the money. That is not so. We are solvent until 2034.

I would say to my colleagues, though, on the other side, they have an opportunity to do something beyond just this lock box. They have an opportunity to secure not only the Social Security surplus but the non-Social Security surplus until we can make sure that the system is solvent.

□ 1800

That is what we have all been working for. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) has a piece of legislation that says he thinks we can do that for 75 years. Let us have that discussion. Let us lock this all up until we get to that solvency of 75 years, or whatever year we come to. I think that is very important.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. THURMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. I agree with what the gentlewoman is saying. I certainly support the lockbox, but with all of you people who are working so hard to develop this, would you sometime during this process work to find a solution to the notch baby problem?

Mrs. THURMAN. I would be glad to do that. I probably have more notch baby folks in my district than you do.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Responding to the comments of the gentleman from Florida, her comment was that Social Security is good until the year 2034. The fact is we begin losing money, we begin spending, paying out in Social Security more than we are bringing in, in the year 2014. Not 2034, but 2014. After that, we begin pulling out the IOUs that have been written, the bonds that have been written. How is that paid? That is not money off a tree. That comes from taxpayers. Our young people are going to have to pay for that.

So we are in a problem, and we are beginning to address it. This is only

the first step. As you mentioned, we have other steps we are going to have to take after that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY).

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, we teach our children about the story of the ant and the grasshopper, in which the ant works hard in the summer laying up supplies for the winter while the grasshopper plays the summer away. Come winter, the ant is warm and well fed, but the grasshopper has no food and starves.

While we expect our children to understand the moral of this story, the government itself cannot seem to set the example of saving for the future, which is why I strongly support the Social Security and Medicare Safe Deposit Act, legislation which locks away 100 percent of the budget surplus attributed to Social Security and Medicare to ensure the long-term solvency of these two vital programs.

Passage of this legislation represents a commitment to today's workers that tax dollars being set aside for Social Security and Medicare will be there for them when they retire. It also represents a commitment to older Americans that their golden years will be marked by peace of mind, not uncertainty, when it comes to the future of Social Security and Medicare.

The wisdom of the ant and the irresponsibility of the grasshopper teach our children an important lesson, Mr. Speaker. I hope Congress will have the wisdom to embrace the fable's meaning and pass this legislation.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), who is the prime sponsor of the motion to recommit on the bill.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Florida for yielding me this time. I would like to talk about the importance of the motion to recommit. We are talking about the fundamental programs of Social Security and Medicare, the two great accomplishments of the Federal Government in the 20th century that have removed the fear of destitution from old age and have made a major difference in the lives of the people of this country. We have before us now a lockbox that we cannot debate fully and that is imperfect, with a hole in the bottom.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LUCAS), the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) and I have proposed a stronger lockbox that would preserve Social Security and Medicare. Let me point out that I have just received, addressed to the gentleman from Kentucky Kentucky, the gentleman from Kansas and to me a letter from the Concord Coalition saying, and I quote:

"The Concord Coalition," watchdogs of budgetary sanity, "is pleased to endorse the motion to recommit on H.R. 1259 which would add to that bill the protections of your bill"—that is, our bill—"H.R. 1927. With this bill you have

raised an important issue in today's Social Security lockbox debate."

They go on to say:

"The Concord Coalition is very concerned that these 'on-budget' surpluses, which are now mere projections, will be squandered before they even materialize.

"Doing so would waste an important opportunity to prepare for the fiscal burdens of the baby boomers' retirement by increasing savings, that is, paying down our national debt. Worse, it would risk a return of economically damaging deficits if the hoped-for surpluses fail to materialize.

"The nature and extent of the surpluses to be locked in the box is thus a very necessary debate and we commend you for raising it in the form of your motion to recommit."

That, I say to my colleagues, would give us an opportunity to really accomplish what my colleagues say they want to accomplish, and that is to really preserve Social Security and, I would add, Medicare.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman from New Jersey, who mentioned how the Concord Coalition was endorsing his legislation, I would like to mention that the Concord Coalition is also endorsing this piece of legislation as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious occasion. Somehow I wish we could holler a little louder and shout about the fact that there is a greater interest in saving Social Security.

I brought with me three bills, one from 1995, one from 1997 and one from 1999, all of which take Social Security off the budget. That is what this bill does, too. I think that is a good point. I hope your recommit bill does the same thing and says from now on at least we are not going to talk and use the Social Security surplus to mask the deficit, because that is what we have been doing. For most every year for the last 40 years, we have been spending the Social Security surplus and in our eagerness to brag about a balanced budget, we have used Social Security to mask the deficit.

At least this is a beginning. This is saying we are not going to do it anymore, we are going to make an effort to say that we are going to take the surpluses, that amount that is coming in from the Social Security tax that is in excess of what is needed for Social Security benefits and we are going to put it aside.

This side has said, "Well, look. It's not perfect." That is right. Fifty percent of the Members can change the rule. It is all going to depend on how much guts we have got. It is going to depend on how much intestinal fortitude we have to say, "Look. We're going to live within our means. We're not going to spend Social Security for

other government programs and expand the size of government."

I compliment the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), I compliment the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), an early mover in trying to solve Social Security. The fact is that this does not solve the Social Security problem, but it gets a little more public awareness.

If we can pass this legislation and stick to it, if we can say, look, we are not going to spend the Social Security surplus for other government programs. And if there are things that are so blasted important, we are going to either cut down on other spending someplace else or we are going to increase taxes. Let us not pretend anymore by spending the Social Security surplus, but, look, let us decide here and now that we have got the will power to move ahead with real solutions for Social Security.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. I thank my friend from Florida for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for this resolution today even though I'm not convinced it is needed. Early this morning many of us got up and we had a nice early morning meeting with outgoing Secretary of the Treasury Robert Rubin. He has been showered in recent weeks with accolades, given his impending retirement, based on his management over the years of our economy and how well it has been going.

He gave us one piece of advice that he drove home so clearly today as policymakers. If we do one thing in this United States Congress to ensure long-term prosperity for this country, it is to use the projected budget surpluses to download our \$5.6 trillion national debt. We do not need gimmicks and fake legislation like we have here today to do that. What is required is some fiscal discipline and coming together in a bipartisan fashion to maintain fiscal discipline and download the debt, instead of dipping into the Social Security Trust Fund for new spending programs as what happened last week with the supplemental appropriation bill, or by offering fiscally irresponsible, across-the-board tax cuts.

That is the same message that Alan Greenspan, Chairman of the Federal Reserve, delivers to us every day. We do not need legislation like this. What we need is political courage to do it.

I have two sons, Mr. Speaker, Johnny and Matthew who are probably going to be living throughout most of the 21st century. If there is anything that we can do to ensure a bright and prosperous economic future for these two little boys, it is by delivering some political courage, practicing some fiscal discipline, making the tough choices that we are capable of making to preserve Social Security, Medicare and pay down our national debt instead of offering legislative gimmicks like the one we are debating here today.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. This is not a gimmick. I guess the question is, why have we not done something before? Is this going to solve the whole problem? No. But at least it is a beginning. It is a first step.

I also have a picture I just pulled out of my eight children, I care about them, one grandchild. This is really for those who are coming after us as well as those who are seniors today. We have to begin sometime. Why not now?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), my good friend on the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to wrap up this issue. We have heard from a lot of Members from both sides of the aisle, from Members on this other side of the aisle that although they have all these criticisms, they are going to end up voting for this bill.

We can work together on this. I do believe that this should be a bipartisan issue, not a partisan issue. We have heard a lot of partisan spats back and forth. We have heard a lot of criticisms. At the end of these criticisms just about every speaker has said, "But I'll be voting for the bill."

Let us work together on this thing. We all are saying we want to stop the raid on Social Security. We all are saying we believe FICA taxes should go to Social Security, period, end of story. So let us put this partisan talk aside and work on this.

This legislation is necessary. If we thought the discipline was there to make sure that all FICA taxes went to Social Security, we would not need this legislation. However, for over 30 years Congress and the White House, Republicans and Democrats, have been raiding Social Security. That is a fact. That is why we are addressing this issue with this lockbox legislation.

This legislation gives us the necessary tools to fight in Congress for stopping the raid on Social Security. It empowers us with the ability to, when any piece of legislation comes up which seeks to raid Social Security, it gives us the ability to stop that legislation. That is what this legislation achieves. It also stops the smoke and mirrors accounting by stopping from masking the deficit with Social Security trust funds.

Can we go farther? Absolutely. Will we go farther? I hope so. But is this a gimmick? Absolutely not. This is real legislation that helps us stop the raid on the Social Security Trust Fund. This is a bipartisan issue. We should work on this together. We should stop these partisan spats. Because if you are going to go vote for the bill, then applaud the bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW).

Ms. STABENOW. I appreciate my colleague yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, we all support protecting Social Security. I totally support placing Social Security outside of the budget process. But the larger issue is how we are going to strengthen Social Security and Medicare for the future.

Unfortunately, this lockbox becomes a gimmick when it does not add one dime to the Social Security Trust Fund or one day to the solvency of the Social Security Trust Fund, let alone Medicare. It becomes an empty box without a commitment to have the entire surplus focused on strengthening Social Security and Medicare for the future. That is what we are talking about.

The motion to recommit really does the job. That is what we really want to have from our colleagues, is a commitment that we will join together to strengthen Social Security and Medicare for the future. Without that commitment, we do not in fact have anything but a gimmick.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from California is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, we have to work together. As the gentlewoman from Michigan said, the only way we are going to solve this problem is by both sides of the aisle working together. I would like to urge us today to allow this to be the first step in doing that, in working together on this. Could we do more? Sure. But this is a first step and the next step will be a little more.

□ 1815

Mr. Speaker, this debate is very simple. This House has an opportunity today to make it much more difficult to spend the Social Security surplus. We have a choice before us. We can take the almost \$1.8 trillion of Social Security surplus and spend it as we have been doing for the last 40 years, or we can take that same \$1.8 trillion and protect it, put it in a lockbox so it can only be used to save Social Security and Medicare.

No matter what some of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle may say about this bill, they would be hard pressed to say it does not make it dramatically more difficult to spend Social Security surpluses. Let us lock it away as a first step. Then we can move on to reform Social Security and Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this very important first step of saving and preserving Social Security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). All time allocated under the rule to the Committee on the Budget having expired, it is now in order to proceed with the time allocated to the Committee on Ways and Means. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW).

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity today to express my support for H.R. 1259, the Social Security and Medicare Safe Deposit Act of 1999.

Today Social Security protects 44 million Americans. Social Security's core features: risk-free, lifetime benefits, progressivity, inflation protection and family and disability benefits are particularly important to women and to our lower-income people.

In fact, Social Security is the main and only source of income for about one in three seniors today. Thanks mostly to Social Security, poverty among seniors has dropped 69 percent since 1959, making seniors today the least likely group in America to be poor.

Yet despite its success, Social Security will not be able to pay promised benefits in the future. The reasons are simple. We are living longer and retiring sooner and having fewer kids. By 2014 Social Security will spend more than it receives in taxes. That is right, by 2014. By 2034, the trust fund will be empty, and only about two-thirds of the benefits will be payable.

In the past the answer has always been to cut benefits or raise payroll taxes, but today these traditional fixes are not acceptable. Social Security is the largest tax most workers pay today, and we must not increase that burden. We must avoid benefit cuts like COLA cuts and retirement age hikes that harm today's seniors or tomorrow's seniors.

That means our only choice is to save and invest, to save Social Security as provided in the Social Security Guarantee Plan the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) and I have proposed. This plan converts Social Security surplus into personal retirement savings for every American worker to help save Social Security. At retirement, workers' savings guarantee full Social Security benefits and are paid without cuts or payroll tax hikes. The plan even creates new inheritable wealth for many workers who die before retirement after ensuring that full survivor benefits are paid. And the plan eliminates the Social Security earnings limit so seniors can work without further penalties.

But most importantly the Social Security Guarantee Plan saves Social Security for all time. Full promised benefits are paid, and the Social Security trust funds never go broke. In fact, the Social Security Administration has said the guarantee plan eliminates Social Security's long-range deficit and permits payment of full benefits through 1973 and beyond, and that is a quote. In the long run there are budget surpluses and the first payroll tax cuts in the program's history.

Passing H.R. 1259, the Social Security and Medicare Safe Deposit Act of 1999 will be a first critical step in this progress. This legislation, for the first time in history, locks away Social Se-

curity surpluses in a safe deposit box, only to be opened to save Social Security and Medicare.

Today there are no rules to protect the Social Security surplus. In contrast, H.R. 1259 sets new rules to protect those surpluses. If a measure does not pay for itself, either the House Committee on Rules or a supermajority of 60 Senators will have to agree to use Social Security surplus to pay for it.

So while the budget resolution made it out of order for the Congress to spend Social Security surpluses this year, this bill goes further to protect Social Security surpluses for as long as it takes to save Social Security and Medicare.

Consider what a difference that will make. For 30 years Federal budgeteers have included Social Security surpluses in their reporting to cover up what was really going on in the rest of the Federal budget. This safety deposit box stops the government from hiding behind Social Security surpluses to claim that its budget is balanced. In the future, all official budget documents must include the Social Security surplus in determining the government's budgetary bottom line. That is a solid foundation for legislation that will finish the job and really save Social Security for 75 years and beyond.

I encourage all Members to support this bill, and I must say this bill does not include the remedy to save Social Security for all time. It puts in place a discipline upon this House of Representatives, upon the Senate and upon the White House to live within our means without raiding the Social Security Trust Fund.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, it was about January or February of this year that we had a resolution offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), a new Member of Congress, who spoke earlier. In that resolution he basically said we should save Social Security. We all voted for that. That was about 5 months ago. And now we have this proposal, this so-called lockbox proposal.

We have been debating this now for about 4 hours. Mr. Speaker, do our colleagues not think it would be better if we just went to a markup and starting marking up a piece of legislation?

We have a real problem on our hands with respect to Social Security. Over the next 35 years benefits paid out will exceed revenues coming in by 25 percent even if the Social Security money is set aside. We have to come up with a solution. We should not be playing around with resolutions and with little gimmicks about setting aside money. We should go to a markup.

And I have to say, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Social Security, and the gentleman from Texas

(Mr. ARCHER) are really trying. They have come up with a bill that maybe I might disagree with, but it is credible. Why do they not just go to a markup with that bill? Why do they not put it in legislation?

The problem is that their Republican leadership and Mr. LOTT on the Senate side do not support it, and as a result of that, we are now playing around. We are not going to come to any resolution of this this year because the polling data that the Republicans showed says that we should not do Social Security because it is too difficult.

But I tell my colleagues the American public wants Social Security done, but if we are going to do a lockbox, we ought to do it right because the legislation of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) does a deal with just 62 percent of the Social Security surplus. They actually use general fund surpluses in order to make sure that the benefits in this, revenues coming in on Social Security over the next 35 years, balance out.

So what we are going to do is we are going to say, "You have got to set aside the Social Security surplus, but the surplus that is on budget we can spend. Well, in the Archer-Shaw bill, one has to use that to save Social Security, so there is an inconsistency in what we are doing now."

I just want everyone to know that we are going to vote for this, but we are going to vote for this on the basis that, why not, it does not do any harm, just like the gentleman from Wisconsin's resolution earlier in the year did no harm. But I have to say that when the day is over, we are not going to extend Social Security by 1 day, or we are not going to actually increase any more revenues or cut expenditures on Social Security. We are not going to do anything.

We are really misleading the American public and pretending, and this Congress has to finally come to grips with the fact that we have been brought here to do the people's business. We probably will not even get an appropriations bill out this week. We will probably leave for the Memorial Day recess without getting one appropriations bill out, even though three were promised, and now we are talking about Social Security on Wednesday night after 3 hours, and we are not going to do anything. It is not going to make one senior citizen or one member of the work force feel any better.

And so let us not kid ourselves. Let us pass this, but let us not tell anybody that this is really going to save Social Security. It is going to set aside money, it is not going to do anything; and we know it and you know it and everyone else knows it as well.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I would answer the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI), who is the

ranking member on the Subcommittee on Social Security, that I look forward to working with him. We do need legislation that is actually drawn up so we can actually look at it. Our conceptual model has been out there for some time, and people are looking at it, and I know the gentleman from California has just recently reviewed this, reviewed the documents that we have supplied, and is becoming knowledgeable and becoming familiar with what it is that we are trying to do.

I also understand that the President will be submitting some legislative language, and this is a positive step. So we do need to get together. This has to be a bipartisan solution, and this is what I think is so important in this whole process.

The gentleman is right. This lockbox is not the solution, but this lockbox does make it more difficult for this Congress to go ahead and continue to raid the Social Security Trust Fund surplus, and that is a fact of life, and that is what this does, and this is why I am supporting this particular bill.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAW. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, this is just for a question, because if he plans to do this this year, why do we need a lockbox? We can just do it. I mean, we only have 3 more months in the year. Why do we not try to get this done?

Mr. SHAW. Reclaiming my time, both processes are going forward, and this lockbox simply puts an impediment in front of the Congress to continue to raid the Social Security Trust Fund while we are trying to come together on a solution.

I may be one of the few Members of this House on Capitol Hill that really believes we are going to produce something this year, but I do, I have confidence in the process, I have confidence that the President wants to cooperate, I have confidence that there are a sufficient number of Democrats and Republicans that want to get together and put together a good bill that will solve the situation, and I am confident that we will do it.

But in the meantime, as we are going through the appropriation process, as we will be going through tax cuts and what not, I think that the decision has been made to hold this money aside, this surplus aside, and I think it is a positive step.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

(Mr. HOUGHTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, it is good to be here talking about this issue.

I really do not think it is playing around. This is an honest debate, and it is a good debate, and I applaud the basic concept of the lockbox. Since

Vietnam, we have been digging into the Social Security fund. It does not make any sense. It is not right. It has got to be stopped. This is one method to stop it.

I just do not happen to agree with it, and I know my associate on the other side of the aisle says, we are going to vote for it. But why not? I think there is a real distinction here, and I would like to tell my colleagues why I am going to vote against the bill.

The goal is valid, and we have got to reach that goal, but we have got to reach it honestly. The thing I fear is that we are so driven by a concept that we will not think through what it means, and this is a pretty exact piece of legislation. It requires that all Social Security receipts, all of them in excess of cost, paying Social Security checks, be set forth separately and immediately into the House and Senate budget resolution.

□ 1630

There are no exceptions for emergencies, and it requires a point of order in the House, and 60 votes of the Senate to act otherwise.

Now, there is going to be a surplus, but there is not a surplus now, and with the supplemental emergency dollars just approved for Kosovo and the military buildup and other natural disasters, we are, as we have in the past, using a part of that Social Security excess.

Now, if we do not, then we have to borrow that money because we do not have that money, and we all want to stop that practice. Now, we have borrowed enough, so all we need to do is to avoid borrowing, or if we do not want to do that, we can wean ourselves away from using Social Security funds.

These are worthy goals. We are within sight of achieving both of them, but we are not there yet, and I think we will be in three years, but we are not today.

So if we insist on passing this lockbox legislation, I predict with almost certainty that before the year is out we will be violating our promise. I cannot believe this is a sound way of approaching our budget and, therefore, I am going to vote against the measure.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from California for yielding me this time. I agree with the point that the gentleman made, and that is that it would be a lot better if we were talking about a bill that would actually help the people on Social Security, that would extend the solvency of the program. We have been here now for many months, and it is time for us to use the regular legislative process of committee hearings and markup to start taking up legislation.

So rather than spending so much time on this lockbox, I wish we would spend the time debating how Social Se-

curity should be strengthened and how we should deal with the long-term solvency.

I also agree with the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) in that this bill is one that we should vote for because it does contain some provisions that, if we adhere to them, would be good. Why am I skeptical about that? Because we have current budget rules in effect that do pretty much everything that is in this bill, but every time we waive those rules or find ways of getting around it. Just look what we did with emergency spending. We found ways to get around the budget rules. I am afraid that what is contained in this particular legislation, it will be very easy for Congress to get around it.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell my colleagues my problems, though, with the lockbox itself. We normally think of a lockbox that we put in there what we need in order to deal with the problem and we have a strong lock on it in order to make sure it is only used for that purpose. Well, that is not the case in the legislation we have before us. We have not put into this lockbox what we should; that is, all the surplus. We should not be spending the surplus until we have fixed Social Security first. I thought that was the commitment that we made on both sides of the aisle, that both leaderships said we are going to fix Social Security first. Yet, we do not put into the lockbox the resources that will be needed in order to deal with that. That is the first major flaw.

But perhaps even more significant is that there is no lock on this lockbox. All we need to do is pass legislation that says that we fixed the problem and we can spend the money. Let me read the language in the bill. I know we rarely do that around this place, but let me read what we are asked to vote on.

It says the term "Social Security reform legislation" means a bill or a joint resolution that is enacted into law and includes a provision stating the following: "For the purposes of the Social Security and Medicare Safe Deposit Box Act of 1999, this act constitutes Social Security reform legislation."

Mr. Speaker, there is no lock on this lockbox. There is no requirement that we extend solvency of Social Security even one day before we can spend the money that we say that we are locking up for Social Security.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are going to have an opportunity to cast a really significant vote, and that significant vote will be on the Holt-Lucas-Moore proposal. It will be in the motion of the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) to recommit. That will be a real vote. Why do I say that?

First, it will put into a lockbox all of the surplus and say that we cannot spend that until we have dealt with Social Security and Medicare. But it goes a second step and puts a lock on the lockbox. It puts a lock on the lockbox

by defining what is Social Security reform, defining what is Medicare reform.

We do not do that in the legislation before us. We do not even allow an amendment for the legislation before us. We have a closed rule. We cannot even bring forward suggestions to improve the bill. That is not the democratic process and the bipartisan cooperation that my colleagues are asking for, when they will not even give us a chance to really debate the issue before us today.

But the motion to recommit, the Holt-Lucas-Moore proposal actually does define what we need to do in order to be able to spend the money in the lockbox: seventy-five year solvency for Social Security. We all agree on that. Let us put it in the bill. We do not do that. But we will have a chance.

Vote for the motion to recommit. It does not delay the process. It brings the resolution immediately back for passage, but says that we have to deal with the 75-year solvency of Social Security, which we should do. And then on Medicare we say we have to have at least 30-year solvency in Medicare. That makes sense. Then we would really be putting this money aside and putting a real lock on the lockbox to make sure the money, in fact, is not spent until we have, in fact, dealt with the solvency of both Medicare and Social Security.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are being asked for bipartisan cooperation. We agree with that. We do not have any chance to amend the bill. Vote for a motion to recommit so that we can have a true lockbox.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of this legislation. Its time has come. This is legislation that is a seminal first step in ensuring that Social Security's retirement safety net will be there for our seniors when they need it. By putting all of the Social Security surpluses into a lockbox, we ensure that Social Security surpluses are not diverted into new spending or new programs by Congress.

Under this legislation Congress could only use non-Social Security surpluses, real surpluses, for spending increases and tax cuts. In effect, it ends the smoke and mirrors of the budget process by not allowing the Social Security surpluses to be invaded.

This legislation commits Congress to setting aside \$1.8 trillion for Social Security and Medicare over the next 10 years. These resources are an essential component of any viable proposal to rescue Social Security. I urge the passage of this legislation.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I find some difficulty in this debate in that evidently this House is planning to adjourn after this vote takes place and leave for the Memorial Day weekend and recess. It seems odd that we would be leaving, having heard that in the Senate chamber, after a great deal of debate and quite a bit of strenuous deliberation, the Senate passed legislation that would deal with crime issues. Whether we agree with every aspect of it or not is not the point. The fact remains that there is a bill on the Senate side sitting, waiting for House action, that would deal with the issue of crime and youth violence, and there it sits.

Here on the House side, we bring up legislation that talks about a so-called lockbox, legislation that did not go through committee, because the people that are debating and sitting on the Committee on Ways and Means, including the Members that are here right now, the committee that has jurisdiction, and asked for a chance to have this bill debated to get the substance out, to really discuss what could be done on Social Security, and, in fact, if we could improve it, to add amendments to it, but rather than go through the normal legislative process where we would have a hearing in committee to discuss and debate the merits of the proposal, we are going straight to the floor of the House, never having gone through the committees of jurisdiction.

We could do that with this bill. And, as we have heard, the bill really does not do anything, because current law already requires that we do these things. But yet legislation that would deal with crime and youth violence and try to address the concerns of many Americans when it comes to the safety of their children in schools, sits right now awaiting action on the part of the House, and yet we are getting ready to adjourn without having taken any action on that crime legislation. Yet we are willing to pull something straight out from earth without ever having given it a chance to be debated and heard and the merits be discussed in committee the way we would normally do soon something as important as crime.

Why is it that on crime we have to let it sit and go through the whole committee process and wait who knows how many months before it can come to the House when the Senate has already passed it, when on Social Security, when we are not doing anything that is not already in existing law, we have to rush it through? I do not understand, but let us continue with the debate.

On the merits of this legislation, one, as we have heard, we could do nothing with this bill and the law would require we do what this bill claims it does, and that is to reserve Social Security surpluses for Social Security. Secondly, if we truly intend to send a message to the American people that we want to act on Social Security, then we would

do as others have said as well. We would really lock up the surpluses, because everyone knows that if we lock up just what is considered a surplus in the Social Security fund, that that will not be enough to resolve the issues of long-term solvency for 75 years.

But this bill does not do it, nor are we being given a chance to amend the legislation to allow it to do that, so we really can send a meaningful message to the American people that we really want to do something on Social Security.

If this is all we are going to do on Social Security for the year or for the term, we are in real trouble, because at the end of the day we can tell the American people we did nothing more than already existed in current law. We could have been absent for the entire two-year session as Members of Congress, and Social Security would be in as good a shape as if this bill passed and quite honestly as bad a shape as it could be if we do not do anything over the next two years.

So here we are in a situation where we are being told this is a way to remedy part of the Social Security problem. In a way, it is a feel-good proposal that maybe makes people believe that we are going to now begin to lock monies up. So in that sense, okay, let us vote for this thing. But the reality is, if we are going to deal with the long-term solvency issues of Social Security, we have to deal with what the President said.

The difficult question is to get us the last 20 or so years of 75 years worth of solvency. This does not do any of that. This does not even come close to doing what the President said would be the easy part of saving the Social Security surpluses, because at the end of the day the President committed that we save part of our surpluses for Medicare. This does not help in that regard.

We really need to get to work. If we are going to do something, let us make it meaningful, and certainly if we are going to rush it through, then let us deal with the crime bill as well, because that is just as important as this because this does not really get us anywhere.

I urge the Members to consider doing something meaningful before we move on.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would say to the gentleman from California, who I do not believe was here when his party was in the majority, that it was rare that a motion to recommit was offered to the minority side when the Republicans were in the minority. So I think this is a very Democratic process. The gentleman can come forward with his bill. Many of his Members have already argued in favor of his motion to recommit, so I think the process going forward is very good.

I would also remind the gentleman that but for the grace of God and six Members, you would be in the majority

today. Nothing is precluding the gentleman and Members from his side from coming forward with their own plan. As a matter of fact, I think we are also looking for one from the White House, and I think there is a certain amount of cooperation.

So I am not slamming this side for it, but I think also when the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) and I have come forward with a plan before the Committee on Ways and Means and are working that plan and talking to the Members, briefing the Members, and the gentleman from California was at the briefing that we had the day we unveiled it, I think this is important progress. We are making progress. However, it is a slow process.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida (Mr. SHAW) for yielding me this time.

It is interesting to listen, and our goal is, of course, a bipartisan solution to this challenge of Medicare, and this lockbox simply sets aside all of the funds designated for Medicare and Social Security to that purpose. It is different, if we want to get technical, from what was done in 1990 that dealt with direct reductions.

What we have heard throughout our districts, whether we are Republicans or Democrats, and I know there is a temptation to deride any effort made in good faith as some sort of gimmick, but what we have heard, not as Republicans or as Democrats but as Americans, is that we need to deal with this problem, devote Social Security surpluses to Social Security, keep the trust fund intact.

I listened with interest to my friend the ranking member from California, who encouraged our side to bring forth legislation, and of course my good friend from Florida, the chairman of the full committee, had brought forward a plan; others folks have, too.

□ 1845

Mr. Speaker, in fairness, my friend, the gentleman from California, also asked that the Treasury Secretary designate, Mr. Summers, where the administration plan was.

I think it is important that we work on this. As we know, a journey of a thousand miles begins with a single step. This is a profound step. It is not a gimmick.

The motion to recommit will be akin to double secret probation. The other side is entitled to do that, but Americans want a rational, reasonable response, and locking up of this fund. That is what it does. It is simple. It is practical. This House should do it.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just point out to the gentleman from Arizona that even though the gentleman only has a 6-vote majority, he is a majority. We cannot bring a bill to the floor of the House, we can-

not bring a bill to the committee and get it marked up. Only the people in the majority can.

The gentleman's side is in the majority. They have the obligation to mark up a piece of obligation. We are 6 months into this year without it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, let me introduce myself. My name is Hillary Clinton. I say that because I see that we have a bill before us today which says that a bill may in the future declare itself to be whatever it wishes to declare itself. I thought since the majority seems to take that seriously, I would see how seriously they took me if I introduced myself as Hillary Clinton.

Let me simply say that if Members look at this bill, what it says is that no point of order will lodge against a bill if it declares itself to be social security or Medicare reform. Boy, there is really some protection, is there not?

I remember that their leader 2 years ago said that social security should be allowed to wither on the vine. I know that their existing floor leader has said that, as far as he is concerned, there should be no room for a program like Medicare in a free society.

I would simply say that letting legislation written by people like that self-declare itself to be reform legislation is a little like asking John Dillinger to pretend that he is Mother Teresa. It may be believable to some people, but it certainly would not be believable to me.

What this bill says, and man, it has muscle, what it says is this Congress will put every dollar on the books into social security unless it votes not to. That is what this wonderful lockbox says. It is just wonderful, what the Congress can do to pass its time when it is not being serious about real legislation.

I would simply suggest to my friends on the majority side of the aisle that if they are serious about saving social security, then I would urge the Members to quit promising the American public that we can provide \$1.7 trillion in tax cuts in the next 15 years and still protect social security and still protect Medicare. We all know that that is not possible, and we can get on with serious legislation as soon as everybody in this place admits it.

I have a simple suggestion. We were sent here not to adopt gimmicks, we were sent here to deal with our problems in serious legislative ways. If Members want to save social security, bring out a bill that saves social security. Do not bring out something which ought to be labeled the number one legislative fraud of the year.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), I know Hillary Clinton, and he is not Hillary Clinton.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER),

a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

(Mr. WELLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding time to me, and for the opportunity to say a few words in support of this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, let me ask this House a very basic question. My friends on the other side of the aisle have been claiming that existing rules and existing laws already protect the social security trust fund.

If that is the case, then, let me ask Members of this House, why do the social security trustees report that this Congress over the last 30 years and the President have raided the social security trust fund to the tune of \$730 billion?

Obviously, the so-called protections that they claim are in place are not really there. That is why this legislation is so important as we take the steps to save social security for future generations, not just today but for the next three. The first step, the important step, is to lock away 100 percent of social security for social security; not part of social security, but all of social security.

I represent a diverse district, the South Side of Chicago, the south suburbs, in Cook and Will counties, a lot of bedroom and rural communities. Whether I am at the union hall, the VFW, the grain elevator, the local coffee shop on Main Street, I am often asked a pretty basic question: When are you guys, when are you politicians in Washington, going to stop raiding the social security trust fund? Because they have been watching Congress and the President do that now for 30 years, to the tune of \$730 billion.

This legislation is important because we set aside \$1.8 trillion of social security revenues, 100 percent of these revenues, for social security and Medicare. That is a big victory, because when we compare that with the alternative, and I point out, this is an important first step as we work to save social security for the long-term.

I would like to point out the alternative here. If we look at why this is the centerpiece of this year's budget, 100 percent of this is for social security.

On this chart I have here, in this coming year \$137 billion is the projected social security surplus. With the lockbox, we set aside \$137 billion, the entire social security surplus, over the next year. The Clinton-Gore Democrat alternative sets aside only 62 percent, continuing the raid on social security. In fact, the Clinton-Gore budget would spend \$52 billion of the social security surplus on other things.

That is why this legislation is so important. We want to wall off the social security trust fund. We need measures that work. Obviously the current rules, the current laws, do not protect the social security trust fund. That is why

the Medicare, social security and Medicare safe deposit box is so important.

Let us give it bipartisan support. Let us take this important first step as we work to save social security.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, rarely has a government program caused so much confusion and misled so many people and perhaps bedeviled so many of us here in Congress, so it is appropriate tonight that we establish this lockbox and go ahead and pass this legislation.

I might point out to my colleagues who are complaining that this did not go through a committee, I have been here 10 years. As the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) knows, there are often times that the Democrats brought legislation that was good without going through the subcommittee or the full committee.

So I think this has wide support. It will pass. I think it is appropriate that we bring this before the committee.

Lastly, I would say that it is a great accommodation for us to be debating and completing this tonight.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us would create a lockbox to ensure that Social Security surpluses be dedicated solely for the purpose they were intended to pay seniors their benefits.

Today we can make history by standing up for not only what we believe to be right but what is absolutely necessary. If we are to make good on our promise to our country's seniors that we will protect the Social Security program, this can be achieved by putting future surpluses into a lockbox that could not be used to perpetuate the tax and spend policies of the past. In other words, the Social Security surpluses could not be used to pay for new spending projects or for tax cuts.

Right now the Social Security Trust Fund is running a 126,000,000,000 surplus and it is used to mask the deficit. The Social Security Trust Fund's surplus shouldn't be used to fund other programs. And it should not be used to mask our Nation's deficit.

Added to that is the irony that this very same fund is scheduled to go bankrupt soon after the baby boomers start to retire.

And so this trust fund which will soon go bankrupt is now in surplus, hiding the true state of the Federal budget.

Rarely has a Government program caused so much confusion, mislead so many people, and bedeviled so many policy makers.

We have been very zealous in cutting wasteful spending and reducing the size of our Government's bureaucracy. We should keep up our efforts and continue to cut out unnecessary spending. Whatever surplus we may have is a result of lower taxes and less government spending.

What would happen if the economy should start to falter? How would that affect the budget process if the surplus were to shrink—keeping in mind that the true state of our budget surplus is dubious at best.

We can through the passage of H. R. 1259—finally stop this practice which started

when President Johnson unified the budget in 1969. It was then that Social Security, and the other Federal trust fund programs, were first officially accounted for in the Federal budget.

The "Safe Deposit Box Act" establishes the submission of separate Social Security budget documents by excluding outlays and receipts of the Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Program under the Social Security Act thereby preventing Social Security surpluses being used for any purpose other than for retirement benefits.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means and a valued member of the Subcommittee on Social Security.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Subcommittee on Social Security for yielding time to me.

I want to also commend the gentleman from California (Mr. WALLY HERGER) for bringing this legislation before us tonight. It is my view that the next logical step toward fiscal sanity in this town. The first step was through a Republican majority to actually get a balanced budget in terms of a unified budget, all the receipts in, income taxes, payroll taxes, other fees, and all payments out of the Federal Government; for the first time in 30 years, we now have a unified balanced budget.

But it is time now to ensure the integrity of the social security system by taking those payroll taxes and requiring that they indeed go to the trust fund and to the social security system. That is what this does, by walling it off. It is not the last step. It is the next logical step.

The next step is actually to take those funds and put them to work for the American people so that financial security and retirement is ensured. That is why I want to compliment the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) for coming forward with a plan that does that over the requisite 75-year period.

That is the challenge of this Congress. It does not mean this step is not important, because it is the foundation upon which real social security reform must be built.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), because I think he and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) have attempted to come up with a piece of legislation conceptually that at least deserves not only a hearing, but perhaps even a markup.

What I really would suggest we do now is go to a markup. We are 6 months into this year. We had a White House summit or conference last December. It appears to me now that now is the time to mark up a bill.

We have essentially 3 months left, probably 25 to 30 legislative days left

this year, and if we run out of time we are going to get into the year 2000, and everyone can see we probably will not take social security up in an election year, Democrats and Republicans. It is not a partisan observation.

So we have a slight window. That means this window is probably within the next 20 or 30 days at the very most, and this issue is too critical to put off with resolutions, as we saw in January, or this so-called lockbox, which will do no harm but do no good.

As a result of that, we should begin the markup. We are going to be 25 percent short of paying out benefits over the next 35 years, 25 percent short. As a result of that, we have an obligation to deal with this problem now. We should not be fooling around with gimmicks like lockboxes and resolutions. We should take this issue seriously.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say, I compliment the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI), the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Social Security of the Committee on Ways and Means, and I take what he says as reaching out to Republicans and wanting to work together to solve this terrible problem that we have.

Mr. Speaker, we talk about the year 2035. The real problem is going to start in 2014, when the fund starts to run out of money. That means that the FICA taxes will not be sufficient to take care of the benefits. That means that those baby-boomers that are getting into the retirement system at that time are going to require either a decrease in their benefits, which would be terrible, or an increase in the payroll taxes for the people that are already overtaxed, and particularly the people of low income.

That would be terrible to do that. So let us not kid ourselves, we do not have until 2035. The problem starts at 2015, and the disaster happens at 2035.

Just 2 weeks ago our ninth grandchild was born to Emily and to me, little Casey Carter, a beautiful little girl. And I cannot help but think, and all of us think as we look into our children's eyes, our grandchildren's eyes, just go out front and look into the eyes of the young people around this Capitol, we are handing them a hand grenade, pulling the pin, and say you hold it, it is your problem.

We can solve it now, and we do need to solve it now. If we do not solve it now, it would be the biggest, biggest curse on this House and the Senate and the White House.

We can work together. There is a way to do it. We have put down a plan. The President is going to be putting down a plan. I hope the Democrats will come out with a plan that they can support. We need to work together. We need to come together and solve this situation.

We can do it now without in any way interfering with the benefits that our

seniors rely upon and without increasing the taxes on our kids and our grandkids. But this may be the last Congress that can do this with as little pain as we can put into it.

So let us work together, and I think this has been a very constructive, constructive session. I accept a lot of the criticism that has been given, and I hope that Members will accept a lot of the criticism that has come from this side. Together we can work together to solve the social security crisis in this country.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, today I will reluctantly vote in favor of the Republican "lock box" proposal. I do so with reluctance because Democrats were not allowed to offer a far better alternative which would have truly extended the life of both Social Security and Medicare.

I am disappointed that, for all their rhetoric, the Republican leadership cannot come up with a real Social Security reform proposal that truly protects and extends the life of our nation's retirement security program.

H.R. 1259 fits into a pattern of Republican-controlled congresses to pass harmless legislation that make political points instead of taking the tough steps necessary to solve our nation's problems. The bill in front of us was not even considered by the committees that have jurisdiction over Social Security. We need real action on Social Security and Medicare, not just procedural bills that do not address the heart of the matter.

The heart of the matter is that 44 million people currently receive Social Security benefits, and Social Security has kept millions of our seniors out of poverty. Without Social Security, a staggering 42% of our seniors would be in poverty. But now due to the pending retirement of the baby boom generation and the very positive fact that people are living longer today, we need to take steps to provide for the long-term health of Social Security.

Democrats are very clear about this—we want to reserve the budget surplus for the long-term health of both Social Security and Medicare. We have a basic difference of opinion with Republicans, who would like to use a significant percentage of the budget surplus for tax cuts which would benefit the richest Americans at a time when the economy is performing superbly.

So while the bill today does no harm, neither does it do any good. Let's take the politics out of this debate about Social Security, roll up our sleeves, and get down to work on realistic and lasting reforms that will extend the life of Social Security and Medicare for generations to come.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Democratic motion to recommit H.R. 1259 so that it can go through the normal Committee process and we can actually save the budget surplus for Social Security and Medicare.

This bill appears to protect Medicare and Social Security from the cavalier spending of Congress, but it merely creates shelter for Congress when our constituents ask us why Social Security and Medicare are facing financial failure. Let's be honest with the American people. We must devise an honest approach to financing and strengthening the two systems.

This bill did not go through the normal legislative process so it does not have the enforce-

ment provisions it could have had if the Ways and Means Committee was allowed to debate and amend it. Furthermore, we must stop blaming the President and take responsibility for enacting—or avoiding—responsible legislation. Not one dollar of taxpayer funds can be spent by the President unless Congress approves it. Finally, we must take this opportunity as a first step in real debate to strengthen Social Security and Medicare.

I. LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT PROCESS SO FAR WITH H.R. 1259

H.R. 1249 did not go through the regular Committee process. It was pulled from the Committees with jurisdiction and brought directly to the House floor without any normal deliberation.

The Republicans avoided sending H.R. 1259 through Ways & Means so the Committee was not able to debate or amend the bill prior to coming to the floor.

Had we used the normal legislative process, today's bill might have the enforcement measures needed to address Medicare and Social Security's insolvency problems. The Speaker promised to meet us half way when he took office. He also promised to play by the rules. Neither promise has been honored in this case. Clearly, we will move back to regular order only when it is convenient to do so.

Had the Ways and Means Committee considered the bill, I would have offered an amendment to more clearly define what would qualify as "Medicare reform". H.R. 1259 makes the "lockbox" provisions of the bill effective until Medicare and Social Security are saved. However, it does not define "saved." This allows Congress to raise the age of eligibility, to force people into HMOs, and to reduce benefits as the means of "extending" the financial life of the program. Medicare is a vital program for our nation's seniors and disabled populations. In my mind, reform cannot include reductions in benefits like some would like to achieve. Some Members may believe that this is an adequate definition of "saved" but I don't. We cannot sacrifice the health and well-being of the American workers for the sake of balancing the books.

II CONGRESS—NOT THE PRESIDENT—RAIDS THE TRUST FUNDS

I might point out that Social Security has already been taken "off-budget" by three separate public laws: by the Social Security Amendments of 1983; by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985; and once more by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990. If Congress has been able to circumvent the spirit of the law for this long, what makes us believe that anything will change this time around?

The GOP has been blaming the President for raiding the Social Security trust funds. This is simply not the case. This body is responsible for passing all spending bills. Just last week, we spent \$12 billion for Kosovo in the Emergency Supplemental bill. Congress spent twice as much as the President requested for a war that the GOP refused to authorize.

This is a clear case of hypocrisy. On the one hand, Congress doesn't want to authorize the war, but on the other hand they'll spend an exorbitant amount on pork for the mission. On the one hand, Congress claims they want to save the budget surplus for Medicare and Social Security but right after, they spend it on a war they don't support.

Let's be honest. Congress controls the spending and we have always been able to

control whether it goes for needed programs like Social Security and Medicare or programs like the National Missile Defense system.

III. STRENGTHEN SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE

I agree that there should be a lockbox for Social Security and Medicare. But I want all surpluses to be used for these programs. First and foremost we must strengthen Social Security and Medicare and ensure their solvency. Before any tax bills are brought to the floor of the House, we must guarantee the American people that their Old Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance is as strong as they need it to be for a happy and healthy retirement. We must guarantee them that their health care needs will be met with quality in their golden years.

We must lock up all of the budget surpluses until these two systems are strengthened through bipartisan legislation. The big tax cut for the wealthy must be postponed until the American worker is assured that his or her health and retirement insurance is safe for years to come.

The only way to do this is by giving this bill some teeth. We must send this bill back to committee and give it the enforcement provisions it needs. Let's really lock up the surplus until Medicare and Social Security are solvent for the long-term.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, the best way to stop the politicians from spending the taxpayers' money is to take it away from them before they can waste it. Today we have the chance to take Social Security and Medicare's money away from the politicians.

The Congressional Budget Office has projected a surplus of \$1.55 trillion over the next ten years. Of that amount, \$1.52 trillion—98 percent—is Social Security reserves, which consist of the payroll tax payments made by employees and employers during the next decade and interest earned on the Social Security Trust Fund during that period.

Clearly, the surplus is not extra money which Congress can spend on any worthy cause. Every one of those dollars will be needed to honor our commitment to future retirees. Social Security is sound today, but we in Congress have a responsibility to worry about tomorrow.

We must ensure that Social Security and Medicare will continue to provide the benefits promised to those who have paid into the system. No one should have to worry that one day Social Security will not be there for them. Our children and our grandchildren deserve to know that Social Security and Medicare will be there when they need it. We can give them that guarantee by voting for H.R. 1259, the "Social Security and Medicare Safe Deposit Box Act."

This bill:

Removes Social Security surpluses from all budget totals used by Congress or the President, so they can no longer be used to mask deficits or inflate overall budget surpluses.

Blocks budgets that spend excess Social Security money by requiring a supermajority (60) in the Senate for passage and allows for a point of order against any legislation in the House—including all spending initiatives or tax cuts.

Creates a safe deposit box shielding Social Security surpluses that can only be opened for Social Security and Medicare reform.

Using Social Security dollars to pay for anything other than retirement benefits would be

an act of political larceny. The victims would be those hard-working men and women who are counting on Social Security to protect them in their retirement years.

Save Social Security and Medicare for future generations, vote for this bill.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deep concerns about the rhetoric that surrounds this bill. I am deeply concerned that some members have stated that this budget will "lock away the Social Security and Medicare surplus." I am puzzled as to what this means. Is the money going to be stuffed under a mattress at the Department of Treasury. Will there be a huge safe with armed guards at the Bureau of Public Debt stuffed full of stacks of cash? Obviously not.

When you peel back the rhetoric, you find out that what the bill really does is to use the Social Security Trust Fund Surplus to pay down publicly held debt. This does absolutely nothing to address the long-term problems of Social Security. As a matter of fact, if Congress leaves current law as it is, all of the surplus from all of the trust funds, and any unified budget surplus, will be used to pay down the publicly held debt. When was the last time you heard seniors in your district telling you that they want FICA taxes to be used to pay for Congress' voracious spending during the 1980's and 90's?

While paying down the publicly held debt may be a laudable goal, let's not say it does something to "Save Social Security." All paying down the publicly held debt does is allow the government to pay down publicly held debt now, so that when all of the IOU's in the Social Security Trust Fund come due in 2014 we can take out more debt. I am puzzled why it is good policy to pay down debt now so that we can take out massive amounts of debt in the future.

My colleague, Mr. MARKEY, and I have introduced legislation which will actually do something to save Social Security. Our legislation will add six years to the solvency of the Social Security Trust Fund. Our bill does this by authorizing the investment of a portion of the Social Security Trust Fund in broad-based index stock funds, just like every pension manager in the country does. We have included extensive provisions to protect the fund from political manipulation. By having a private sector fund managers invest in the market, our bill will finally get a portion of the trust fund out of the hands of a spend-happy Congress in Washington, and simultaneously grow the assets in the trust fund. This is almost identical to the investment strategy that has been employed by the highly successful Thrift Savings Plan. Most importantly though, our bill will add at least six years to the solvency of the Social Security Trust Fund.

While I intend to vote for this bill, let's be honest with the American people. This bill does nothing to "Save Social Security." And if we tell the taxpayer otherwise we are doing them a disservice.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 1295, the Social Security and Medicare Safe Deposit Box Act of 1999. We must move this bill forward. For decades politicians in Washington have voted to spend the Social Security surplus on new and larger government programs.

When Republicans took control of the Congress in 1994, we promised to put a cap on government spending and to protect Social

Security. We were submitted to a relentless attack by those who wanted to expand the size and scope of government. But our efforts have paid off and the American people are better off because we have a real balanced budget for the first time in decades. When we take all of the Social Security Surplus money and set it aside in the lock-box, we still have a few dollars left over.

Social Security is much safer today that it was four years ago because we have balanced the budget. Had we not persevered in our efforts to balance the budget no one would be here today talking about a Social Security Trust Fund lock-box. This debate would be impossible.

I am pleased that the Republican Budget Resolution that we passed earlier this year committed us to passing a lock-box. We are doing that today with the passage of H.R. 1295.

The greatest objections to this bill are coming from those who have voted over the past years to use the Social Security Trust Fund money to pay for larger government. They know that after today it will be more difficult to do so because they can no longer secretly dip their hand into the Trust Fund to pay for their new program.

The bill will force fiscal discipline on Washington. In order to create a new federal program, politicians who propose new Washington programs will have to say how they are going to pay for their new program because they can no longer dip into Social Security for the money.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1259, the Social Security Lock Box bill. For too long, our Nation's seniors—and tomorrow's seniors—have been faced with uncertainty. It's an uncertainty about the promises they've been made, that the Social Security benefits they earned will be there for them when it's time for retirement.

Our legislation locks away 100 percent of all Social Security surpluses. It locks them away from Congressional big spenders who'd rather break tomorrow's promises and fill the Social Security Trust Fund with IOUs, to spend for budget-busting federal spending today. With passage of our bill today, we can ensure that any new federal spending does not come at the expense of Social Security beneficiaries.

Today, we make the guarantee for future beneficiaries and current Social Security recipients, that their benefits will be there. When they step toward retirement, they won't find IOUs in their Social Security accounts. Instead, they'll find their full benefits, and a promise kept.

Let's put "security" back in Social Security. Support the Social Security Lock Box bill.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired. Pursuant to House Resolution 186, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. RANGEL.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. RANGEL. Yes, in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RANGEL moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1259 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Redesignate sections 4 and 5 as sections 5 and 6, respectively, and insert after section 3 the following new section:

SEC. 4. SURPLUSES RESERVED UNTIL SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE SOLVENCY LEGISLATION IS ENACTED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 312 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (as amended by section 3) is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(h) SURPLUSES RESERVED UNTIL SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE SOLVENCY LEGISLATION IS ENACTED.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Until there is both a social security solvency certification and a Medicare solvency certification, it shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider—

"(A) any concurrent resolution on the budget, or conference report thereon or amendment thereto, that would use any portion of the baseline budget surpluses, or

"(B) any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report if—

"(i) the enactment of that bill or resolution as reported,

"(ii) the adoption and enactment of that amendment, or

"(iii) the enactment of that bill or resolution in the form recommended in that conference report,

would use any portion of the baseline budget surpluses.

"(2) BASELINE BUDGET SURPLUSES.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'baseline budget surplus' means the sum of the on- and off-budget surpluses contained in the most recent baseline budget projections made by the Congressional Budget Office at the beginning of the annual budget cycle and no later than the month of March.

"(B) BASELINE BUDGET PROJECTION.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'baseline budget projection' means the projection described in section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 of current year levels of outlays, receipts, and the surplus or deficit into the budget year and future years; except that if outlays for programs subject to discretionary appropriations are subject to statutory spending limits then these outlays shall be projected at the level of any applicable statutory discretionary spending limits. For purposes of this subsection, the baseline budget projection shall include both on-budget and off-budget outlays and receipts.

"(3) USE OF PORTION OF THE BASELINE BUDGET SURPLUSES.—For purposes of this subsection, a portion of the baseline budget surpluses is used if, relative to the baseline budget projection—

"(A) in the case of legislation affecting revenues, any net reduction in revenues in the current year or the budget year, or over the 5 or 10-year estimating periods beginning with the budget year, is not offset by reductions in direct spending,

"(B) in the case of legislation affecting direct spending, any net increase in direct spending in the current year or the budget year, or over such 5 or 10-year periods, is not offset by increases in revenues, and

"(C) in the case of an appropriations bill, there is a net increase in discretionary outlays in the current year or the budget year when the discretionary outlays from such bill are added to the discretionary outlays from all previously enacted appropriations bills.

"(4) SOCIAL SECURITY SOLVENCY CERTIFICATION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'social security solvency certification' means a certification by the Board of Trustees of the Social Security Trust Funds that the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are, taken together, in actuarial balance for the 75-year period utilized in the most recent annual report of such Board of Trustees pursuant to section 201(c)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401(c)(2)).

"(5) MEDICARE SOLVENCY CERTIFICATION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'Medicare solvency certification' means a certification by the Board of Trustees of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund that such Trust Fund is in actuarial balance for the 30-year period utilized in the most recent annual report of such Board of Trustees pursuant to section 1817(b) of the Social Security Act."

(b) SUPER MAJORITY REQUIREMENT.—(1) Section 904(c)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (as amended by section 3) is further amended by inserting "312(h)," after "310(g)."

(2) Section 904(d)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (as amended by section 3) is further amended by inserting "312(h)," after "310(g)."

□ 1900

Mr. RANGEL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, this is merely a parliamentary maneuver. It does not mean too much as it relates to whether or not this Congress or this House deals with Social Security. It takes the so-called Social Security surplus, puts it into a lockbox, and gives the key to that lockbox to the majority.

I suppose that this is supposed to send a positive message to America that we do recognize the serious nature of the crisis that will face the next generation as they look forward to receiving the benefits that they rightly deserve.

We on this side say that the President has tried to put pressure on the Congress by saying, let us do Social Security first. Let us do Medicare first.

In order to put additional pressure on us, it is suggested, not only by the President, but by this stronger lockbox provision, which is identical to H.R. 1927 introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LUCAS), and the

gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE), that says why restrict ourselves just to the Social Security surplus? Why not take the on-budget surplus? Why not take the monies that we will have, and as some people say, while the sun is shining, that is the time to fix the roof?

Why not say that we are going to attempt to work in a bipartisan way, not to see who can outscore each other on points? Because when this motion is analyzed by those who study the work of the Committee on Ways and Means, it is going to be clear to everybody that we have not locked anything in. As long as there is a majority in this House, that box can be unlocked. There is no lock on it.

But if we did say that we were going to work together, not as Democrats and Republicans, but as committed Members of this House, it would seem to me that we would start now in trying to cooperate with each other and not bring motions out on the floor without having full debate in the Subcommittee on Social Security and the Committee on Ways and Means.

No one has worked harder to achieve a bipartisan approach to this than the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW). I think that our chairman and my President would like to be able to say that on their watch, they have been able to tackle this very serious problem.

But this problem is not going to be resolved by Republicans, and it is not going to be resolved by Democrats. It is not going to be resolved by demagoguery. It is not going to be resolved by rhetorical motions and amendments.

It can only be done when the leadership of this House decides that it is going to talk with the leadership on the other side, and they agree that we are going to work together, not to make points, but to make history.

These things could have been discussed in the committee, but then again, if we do that, we have debate, and God knows we do not want any of that anymore.

It seems to me that now is the time for the leadership to be a little more outspoken, not in terms of lockboxes, but in terms of leadership in saying that they have met, they have decided, and they have talked with the President, and they would like to resolve this problem. That way, we will not spend a lot of time pointing at each other for what we have not done, but we can spend more time taking care of the people's business.

This motion to recommit, those who are voting for it are saying we make this a priority. If it is going to be a lockbox, let us lock up the leadership of the Republicans and Democrats and put them in a room and say they cannot get out of that room until they come up with a Social Security reform package. But my colleagues know and I know, if this is not done this year, it is not going to be done in this session.

So we can bring out these amendments, we can talk about it, and we

can move to recommit, but so far, we have no bill.

I just want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) for having the courage to put his name at least on the talking paper when his colleagues could not see fit to put their name on a bill.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, it is important to understand what is going on here. H.R. 1259 saves 100 percent of the Social Security surplus, \$1.8 trillion over the next 10 years or \$100 billion more than the President proposed in his budget for saving Social Security and Medicare.

Under our safe deposit box, none of that money can be spent on anything else until we actually save Social Security and Medicare. For those who say that is not enough, Mr. Speaker, not enough, the gentleman from Texas (Chairman ARCHER) and the gentleman from Florida (Chairman SHAW) have already offered a proposal to save Social Security for 75 years and beyond, that costs far less than the \$1.8 trillion over the next decade, leaving hundreds of billions of dollars for Medicare reform.

But in their zeal to prevent any tax relief for American people, the Democrat proposal would also freeze budget surpluses that have nothing to do with Social Security and Medicare. Apparently what that means is that the fiscal policy of the House Democrat leadership is that hard-working Americans who have paid too much in income taxes cannot get any of their money back. It all has to stay trapped in Washington until the government agrees on how to save Social Security and Medicare. The longer that takes, the less money there is to return to the taxpayers.

This proposal does not just prevent excess taxes from being returned in the form of income tax cuts, it also blocks the money from being spent on building a stronger military, improving public schools, or protecting the environment.

The President said in his State of the Union address, we need to use the surplus wisely, including for such purposes. Is the Democrat leadership now telling the country those important goals do not matter? Or are the Democrats saying that, to the degree that issues other than Social Security and Medicare matter, we have to raise taxes to pay for them? Or are they suggesting we cut current government spending to pay for any new spending? I seriously doubt it.

Finally, the Democrats' motion states any legislation opening the safe deposit box must save Social Security for at least 75 years. I welcome their use of this standard which the Social Security Administration says the Archer-Shaw plan achieves. Since the President's plan the Democrats are

drafting falls short of this 75-year standard, saving Social Security for only about 55 years, I look forward to hearing how the Democrats would fill in those final 20 years.

Until then, we should defeat the Democrat motion and get on with saving the Social Security surplus, to strengthen Social Security and Medicare without tying the rest of the government in knots.

In closing, our H.R. 1259 saves \$100 billion more than under the President's budget for Social Security and Medicare. My colleagues from the other side of the aisle were in power here in the House for 40 years, and guess how much money was set aside for Social Security? Zero. Nada. Not a single penny.

Mr. Speaker, this lockbox in H.R. 1259 is good legislation. It is good for Social Security. That is why H.R. 1259 is supported by the United Seniors Association, the Seniors Coalition, the 60 Plus Association, the Concord Coalition, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, last month the House and Senate passed the fiscal year 2000 budget resolution which committed to locking up 100 percent of Social Security. Now it is time to put that commitment into law.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on this motion to recommit and vote yes on H.R. 1259 and lock up Social Security for current and future generations.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to recommit with instructions. The language contained in the instructions, which was introduced yesterday by my colleagues, Mr. HOLT, Mr. LUCAS, and me, offers the strongest lockbox of the proposals before us today.

The Holt-Lucas-Moore language improves upon H.R. 1259 in two respects. First, it protects all unified budget surpluses, not just those attributed to Social Security. Second, it allows the Trustees of the Social Security and Medicare programs to be the arbiters of those programs' long term stability, not Congress and the White House.

Mr. Speaker, we need to protect all budget surpluses until we've solved the problem of Social Security and Medicare solvency. The Clinton Administration and Congress, throughout this decade, have worked hard to bring us to the verge of a budget surplus. H.R. 1259, however, would allow us to exploit the surpluses through a loophole described as Social Security or Medicare "reform." But the word "reform" is never defined. Let the Trustees of the Social Security and Medicare programs make these decisions—not Congress. We cannot allow politics to wreck Social Security and Medicare.

Don't just take my word for it, though. I am including in the RECORD a statement released today by the nonpartisan Concord Coalition. These budget watchdogs "give extra credit to Congressmen RUSH HOLT, KEN LUCAS, and DENNIS MOORE for their proposal to protect the entire budget surplus, over and above the Social Security surplus, until real entitlement reform is enacted."

Many of us are in Congress today because we pledged to our constituents that we would make the tough choices necessary to preserve

and protect Social Security and Medicare. I made the same promise and adoption of the motion to recommit is an essential step toward keeping our faith with our constituents. Our responsibility to future generations of Americans remains.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this motion to recommit, and I thank Mr. RANGEL for offering it on our behalf.

THE CONCORD COALITION

CONCORD COALITION APPLAUDS SOCIAL SECURITY LOCK BOX PROPOSALS BUT WARNS THEY ARE NOT TAMPER PROOF

WASHINGTON.—The Concord Coalition today commended the sponsors of Social Security lock box proposals, specifically bills H.R. 1259 and H.R. 1927, for their efforts to lock away the Social Security surplus.

"Both bills would make it more difficult for Congress to pay for new spending or tax cuts by dipping into the Social Security surplus. While structured somewhat differently, either bill would provide an extra measure of protection for the Social Security surplus. I applaud the sponsors of both bills for their commitment to this issue and give extra credit to Congressmen Rush Holt, Ken Lucas and Dennis Moore for their proposal to protect the entire budget surplus, over and above the Social Security surplus, until real entitlement reform is enacted," said Concord Coalition Policy Director Robert Bixby.

While encouraged by the lock box proposals, the Concord Coalition cautioned that their enforcement measure—a budget point of order—is not tamper proof. "Both lock box proposals make attacking the Social Security surplus subject to a budget point of order requiring additional votes. However, we only have to look at the number of yes votes for last week's emergency supplemental legislation to see that this enforcement mechanism is not tamper proof," Bixby said.

For example, the Senate requires a supermajority of 60 votes to override a budget point of order. Last week's emergency spending legislation received 64 votes, more than enough votes to waive a budget point of order.

"The Social Security lock box proposals have raised the important question of how we can best preserve budget surpluses for entitlement reform. However, we cannot let these proposals overshadow the need for real reform. We hope Congress and the President will turn to this task next," Bixby said.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Democratic motion to recommit H.R. 1259 so that it can go through the normal Committee process and we can actually save the budget surplus for Social Security and Medicare.

This bill appears to protect Medicare and Social Security from the cavalier spending of Congress, but it merely creates shelter for Congress when our constituents ask us why Social Security and Medicare are facing financial failure. Let's be honest with the American people. We must devise an honest approach to financing and strengthening the two systems.

The bill did not go through the normal legislative process so it does not have the enforcement provisions it could have had if the Ways & Means Committee was allowed to debate and amend it. Furthermore, we must stop blaming the President and take responsibility for enacting—or avoiding—responsible legislation. Not one dollar of taxpayer funds can be spent by the President unless Congress approves it. Finally, we must take this oppor-

tunity as a first step in real debate to strengthen Social Security and Medicare.

I. LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT PROCESS SO FAR WITH H.R. 1259

H.R. 1259 did not go through the regular Committee process. It was pulled from the Committees with jurisdiction and brought directly to the House floor without any normal deliberation.

The Republicans avoided sending H.R. 1259 through Ways & Means so the Committee was not able to debate or amend the bill prior to coming to the floor.

Had we used the normal legislative process, today's bill might have the enforcement measures needed to address Medicare and Social Security's insolvency problems. The Speaker promised to meet us halfway when he took office. He also promised to play by the rules. Neither promise has been honored in this case. Clearly, we will move back to regular order only when it is convenient to do so.

Had the Ways and Means Committee considered the bill, I would have offered an amendment to more clearly define what would qualify as "Medicare reform". H.R. 1259 makes the "lockbox" provisions of the bill effective until Medicare and Social Security are saved. However, it does not define "saved." This allows Congress to raise the age of eligibility, to force people into HMOs, and to reduce benefits as the means of "extending" the financial life of the program. Medicare is a vital program for our nation's seniors and disabled populations. In my mind, reform cannot include reductions in benefits like some would like to achieve. Some Members may believe that this is an adequate definition of "saved" but I don't. We cannot sacrifice the health and well-being of the American workers for the sake of balancing the books.

II. CONGRESS—NOT THE PRESIDENT—RAIDS THE TRUST FUNDS

I might point out that Social Security has already been taken "off-budget" by three separate public laws: by the Social Security Amendments of 1983; by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985; and once more by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990. If Congress has been able to circumvent the spirit of the law for this long, what makes us believe that anything will change this time around?

The GOP has been blaming the President for raiding the Social Security trust funds. This is simply not the case. This body is responsible for passing all spending bills. Just last week, we spent \$12 billion for Kosovo in the Emergency Supplemental bill. Congress spent twice as much as the President requested for a war that the GOP refused to authorize.

This is a clear case of hypocrisy. On the one hand, Congress doesn't want to authorize the war, but on the other hand they'll spend an exorbitant amount on pork for the mission. On the one hand, Congress claims they want to save the budget surplus for Medicare and Social Security but right after they spend it on a war they don't support.

Let's be honest. Congress controls the spending and we have always been able to control whether it goes for needed programs like Social Security and Medicare or programs like the National Missile Defense system.

III. STRENGTHEN SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE

I agree that there should be a lockbox for Social Security and Medicare. But I want all surpluses to be used for these programs. First

and foremost we must strengthen Social Security and Medicare and ensure their solvency. Before any tax bills are brought to the floor of the House, we must guarantee the American people that their Old Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance is as strong as they need it to be for a happy and healthy retirement. We must guarantee them that their health care needs will be met with quality in their golden years.

We must lock up all of the budget surpluses until these two systems are strengthened through bipartisan legislation. The big tax cut for the wealthy must be postponed until the American worker is assured that his or her health and retirement insurance is safe for years to come.

The only way to do this is by giving this bill some teeth. We must send this bill back to committee and give it the enforcement provisions it needs. Let's really lock up the surplus until Medicare and Social Security are solvent for the long-term.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas were 205, nays 222.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 205, nays 222, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 163]

YEAS—205

Abercrombie	Condit	Gephardt
Ackerman	Conyers	Gonzalez
Allen	Costello	Goode
Andrews	Coyne	Gordon
Baird	Cramer	Green (TX)
Baldacci	Crowley	Gutierrez
Baldwin	Cummings	Hall (OH)
Barcia	Danner	Hall (TX)
Barrett (WI)	Davis (FL)	Hastings (FL)
Becerra	Davis (IL)	Hill (IN)
Bentsen	DeFazio	Hilliard
Berkley	DeGette	Hinchee
Berman	DeLaunt	Hinojosa
Berry	DeLauro	Hoefel
Bishop	Deutsch	Holden
Blagojevich	Dicks	Holt
Blumenauer	Dingell	Hooley
Bonior	Dixon	Hoyer
Borski	Doggett	Inslie
Boswell	Dooley	Jackson (IL)
Boucher	Doyle	Jackson-Lee
Boyd	Edwards	(TX)
Brady (PA)	Engel	Jefferson
Brown (FL)	Eshoo	John
Brown (OH)	Etheridge	Johnson, E. B.
Capps	Evans	Jones (OH)
Capuano	Farr	Kanjorski
Cardin	Fattah	Kaptur
Carson	Filner	Kennedy
Clay	Ford	Kildee
Clayton	Frank (MA)	Kilpatrick
Clement	Frost	Kind (WI)
Clyburn	Gejdenson	Klecza

Klink	Moore	Sisisky
Kucinich	Moran (VA)	Skelton
LaFalce	Murtha	Slaughter
Lampson	Nadler	Smith (WA)
Lantos	Napolitano	Snyder
Larson	Neal	Spratt
Lee	Oberstar	Stabenow
Levin	Obey	Stark
Lewis (GA)	Olver	Stenholm
Lipinski	Ortiz	Strickland
Lowe	Owens	Stupak
Lucas (KY)	Pallone	Tanner
Luther	Pascrell	Tauscher
Maloney (CT)	Pastor	Taylor (MS)
Maloney (NY)	Payne	Thompson (CA)
Markey	Peterson (MN)	Thompson (MS)
Martinez	Phelps	Thurman
Mascara	Pickett	Tierney
Matsui	Pomeroy	Towns
McCarthy (MO)	Price (NC)	Trafigant
McCarthy (NY)	Rangel	Turner
McGovern	Reyes	Udall (CO)
McIntosh	Rivers	Udall (NM)
McIntyre	Rodriguez	Velazquez
McKinney	Roemer	Vento
McNulty	Rothman	Visclosky
Meehan	Roybal-Allard	Waters
Meek (FL)	Rush	Watt (NC)
Meeks (NY)	Sanchez	Waxman
Menendez	Sanders	Weiner
Millender-	Sandlin	Wexler
McDonald	Schakowsky	Weygand
Miller, George	Scott	Wise
Minge	Serrano	Woolsey
Mink	Sherman	Wu
Moakley	Shows	Wynn

NAYS—222

Aderholt	Everett	Linder
Archer	Ewing	LoBiondo
Armey	Fletcher	Lofgren
Bachus	Foley	Lucas (OK)
Baker	Forbes	Manzullo
Ballenger	Fossella	McCollum
Barr	Fowler	McCrery
Barrett (NE)	Franks (NJ)	McDermott
Bartlett	Frelinghuysen	McHugh
Barton	Galleghy	McInnis
Bass	Ganske	McKeon
Bateman	Gekas	Metcalfe
Bereuter	Gibbons	Mica
Biggert	Gilchrest	Miller (FL)
Bilbray	Gillmor	Miller, Gary
Bilirakis	Gilman	Mollohan
Bliley	Goodlatte	Moran (KS)
Blunt	Goodling	Morrell
Boehlert	Goss	Myrick
Boehner	Graham	Nethercutt
Bonilla	Granger	Ney
Bono	Green (WI)	Northup
Brady (TX)	Greenwood	Norwood
Bryant	Gutknecht	Nussle
Burr	Hansen	Ose
Burton	Hastings (WA)	Oxley
Buyer	Hayes	Packard
Callahan	Hayworth	Paul
Calvert	Hefley	Pease
Camp	Herger	Peterson (PA)
Campbell	Hill (MT)	Petri
Canady	Hilleary	Pickering
Cannon	Hobson	Pitts
Castle	Hoekstra	Pombo
Chabot	Horn	Porter
Chambliss	Hostettler	Portman
Chenoweth	Houghton	Pryce (OH)
Coble	Hulshof	Quinn
Coburn	Hunter	Radanovich
Collins	Hutchinson	Rahall
Combest	Hyde	Ramstad
Cook	Isakson	Regula
Cooksey	Istook	Reynolds
Cox	Jenkins	Riley
Crane	Johnson (CT)	Rogan
Cubin	Johnson, Sam	Rogers
Cunningham	Jones (NC)	Rohrabacher
Davis (VA)	Kelly	Ros-Lehtinen
Deal	King (NY)	Roukema
DeLay	Kingston	Royce
DeMint	Knollenberg	Ryan (WI)
Diaz-Balart	Kolbe	Ryun (KS)
Dickey	Kuykendall	Sabo
Doolittle	LaHood	Salmon
Dreier	Largent	Sanford
Duncan	Latham	Saxton
Dunn	LaTourette	Schaffer
Ehlers	Lazio	Sensenbrenner
Ehrlich	Leach	Sessions
Emerson	Lewis (CA)	Shadegg
English	Lewis (KY)	Shaw

Shays	Sununu	Walden
Sherwood	Sweeney	Walsh
Shimkus	Talent	Wamp
Shuster	Tancredo	Watkins
Simpson	Tauzin	Watts (OK)
Skeen	Taylor (NC)	Weldon (FL)
Smith (MI)	Terry	Weldon (PA)
Smith (NJ)	Thomas	Weller
Smith (TX)	Thornberry	Whitfield
Souder	Thune	Wicker
Spence	Tiahrt	Wilson
Stearns	Toomey	Wolf
Stump	Upton	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Brown (CA)	Pelosi	Scarborough
Kasich	Sawyer	Young (AK)

□ 1930

Messrs. HORN, RAHALL, and SMITH of Michigan changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. Peterson of Minnesota and Mr. BLUMENAUER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The question is on passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas were 416, nays 222.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 12, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 164]

YEAS—416

Abercrombie	Brown (FL)	DeFazio
Ackerman	Brown (OH)	DeGette
Aderholt	Bryant	Delahunt
Allen	Burr	DeLauro
Andrews	Burton	DeLay
Archer	Buyer	DeMint
Armey	Callahan	Deutsch
Bachus	Calvert	Diaz-Balart
Baird	Camp	Dickey
Baker	Campbell	Dicks
Baldacci	Canady	Dixon
Baldwin	Cannon	Doggett
Ballenger	Capps	Dooley
Barcia	Capuano	Doolittle
Barr	Cardin	Doyle
Barrett (NE)	Carson	Dreier
Barrett (WI)	Castle	Duncan
Bartlett	Chabot	Dunn
Barton	Chambliss	Edwards
Bass	Chenoweth	Ehlers
Bateman	Clay	Ehrlich
Becerra	Clayton	Emerson
Bentsen	Clement	Engel
Bereuter	Clyburn	English
Berkley	Coble	Eshoo
Berman	Coburn	Etheridge
Berry	Collins	Evans
Biggert	Combest	Everett
Bilbray	Condit	Ewing
Bilirakis	Conyers	Farr
Bishop	Cook	Fattah
Blagojevich	Cooksey	Fletcher
Bliley	Costello	Foley
Blumenauer	Cox	Forbes
Blunt	Coyne	Ford
Boehlert	Cramer	Fossella
Boehner	Crane	Fowler
Bonilla	Crowley	Franks (NJ)
Bonior	Cubin	Frelinghuysen
Bono	Cummings	Frost
Borski	Cunningham	Galleghy
Boswell	Danner	Ganske
Boucher	Davis (FL)	Gejdenson
Boyd	Davis (IL)	Gekas
Brady (PA)	Davis (VA)	Gephardt
Brady (TX)	Deal	Gibbons

Gilchrest	Lucas (KY)	Ryun (KS)
Gillmor	Lucas (OK)	Salmon
Gilman	Luther	Sanchez
Gonzalez	Maloney (CT)	Sanders
Goode	Maloney (NY)	Sandlin
Goodlatte	Manzullo	Sanford
Goodling	Markey	Sawyer
Gordon	Martinez	Saxton
Goss	Mascara	Schaffer
Graham	Matsui	Schakowsky
Granger	McCarthy (MO)	Scott
Gutierrez	McCarthy (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Goodlatte	McCollum	Serrano
Gutknecht	McCrery	Sessions
Hall (OH)	McGovern	Shadegg
Hall (TX)	McHugh	Shaw
Hansen	McInnis	Shays
Hastert	McIntosh	Sherman
Hastings (FL)	McIntyre	Sherwood
Hastings (WA)	McKeon	Shimkus
Hayes	McKinney	Shows
Hayworth	McNulty	Shuster
Hefley	Meehan	Simpson
Herger	Meek (FL)	Sisisky
Hill (IN)	Meeks (NY)	Skeen
Hill (MT)	Menendez	Skelton
Hilleary	Metcalf	Slaughter
Hilliard	Mica	Smith (MI)
Hinchey	Millender-	Smith (NJ)
Hinojosa	McDonald	Smith (TX)
Hobson	Miller (FL)	Smith (WA)
Hoefel	Miller, Gary	Snyder
Hoekstra	Miller, George	Souder
Holden	Minge	Spence
Holt	Mink	Spratt
Hooley	Moakley	Stabenow
Horn	Moore	Stark
Hostettler	Moran (KS)	Stearns
Hoyer	Moran (VA)	Stenholm
Hulshof	Morella	Strickland
Hunter	Myrick	Stump
Hutchinson	Napolitano	Stupak
Hyde	Neal	Sununu
Inlee	Nethercutt	Sweeney
Isakson	Ney	Talent
Istook	Northup	Tancredo
Jackson (IL)	Norwood	Tanner
Jackson-Lee	Nussle	Tauscher
(TX)	Oberstar	Tauzin
Jefferson	Obey	Taylor (MS)
Jenkins	Ortiz	Taylor (NC)
John	Ose	Terry
Johnson (CT)	Oxley	Thomas
Johnson, E. B.	Packard	Thompson (CA)
Johnson, Sam	Pallone	Thompson (MS)
Jones (NC)	Pascarell	Thornberry
Jones (OH)	Paul	Thune
Kanjorski	Payne	Thurman
Kaptur	Pease	Tiahrt
Kelly	Peterson (MN)	Tierney
Kennedy	Peterson (PA)	Toomey
Kildee	Petri	Towns
Kilpatrick	Phelps	Trafficant
Kind (WI)	Pickering	Turner
King (NY)	Pickett	Udall (CO)
Kingston	Pitts	Udall (NM)
Kleczka	Pombo	Upton
Klink	Pomeroy	Velazquez
Knollenberg	Porter	Vento
Kolbe	Portman	Visclosky
Kucinich	Price (NC)	Walden
Kuykendall	Pryce (OH)	Walsh
LaFalce	Quinn	Wamp
LaHood	Radanovich	Waters
Lampson	Ramstad	Watkins
Largent	Rangel	Watt (NC)
Larson	Regula	Watts (OK)
Latham	Reyes	Waxman
LaTourette	Reynolds	Weiner
Lazio	Riley	Weldon (FL)
Leach	Rivers	Weller
Lee	Rodriguez	Wexler
Levin	Roemer	Weygand
Lewis (CA)	Rogan	Whitfield
Lewis (GA)	Rogers	Wicker
Lewis (KY)	Rohrabacher	Wilson
Linder	Ros-Lehtinen	Wise
Lipinski	Rothman	Wolf
LoBiondo	Roukema	Woolsey
Lofgren	Roybal-Allard	Wu
Lowey	Royce	Wynn
	Rush	Young (FL)
	Ryan (WI)	

NAYS—12

Dingell	Frank (MA)	McDermott
Filner	Houghton	Mollohan

Murtha	Olver	Rahall
Nadler	Owens	Sabo

NOT VOTING—6

Brown (CA)	Pelosi	Weldon (PA)
Kasich	Scarborough	Young (AK)

□ 1940

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts changed his vote from "yea" to "nay." Ms. LOFGREN changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill, as amended, was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker on rollcall No. 164, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF SENATE FROM MAY 27, 1999 TO JUNE 7, 1999, AND CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF HOUSE FROM MAY 27, 1999 TO JUNE 7, 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following privileged Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 35) providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 35

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Thursday, May 27, 1999, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, June 7, 1999, or until such time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, May 27, 1999, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 12:30 p.m. on Monday, June 7, 1999, for morning-hour debate, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and House, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

□ 1945

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The resolution is not debatable.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, my parliamentary inquiry is the vote that is before us is the adjournment resolution.

Does the passage of this resolution mean that we will not be able to address the school violence issue before we adjourn?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The concurrent resolution is self-explanatory. When the House adjourns on tomorrow's legislative day, it will reassemble on June 7, 1999.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Senate concurrent resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 249, nays 178, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 165]

YEAS—249

Aderholt	Dunn	Knollenberg
Archer	Ehlers	Kolbe
Armey	Ehrlich	Kuykendall
Bachus	Emerson	LaHood
Baker	English	Lampson
Ballenger	Everett	Largent
Barr	Ewing	Latham
Barrett (NE)	Fletcher	LaTourette
Bartlett	Foley	Lazio
Barton	Forbes	Leach
Bass	Fossella	Lewis (CA)
Bateman	Fowler	Lewis (KY)
Bereuter	Franks (NJ)	Linder
Biggert	Frelinghuysen	Lipinski
Bilbray	Gallegly	LoBiondo
Billirakis	Ganske	Lucas (KY)
Bliley	Gekas	Lucas (OK)
Blunt	Gibbons	Manzullo
Boehlert	Gilchrest	McCollum
Boehner	Gillmor	McCrery
Bonilla	Gilman	McHugh
Bono	Goode	McInnis
Boswell	Goodlatte	McIntosh
Boucher	Goodling	McIntyre
Boyd	Gordon	McKeon
Brady (TX)	Goss	Metcalf
Bryant	Graham	Mica
Burr	Granger	Miller (FL)
Burton	Green (TX)	Miller, Gary
Buyer	Green (WI)	Moran (KS)
Callahan	Greenwood	Morella
Calvert	Gutknecht	Murtha
Camp	Hall (OH)	Myrick
Campbell	Hall (TX)	Nethercutt
Canady	Hansen	Ney
Cannon	Hastert	Northup
Castle	Hastings (WA)	Norwood
Chabot	Hayes	Nussle
Chambliss	Hayworth	Obey
Chenoweth	Hefley	Ose
Coble	Herger	Oxley
Coburn	Hill (MT)	Packard
Collins	Hilleary	Paul
Combest	Hobson	Pease
Cook	Hoekstra	Peterson (MN)
Cooksey	Horn	Peterson (PA)
Costello	Hostettler	Petri
Cox	Houghton	Phelps
Cramer	Hulshof	Pickering
Crane	Hunter	Pickett
Cubin	Hutchinson	Pitts
Cunningham	Hyde	Pombo
Danner	Isakson	Porter
Davis (VA)	Istook	Portman
Deal	Jenkins	Pryce (OH)
DeLay	Johnson (CT)	Quinn
DeMint	Johnson, Sam	Ramstad
Diaz-Balart	Jones (NC)	Regula
Dickey	Kasich	Reynolds
Dingell	Kelly	Riley
Doolittle	Kind (WI)	Rogan
Dreier	King (NY)	Rogers
Duncan	Kingston	Rohrabacher

Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sandlin
Sanford
Saxton
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky

Skeen
Skeltson
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas

Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (FL)

NAYS—178

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Coyne
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez

Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinche
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hoolley
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Klecza
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lantos
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-
McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)

Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sawyer
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—7

Brown (CA)
Edwards
Larson

Pelosi
Radanovich
Scarborough

Young (AK)

□ 2000

So the Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 902

Mr. PHELPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor to H.R. 902.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 24, 1999, I was unavoidably detained in New York due to poor weather conditions. The weather delays caused me to miss Rollcall Votes 145 and 146, and had I been present, I would have voted in the affirmative on both Rollcall Vote No. 145 and Rollcall Vote No. 146.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to indicate that yesterday, on May 25, I was in the district on official business, and I would like to record in the RECORD the rollcall votes that I missed and how I would have voted.

On Rollcall Vote No. 157, if I had been here, I would have voted no. On Rollcall Vote No. 156, I would have voted no; Rollcall Vote 155, no; Rollcall Vote 154, no; 153, no; Rollcall Vote 152, no.

And on the suspensions, if I had been present on Rollcall No. 150, I would have voted yea; on Rollcall No. 149 I would have voted yea, and 148, I would have voted yea.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 24, a storm in Connecticut kept me from returning from official business in my congressional district. As such, I was unavoidably detained on rollcall votes Nos. 145 and 146. Had I been present, I would have voted yea on both.

NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO IRAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—(H. DOC. NO. 106-73)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c) and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12170 of November 14, 1979.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 26, 1999.

NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO BURMA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 106-74)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c) and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Burma that was declared in Executive Order 13074 of May 20, 1997.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 26, 1999.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 25, 1999.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Under Clause 2(g) of Rule II of the Rules of the House of Representatives, in addition to Gerasimos C. Vans, Assistant to the Clerk, I herewith designate Daniel J. Strodel, Assistant to the Clerk, in lieu of Daniel F.C. Crowley who resigned, to sign any and all papers and do all other acts for me under the name of the Clerk of the House which he would be authorized to do by virtue of this designation, except such as are provided by statute, in case of my temporary absence or disability.

This designation shall remain in effect for the 106th Congress or until modified by me.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHLL,
Clerk of the House.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DIAZ-BALART addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. RUSH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

WHY I AM A REPUBLICAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, many times when my colleague, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN), and I are back in our districts, we have constituents who ask us, "Why are you a Republican?" Tonight the gentlewoman from Wyoming and I are going to address that question.

For me as a hispanic woman who is a refugee from Communist Cuba, I know that our Republican party is the party which is most likely to stand up for individual liberty both abroad and here at home. But the fact is that our party's message of smaller government, of less bureaucratic regulation and lower taxes has got to get through to the individuals that it will help the most, small business owners, women and minorities.

This vision, which is shared by the vast majority of Republicans, is simply one of practical, commonsense, limited government which has made our country the beacon of liberty to the world. It is based on simple principles, simple principles that say that government cannot solve all of our problems, that individuals need to be held accountable for their actions and for their choices in life, that Washington does not always know best, principles that say that the free market is the greatest engine of prosperity in the history of the world, that no Nation in history can be successful without strong families and strong values, a principle which says

that peace is best preserved by a strong national defense, that America must stand up against Communist tyranny and refuse to accommodate evil regimes which extinguish the freedom and the hope of their people.

Mr. Speaker, a great number of my constituents know about having their freedom extinguished, about having their hopes destroyed and their lives held in bondage based on their personal experiences with totalitarian regimes from Castro's Cuba, to Cedras' Haiti, to Hitler's Europe. The thousands of people, for example, who have fled Fidel Castro's Communist regime are in little doubt about the nature of his lies. Where I come from there is not much confusion about the false promise of socialism, the reality of a one-party State or the empty slogans mouthed by leaders who use words to hide their true agenda. We are under few allusions, and we have little tolerance for those who are apologists for corrupt and dictatorial Communist regimes.

So for me the choice to become a Republican was easy. The Republican party prides itself in its realistic world view, a world view that is not given to pie in the sky schemes to manipulate human nature, to make everyone fit a cookie cutter mold or to blame others for our failures. No, our vision is simply one given to us in the Constitution and in our Bill of Rights.

Taking the Constitution as our framework and trusting experience over the social experiments dreamed up by Washington bureaucrats, I stand today for the same principles that I have been standing for my entire adult life. I think that average Americans are overtaxed, that the middle class, hard-working Americans are not getting their tax dollar's worth. I think that small businesses are the backbone of America and that entrepreneurs should be encouraged, not penalized, and certainly not demonized for the so-called crime of creating jobs and for producing prosperity.

The facts show that small business have always provided the best way for women, for minorities and for immigrants to achieve the American dream. I think that our public educational system is nearly broken, but I do not think that what ails schools today can be fixed in Washington, D.C. If it could, I think that we would have done it long ago and many billions of dollars and thousands of bureaucrats ago. I think that Social Security and Medicare are vital programs for millions of seniors who depend on them but that we will be shortchanging our current and future seniors if serious reforms are not enacted soon.

I would also like to add that I supported our successful effort to balance the budget so that long-term solvency of these programs will be insured and that we will have a retirement system that will protect seniors into the next century.

I think that Ronald Reagan was right, that military strength, not fine

words or unwise arms control agreements with evil regimes, is the key to preserving the peace, and I think that we should not take our freedoms for granted, a freedom that is all too rare in the world, a freedom that does not exist in Cuba or China or in North Korea and so many other lands which are untouched by the democratic spirit.

Mr. Speaker, that is what I stand for, and that is why I stand before my colleagues today as a proud Republican and a proud citizen of the greatest country on this earth, and that is why I know that the Republican party is going to grow and grow because it stands for the very principles that founded our great country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WILSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

WHY I AM A REPUBLICAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CUBIN. Madam Speaker, as a Member of Congress and a woman, I am frequently asked why I am a Republican. After all, we all know about the gender gap. As a woman, a wife and a mother of two sons, my values and beliefs are the beliefs that are mirrored in the traditional ideals of individual freedom and personal responsibility. The Republican party best reflects my values and opinions.

□ 2015

I believe the strength of our Nation lies with the individual, and each person's dignity, freedom, ability and responsibility must be honored. I believe in equal rights, equal justice and equal opportunity for all; that every single child has a right to live in an environment where they can achieve their fullest potential. I believe that free enterprise and the encouragement of individual initiative have brought prosperity, opportunity and economic growth to our country. I believe that the government must practice fiscal responsibility and allow individuals to keep more of the money that they earn.

I believe that the proper role of government is to provide for people only those functions that they cannot perform for themselves, and that the best government is that which governs the least. I believe the most effective, responsible and responsive government is the best for the people and closest to the people.

I believe Americans must retain the principles that have made us strong

while developing new and innovative ideas to meet the challenges of a changing world. I do believe that Americans value and should preserve our national strength and pride, while working to extend peace, freedom and human rights throughout the world. Finally, I believe that the Republican Party is the best vehicle for translating these ideas into positive and successful principles of government.

As America faces tragedies like the shootings that we have seen across the country in the last few months, I remain even more convinced that a return to traditional values and personal responsibility that made this country great are absolutely essential. I think President Reagan said it best when he said, We must reject the idea that every time a law is broken, society is guilty rather than the lawbreaker. It is time to restore the American precept that each individual is accountable for his actions.

As a wife, a woman, a mother of two sons, I believe that only a return to values and personal responsibility will end this sort of violence. That is why I am a Republican.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WILSON). The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House, and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of the proceedings or other audible conversation is in violation of the Rules of the House.

FULLY FUND THE E-RATE

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise this evening to talk about E-Rate. I strongly urge my colleagues to fully fund the Universal Service Fund program for schools and libraries, commonly called the E-Rate. The E-Rate has successfully helped provide equal access to opportunity and education for school children and the public at large.

In just 18 months, the E-Rate has connected over 600,000 classrooms in over 80,000 schools and libraries across this great Nation. At a recent roundtable discussion that I held in my district with educators, I asked principals and superintendents in my 7th congressional district, what is the one thing I can do right now in Congress to help education, and unanimously they said, continue the E-Rate program. Do not let the E-Rate program die, do not let it diminish. It is effective, it is working. It is connecting our schools to the future.

Most importantly, the E-Rate program enables all schools and libraries to provide Internet access to children, regardless of their means. For most

schools and libraries, the cost of both telephone and Internet access is cut in half, and for some of our most poorest schools, access will be almost free, almost free.

The E-Rate is helping to close the digital divide. Children in the most isolated inner city or rural town will have access to the same expansive knowledge and technology as a child in the most affluent suburbs.

This House supported this program in 1996 and should continue to support this program today, especially because of the scope and influence of the Internet on our children's lives.

Recently, surveys have shown that the American public strongly supports the introduction of information technology into our Nation's schools and libraries. A nonpartisan poll was commissioned by EdLiNC and conducted by Lake, Snell, Perry and Associates and the Tarrance Group. The results of this poll are impressive and send a clear signal that the American people support the concept of the E-Rate.

Madam Speaker, 87 percent of Americans support providing discounts to schools and libraries. Eighty-three percent of Americans think that access to the Internet in schools and libraries will improve educational opportunities for all Americans. Eighty-seven percent of Americans support continuing discounts for libraries and schools. Seventy-nine percent of Americans believe that PCs are an effective alternative for teaching subjects such as math and reading.

Tomorrow the FCC will vote on the funding level for the Universal Service Fund for America's schools and libraries for the year beginning July 1, 1999. I urge every member of this House to lend their support to fully funding the E-Rate program.

JOHN HART: ONE OF AMERICA'S TREASURES

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, I just want to shift gears for a moment. We all know there is a very, very important weekend coming up and that is Memorial Day weekend where we celebrate and commemorate all of those who fought for the saving of this country in all our world wars. In particular, I just want to mention a good friend of mine, a neighbor, a mentor of mine as I was growing up, Mr. John Hart, actually my next door neighbor. I am proud to say that this weekend John Hart will be the grand marshal of the Woodside, Queens Memorial Day Parade.

John Hart is one of America's treasures. He served our country in World War II and saw action in Europe. He came back from that war and he and his wife, Pat, raised four children in the community of Woodside. John, like so many other Americans who gave of themselves that we might be free, is still alive today and is having an opportunity to walk amongst his fellow citizens in Woodside so that they can show their appreciation to John and men and women like him.

So when my colleagues are eating hot dogs and hamburgers and having

corn on the cob this weekend, think of John Hart and think of all of those men and women who gave so much of themselves so that we today are free.

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

(Mrs. CHENOWETH addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. HOLT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

UNITED STATES' NATIONAL SECURITY COMPROMISED BY CHINESE ESPIONAGE

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

Mr. FOSSELLA. Madam Speaker, I would like to compliment my colleague and friend from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) and congratulate Mr. Hart as well. Memorial Day is I think too often taken for granted in this country, and it is an opportunity, however, for most of us to appreciate and demonstrate our support for our veterans who were willing to give their lives for our country, too many of whom made the supreme sacrifice, physically, mentally scared for life. So I compliment those in Woodside, Queens and of course in Staten Island where I live. I think it is an appropriate opening to what I wanted to talk about tonight.

I will read my colleagues a little clause here. "The People's Republic of China has stolen classified design information on the United States's most advanced thermonuclear weapons. The stolen United States' nuclear secrets give the People's Republic of China design information on thermonuclear weapons on par with our own."

So begins the United States national security and military commercial concerns of the People's Republic of China from the Select Committee, commonly known now as the Cox Report that was declassified in the last couple of days.

Madam Speaker, we talk about a lot of things here in Washington, and clearly, many of them are important and affect everybody across this country. But I think to me and so many others here, there is nothing more vital than protecting our national security. Frankly, I think if any American can, they should read the Cox report. What I am going to do is just read some outtakes from this.

"The stolen information includes classified information on seven U.S. thermonuclear warheads, including every currently deployed thermonuclear warhead in the United States

ballistic missile arsenal. The stolen information also includes classified design information for enhanced radiation weapons, commonly known as the neutron bomb, which neither the United States nor any other Nation has yet deployed. The People's Republic of China has obtained classified information on the following United States thermonuclear warheads, as well as a number of associated reentry vehicles, the hardened shell that protects the thermonuclear warhead during reentry."

Might I add, this Cox Committee was a bipartisan committee, Democrats and Republicans in the House of Representatives, and clearly demonstrates, for example:

"The People's Republic of China has stolen United States design information and other classified information for neutron bomb warheads. China has stolen classified U.S. information about the neutron bomb from a U.S. national weapons laboratory. The United States learned of the theft of this classified information on the neutron bomb in 1996," and practically nothing was done.

"The Select Committee judges that if the People's Republic of China were successful in stealing nuclear test codes, computer models and data from the United States, it could further accelerate its nuclear development. By using such stolen codes and data in conjunction with the high performance computers already acquired by the People's Republic of China, the PRC could diminish its needs for further nuclear testing to evaluate weapons and proposed design changes."

The small warheads that we talk about, multiple warheads, will make it possible for the People's Republic of China to develop and deploy missiles with multiple reentry vehicles. Multiple reentry vehicles increase the effectiveness of a ballistic missile force by multiplying the number of warheads, and a single missile can carry as many as tenfold.

Multiple reentry vehicles also can help to counter missile defenses. For example, multiple reentry vehicles make it easier for the People's Republic of China to deploy penetration aids with its ICBM warheads in order to defeat antimissile defenses.

At the beginning of the 1990s, the People's Republic of China had only one or two silo-based ICBMs capable of attacking, attacking the United States. Since then, the People's Republic of China has deployed up to two dozen additional silo-based ICBMs capable of attacking the United States. That is 24 additional silo-based ICBMs; has upgraded its silo-based missiles and has continued development of three mobile ICBM systems and associated modern thermonuclear warheads, something they never had.

Even though the United States discovered in 1995, in 1995, that is almost four years ago, that the People's Republic of China had stolen design infor-

mation on the W-88 Trident D-5 warhead and technical information on a number of U.S. thermonuclear warheads, the White House has informed in response to specific interrogatories propounded by the committee that the President was not briefed about the counterintelligence failures until 1998.

Madam Speaker, this is just a disgrace, and unless something happens, we should not be here today discussing anything else until our national security is protected.

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

(Mr. BECERRA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

WHY I BECAME A REPUBLICAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. FOWLER. Madam Speaker, I became a Republican because of the party's long-held principles. The Republican Party was founded on two fundamental issues: free land and abolishing slavery. Since that day, the party embraced the role of leader and never shied away from taking the challenge of taking an unpopular and difficult stance. From striving successfully to abolishing slavery to being the vanguard in the struggle for women's right to vote, the Republican Party has constantly forced all Americans to re-evaluate the role of individuals and the role of the government.

□ 2030

The Republican party has always believed in individuals. We have an abiding faith in the idea that individuals and local communities can accomplish more than a distant Federal Government, a government that tends to become large, bloated, and wasteful, as ours has.

As the great Republican statesman, Abraham Lincoln, said, "The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do, for themselves in their separate and individual capacities. In all that people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

There is an important role for the government. Imagine an individual trying to build a freeway alone. But it is a role that should be limited.

Republicans believe the most effective government is closest to the people. After all, who knows more about educating our children, us and our child's teacher, or a distant bureaucracy across the country in Washington, D.C.?

I chose the Republican party because I believe that each American citizen

can be trusted. I believe that they know best and that they will make the best decision for themselves, and they will make the wisest choices. Whether it is how to spend their hard-earned money or how to spend their time, they should be in charge.

The Republican party's economic policies of lower taxes and less government have reduced interest rates and sent the stock market soaring, yet inflation has remained stable. Thanks to these smart policies, every one of us is enjoying the largest sustained peacetime expansion ever.

Our commonsense agenda and leadership has produced a healthy and strong economy. Job opportunities have increased significantly, unemployment is down, the budget is balanced, and because of our welfare reform, tens of thousands have moved from the welfare rolls to the payrolls.

I have to say, while I firmly believe that all issues are women's issues, and I resist the popular tendency to view women as a monolithic group in politics or anything else, I still must emphasize the Republican party's accomplishments with regard to women in politics.

I want to take Members back to 1896, when it was the Republican party who became the first major party to officially favor Women's Suffrage. That year Senator A.A. Sargent, a Republican from California, introduced a proposal in the Senate to give women the right to vote. It was defeated four times by a Democratic Senate, and it was not until the Republicans would gain control of Congress that it was finally passed in May of 1919.

The first woman to serve in Congress was a Republican, Jeanette Rankin of Montana.

In 1940, the Republican party became the first major political party to endorse an Equal Rights Amendment for women in its platform.

In 1953, Republican President Eisenhower appointed the first woman Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the first woman ambassador to a major power.

In 1964, Republicans were the first major American party to nominate a woman for president, Senator Margaret Chase Smith of Maine.

In 1981, Republican President Reagan appointed the first woman Supreme Court Justice and the first woman U.S. representative to the United Nations.

In 1983, Republican President Reagan had three women serving concurrently in his cabinet, the first time in the history of this country.

Currently, Republican women chair a record seven House subcommittees and three Senate subcommittees. I serve as a deputy majority whip, along with two other women, and as a newly elected Vice Chairman of the Republican conference, I am now the highest ranking woman in the House elected leadership. The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. DEBORAH PRYCE) serves as Conference Secretary.

In the 106th Congress, Democrats have no woman in their elected leadership.

We are working hard to ensure that each American has a safe, secure, and positive future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WILSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. KELLY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ASTHMA AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MORELLA. Madam Speaker, I am a Republican woman Member of the House, and I want to associate myself with the comments made by my colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER).

But tonight I want to address this body with regard to something that is nonpartisan that requires bipartisan support, and that is asthma awareness.

This is Asthma Awareness Month, and I want to focus attention on the asthma epidemic in our country today. This is an epidemic that cannot be cured, but through better education and awareness, it can be a manageable part of one's life.

More than 14 million people in the United States have asthma, and of these, almost 5 million are children. One in every three children with asthma had to go to an emergency room because of an asthma attack in the past year.

Asthma is a problem among all races, but the asthma death rate and hospitalization rate for African Americans are three times the rate of white Americans. Asthma is a serious lung disease. Forty-one percent of all asthma patients, an estimated 6 million Americans, were hospitalized, treated in emergency rooms, or required other urgent care for asthma in the last year.

Madam Speaker, this Nation is falling far short of meeting new government guidelines for asthma care. Failure to meet these basic guidelines means that a generally controllable disease quickly spirals out of control. Asthma cannot be cured. Having asthma is a part of one's life. However, with proper medical care, one can control one's asthma and become free of symptoms most of the time.

But asthma does not go away. We must renew our commitment to our national goals for asthma care, goals established by the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute at the National Institutes of Health.

These goals include:

No missed school or work because of asthma. Forty-nine percent of children with asthma and 25 percent of adults

with asthma missed school or work due to asthma last year;

No missed sleep because of asthma. Almost one in three asthma patients, 30 percent, is awakened with breathing problems at least once a week;

Maintain normal activity levels. Forty-eight percent say that asthma limits their ability to take part in sports and recreation, 36 percent say it limits their normal physical exertion, and 25 percent say it interferes with social activities.

All too often the severity of asthma is ignored or goes undiagnosed. When this happens, adults as well as children find themselves rushing to the hospital and many times having to give up activities they love. They do not understand how treatable asthma is. We must increase awareness, education, and most of all, communication on how to best control the disease and how to control those things that make asthma worse.

Proper asthma care is crucial. America needs better asthma education and treatment, and especially in the hardest hit inner cities. We must all work together as parents, teachers, and public officials to ensure that all Americans, especially our children, have a basic knowledge and understanding of how to diagnose and how to control asthma before it becomes a life-threatening condition. We should do no less.

A CRISIS IN AGRICULTURE, AND THE NEED FOR BUDGET REFORM

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

Mr. THUNE. Madam Speaker, agriculture is in incredible crisis. Earlier today we voted on a number of amendments to the agricultural appropriations bill, and the bill funds programs that are very important to my constituency, programs that provide credit, dollars for conservation, income support for our farmers and ranchers.

For that reason, I have been very frustrated as I have watched this process and the tactics that have been employed here on the floor to try and slow this process down. It is a bill that is important to me, it is important to those I serve, and so I would hope that we can move this bill forward in a timely way.

Even though the spending does not take effect until October 1, the next fiscal year, we need to get these appropriation bills done. It is the work that the American people sent us here to do.

I appreciate what the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) is trying to do. I do not believe he is taking issue with the agriculture bill itself, with the spending in the agriculture bill, as much as he is with the process by which we accomplish our work here.

On that point, I believe he happens to be right. We need budget process reform here in Washington. This process is an embarrassment to the people of

this country. It is an embarrassment to me, and it ought to be an embarrassment to every Member who serves here in the House or in the Senate.

There is a bias in the budget process toward higher spending. I want Members to think about what the current budget process has given us. We have \$5.5 trillion in debt, or \$20,000 for every man, woman, and child in America today.

In fact, people have a hard time grasping what \$1 trillion is. We are \$5.5 trillion in debt. If you started a business on the day that Christ was born and lost \$1 million every day, every day up until the present, you would not even have lost \$1 trillion. We are \$5.5 trillion in debt. That is what this budget process has gotten us.

The other thing it has gotten us is a \$1.7 trillion annual budget because of a Washington gimmick known as baseline budgeting, where every year we have increases that are built into the budget. Nobody else in America has to get the budget that way, but here in Washington, that is what we do.

The tax burden in this country is at the highest level since any time since 1945, where every American essentially works 2 hours and 51 minutes of every working day just to pay the cost of government.

Last fall we had a debate here as we got to the end of the year, and of course, as usual, we had not done our work. We had not completed the appropriations process, so everything was wrapped into this huge omnibus continuing resolution which was some \$600 billion, a bill most of us had not even seen, let alone read, done in the middle of the night with a handful of people, and we are asked to vote on it.

This is a process which begs and cries out for reform. We are the guardians here of the public trust in Washington. This is a national tragedy. The American people ought to get engaged on this issue, because there is nothing that we could do that would more fundamentally change the way Washington operates and the way the taxpayer dollars are spent than for us to reform the budget process.

The American people need to be engaged, because it is their money we are talking about. We go about it with the process that we have in place today, and frankly could make the argument that if we had the political courage to make the hard decisions we could get it down, and we could.

But the fact of the matter is that the process lends itself to the very worst instincts I think of all of us here in Washington. There is a bias towards higher spending.

There is a proposal on the table this year to reform the budget process. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), this is a bipartisan bill, and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) have come up with a proposal to reform the budget process. Last year I was a cosponsor of the bill of the gentleman from California (Mr. CHRIS COX) that would do the same thing.

But we need safeguards that protect the American people. We need to see that we have an emergency reserve contingency fund, so we do not end up at the end of every year having to come up with an omnibus emergency disaster bill and not get the process done or the bills done in a timely and orderly way.

We need to have some enforcement in the budget process, so that when we pass the resolution, that it is binding, not only upon us but upon the administration.

We need to have this debate about the budget earlier in the process, so we do not end up at the end of the year with all this pressure and with nowhere to go but to get into a bidding war, where we continue to spend more and more and more of the American people's money.

We need budget reform in this town more than just about anything else that I can think of. Watching the debate today reaffirmed in my mind how important it is that we deal with this issue now, we do it this year.

I urge all my colleagues to get on board and the American people to get on board with this issue.

CALLING ON LEADERSHIP TO BRING UP HMO REFORM LEGISLATION

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, it is very important that we keep up the pressure in this House to pass HMO reform.

Despite the overwhelming support among the American people for HMO or managed care reform, the Republican leadership continues to let the issue languish. We still have no indication when or even if they will allow the Patients' Bill of Rights to come to the House floor for a vote.

□ 2045

The reason for this activity is the same as it was last year. The Republican leadership cannot figure out how they can pass a good managed care bill without alienating the insurance agency.

So instead of doing what is right and best for the American people, they are once again appeasing the insurance industry and hoping an answer to this problem will magically fall from out of the sky.

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, as the leadership sits and waits and does nothing, the shortcomings of the system continue to forever change the lives of countless Americans. We need only to turn on the TV or open the newspaper to see this.

I would like to use one example here tonight, and that is the issue of emergency room care. Earlier this month,

USA Today ran an editorial on this issue. It was called "Early Last Year" starts the editorial.

It mentions that a Seattle woman began suffering chest pains and numbness while driving. The pain was so severe that she pulled into a fire station seeking help only to be whisked to the nearest hospital where she was promptly admitted.

To most, that would seem a prudent course of action, but not to her health plan. It denied payment because she did not call the plan first to get preauthorized, according to an investigation by the Washington State Insurance Commissioner.

I mentioned this editorial, Madam Speaker, as an example of the problems people have with their HMOs in terms of access and paying to for emergency room care.

Let me just go on to talk about this editorial again. The editorial says that this incident is typical of the enumerable bureaucratic hassles patients confront as HMOs and other managed care companies attempt to control costs.

But denial of payment for emergency care presents a particularly dangerous double-whammy. Patients facing emergencies might feel they have to choose between putting their health at risk and paying a huge bill they may not be able to afford.

The editorial in USA Today goes on to suggest a solution to the problem, noting that a national prudent layperson standard law covering all health plans would help fill in the gaps left by the current patchwork of State and Federal laws.

Democrats have been basically making this point about managed care for a long time. We know that people have had problems with their HMOs if they need to use an emergency room either because they are told to go to a hospital emergency room a lot further away from where they live or where the accident occurred, or, as in this case that I just mentioned, the actual payment afterwards is denied because they did not seek preauthorization, which seems nonsensical certainly in the context of emergency room care.

One only goes to an emergency room if it is an emergency. If one has to get preauthorization for it, it really is not an emergency. That is the dilemma that more and more Americans face, that their HMO plan does not cover emergency room care.

The Democrats, in response to this, have introduced a bill called the Patients' Bill of Rights. Basically what we do in the Patients' Bill of Rights is say that the prudent layperson's standard applies.

In other words, if the average person, the average, prudent person, if you will, decided that they had chest pains or they had a problem that necessitated going to the local emergency room, then they can go to the emergency room that is closest by, and the HMO has to pay, has to compensate for that care, has to pay for that emergency room care.

In the last Congress, we, the Democrats, tried to bring up the Patients' Bill of Rights. The Patients' Bill of Rights provides a number of patient protections, not just the emergency room care, but access to specialists.

It basically applies the principle that says, if particular care is necessary, medically necessary, and in the opinion of one's doctor is medically necessary, then it is covered; and the HMO has to cover that particular type of care.

In the last Congress, the Republican leadership did not hold a single hearing on the Patients' Bill of Rights or even on an alternative managed care bill that they had proposed.

So what we had to do, basically, was to seek what we call a discharge petition. We had to have a number of our colleagues come down to the well here and sign a discharge petition that said that the Patients' Bill of Rights should be allowed to come to the floor.

As we reached the magical number that was necessary in order to bring the Patients' Bill of Rights to the floor, the Republican leadership finally decided that they would bring their own managed care reform bill to the floor. In the context of that, we were allowed to bring up the Patients' Bill of Rights.

I think we are going to have to be forced to do that again. Basically in this session of Congress, even though the Patients' Bill of Rights have been reintroduced and even though there are some Republican managed care reform proposals, so far, the Republican leadership has refused to bring up HMO reform, either their bill, which is not as good, or the Patients' Bill of Rights, the Democratic bill.

So what we have had to do again, and starting tomorrow, is to file a rule allowing for a discharge petition to be brought up and have as many Members of Congress come down to the well again in a couple of weeks and sign this discharge petition in order to force the Republican leadership to bring the Patients' Bill of Rights to the floor.

It should not be that way. It should not be necessary that, in order to achieve HMO reform, that we have to sign a petition as Members of Congress to bring it up. It simply should be brought up in committee. There should be hearings. It should be voted on in committee to come to the floor. But so far, we have nothing but stalling tactics from the Republican leadership.

I mentioned the example of emergency room care. But there are a lot of other examples that we can mention about why we need patient protections, why we need the Patients' Bill of Rights.

Let me just give my colleagues another example, though. We have a Democratic Task Force on Health Care, which basically put together the Patients' Bill of Rights. We had some hearings on the Patients' Bill of Rights in the context of our Democratic Health Care Task Force because we could not get hearings in the regular

committees of the House because of the opposition from the Republican leadership.

I just wanted to mention another example because I think it is one of the most egregious that came before us when we had this hearing. We invited a Dr. Charlotte Yeh, who is a practicing emergency physician at the New England Medical Center in Boston, to the hearing that we had. She provided a number of examples of the effects that the managed care industries approach to emergency room care is having on patients, including one from Boston.

She told our task force about a boy whose leg was seriously injured in an auto accident. At a nearby hospital in Boston, emergency room doctors told the parents he would need vascular surgery to save his leg and that a surgeon was ready at that hospital to perform the operation.

Unfortunately for this young man, his insurer insisted he be transferred to an in-network hospital for the surgery. His parents were told, if they allowed the operation to be done anywhere else, they would be responsible to the bill. They agreed to the move. Surgery was performed 3 hours after the accident. By then, it was too late to save the boy's leg.

Dr. Yeh went on to express her very strong support to making the prudent layperson's standard the national standard for emergency room care. As I said before, basically the prudent layperson's standard says, if one does go to the emergency room to seek treatment under conditions that would prompt any reasonable person to go there, one's HMO would pay for it.

But in addition to the prudent layperson's standard, Dr. Yeh also emphasized the need to eliminate restrictive prior authorization requirements and the establishment of post-stabilization services between emergency physicians and managed care plans.

The Patients' Bill of Rights includes all of these types of provisions. If I could for a minute, Madam Speaker, just run through some of the protections that are included in the Patients' Bill of Rights, it guarantees access to needed health care specialists, very important. It provides, as I said, access to emergency room services when and where the need arise. It provides continuity of care protections to assure patient care if a patient's health care provider is dropped.

It gives access to a timely internal and independent external appeals process. Let me mention that for a minute. If one is denied care right now because one's HMOs decides that they will not pay for it, one of the things that my constituents complain to me about is that they have no way to appeal that decision other than internally within the HMO.

So if the HMO decides, for example, that a particular type of treatment is not medically necessary or that one does not have to stay in the hospital a couple more days, even though one's

doctor thinks that one should be staying there, or a number of other things that they consider not medically necessary, well, most of the times, under current law, there is no appeal other than to the HMO itself; and they of course routinely deny the appeal because, for them, it is largely a cost issue.

What we are saying in the Patients' Bill of Rights is that that person should be able to go to an external appeal, someone outside the HMO, or a panel outside the HMO that would review the case and decide whether or not that care should be provided and paid for by the HMO.

In addition, what we say is that, if one has been damaged for some reason, God forbid, that one needed some kind of procedure or one needed to stay in the hospital a few more days and the HMO refused to allow that and, as a result, one suffered injury and damage, then one should be able to bring suit in a court of law and recover for those damages.

Most people do not realize that option does not exist today for a lot of people who are in HMO plans because the Federal Government has said that, in the case of people covered by a Federal plan or where the Federal Government has usurped or preempted the State law for those who are mostly self-insured by their employer, that there is no recourse to seek damages in a court of law.

That is not right. It is not right. Someone should be able to sue for damages and sue the HMO if they have been denied care and if they have been hurt or damaged as a result of that.

Just to mention a couple more things, we also have in the Patients' Bill of Rights, we assure that doctors and patients can openly discuss treatment options, because, oftentimes, HMOs tell the doctors they cannot tell about treatment options that are not covered, the so-called gag rule.

We assure that women have direct access to an OB/GYN. As I said, we provide an enforcement mechanism that ensures recourse for patients who have been maimed or die as a result of health plan actions.

There are a lot more things that we can go into, and we will tonight; but I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), who has been outspoken on this issue and has oftentimes talked about how in her own State of Texas a lot of these protections exist. They exist in Texas. They should exist nationally.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) for his persistent leadership on the issue.

He is very right. Some two sessions ago, the legislative team or the legislative body and houses of the State of Texas passed a bipartisan Patients' Bill of Rights and one that has been effective in assisting the individuals of my State in better health care. We can always do better, however.

I think to follow up on the gentleman's line of reasoning about the discharge petition, I think it is important to note just what that means. The discharge petition is something that most Members would rather not have to procedurally utilize. It is really a cry of anguish and frustration as well as an emphasis on the national, if you will, priority that the issue deserves.

We have done it with campaign finance reform, which the American people over and over again have indicated that it is high time to get special interests out of politics. We are now doing it and have done it in the past with the Patients' Bill of Rights because we have seen the response by the American people.

In fact, I just recently saw, about 2 weeks ago, a poll done that indicated the high level of frustration with HMOs by the American people, just an enormous amount of frustration, not with the physicians who have already said get the business or the insurance companies out of my hypocritical oath, if I have it correct in their phraseology, let me be a physician, a nurturer.

But the American people have now spoken. So this discharge petition is a response to the fact that we have a crisis. We have a road of no return. We have no light at the end of the tunnel.

The American people are over and over speaking about the need to be able to make personal decisions about their health care with their physicians. We already understand the value of efficiency. We already under the value of making sure that we do not wastefully spend monies that are not necessary, unnecessary procedures, or unnecessary equipment, if you will. I can think of a box of tissues that showed up on a bill more than 10 times or so. We have already gone through that.

I think the American people, the Congress has addressed the question of waste. So waste is not the issue. The issue is what kind of care are we giving our patients and those who work every day and deserve health care.

I think that there is something so pivotal to the relationship and the confidence that people would have in their HMOs and their health care; and that is to be able to go somewhere and say, "Doctor, I have a pain", to the emergency room, "I have a severe pain", and being considered legitimate in one's expression.

□ 2100

The Democratic Patients' Bill of Rights allows for severe pain to be established as a legitimate reason to be able to go to the emergency room.

Why is this so very important? My colleague already evidenced where there was a situation where there was an accident and a tragedy occurred where a young man's leg could have been saved if they only had not shipped him from one place to the other 3 hours later.

What about a situation where it is not visible that there is something

very tragic happening? My example that I offer to my colleagues is not the same. But a very outstanding member of our committee, someone who did not think that they were sick and went with their spouse to the emergency room, drove themselves and walked up to the emergency room, which was not a familiar emergency room, not one maybe in their neighborhood, experiencing pain, and they had to sit down.

Now, this is not directly. But it shows what happens when we have delayed circumstances with hospitals because they are checking on their HMO rather than the ability to go to the nearest emergency room because of an expressed pain. And of course, they had to take time checking whether they were at the right place.

Lo and behold, that individual had a massive cardiac arrest and did not survive. The tragedy of the family having to be delayed with paperwork, "where is your identification? do you belong here?" realizing that they had some coverage but they had to detail whether they were at the right location.

The Patients' Bill of Rights that we, as Democrats, are offering deals with these kinds of delays because it provides them the opportunity to be at almost any emergency room if they have a severe pain and they can be covered.

I listened as there were discussions on the floor of the House earlier about the values between the Democrats and the Republicans, more particularly the Republican Party. I want to remind the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that we are always to be counted upon, I believe, when there are crises around survival.

I am reminded of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Social Security. Social Security now is the infrastructure, is the backbone of survival for our senior citizens. I am very proud that a Democratic president saw that it was crucial to deal with this issue. And it has survived.

Lyndon Baines Johnson saw the great need in providing senior citizens with a basic kind of coverage so that they would have the ability to have good health care, Medicare. And although we are in the midst of trying to fix and extend Social Security and Medicare, those two entities have withstood the test of time.

Unfortunately, the Republican bill dealing with the Patients' Bill of Rights does not allow people with chronic conditions to obtain standing referrals. Our Patients' Bill of Rights does. The Republican bill purports to prohibit gag clauses but in reality does not do such things, and that is that they cannot have the ability of doctors talking with doctors about their health care and, therefore, keeping information away from both the patients and another doctor about what is transpiring with their condition.

The Republican bill does not require plans to collect data on quality. Our Patients' Bill of Rights does. And the Republican bill does not establish an

ombudsman program to help consumers navigate their way through the confusing array of health options available to them.

The other thing that is so very important to many women who I have met in my district is that it does not, whereas ours does, the Republican bill does not allow women to choose their OB-GYN as their primary care provider. That is key in the private relationship between physician and patients.

Let me say, as well, in closing to my friend from New Jersey, I would like to again thank him for consistent and persistent leadership dealing with getting this bill to the floor. It is important to let the American people know that we do not bypass procedures.

I remember 2 or 3 or 4 years ago having hearings out on the lawn about Medicare. We were so serious about the issue that we decided, if we could not get hearings here in the Congress, that we as Democrats would be out on the front lawn. We may be relegated to this.

I know there have been a number of hearings dealing with this particular issue. But we have been bogged down by the allegations that we have lifted up this right to sue and medical necessity and that these are issues that are maybe holding us back. And I think people should understand that this is not an issue of attack, this right to sue. This is not to encourage frivolous litigation.

But even the physicians who two-to-one have supported and are supporting the Democratic Patients' Bill of Rights have said, "We are sued. Sometimes we are blocked from giving good health care or providing a specialist because someone far away with a computer is saying 'you cannot do it'."

Why should they be vulnerable and the actual decision was made by an HMO, an insurance company, or someone looking at the bottom line and not looking at good health care?

I think America deserves better. And I would just simply say that all the people who have been injured, all the people who have suffered, the loved ones, because of countless deaths, my fear of an injury being in the United States Congress, why should I be in fear? Because it still happens to any one of us that would be confronted with the choices of an emergency room that would say they are not eligible to come in here. This is a fear that happens more to our constituents that have no other options.

I think it is high time that we take the time out as we are moving to discuss passing gun safety laws that should be passed this week. I voted against adjourning because we have so many things to be doing. It is important that we get the Patients' Bill of Rights here to the floor of the House with a vigorous debate.

I am convinced that we will draw many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle when they see the rea-

soning of our debate on this issue that a Patients' Bill of Rights is only fair for all Americans. Because we deserve and they deserve and frankly this Nation deserves the best health care we can possibly give.

We have got all the talent, but we do not have the procedures to allow them to have it. I hope our colleagues will sign the discharge petition. It is not something we do lightly. But we have a problem here. American people are losing faith, and I think now is the time for us to respond to that.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman and particularly emphasize again what she said about the extraordinary nature of this procedure of the discharge petition. And it is unfortunate.

As my colleague mentioned, there are major differences between the Democrats' Patients' Bill of Rights and the Republican leadership bill, which we know is really defective in terms of providing patients' protections compared to what the Democrats have put forward.

The bottom line is that the Republican leadership refuses to bring any bill up. So it is not even a question, as my colleague pointed out, whether this is a good bill or bad bill. They just refused to bring the issue up and let us have a debate on the floor of the House of Representatives.

We had the same problem last year. We had to use this discharge petition. As my colleague knows, back a month ago, I guess in April around the time of Easter and Passover, we actually had the President going to Philadelphia with a number of us and start this whole national petition drive on the Internet to show how many people supported bringing up the Patients' Bill of Rights.

Since that time, a number of us on the Committee on Commerce, and I see my colleague the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is here, also on the Committee on Commerce, have pleaded and sent letters to the Republican leadership and our committee asking that they have hearings and mark up this legislation or any legislation related to HMOs, managed care reform.

So far, we have been told we will have hearings sometime this summer. Well, that is a long time. That brings us into the fall. And if there is no action on this because we are having hearings all summer, that is not going to solve the problem. So we have no recourse, essentially, other than to go to this petition route. That is why we are doing it. And it is extraordinary.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I am glad he reminds me. While he was in Philadelphia, as he well knows, we agreed, if you will, to not go just upon our position or our opinion and a lot of us were in our districts.

So I do want to share with my colleague that I was at the Purview A&M School of Nursing; and two-to-one, the nursing staff professional staff, students, joined in in signing on-line for

the Patients' Bill of Rights. I understand that all over the country people joined voluntarily to say that we needed to pass this.

I think that was a very important point that my colleague made. So we are not just here speaking on our personal behalf or we are not trying to get a discharge petition because we are over anxious for personal legislation to pass.

But I tell my colleagues, everywhere I go in my district, and I have talked to my colleagues, people are talking about getting some fair treatment with HMOs and needing our assistance, and I think that is important to bring to the floor's attention.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON), who is one of the co-chairs of our Health Care Task Force.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to thank him also for the leadership. And I like the word that the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) used, his "persistent" leadership, his dogged persistent leadership, his patient leadership. It takes all of that to get an issue of this magnitude in the consciousness of us. So I want to thank him for that.

Madam Speaker, when a child suffers with a disease that can be cured, should that decision on whether to provide the needed treatment be made by a doctor or the child's parents or by a bureaucrat who is counting dollars and dimes?

When a wife and mother undergo surgery for a mastectomy and the anesthesia has yet to wear off, should she be forced to leave the hospital that very day because of a rigid routine that puts saving money and sparing pain and suffering?

When a husband and father forced to go to the emergency room is unable to get approval from his insurance provider, the very provider he pays for insurance, should he be required to pay the medical bill himself?

When a grandfather is stricken with a life-threatening stroke, should those transporting him to the hospital emergency care be forced to pass one hospital to go to one farther away because narrow thinking people are more interested in crunching numbers and saving lives?

These are not rhetorical questions. They are not even hypothetical situations. These are real-life examples of what can happen to anyone, in fact what is happening all too often across this country under the current Federal law.

So that is the reason we need the Patients' Bill of Rights. The Patients' Bill of Rights effectively provides basic and fundamental rights to patients. The Patients' Bill of Rights provides real choice because patients are entitled to choose their health care provider and treatment decisions are made by the patient's doctor and not the insurance company bureaucrat.

The Patients' Bill of Rights that we are talking about provides real access. Managed care plans are required to ensure timely and necessary care. Patients would also have the right to go to the emergency room when they need to without prior authorization.

The Patients' Bill of Rights actually provides open communication between their doctor and the patient. Physicians are free to discuss any and all aspects of their care with the patient. That is what we are trying to guarantee in the Patients' Bill of Rights. That is why we need health care now and we need health care protected by the Patients' Bill of Rights.

This is not an isolated issue. This is a national challenge. However, our national challenge does not stop here. We have an even deeper-rooted problem. Approximately 45 million Americans are uninsured. The numbers of Americans without health insurance has grown by nearly 10 million over the past decade.

A smaller share of Americans have health insurance today through their jobs than 10 years ago. And even more would be uninsured if it were not for the extension of eligibility under the Medicaid program.

In 1997, almost one-third of non-elderly adults were uninsured at times in a two-year period. Of these, over 40 percent were uninsured over 2 years.

Why are these persons without insurance? Because, simply, it is too expensive or their employers do not provide it. And even though the Medicaid expansion in the 1980s and the 1990s lowered the number of uninsured children, why does it remain almost one out of ten Americans are uninsured? Because job-based insurance coverage is decreasing while the cost of working families is increasing. And, therefore, we have a real serious problem.

We heard reference to the April event when we were announcing our intentions about the Patients' Bill of Rights. I sponsored an April event in the First Congressional District at my community college where I engaged nurses. In fact, I had a town hall meeting through the information highway where we were in four locations.

□ 2115

In addition to that, we went out into the community and got people to sign up. All too often what I found, many of these individuals were not indeed insured by anyone. Therefore, the Patients' Bill of Rights petition that they signed, they wanted for themselves, they were not eligible. Too many of my constituents do not even have the opportunity of being insured. However, if they were insured, indeed they would need the protection that the Democratic Patients' Bill of Rights would provide for them.

Therefore, Madam Speaker, we must focus on two issues in health care reform. First, to reform the Patients' Bill of Rights, and, second, we must protect the right of uninsured persons

to get health insurance. Again, I want to say that when we are asked to find opportunities for the Patients' Bill of Rights to ensure those of us who are fortunate enough to have insurance, we cannot forget the millions of individuals and families who are not insured at all.

I thank the gentleman for providing the leadership on the Patients' Bill of Rights and just say that we are approaching tomorrow one phase of our national crisis but not the total phase of it. I am pleased that we will indeed do that. I agree with my colleague who said that the discharge procedure indeed is a radical method that we have to undertake simply because we are denied an opportunity to discuss it in the formal legislative processes that are available to us. We are using this process because that is the only way we can get it as a full debate. I think on tomorrow the American people will understand the difference between our commitment to health care and certainly our commitment to have a Patients' Bill of Rights that protects those who are not insured.

But I want to say, I am further committed, our goal is even greater than just protecting those who have insurance. Our goal must be to provide health coverage for all those who need health coverage.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank the gentlewoman. I think it is very important as she did to point out that as much as we support the Patients' Bill of Rights and we want to bring it up, that we also need to address the problems of the uninsured and the fact that the numbers are growing. Of course part of our Democratic platform that has been pushed, also, by President Clinton is to address some of the problems of the uninsured.

Of course, a few years ago, our health care task force worked on the Kennedy-Kassebaum bill which allows people to take their insurance with them if they lose their job or they go from one job to another, and then we moved on the kids health care initiative which is now insuring a lot of the children who were uninsured, and, of course, the President and the Democrats had the proposal for the near elderly where people who are between 55 and 65, depending on the circumstances, can buy into Medicare.

But the gentlewoman is right. We are trying to address those issues but the larger issue of the uninsured also needs attention.

Mrs. CLAYTON. I would just say that the gentleman is absolutely correct. We tried to address this large, pressing issue, I guess, about 6 years ago. At that time we had 40 million who were uninsured, where it is reported now we may have 45 to 46 million who are uninsured. As we try to address this issue, the pool is getting larger and a larger number of individuals are falling through the cracks.

Now, I am very pleased the effort we indeed did make and were successful as

it related to children. I am also very pleased that we were able to have portability and remove the barrier of pre-existing conditions as a means of eligibility for coverage. All of those enabled us to expand the coverage in a meaningful way. But I would be remiss if I ignore the suffering, and we are talking about the working poor, who are just not able to buy into insurance and they need it desperately.

I just want to commend the gentleman for what he is doing on the Patients' Bill of Rights. I think it will be a great first step tomorrow and we will push to make sure that this is successful, but we also have a higher goal, to make sure that those who are unfortunate enough to have no insurance whatsoever, indeed we are speaking for the poorest of the poor as well as for those who are fortunate enough to have insurance.

Mr. PALLONE. I agree and I appreciate the gentlewoman bringing it up. We can also continue to address and find ways of providing coverage as part of our health care task force which the gentlewoman cochairs.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN). He is the second Texan we have had tonight. I think part of the reason is because he has had a very successful type of patients' bill of rights passed in Texas that applies statewide.

One of the things we have been pointing out tonight is that even States like Texas that have gone very far in providing these kind of patient protections that we would like to see done nationally, because of the Federal preemption that exists for those where the employer is self-insured, the Texas law in many cases does not apply. That is why we need Federal legislation.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. I would like to thank my colleague again for this special order like my other friends, and neighbors even, because to talk about managed care reform is so important, and also in light of the filing of the rule for a discharge petition, which is a major step in the legislative process.

I am proud to serve on the Committee on Commerce. It took me a couple of terms to get there. I would like for the Committee on Commerce, both Democrats and Republicans, to be able to deal with this bill. The last session we were not. The bill was actually drafted by a health care task force of the Republican majority and written in the Speaker's office. It was placed here on the floor that we could not amend except we had one shot at it. We came close, lost by six votes, it went to Senate and died which it should have because it actually was a step backward in reform.

I am glad you mentioned Texas, New Jersey and other States have passed managed care reform that affect the policies that are issued under State regulation. But in Texas, I think the percentage is about 60 percent of the insurance policies are interstate and national in scope, so they come under ERISA.

A little history. ERISA, I understand, was never intended to cover health insurance, it was really a pension protection effort. But be that as it may, that is why we have to deal with it in Congress to learn from what our States have done and to say, "Okay, let's see what we can do to help the States in doing it." The State of Texas now has had the law for 2 years. I know there is some concern about the additional cost, for example, that these protections would provide, emergency, without having to drive by an emergency room, to go to the closest emergency room, outside appeals process, accountability and eliminate the gag rules. In Texas it is very cheap. In fact there was only one lawsuit filed, and that was actually by an insurance company challenging the law that was passed. Now, maybe there have been other ones recently, but it is not this avalanche of lawsuits, suing, whether it be employers or insurance companies or anything else. And so it has worked in a State the size of Texas, a large State, very diverse population, both ethnically and racially but also with a lot of rural areas and also some very urban areas.

In fact, my district in Houston, Houston and Harris County, is the fourth largest city in the country. So you can tell that it is a very urban area and it is providing some relief, but again only for about 40 percent of our folks. So we need to pass real managed care reform. And we need to deal with it in the committee process, not like we did last session. And the discharge petition that I hope would be available by the middle of June, and both Democrats and Republicans hopefully will sign that petition to have us a hearing on it and to have the bill here so we can debate, so we can benefit those folks.

The reason I was late tonight, I take advantage of the hour difference in Texas and try to return phone calls. A young lady called my office and was having trouble with her HMO. She was asking us to intervene. We have done that. We have sent letters to lots of individual HMOs. Frankly they are responsive to the Members of Congress oftentimes, but we each represent approximately 600,000 people, and how many of those folks call their Member of Congress to have that intervention? We need to structuralize it where people can do it. The outside appeals process, timely appeals, not something that will stretch out, because again health care delayed is health care denied.

If, for example, you have cancer, then you want the quickest decision by the health care provider that you can. That is why it is important. I am looking forward to being able to work on the bill, whether it be through our committee or on the floor of the House and send to the Senate real managed care reform. We cannot eliminate managed care, and I do not think I want to. What I want to do is give the managed care companies some guidelines to live by, just like all of us have in our busi-

nesses, or in our offices and individual lives. We just need to give them some parameters and say, "This is the street you have to drive on. You can't deviate. You can't deny someone access to some of the cutting-edge technology that's being developed around the country for health care." We just want to give them that guideline and go their merry way and make their money but also provide the health care.

Let me tell the gentleman a story. My wife and I are fortunate, our daughter just completed her first year of medical school. Last August, she had just started, and I had the opportunity to speak to the Harris County Medical Society and talk about a number of issues. During the question and answer session, the President of the Harris County Medical Society, the first question is, when I explained that I am a lawyer, and normally legislators and Democrats do not speak to medical societies in Texas. He congratulated me on my daughter who had been in medical school all of 2 weeks.

And so I joked. I said, "She's not ready for brain surgery yet." The President of the medical society said, "You know, your daughter after 2 weeks of medical school has more knowledge than who I call to get permission to treat my patients." That is atrocious in this great country. That is, that it is affecting your and my constituents and all the people in our country. Sure, we want the most reasonable cost health care and I think we can get it. We are doing it in Texas, at least for the policies that come under State law. But we also want to make sure we have some criteria there so our constituents will be able to know the rights they have.

Let me just touch lastly on accountability. At that same discussion, the physician said, they are accountable for what they do. That if they make a mistake, they can go to the courthouse. And in Texas we have lots of different ways. You do not necessarily go to the courthouse. You can go to other alternative means, instead of filing lawsuits, to have some type of resolution of the dispute. But accountability is so important, because if that physician calls someone who has less than a 2-week training in medical school, that decision that that person makes, that doctor has to live with.

That doctor has to say, "Well, I can't do that." Or hopefully they would say that. But that accountability needs to go with the decision-making process. If that physician cannot say, "This is what I recommend for my patient who I see here, I've seen the tests, and I'm just calling you and you're saying no, we can't do that."

We have lots of cases in our office, and I think all Members of Congress do, where, for example, someone under managed care may have a prescription benefit but their doctor prescribed a certain prescription, but the HMO says, "No, we won't do that, we'll give you something else." I supported as a State

legislator generic drugs if they are the same component, but oftentimes we are seeing the managed care reform not agree to the latest prescription medication that has the most success rate that a lot of our National Institutes of Health dollars go into research, and they are prescribing something or saying, no, we will only pay for something that maybe is 5 or 10-year-old technology. Again, that is not what people pay for. They want the latest because again the most success rate. And it ought to be in the long run cheaper for insurance companies to be able to pay up front instead of having someone go into the hospital and have huge hospital bills because maybe they did not provide the most successful prescription medication.

There are a lot of things in managed care reform, antigag rules, and I know some managed care companies are changing their process and they are changing it because of the market system. That is great. I encourage them to do it. But city councils, State legislators and Members of Congress, we do not pass the laws for the people who do right, we do not pass the laws for the companies who treat their customers right. We have to pass the laws for the people who treat their customers wrong. That is why we have to pass this and put it in statute and say even though XYZ company may allow doctors to freely discuss with their patients potential medical services, or they may have an outside appeals process, a timely outside appeals process, but we still need to address those people who are not receiving that care.

I can tell you just from the calls and the letters we get in our own office, without doing any scientific surveys, we get a lot of calls from people, partly because I talk about it a lot not only here but in the district. But people need some type of reform.

□ 2130

Mr. Speaker, I hope this Congress will do it timely. When the gentleman mentioned a while ago that he heard our committee may conduct hearings all summer, that is great. I mean I would like to have hearings in our committee, but we got to go to mark up what we learn from our committee. We have to make the legislative process work, the committee process work. We will put our amendments up and see if they work, and maybe they are not good, and we can sit down with the Members of the other side.

But that is what this democracy and this legislative process is about, and last session it was terminated, it was wrong, and we saw what happened. We delayed, and there was no bill passed. It did not even receive a hearing in the Senate because it actually was a step backward in changing State laws like in Texas.

So I would hope this session, maybe with the discharge rule being filed tomorrow, we will see that we are going down that road, but maybe we can ac-

tually see maybe hearings in June when we come back after celebrating Memorial Day, and with a short time we can, a lot of us have worked on this issue. So, sure, I would like to have some hearings, but maybe we could have a markup before the end of July or June or mid July, something like that, so we could set it on a time frame where we would vote maybe before the August recess on this floor of the House for a real managed care reform, and when we vote on the House floor, let us not just come out with a bill and say, "Take it or leave it." As my colleagues know, let us have the legislative process work within reason and so we can come up with different ideas on how it works and the success.

So again I thank the gentleman for taking the time tonight and my colleagues here, and particularly glad we had the first hour.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN). He brought up a number of really good points, if I could just, as my colleague knows, comment on them a little bit.

I mean first of all I think it is important to stress that with this discharge petition, we are not doing it out of spite or disrespect or anything like that. We just want this issue brought to the floor, and as my colleague said, as my colleagues know, having hearings all summer does not do the trick. So far we have not gotten any indication from the Republican leadership or the committee leadership that there is any date certain to mark up this bill in committee and to bring it to the floor, and that is why we need to go the discharge petition way.

The other thing the gentleman said I think is so important is he talked about how the Texas law, which does apply to a significant number of people in Texas, even not everyone, that both the cost issue and the issue of the fear, I guess, of frivolous lawsuits has so far proven not to be the case. In other words, the, as my colleagues know, one of the criticisms of HMO reform or Patients' Bill of Rights that the insurance companies raise unfairly is the fact that it is going to cost more, and in fact in Texas it has been found that the cost, there is practically no increased costs whatsoever. I think it was a couple of pennies or something that I read about.

And in terms of this fear that there are going to be so many lawsuits and everybody is going to be suing, actually there have been very few suits filed, and the reason I think is because when we put in the law that people can sue the HMO, prevention starts to take place. They become a lot more careful about what they do, they take preventive measures, and the lawsuits do not become necessary because you do not have the damages that people sue for. So I think that is a very important point.

The other point the gentleman made that I think is really crucial is the suggestion that somehow because of the

debate and because of the pressure that is coming from, as my colleagues know, the talk that is out there, that somehow many; some HMOs I should say; are starting to provide some of these patient protections, and the gentleman's point is well taken, that even though some of them may be doing it, and there are not really that many that are, but even though some of them are doing it, that does not mean that we do not need the protections passed as a matter of law for those, as my colleagues know, bad actors, if you will, who are not implementing these Patients' Bill of Rights.

So there needs to be a floor. These are nothing more than commonsense proposals that are sort of a floor of protections. They are not really that outrageous, they are just, as my colleagues know, the commonsense kind of protections that we need.

So I think that our time is up, but I just wanted to thank my colleague from Texas. We are going to continue to push. Tomorrow the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) is going to file the rule for this discharge petition, and we are going to get people to sign it so we can bring up the Patient Bill of Rights.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. Wilson). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 0033

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DREIER) at 12 o'clock and 33 minutes a.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1401, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000

Mrs. MYRICK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-166) on the resolution (H. Res. 195) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1401) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal years 2000 and 2001, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President, subsequent to sine die adjournment of the 2nd Session, 105th Congress, notified the Clerk of the

House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

November 10, 1998:

S. 459. An act to amend the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to extend certain authorizations, and for other purposes.

S. 1364. An act to eliminate unnecessary and wasteful Federal reports.

S. 1718. An act to amend the Weir Farm National Historic Site Establishment Act of 1990 to authorize the acquisition of additional acreage for the historic site to permit the development of visitor and administrative facilities and to authorize the appropriation of additional amounts for the acquisition of real and personal property, and for other purposes.

S. 2241. An act to provide for the acquisition of lands formerly occupied by the Franklin D. Roosevelt family at Hyde Park, New York, and for other purposes.

S. 2272. An act to amend the boundaries of Grant-Kohrs Ranch National Historic Site in the State of Montana.

S. 2375. An act to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977 to improve the competitiveness of American business and promote foreign commerce, and for other purposes.

S. 2500. An act to protect the sanctity of contracts and leases entered into by surface patent holders with respect to coalbed methane gas.

November 12, 1998:

S. 759. An act to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to require the Secretary of State to submit an annual report to Congress concerning diplomatic immunity.

S. 1132. An act to modify the boundaries of the Bandelier National Monument to include the lands within the headwaters of the Upper Alamo Watershed which drain into the Monument and which are not currently within the jurisdiction of a Federal land management agency, to authorize purchase or donation of those lands, and for other purposes.

S. 1134. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate forest fire protection compact.

S. 1408. An act to establish the Lower East Side Tenement National Historic Site, and for other purposes.

S. 1733. An act to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977 to require food stamp State agencies to take certain actions to ensure that food stamp coupons are not issued for deceased individuals, to require the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a study of options for the design, development, implementation, and operation of a national database to track participation in Federal means-tested public assistance programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2129. An act to eliminate restrictions on the acquisition of certain land contiguous to Hawaii Volcanoes National Park.

S.J. Res. 35. Joint Resolution granting the consent of Congress to the Pacific Northwest Emergency Management Arrangement.

November 13, 1998:

S. 191. An act to throttle criminal use of guns.

S. 391. An act to provide for the disposition of certain funds appropriated to pay judgment in favor of the Mississippi Sioux Indians, and for other purposes.

S. 417. An act to extend certain programs under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act and the Energy Conservation and Production Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1397. An act to establish a commission to assist in commemoration of the centennial of powered flight and the achievements of the Wright brothers.

S. 1525. An act to provide financial assistance for higher education to the dependents of Federal, State, and local public safety officers who are killed or permanently and totally disabled as the result of a traumatic injury sustained in the line of duty.

S. 1693. An act to provide for improved management and increased accountability for certain National Park Service programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1754. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to consolidate and reauthorize health professions and minority and disadvantaged health education programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2364. An act to reauthorize and make reforms to programs authorized by the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

S. 2432. An act to support programs of grants to States to address the assistive technology needs of individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE AD- JOURNMENT

The President, subsequent to sine die adjournment of the 2nd Session, 105th Congress, notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles:

November 10, 1998:

H.R. 378. An act for the relief of Heraclio Tolley.

H.R. 379. An act for the relief of Larry Errol Pieterse.

H.R. 1794. An act for the relief of Mai Hoa "Jasmin" Salehi.

H.R. 1834. An act for the relief of Mercedes Del Carmen Quiroz Martinez Cruz.

H.R. 1949. An act for the relief of Nuratu Olarewaju Abeke Kadiri.

H.R. 2744. An act for the relief of Chong Ho Kwak.

H.R. 3633. An act to amend the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act to place limitations on controlled substances brought into the United States.

H.R. 3723. An act to authorize funds for the payment of salaries and expenses of the Patent and Trademark Office, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4501. An act to require the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to improve the access for persons with disabilities to outdoor recreational opportunities made available to the public.

H.R. 4821. An act to extend into fiscal year 1999 the visa processing period for diversity applicants whose visa processing was suspended during fiscal year 1998 due to embassy bombings.

November 11, 1998:

H.R. 4110. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve benefits and services provided to Persian Gulf War veterans, to provide a cost-of-living adjustment in rates of compensation paid to veterans with service-connected disabilities, to enhance programs providing health care, compensation, education, insurance, and other benefits for veterans, and for other purposes.

November 12, 1998:

H.R. 1023. An act to provide for compassionate payments with regard to individuals with blood-clotting disorders, such as hemophilia, who contracted human immunodeficiency virus due to contaminated antihemophilic factor, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2070. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for the testing of certain persons who are incarcerated or ordered detained before trial, for the presence of the human immunodeficiency virus, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2263. An act to authorize and request the President to award the Congressional Medal of Honor posthumously to Theodore Roosevelt for his gallant and heroic actions in the attack on San Juan Heights, Cuba, during the Spanish-American War.

H.R. 3267. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Reclamation, to conduct a feasibility study and construct a project to reclaim the Salton Sea, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4083. An act to make available to the Ukrainian Museum and Archives the USIA television program "Window on America".

H.R. 4164. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to the enforcement of child custody and visitation orders.

November 13, 1998:

H.R. 633. An act to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1980 to provide that the annuities of certain special agents and security personnel of the Department of State be computed in the same way as applies generally with respect to Federal law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2204. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3461. An act to approve a governing international fishery agreement between the United States and the Republic of Poland, and for the other purposes.

H.R. 4283. An act to support sustainable and broad-based agricultural and rural development in sub-Saharan Africa, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week on account of official business.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) after 6:30 p.m. today and Thursday, May 27, on account of family matters.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and Thursday, May 27, 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. FOSSELLA) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, May 27.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CUBIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CHENOWETH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOSSELLA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. FOWLER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. KELLY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. THUNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MORELLA, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RUSH, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CROWLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOLT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BECERRA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 60 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 34 minutes a.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 27, 1999, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2353. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Spinosad; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-300864; FRL-6081-8] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received May 18, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2354. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Tebuconazole; Pesticide Tolerance for Emergency Exemption [OPP-300855; FRL-6079-1] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received May 18, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2355. A letter from the Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Service's final rule—Secondary Direct Food Additives Permitted in Food for Human Consumption [Docket No. 98F-0342] received May 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2356. A letter from the Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Indirect Food Additives: Adjuvants, Production Aids, and Sanitizers [Docket No. 91F-0399] received May 17, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2357. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Seat Belt Assemblies [Docket No. 99-5682] (RIN: 2127-AG48) received May 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2358. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard; Final Listing of Model Year 2000 High-Theft Vehicle Lines [Docket No. NHTSA-99-5416] (RIN: 2127-AH36) received

May 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2359. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Consumer Information Regulations; Uniform Tire Quality Grading Standards [Docket No. 99-5697] (RIN: 2127-AG67) received May 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2360. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Oil and Natural Gas Production and National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Natural Gas Transmission and Storage [AD-FRL-6346-8] (RIN: 2060-AE34) received May 18, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2361. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Steel Pickling—HCl Process Facilities and Hydrochloric Acid Regeneration Plants [IL-64-2-5807; FRL-6344-5] (RIN: 2060-AE41) received May 18, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2362. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Pesticide Active Ingredient Production [AD-FRL-6345-5] (RIN: 2060-AE83) received May 18, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2363. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Accidental Release Prevention Requirements: Risk Management Programs Under Clean Air Act Section 112(r)(7); Amendments to the Worst-Case Release Scenario Analysis for Flammable Substances [FRL-6348-2] received May 18, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2364. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Primary Lead Smelting [AD-FRL-6345-8] (RIN: 2060-AE97) received May 18, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2365. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Source Categories; Portland Cement Manufacturing Industry [FRL-6347-2] (RIN: 2060-AE78) received May 18, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2366. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Source Categories; Wool Fiberglass Manufacturing [FRL-6345-3] (RIN: 2060-AE75) received May 18, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2367. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Materials Safety and Safeguards, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—NRC Generic Letter 99-01: Recent Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards Decision on Bundling Exempt Quantities—received May 20, 1999, pursuant to 5

U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2368. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

2369. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report as part of his efforts to keep the Congress fully informed, consistent with the War Powers Resolution; (H. Doc. No. 106-72); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

2370. A letter from the Under Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting notification of certain foreign policy-based export controls which are being imposed on Serbia; to the Committee on International Relations.

2371. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on "Economic and Political Transition in Indonesia"; to the Committee on International Relations.

2372. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting the actuarial reports on the Judicial Retirement System, the Judicial Officers' Retirement Fund, the Judicial Survivors' Annuities System, and the Court of Federal Claims Judges' Retirement System for the plan year ending September 30, 1996, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2373. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the Commission's Inspector General Semiannual Report for the period October 1, 1998-March 31, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2374. A letter from the Director, Office of General Counsel and Legal Policy, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting the Office's final rule—Amendments to the Office of Government Ethics Freedom of Information Act Regulation (RIN: 3209-AA22) received May 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2375. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the Triennial Comprehensive Report on Immigration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2376. A letter from the Assistant Secretary (Civil Works), Department of the Army, transmitting a final response to a resolution adopted by the House Committee on Public Works and Transportation on August 25, 1960; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2377. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29570; Amdt. No. 1930] received May 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2378. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29571; Amdt. No. 1931] received May 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2379. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting an information copy of the alteration prospectus for 1724 F Street, NW, Washington, DC, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 606(a); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2380. A letter from the Director, National Science Foundation, transmitting a report on Women, Minorities, and Persons with Disabilities in Science and Engineering: 1998, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1885d; to the Committee on Science.

2381. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—June 1999 Applicable Federal Rates [Rev. Rul. 99-25]—received May 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2382. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Guidance Regarding 664 Regulations [Notice 99-31]—received May 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Filed on May 27 (Legislative day of May 26), 1999]

Mrs. MYRICK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 195. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1401) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal years 2000 to 2001, and for other purposes (Rept. 106-166). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CRANE (for himself, Mr. DREIER, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Ms. DUNN):

H.R. 1942. A bill to encourage the establishment of free trade areas between the United States and certain Pacific Rim countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHADEGG:

H.R. 1943. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat for unemployment compensation purposes Indian tribal governments the same as State or local units of government or as nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1944. A bill to approve a mutual settlement of the Water Rights of the Gila River Indian Community and the United States, on behalf of the Community and the Allottees, and Phelps Dodge Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

H.R. 1945. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax credits for Indian investment and employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1946. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the issuance of tax-exempt bonds by Indian tribal governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHUSTER (for himself and Mr. OBERSTAR) (both by request):

H.R. 1947. A bill to provide for the development, operation, and maintenance of the Nation's harbors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. RUSH (for himself, Mr. HILLIARD, and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 1948. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the discrimination, in the purchase or placement of advertisements for wire or cable communications, against minority owned or formatted communications entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BECERRA:

H.R. 1949. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Rhinovirus drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARR of California (for himself, Mr. GILCREST, Mr. CONDIT, and Mr. BOEHLERT):

H.R. 1950. A bill to amend the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 to improve the farmland protection program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BECERRA:

H.R. 1951. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on HIV/AIDS drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1952. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on HIV/AIDS drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BONO (for herself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 1953. A bill to authorize leases for terms not to exceed 99 years on land held in trust for the Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians and the Gudiville Band of Pomo Indians of the Gudiville Indian Rancheria; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. BRYANT (for himself, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. PICKERING, and Mr. COBURN):

H.R. 1954. A bill to regulate motor vehicle insurance activities to protect against retroactive regulatory and legal action and to create fairness in ultimate insurer laws and vicarious liability standards; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

H.R. 1955. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt certain transactions at fair market value between partnerships and private foundations from the tax on self-dealing and to require the Secretary of the Treasury to establish an exemption procedure from such taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. GILCREST, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SENBRENNER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. SCHAFER, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CLEMENT, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MOORE, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FARR of California, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. SHIMKUS):

H.R. 1956. A bill to prohibit the Department of State from imposing a charge or fee for providing passport information to the general public; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 1957. A bill to provide fairness in voter participation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLISH (for himself, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. WELLER, and Mr. HOLDEN):

H.R. 1958. A bill to establish the Fort Presque Isle National Historic Site in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 1959. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 743 East Durango Boulevard in San Antonio, Texas, as the "Adrian A. Spears Judicial Training Center"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CLAY (for himself, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. SCOTT, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. KIND, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. FORD, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. WU):

H.R. 1960. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, to reauthorize and make improvements to that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HOEFFEL (for himself, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. KLINK, Mr. PITTS, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. COYNE, and Mr. TOOMEY):

H.R. 1961. A bill to designate certain lands in the Valley Forge National Historical Park as the Valley Forge National Cemetery; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 1962. A bill to prohibit the export of high-performance computers to certain countries until certain applicable provisions of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 are fulfilled; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 1963. A bill to suspend until December 31, 2002, the duty on triacetaminone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAZIO (for himself, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. GILCREST, Mr. HORN, and Mrs. WILSON):

H.R. 1964. A bill to empower our educators; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself and Mr. BARTON of Texas):

H.R. 1965. A bill to provide the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Education with increased authority with respect to asthma programs, and to provide for increased funding for such programs; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (for herself, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CARSON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DANER, Mr. FROST, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HILLIARD, Ms. NORTON, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. LEE, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. OWENS, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. WEYGAND, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 1966. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to carry out

programs regarding the prevention and management of asthma, allergies, and related respiratory problems, to establish a tax credit regarding pest control services for multifamily residential housing in low-income communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SHOWS (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. Boucher, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BOYD, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. CARSON, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. DANNER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GOODE, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. JOHN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEY, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. REYES, Mr. RILEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WISE, and Mr. WU):

H.R. 1967. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives and job training grants for communities affected by the migration of businesses and jobs to Canada or Mexico as a result of the North American Free Trade Agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 1968. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for additional benefits under the Medicare Program to prevent or delay the onset of illnesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STUMP:

H.R. 1969. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain administrative sites in national forests in the State of Arizona, to convey certain land to the City of Sedona, Arizona for a wastewater treatment facility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico:

H.R. 1970. A bill to designate the Galisteo Basin Archaeological Protection Sites, to provide for the protection of archaeological sites in the Galisteo Basin of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. WATKINS (for himself, Mr. JOHN, and Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma):

H.R. 1971. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage domestic oil and gas production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mrs. ROUKEMA):

H. Con. Res. 119. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that a

commemorative postage stamp should be issued in honor of the U.S.S. New Jersey and all those who served aboard her; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. GEJDENSON (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BALDACC, Mr. BALLINGER, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. BATEMAN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. COOK, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. ENGLISH, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. FROST, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HILL of Indiana, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HORN, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. JENKINS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KIND, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. KING, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KLINK, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. LARSON, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mrs. NORTHUP, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLIVER, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. PITTS, Mr. REYES, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. SCHAFER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. TALENT, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WOLF, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H. Con. Res. 120. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued honoring the United States Submarine Force on its 100th anniversary; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Ms. CARSON:

H. Res. 191. A resolution recognizing and honoring Medal of Honor recipients for their selfless acts for our Nation, and commending IPALCO Enterprises for its contributions to honor each these American heroes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, and Ms. CARSON):

H. Res. 192. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1037) to ban the importation of large capacity ammunition feeding devices, and to extend the ban on transferring such devices to those that were manufactured before the ban became law; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 193. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 902) to regulate the sale of firearms at gun shows; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 194. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 515) to prevent children from injuring themselves with handguns; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mrs. CUBIN introduced A bill (H.R. 1972) for the relief of Ashley Ross Fuller; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 44: Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, and Mr. HOSTETTLER.

H.R. 65: Mr. ETHERIDGE.

H.R. 90: Mr. BONIOR, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. KLINK, Mr. LUTHER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. STRICKLAND, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 170: Mr. CAMP and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 271: Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 303: Mr. MOLLOHAN.

H.R. 306: Mr. COYNE, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. PHELPS, and Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 315: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 383: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 434: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.

H.R. 483: Mr. COYNE.

H.R. 486: Mr. DICKEY, Mr. GORDON, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RILEY, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BAKER, Mr. COBURN, and Mr. COYNE.

H.R. 489: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 515: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 518: Mr. HEFLEY.

H.R. 583: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. COYNE, and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 586: Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 592: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 597: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. DANNER, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. STABENOW.

H.R. 599: Mr. METCALF.

H.R. 673: Mr. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 692: Mr. PACKARD and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 701: Mr. NEY, Mr. FROST, Mr. BOYD, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 721: Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 732: Mr. INSLEE, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 745: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 750: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 773: Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. KUYKENDALL, and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 783: Mr. LAMPSON and Mr. GOSS.

H.R. 784: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 789: Mr. MCHUGH and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 815: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 827: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 850: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 860: Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 875: Mr. GONZALEZ and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 886: Ms. LEE and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
 H.R. 895: Mr. EDWARDS and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 896: Mr. ISTOOK.
 H.R. 899: Mr. FORBES, Mr. KING, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WEINER, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
 H.R. 925: Mr. BOUCHER and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
 H.R. 953: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. STRICKLAND, and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.
 H.R. 960: Ms. VELAZQUEZ.
 H.R. 986: Mr. JEFFERSON.
 H.R. 987: Mr. THUNE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. KINGSTON.
 H.R. 997: Mrs. JONES of Ohio and Mr. MEEHAN.
 H.R. 1008: Mr. JEFFERSON.
 H.R. 1046: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. BERRY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
 H.R. 1064: Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 1071: Mr. REYES.
 H.R. 1080: Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 1111: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.
 H.R. 1163: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.
 H.R. 1202: Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. WHITFIELD.
 H.R. 1213: Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 1238: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 1244: Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
 H.R. 1256: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. GILLMOR.
 H.R. 1260: Mr. BAIRD, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, and Mr. MOAKLEY.
 H.R. 1265: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. WISE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KLINK, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
 H.R. 1285: Mr. QUINN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WATERS, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.
 H.R. 1291: Mr. HORN, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. DREIER, Mr. BORSKI, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. HALL of Texas.
 H.R. 1292: Mr. DEUTSCH and Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 1300: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. SWEENEY.
 H.R. 1320: Mr. LUTHER.
 H.R. 1326: Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, and Mr. PICKETT.
 H.R. 1342: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. PELOSI, and Ms. CARSON.
 H.R. 1348: Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. GILCHREST.
 H.R. 1349: Mr. GIBBONS.
 H.R. 1355: Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 1358: Mr. INSLEE and Mr. POMBO.
 H.R. 1366: Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. TANCREDI, and Mr. SANDLIN.
 H.R. 1476: Ms. WOOLSEY.
 H.R. 1478: Mr. INSLEE.
 H.R. 1483: Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. NEAL, of Massachusetts, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. McNULTY.
 H.R. 1484: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 1485: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
 H.R. 1494: Mr. BAKER.
 H.R. 1495: Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
 H.R. 1523: Mr. GOODLATTE.
 H.R. 1525: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 1546: Mr. NETHERCUTT and Mr. ENGLISH.
 H.R. 1591: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. DICKS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
 H.R. 1593: Mr. HILL of Montana.
 H.R. 1598: Mr. CALLAHAN.
 H.R. 1602: Mr. FOLEY.
 H.R. 1607: Mr. GARY MILLER of California and Mr. ISAKSON.
 H.R. 1623: Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. WU, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FROST, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. FORD, Mr. NADLER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. WATERS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. WEINER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. HOLT, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, and Mr. SCOTT.
 H.R. 1630: Mrs. JONES of Ohio.
 H.R. 1660: Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. FORD, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. WU, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. WATERS, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. BARCIA.
 H.R. 1684: Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. TOWNS.
 H.R. 1703: Mr. MATSUI.
 H.R. 1707: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
 H.R. 1710: Mr. SOUDER.
 H.R. 1713: Mr. ENGLISH.
 H.R. 1723: Mr. WISE.
 H.R. 1746: Mr. PICKERING, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, and Mr. EWING.
 H.R. 1747: Mr. HALL of TEXAS, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. FORBES, Ms. RIVERS, and Mr. BASS.
 H.R. 1764: Ms. WOOLSEY.
 H.R. 1777: Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 1791: Mr. GOODE and Mr. SAXTON.
 H.R. 1798: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 1812: Mr. UNDERWOOD.
 H.R. 1839: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. REYES, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 1842: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. FROST, and Mr. TERRY.
 H.R. 1848: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 1849: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
 H.R. 1862: Mr. EVANS.
 H.R. 1885: Mr. BAKER, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. STARK, and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.
 H.R. 1895: Mr. GEJDENSON, Ms. WATERS, Mr. DIXON, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. PASTOR, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
 H.R. 1912: Mr. DAVIS of Virginia.
 H.R. 1923: Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 1926: Mr. TANCREDI and Mr. TALENT.
 H.R. 1941: Mr. INSLEE, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. BONIOR.
 H.J. Res. 25: Mr. JEFFERSON.
 H.J. Res. 41: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. NADLER.
 H.J. Res. 55: Mr. CAMPBELL.
 H. Con. Res. 8: Ms. BERKLEY.
 H. Con. Res. 22: Mr. SESSIONS.
 H. Con. Res. 25: Mr. JEFFERSON.
 H. Con. Res. 30: Mr. KINGSTON.
 H. Con. Res. 62: Mr. HOLDEN and Mr. WATT of North Carolina.
 H. Con. Res. 64: Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CANADY of Florida, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
 H. Con. Res. 78: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, and Mr. WATT of North Carolina.
 H. Con. Res. 94: Mr. GOODE, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. CRANE.
 H. Con. Res. 100: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. FORBES, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. NEY, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mrs. MORELLA.
 H. Con. Res. 106: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.
 H. Con. Res. 107: Mr. MANZULLO.
 H. Con. Res. 113: Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. SNYDER, and Mr. OBERSTAR.
 H. Con. Res. 118: Mr. WOLF.
 H. Res. 41: Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. TANNER, Mr. WELLER, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. QUINN.
 H. Res. 89: Ms. SANCHEZ.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 902: Mr. PHELPS.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1401

OFFERED BY: MR. SOUDER

AMENDMENT No. 7. Strike section 1006 (page 270, line 20, through page 271, line 9) and insert the following new section:

SEC. 1006. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR MILITARY OPERATIONS IN FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA.

None of the funds appropriated or otherwise available to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2000 may be used for military operations in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.