

GRANTING MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE PRIVILEGE TO EXTEND THEIR REMARKS IN CONGRESSIONAL RECORD TODAY

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that for today all Members be permitted to extend their remarks and to include extraneous material in the section of the RECORD entitled "Extension of Remarks."

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER, MAJORITY LEADER AND MINORITY LEADER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS AND TO MAKE APPOINTMENTS NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Tuesday, February 25, 1997, the Speaker, majority leader and minority leader be authorized to accept resignations and to make appointments authorized by law or by the House.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SPEAKER TO APPOINT MEMBERS TO REPRESENT THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AT CEREMONIES FOR THE OBSERVANCE OF GEORGE WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order for the Speaker to appoint 2 Members of the House, one upon the recommendation of the minority leader, to represent the House of Representatives at appropriate ceremonies for the observance of George Washington's birthday to be held on Thursday, February 20, 1997.

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

There was no objection.

DESIGNATION OF THE HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS THROUGH FEBRUARY 25, 1997.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 13, 1997.

I hereby designate the Honorable Constance A. Morella to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through February 25, 1997.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the
House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the designation is agreed to.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

TRIBUTE TO DR. TIMOTHY WINTERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, colleagues, I rise today in celebration of Black History Month and to recognize a truly remarkable leader from my 50th Congressional District in San Diego.

In the Rev. Dr. Timothy Winters, we find a man who has dedicated his life to the spiritual well-being of many of our neighborhoods in San Diego. In addition to being pastor of the Bayview Baptist Church, one of the largest churches in San Diego, he also holds the position as president of the Baptist Ministers Union. While in this position, Dr. Winters is shown to be a very capable leader in guiding his church and a ministerial organization to success and high achievement. He was instrumental in building of the Martin Luther King School, complete with meeting halls and banquet facilities.

Dr. Winters is also an accomplished speaker, often called to speak on various problems and concerns of the African-American community and the city at large. He lectures frequently on the matters of consumer awareness and debt-free living. His workshops and finance seminars, which he often conducts from various churches, have helped to improve the lives of literally thousands who have heeded his advice and counsel.

I am also proud of the many fair lending agreements that Dr. Winters assisted in forging with the many banks and financial institutions in our city.

The accolades for Dr. Winters go far beyond the African-American community. His writings and teachings are celebrated nationwide. And, at a gala evening of celebration, the city of San Diego will honor this individual of such energy. He has often been a great inspiration to me, and I look forward to working with Dr. Winters to raise the quality of life in our community.

Please join me in celebrating the great contributions and achievement made to the constituents of the 50th Congressional District by Dr. Timothy Winters.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it was interesting in the Committee on the Budget this morning that Dr. June O'Neill, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, came with their analysis of the President's budget. One of the conclusions of the CBO was that the President's budget is not going to be in the surplus by the year 2002, but under their projections will run a \$50 billion deficit in the year 2002. So I would ask that we make a humble, respectful request to the President to resubmit a budget that balances by the Congressional Budget Office scoring.

Another thing that Dr. O'Neill said was that if we continue spending the way we are today, we need an immediate 50-percent increase in income tax rates to keep the budget in balance. If we put off any decision until the year 2017, we would have to have an 87-percent increase in the income tax. That means that families' take-home pay would be cut in half, and what they can spend on health care and on clothes and on food and on transportation would end up being cut in half.

I want to quickly give a presentation of what is happening in what has become the largest spending item, and that is Social Security. As you see by this chart, Social Security now takes up 22 percent of the Federal budget. And what has happened is Congress, I would suggest, made a mistake by requiring everybody to contribute to Social Security, and not putting any of that money in savings and investment. Instead, since it started in 1935, Social Security has been a pay-as-you-go program where existing workers pay in their taxes to support the benefits of existing retirees.

If I get my charts correct, this shows what is going to happen to Social Security if we make no changes, and that is that there is going to be less money coming in in this pay-as-you-go program. In 2011, Dorcas Hardy, a former commissioner, says there is going to be less tax money coming into Social Security than is required for the payouts as early as 2005. That's not very far in the future. So if we are going to preserve Social Security not only for future retirees but for existing retirees, we simply got to start taking our heads out of the sand and be willing to face this very tough question on what we're going to do to preserve Social Security, to preserve Medicare, to preserve some of the important programs that Government has developed to help people, and not put the burden on future generations and ask them to pay an 87-percent increase in their taxes.

Here is the problem on Social Security. It was developed as a pay-as-you-go system where existing workers pay for existing retirees. But what has happened is there are fewer workers paying for the support of that retiree.

In 1950, we had 17 workers earning money, paying their taxes to support each retiree. Today, there are three workers. In another 35 years there are going to be only two workers working

and paying the taxes to support each retiree.

Now here is what the average retired couple has already gotten back: Over four times what they and their employer put into the Social Security taxes, plus compound interest. This chart shows that if you happened to retire in 1940, it took just 2 months to get everything back that you and your employer put into Social Security taxes. If you retired in 1960, it took 2 years.

Look what is going to happen to the workers that are starting to retire today, to the workers that are 35 and 45 and 50 years old. They are going to have to work 26 years after retirement. They are going to have to live 26 years after retirement in order to collect the benefits that they and their employer put into Social Security. We have got to have a change.

I have developed a proposal that I think we should run up the flagpole in order to start coming up with solutions to save Social Security. My proposal allows some private investment, but at the same time does not take away benefits from anybody over 58 years old.

□ 1530

So I think we have to tell people ahead of time what is happening. Part of the solution is a private investment. Part of the solution is slowing down benefits for the higher income recipients.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that we deal with these serious problems as soon as possible and not put it off for another decade.

SPECIAL ATTENTION TO THE CAPITAL OF THE UNITED STATES

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. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today first and foremost to thank the leadership of this country for the priority they have placed upon the capital of the United States, to thank President Bill Clinton, majority leader of the Senate TRENT LOTT, and our own Speaker, NEWT GINGRICH, who have agreed that among the five priorities for this session of Congress should be special attention to the capital of the United States. There is there the kind of bipartisanship that one would expect from a great country for its great capital.

Why this priority for the capital of the United States? Well, I suppose its name tells it all. It is the capital of the United States, and there is in this body and this country a fiduciary obligation to its own capital. It is self-evident. The District of Columbia is a financial orphan under our Constitution. It is not a part of any State. It cannot even tax people who come here from other regions, use our services and go home without leaving any, not even one thin dime of tax money here.

Why has the city come to this state of affairs now? Well, all of the cities are in great trouble, but they have States. There is not a big city in the United States that would not be flat on its back if it were not for its State. Cities are increasingly clusters of the poor, with the middle class having fled.

This chart tells the story of the death-dealing crisis of your capital city. We are on line to lose three times as many people in the 1990's as we lost in the 1980's. If we mean to have a capital, now is the time to move in. This is the session of Congress to move in to help the city.

The reason this has not been as apparent as it should be is that the District Government has been historically poorly managed. That hides the poor performance of the Congress and of the country. The poor performance of the city should not give rise to the abandonment of the capital by our country.

And what about the performance of the Congress, which offloaded \$5 billion in pension liability built up before home rule? What about a Congress that says to a city in this day and time, hey, you pay for State functions, prisons, Medicaid, courts, all by yourself with no help from anyone else? It cannot be done, my good colleagues. And yet there are no sure and fast answers to the problems of the District.

I went this week to the funeral of a brave young officer, Officer Brian Gibson, executed, and I come back the day of his funeral to find a Member of the other body wanting to put the death penalty on the District of Columbia. This is 4 years after the District faced this issue and voted that it would be among the jurisdictions not to have the death penalty.

The top killing States in the United States all have the death penalty. We do not see the death penalty as the answer to the crime problems of the District of Columbia. We do note that the American Bar Association says that the death penalty is so inequitably applied that there should be a moratorium on it.

We ask the help of our country. We are prepared to make, and are making, excruciating sacrifices that no city which has gotten into trouble has had to make, that New York and that Philadelphia, which all became insolvent years before the District, none had to make, because there was a State.

We are asking for the help of our country. We believe that the half-million people who live in the District deserve the help of our country. But please do not impose on us matters that we ourselves have not approved. This is yet a free country, and this is the Congress that boasts that it is devolving power back to the localities, not usurping power from the localities.

I welcome the help of my colleagues. I look forward to working with the President, with the majority leader of the Senate, with the Speaker of the House, and with my own leadership to

make the capital of the United States a city that we truly can all be proud of.

THE COMMON SENSE CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, the fundraising scandals of the 1996 Presidential election have moved campaign finance reform to the front burner of the agenda for the 105th Congress. Things like the ever-expanding influence of special and large contributions from non-U.S. citizens have eroded the public's confidence in our democratic process and left far too many Americans demoralized and in fact disenfranchised.

At the same time, while the level of attention has increased significantly in just the last few months, most observers agree that the chances of passing a comprehensive overhaul of our campaign finance system in this Congress remain very, very slim. I happen to agree with that assessment.

Currently, we have a Democrat in the White House, we have the Republicans in control of both Houses. Asking us to pass a comprehensive bill now would be like asking two football teams to overhaul the rules of the game while it is being played.

Instead, I believe that we should take a series of incremental steps toward reform and correcting the most glaring and immediate problems of the current system, while leaving the larger issues to a time when the chances of passing a comprehensive bill are more realistic.

I rise today to introduce what I believe should be the first step: the Common Sense Campaign Finance Reform Act of 1997. This bill is designed to remedy the most pressing problems, and I say again, the most pressing problems of our current system, namely, the influx of special interest and foreign money into the Nation's campaign coffers.

First, and this chart I think says it all very well, my bill would require that House and Senate candidates limit their PAC contributions to 35 percent, as represented by this graph.

Second, there is a limit on outside donors. Candidates can raise no more than 35 percent of their individual contributions, I am talking about individual contributions, from donors who live outside their districts for House Members or outside the State for Senators. Then finally, limit foreign money. Candidates may not accept contributions from people who are ineligible to vote. So one, two, three; it is very simple.

This would address the concerns raised by the amount of money that came from non-U.S. citizens during the 1996 election, and it would also, I think, crack down on efforts to circumvent individual contribution limits