

NOT VOTING—13

Andrews	Gephardt	Owens
Carson	Kaptur	Roukema
Coble	Largent	Rush
Flake	Millender-	Towns
Furse	McDonald	

□ 1737

Mr. McKEON and Mr. BUYER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: "A resolution stating the sense of the House of Representatives that the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security Between the United States of America and Japan is essential for furthering the security interests of the United States, Japan, and the nations of the Asia-Pacific region, and that the people of Japan, especially the people of Okinawa, deserve recognition for their contributions toward ensuring the treaty's implementation."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONG KONG REVERSION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 750, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BE-REUTER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 750, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 1, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 38]

YEAS—416

Abercrombie	Boehlert	Clay
Ackerman	Boehner	Clayton
Aderholt	Bonilla	Clement
Allen	Bonior	Clyburn
Archer	Bono	Coburn
Armey	Borski	Collins
Bachus	Boswell	Combest
Baesler	Boucher	Condit
Baker	Boyd	Conyers
Baldacci	Brady	Cook
Ballenger	Brown (CA)	Cooksey
Barcia	Brown (FL)	Costello
Barr	Brown (OH)	Cox
Barrett (NE)	Bryant	Coyne
Barrett (WI)	Bunning	Cramer
Bartlett	Burr	Crane
Barton	Burton	Crapo
Bass	Buyer	Cubin
Bateman	Callahan	Cummings
Becerra	Calvert	Cunningham
Bentsen	Camp	Danner
Bereuter	Campbell	Davis (FL)
Berman	Canady	Davis (IL)
Berry	Cannon	Davis (VA)
Bilbray	Capps	Deal
Billirakis	Cardin	DeFazio
Bishop	Castle	DeGette
Blagojevich	Chabot	Delahunt
Bliley	Chambliss	DeLauro
Blumenauer	Chenoweth	DeLay
Blunt	Christensen	Dellums

Deutsch	Johnson, Sam	Paxon
Diaz-Balart	Jones	Payne
Dickey	Kanjorski	Pease
Dicks	Kasich	Pelosi
Dingell	Kelly	Peterson (MN)
Dixon	Kennedy (MA)	Peterson (PA)
Doggett	Kennedy (RI)	Petri
Dooley	Kennelly	Pickering
Doolittle	Kildee	Pickett
Doyle	Kilpatrick	Pitts
Dreier	Kim	Pombo
Duncan	Kind (WI)	Pomeroy
Dunn	King (NY)	Porter
Edwards	Kingston	Portman
Ehlers	Klecza	Poshard
Ehrlich	Klink	Price (NC)
Emerson	Klug	Quinn
Engel	Knollenberg	Radanovich
English	Kolbe	Rahall
Ensign	Kucinich	Ramstad
Eshoo	LaFalce	Rangel
Etheridge	LaHood	Regula
Evans	Lampson	Reyes
Everett	Lantos	Riggs
Ewing	Latham	Riley
Farr	LaTourette	Rivers
Fattah	Lazio	Roemer
Fawell	Leach	Rogan
Fazio	Levin	Rogers
Filner	Lewis (CA)	Rohrabacher
Foglietta	Lewis (GA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Foley	Lewis (KY)	Rothman
Forbes	Linder	Roybal-Allard
Ford	Lipinski	Royce
Fowler	Livingston	Ryun
Fox	LoBiondo	Sabo
Frank (MA)	Lofgren	Salmon
Franks (NJ)	Lowey	Sanchez
Frelinghuysen	Lucas	Sanders
Frost	Luther	Sandlin
Gallegly	Maloney (CT)	Sanford
Ganske	Maloney (NY)	Sawyer
Gejdenson	Manton	Saxton
Gekas	Manzullo	Scarborough
Gibbons	Markey	Schaefer, Dan
Gilchrest	Martinez	Schaffer, Bob
Gillmor	Mascara	Schiff
Gilman	Matsui	Schumer
Gonzalez	McCarthy (MO)	Scott
Goode	McCarthy (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Goodlatte	McCollum	Serrano
Goodling	McCrery	Sessions
Gordon	McDade	Shadegg
Goss	McDermott	Shaw
Graham	McGovern	Shays
Granger	McHale	Sherman
Green	McHugh	Shimkus
Gutierrez	McInnis	Shuster
Gutknecht	McIntosh	Sisisky
Hall (OH)	McIntyre	Skaggs
Hall (TX)	McKeon	Skeen
Hamilton	McKinney	Skelton
Hansen	McNulty	Slaughter
Harman	Meehan	Smith (MI)
Hastert	Meek	Smith (NJ)
Hastings (FL)	Menendez	Smith (OR)
Hastings (WA)	Metcalf	Smith (TX)
Hayworth	Mica	Smith, Adam
Hefley	Miller (CA)	Smith, Linda
Hefner	Miller (FL)	Snowbarger
Heger	Minge	Snyder
Hill	Mink	Solomon
Hillery	Moakley	Souder
Hilliard	Molinari	Spence
Hinche	Mollohan	Spratt
Hinojosa	Moran (KS)	Stabenow
Hobson	Moran (VA)	Stark
Hoekstra	Morella	Stearns
Holden	Murtha	Stenholm
Hoolley	Myrick	Stokes
Horn	Nadler	Strickland
Hostettler	Neal	Stump
Houghton	Nethercutt	Stupak
Hoyer	Neumann	Sununu
Hulshof	Ney	Talent
Hunter	Northup	Tanner
Hutchinson	Norwood	Tauscher
Hyde	Nussle	Tauzin
Inglis	Oberstar	Taylor (MS)
Istook	Obey	Taylor (NC)
Jackson (IL)	Olver	Thomas
Jackson-Lee	Ortiz	Thompson
(TX)	Oxley	Thornberry
Jefferson	Packard	Thune
Jenkins	Pallone	Thurman
John	Pappas	Tiahrt
Johnson (CT)	Parker	Tierney
Johnson (WI)	Pascrell	Torres
Johnson, E. B.	Pastor	Traficant

Turner	Watt (NC)	Whitfield
Upton	Watts (OK)	Wicker
Velazquez	Waxman	Wise
Vento	Weldon (FL)	Wolf
Visclosky	Weldon (PA)	Woolsey
Walsh	Weller	Wynn
Wamp	Wexler	Yates
Waters	Weygand	Young (AK)
Watkins	White	Young (FL)

NAYS—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—15

Andrews	Greenwood	Pryce (OH)
Carson	Kaptur	Roukema
Coble	Largent	Rush
Flake	Millender-	Towns
Furse	McDonald	
Gephardt	Owens	

□ 1747

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and 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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 38, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Speaker, I rise to indicate that on Thursday, March 6, I was on a leave of absence for official business, having had the pleasure of escorting the President of the United States to my district to discuss education issues.

As a result, I missed rollcall votes 32 through 35. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall votes 32 and 35, and "yea" on rollcall votes 33 and 34.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). 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.

IMPROVING THE COMMUTE TO WORK

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, throughout the Capitol this week, we are being visited by men and women who are the leaders of our transit agencies around the country. I hope that as they are visiting with us today dealing with the things that make a difference to Americans, that we in Congress will be particularly aware of two pieces of legislation that they are seeking our assistance for that will make a difference for American families.

After all, notwithstanding a lot of what passes for topical political rhetoric in our Capitol, really what American families care about most is they

want to be safe, they want their families economically secure, they want them healthy. I am here today to argue on behalf of two of these bills that will do that in terms of having a more balanced transportation system.

One, House Resolution 37, would give congressional employees here in the District of Columbia and in our district offices the opportunity to contribute to the livability of their communities by using transit. As local elected officials we have had the opportunity of implementing such programs in our community, and we found that transit passes made a great deal of difference. They improved morale of our employees, they decreased the demand for parking, they helped clean the air, they decreased congestion, and they actually ended up saving our employees money.

Sadly, the House of Representatives is behind the curve in offering transit benefits. Since 1984, private sector employers have offered their employees transit benefits for their commute to work. Even our colleagues in the U.S. Senate have successfully operated a transit pass program since 1992. Today over 2,000 employees of the Congressional Budget Office, the Architect of the Capitol, and the Senate participate in an employer-sponsored transit pass program. With the passage of the Federal Employees Clean Air Incentives Act of 1993, the House is authorized to offer its employees the same incentive.

Unfortunately, we have yet to do so. This is a bipartisan resolution, already with over 3 dozen cosponsors, that would give House offices the option to underwrite part of the cost of monthly passes for our employees. No additional revenue is needed to approve the program, since our employee transit passes would be funded out of existing transit office budgets.

The Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, WMATA, is extremely supportive of this legislation, and is ready to help the House implement the transit benefit program here in the D.C. metro area as soon as we are willing to work with them.

Additionally, we are hearing from our transit friends about another important piece of legislation. This is the Commuter Choice Act, H.R. 873, that is primarily sponsored by our colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS].

Most of us understand that the overwhelming reliance on single-occupant vehicles is responsible for unsafe air, unsafe streets, and gridlock that is increasingly paralyzing our communities. Yet, sadly, our tax policy encourages commuting by car over any other means of transportation. It is not enough that in America we spend more advertising the automobile than supporting transit. We have a tax system that discriminates against people who would like to do the right thing and not use their private automobile.

Employers can currently provide free parking up to \$170 a month tax-free, but a transit pass or car pool benefits

are allowed for only one-third of that value. The Commuter Choice Act would eliminate this imbalance, and encourage energy savings without penalizing drivers.

It would increase the nontaxable transit pass benefit to the same \$170 per month as the tax-free parking benefit.

□ 1800

In addition, this bill will take away the disincentive for people who choose alternative transportation modes. Right now, if an employer decides that they are going to give \$25 a month as an incentive for people to walk, run, or bike to work, that will make the other benefits that they provide potentially taxable, including tax-free parking.

This bill would provide the opportunity for a stipend of \$15 to \$50 per month. This cash benefit would support employees who choose to walk, bike, run, rollerblade to work. We have had opportunities in the State of California, where this has been implemented by some employers.

I urge my colleagues to support these two bills.

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the Committee on the Budget. Last week Alan Greenspan, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, came before our committee. Today Secretary Rubin, Secretary of the Treasury, came before our committee. They made, I think, a very important point that everybody should be aware of. That is that Social Security has very serious problems for the future.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to talk about some of the things that are happening in Social Security that means that the benefits for existing retirees are threatened as well as the potential for retirement benefits for workers that are going to retire in the future.

In terms of the Federal budget, Social Security uses up now 22 percent of the total Federal budget. What is happening is we have a system in Social Security where existing workers pay their taxes in to support the retirement benefits of existing retirees, a pay as you GOPAC.

That is the way it is today. That is the way it always has been since Social Security started in 1935. What is happening is there is a fewer number of workers. The birth rate is going down, so we are seeing a fewer number of workers paying in their taxes to support an increasing number of retirees. For example, in 1945, there were 42 people working paying in their taxes to support the benefits of each retiree. By 1950, that went down to 17 individuals working paying in their taxes to support each retiree. Today there are

three people working, paying in their taxes to support each retiree.

What has happened at the same time is an increasing number of retirees. The life span is much longer. When we started Social Security, the average age of death was 61, even though the retirement age was 65. And today the average age of death is almost 74 years. If you are fortunate enough to live to be 65 years old, then the average age of death is 84 years old. So a tremendous increase in the number of retirees which is going to be compounded by the fact that the baby boomers, that huge population growth after World War II, are going to start to retire in about 2011.

So everybody is guessing we are going to run out of money, there is not enough money coming in to pay the outgo after 2011. Dorcas Hardy, a former Social Security Commissioner, estimates that we are going to run out of money as early as 2005.

Let me give you an example of the increased cost of Social Security. This year on average we are paying out for Social Security benefits \$700,000 a minute. By 2029, we will be paying out \$5,600,000 a minute. Today \$700,000, by 2029 it is going to be \$5,600,000. A tremendous increase in cost.

How do we solve the problem? I have introduced a bill last session that makes 12 modest changes for future retirees, that holds safe existing retirees, but it slightly slows down the increase in benefits for higher income retirees. It adds an additional year that you are going to have to work to be eligible for retirement. It has some changes in the bend points. It makes changes in the requirements of a spouse receiving Social Security benefits that did not work, but the point is how do we make the changes. How are we going to come to grips with changes in a program that has been called the third rail, that if politicians start touching this like they did Medicare, they are going to be chastised in the next election.

I urge my colleagues to come forward. Let us start taking our heads out of the sand.

Mr. President, I ask you, Secretary Rubin, I ask you, colleagues, I ask you, let us start dealing with this program. If we delay the solutions of solving Social Security, that simply means that the solutions are going to be much more drastic. It is important that we start today working on these solutions for Social Security.

I invite my colleagues to examine my bill. Let us run this idea up the flag pole. Let us come up with better solutions, but let us not put this decision off by simply appointing a commission that is going to come back 2 or 3 or 4 years later with three different proposals on how to solve it.

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