

I will caution again all the Members here, and those who are not, that they need to read this plan because this plan, in fact, does request and require a 2½ percent reduction in discretionary outlays.

This is not Republicans; this is the President of the United States who is suggesting this.

Now I would just like to remind everyone that we are having a dickens of a time negotiating a 1 percent reduction in discretionary outlays, and the President is suggesting that his plan to save Social Security is based on a 2½ percent reduction in discretionary outlays.

I urge Members to read this plan. The numbers do not add up. The numbers do not add up, Mr. Speaker. Please read the plan.

ROLL-CALL VOTES ON THE PASSAGE OF THE  
ORIGINAL 1935 SOCIAL SECURITY ACT  
CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE—LIBRARY  
OF CONGRESS

In response to numerous requests for information on the Senate and House roll-call votes on the original 1935 Social Security Act (H.R. 7260/P.L. 74-271), we have compiled this packet. The Social Security Act was signed into law by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on August 14, 1935. The following roll-call votes were taken on the measure:

House—April 19, 1935: Yeas: 372 (288 Democrat; 77 Republican; 7 Independent); Nays: 33 (13 Democrat; 18 Republican; 2 Independent); *Answering Present*: 2 (2 Republican); *Not Voting*: 25 (18 Democrat; 6 Republican; 1 Independent).

Senate—June 19, 1935: Yeas: 77 (60 Democrat; 15 Republican; 2 Independent); Nays: 6 (1 Democrat; 5 Republican); *Not Voting*: 12 (8 Democrat; 4 Republican).

In 1935, there were only 48 states, since Alaska and Hawaii were not admitted to the Union until 1958 and 1959, respectively. So, the Senate had 96 seats in 1935, according to Stephen G. Christianson's *Facts About the Congress* [New York, H.W. Wilson, 1996], 339). Also, “[t]he current House size of 435 Members . . . was established in 1911,” according to CRS Report 95-971, *House of Representatives: Setting the Size at 435*, by David C. Huckabee. Thus, 95 of the eligible 96 Senators and 432 of the eligible 435 Representatives participated in the bill's roll-call votes. The roll-call vote charts following this page, which are organized by chamber, are arranged alphabetically by last names, then, where necessary, by first names. Party and state information is provided for all Members, and district information is also given for each Representative.

The original House and Senate roll-call votes can be found on p. 6069-70 and p. 9650, respectively, in the 1935 edition of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Copies of bound volumes of the RECORD may be available for use at the nearest federal depository library. Addresses of the closest depository libraries can often be obtained: through a local library; from the office of Depository Services of the U.S. Government Printing Office, (202) 512-1119; or at the following Internet address: [[http://www.access.gpo.gov/su\\_docs/dpos/adpos003.html](http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/dpos/adpos003.html)].

Information Research Division.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLETCHER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and

under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

ADDITIONAL ALL-CARGO SERVICE  
TO CHINA

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in April of this year the United States and the People's Republic of China signed a new civil aviation agreement. In addition to doubling the number of scheduled flights between the two countries, the agreement allows one additional carrier from each country to serve the U.S.-China market beginning in the year 2001.

Currently, three U.S. and three Chinese carriers have the authority to serve the U.S.-China market. The Department of Transportation will soon grant an additional U.S. carrier the right to fly directly to China.

China is the largest market in the world, as we all know, and holds great trading potential for the United States.

All-cargo carriers that provide time-sensitive express service play an important role in promoting trade opportunities for U.S. companies large and small. Express all-cargo carriers are able to connect every business and residence in the United States every day to China. Unfortunately, of the three U.S. carriers allowed to fly directly to China, Federal Express is the only all-cargo carrier serving the market. For this reason, United Parcel Service is now applying to the Department of Transportation for the right to fly directly to China.

United Parcel Service has served the nations of Asia since 1988 and already operates an extensive ground network in China. By applying for the right to fly directly to China, United Parcel Service hopes to expand its Chinese service by using United Parcel Service jet aircraft. United Parcel Service would also provide needed competition in the all-cargo express market.

As the only all-cargo U.S. carrier, Federal Express now enjoys a monopoly advantage in the Chinese market. Allowing another all-cargo carrier like United Parcel Service into the vast China market would provide U.S. consumers and exporters with increased access to competitive service.

More importantly, United Parcel Service would help meet the growing demand for air cargo service. Even with Federal Express in the market, roughly 60 percent of the cargo that is transported between the United States and China is carried on third-country carriers. In other words, foreign carriers benefit the most from the growing trade between the United States and China. This just is not right.

However, if United Parcel Service is allowed to fly directly to China, then a U.S. carrier would be able to benefit from the growing demand for cargo

service between the United States and China.

This would, in turn, benefit the U.S. economy and U.S. workers. In fact, a recent study found that for every 40 additional international packages delivered by United Parcel Service each day, a new job is created at United Parcel.

Let me run that by once again. A recent study found that for every 40 additional international packages delivered by United Parcel Service each day, a new American job is created at United Parcel Service.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I would like to strongly urge the Department of Transportation to grant United Parcel Service the right to serve China. Awarding that right to United Parcel Service will bring competition to the marketplace, provide much needed service in the air cargo market, and provide substantial economic benefits to the United States and its citizens.

INVESTIGATING WACO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE. Mr. Speaker, as we continue in this body with the day-to-day debate over next year's budget, I would like to take a moment to help refocus our attention on an issue that demands the attention and the action of Congress, an issue that is not necessarily pleasant to deal with but one that we must deal with, and that is the role of the Federal law enforcement and the military in the Waco tragedy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues an article written by George Nourse, who is a sheriff of Canyon County in my State of Idaho. This article is about the outstanding and relentless work of the Texas Rangers in seeking justice in the Waco tragedy and is appropriately entitled, quote, “Spin is Not an Investigation,” end quote.

Mr. Speaker, I will read only a portion of this article and would submit the remainder of the article to be included in the RECORD.

It is imperative that we investigate what went wrong in Waco and that we consider the view of those who know how to do it right, the many dedicated and honest law enforcement officials throughout this great country. In commenting on how Washington works when it comes to investigations, Sheriff Nourse, in his article, profoundly states, quote, “Washington does not investigate. It spins. The spin in Waco was to demonize the people who were killed. The Feds killed more people at Waco than all the school violence and wacko shootings added together over the last 6 years. Seventeen of the 24 Waco children were under the age of 10. Think about it.”

He wrote, “The terror! The pain and confusion those young children went

through before they died. However, the media bought Washington's spin, plain and simple," end quote.

Sheriff Nourse contrasts the Federal spin with the real investigation by the Texas Rangers in pointing out the following: He said, "The investigation by the Texas Rangers is not spin. A dozen spent rifle cartridges preferred by sharpshooters, as well as the FBI and ATF, were found in a house near the Davidians' compound that was occupied by Federal agents during that stand-off. Both agencies denied firing a single round during that stand-off that followed the initial attack."

Mr. Speaker, Sheriff Nourse also asked the puzzling question that every single county sheriff must grapple with. He wrote, "The question that really bothers me is how did the Federal Government take over such an operation? And why the total absence of local law enforcement on the scene? And what was the local sheriff doing while all of this was going on?"

Sheriff Nourse continued, "I have never been told this part of the story and it deeply worries me. I know what my position would be here in Canyon County and I am more than a little concerned as to what that might lead to."

Finally, Mr. Speaker, Sheriff Nourse, who has himself participated in numerous law enforcement activities, makes an observation that dumbounds us all. States Nourse, "Think about it. Law enforcement officers shooting fully automatic weapons at a building knowing there are 24 small children inside. That is not law enforcement," the sheriff writes. "It is an act of war at its worst."

Mr. Speaker, I again urge my colleagues to join me in seeking hearings on this tragic epic in American history. We must get to the bottom of why the Federal Government waived the Posse Comitatus Act and involved the military in this domestic law enforcement action. This is a decision that could only have been made at the very top levels of government and we must find out who exactly made that decision at that top level.

Outstanding Americans such as Sheriff Nourse are demanding answers to these questions. We must join him. Let us not make this same tragic mistake, as Federal law enforcement, by spinning instead of conducting real bona fide investigations.

THE SHINING STAR: SPIN IS NOT AN INVESTIGATION!

(By Sheriff George Nourse)

Janet Reno's Whacky War on Waco is back in the news. And Washington D.C. is gearing up to give it a second coat of whitewash.

Democrat Henry Waxman is leading the defense, saying the Republicans just overlooked the evidence that the F.B.I. shot incendiary devices into the Davidians' compound. It was not a cover-up? This, of course, conflicts with Janet Reno's statement that the F.B.I. assured her no incendiary devices were used.

Washington doesn't investigate. It spins! The spin in Waco was to demonize the people

who were killed. (Demonizing people was the tactic used to justify the killing of innocent people as witches in our early history.) The feds killed more people at Waco than all the school violence and wacko shootings added together over the last six years. Seventeen of the 24 Waco children were under the age of ten. Think about it! The terror! The screaming and confusion those people went through before they died. Compare how the national news media beat us over the head with all the lurid details of Columbine, and the absence of such details at Waco. The media bought Washington's spin, plain and simple.

My hat is off to the chief of the Texas Rangers. After 6 years the truth about the Waco War may come out. But don't bet on it; the Washington spin machine is hard at work.

The investigation by the Texas Rangers is not spin! A dozen spent rifle cartridges preferred by sharpshooters, as well as the F.B.I. and A.T.F., were found in a house near the Davidians' compound that was occupied by federal agents during the stand-off. Both agencies denied firing a single round during the stand-off that followed the initial attack.

The reason I call it the "Waco War" is because the mentality used by the A.T.F. and F.B.I. was identical to the mentality used in fighting a war. They certainly were not there to solve a social problem in the sense local law enforcement applies. The question that really bothers me is, How did the federal government take over such an operation? And, Why the total absence of local law enforcement on the scene? What was the local sheriff doing while all of this was going on?

I have never been told this part of the story, and it deeply worries me. I know what my position would be here in Canyon County. And I'm more than a little concerned as to what that might lead to.

Think about it! Law enforcement officers shooting fully automatic weapons at a building, knowing there are 24 small children inside. This is not law enforcement! It is an act of war at its worst.

Reflect on what happened in the local law enforcement agency involved with Rodney King: officers caught on video hitting King with night sticks. King was high on P.C.P., and led officers on a high-speed chase that threatened the lives of anyone in his path. King wasn't killed. In fact, he wasn't even hospitalized.

Result? King got \$1,000,000; two police officers went to prison; and the police chief got fired. Compare this to Waco, and you come up with a huge credibility gap.

If the American people are counting on Detective Janet Reno for answers on Waco, they should know by now she can't detect a giraffe in a band of sheep! It's all a spin!

#### □ 1900

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOKSEY). 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 Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF WALTER PAYTON

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a tremendous American, a great individual who was known perhaps best for being an outstanding football player. I guess he was, indeed, an outstanding football player, Walter Payton, who broke every record, set every record at the position which he played.

Chicago is a great football town. For many years, our football fortunes were not where we wanted them to be. There was not much to cheer about. There was not much to bring the people out. But then, from a small historically black college came Walter Payton, a college that not many people necessarily knew about, had heard about, Jackson State. Here comes a young man with the grace and finesse of a wizard, one who could sneak and weave through lines no matter what the linemen looked like.

While Walter set all of these records and we talk about his greatness as an athlete, if one ever had an opportunity to interact with him, to see him up close, to know the man, to talk with him, to understand him, then one saw much more than an athlete. One saw much more than a football player. One saw a role model. One saw a humanness that existed. One saw just a good solid human being. Walter was well coached and was ready for the National Football League when he came.

I always felt a tremendous sense of pride in his accomplishments because I, too, attended one of the historically black colleges or universities. We were in the same conference, and I must confess that Jackson State usually beat the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff more than we beat them.

But also in that conference was Alcorn University, Grambling, Southern, Texas Southern, Prairie View, sometimes Wiley College, sometimes Bishop, sometimes Mississippi Valley.

The real point is this is an opportunity to highlight the contributions of historically black colleges and universities, not only academically, not only athletically, but in a total sense of what they meant.

Walter died needing an organ transplant. This is also an opportunity to urge all Americans who are able to participate in organ donation programs to help give and sustain life to those who might need an organ, especially if ours is no longer going to be useful to us.

So, Walter, even in your death, you win out victorious because you raised the question, you raised an issue, and you helped America understand the need for a program, an organ donation program and policies which will assure that, when people need organs, they are in fact available. You will be in the other Hall of Fame. Rest easy.