

is how Republicans propose to secure America's future.

PROTECT SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Speaker, last weekend I was back home in our district for the third time since being sworn in just a month ago, and I attended our senior lobby day and one question was on the lips of every senior there: What are you going to do to protect Social Security, and will you protect it for my children?

The President's budget has answered that question yes. Yes, we will protect Social Security. We will do so in a common sense way. We will set aside the surplus to protect Social Security, to protect Medicare, and to invest in our future. It is the right thing to do, it is the common sense thing to do, and it is what the American people and the people of my district of southwest Washington want us to do.

Madam Speaker, when this debate moves forward on how we will spend that surplus, I urge my colleagues and friends here, do the right thing. Protect Social Security for our current seniors and for our future generations.

□ 1045

REPUBLICANS WANT AMERICANS TO KEEP MORE OF THEIR HARD-EARNED MONEY, DEMOCRATS WANT MORE BIG GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. MANZULLO. Madam Speaker, the issue is very simple. We want, on the Republican side, to allow Americans to keep more of their hard-earned dollars. The Democrats want to increase the size of government.

Let me say that again so the message is clear. On the Republican side, we want the American people to keep more of their hard-earned dollars through tax cuts. On the Democratic side, they want to increase the size of government.

Let me say it again so the message is loud and clear. On the Republican side, we want the American workers to keep more of their hard-earned dollars through tax cuts. The Democrats want to spend more of our money.

Let me say it a fourth time, or do I have to? Who do we trust? Do we trust big government to spend our money, or do we trust yourself to spend more of our money through tax cuts?

THE DEMOCRAT PLAN WILL PROTECT SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE

(Mrs. NAPOLITANO asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, we all of us here in Congress must speak out very loudly and very clearly about protecting the very foundations of our Nation's retirement security. Democrats say save the surplus to protect social security and Medicare.

Our Republican colleagues' rhetoric has frightened a whole generation of American people to such an extent that they fear it will not be there when they retire. I am one of them. But the Democratic plan will keep our economic engine running and competitive while maintaining fiscal discipline, and ensuring that social security and Medicare will absolutely be there to protect every American family.

Republicans want to leave over 45 million middle class families out in the cold with their tax cuts for the wealthy, with their tax plan. But the average annual cut for 60 percent of regular American taxpayers would be a measly \$100. Compare that to \$20,000 for those earning over \$300,000 and we will see who will be shortchanged.

The Republican tax cut plan is unfair. Let us use the surplus for everyone.

THE SURPLUS SHOULD BE SPENT IN PAYING DOWN THE NATIONAL DEBT

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

Mr. METCALF. Madam Speaker, there is a lot of talk about the surplus. Everybody has ideas on how to spend the surplus. Fortunately, saving social security is high on every list, as well as tax cuts.

There is another necessity, paying down the national debt. We do not hear much about paying down the national debt. It is a lot more fun to spend money. But the interest on the present debt is \$300 billion a year. As we pay down the debt, interest payments will decrease, which means more money for the real needs of government.

Let us put paying down the debt high on our priority list.

DEMOCRAT PLAN WILL SAVE SOCIAL SECURITY, MEDICARE, AND PROVIDE TARGETED TAX CUTS TO MIDDLE CLASS AMERICANS

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

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, for the first time in three decades the Federal Government has a surplus. The debate: what to do with it. Today Democrats want to use the historic \$70 billion surplus to save social security, save Medicare, and to provide targeted tax cuts to middle class families.

Republicans want to give a one-time tax break that mostly benefits the

wealthy. The Republican tax plan is unfair and it is ill-advised. A 10 percent tax cut is a plan that is skewed to the wealthy. If Republicans get their way, 60 percent of Americans, the middle class backbone of this country, will get a tax rebate of only \$100, while the wealthy, those making over \$300,000, will get a \$20,000 tax break.

Let us take this opportunity to help people. Let us save social security and Medicare. Let us look at those targeted tax cuts, like a tax cut for long-term health care, school modernization, child care, for stay-at-home parents, those that directly benefit working middle class families. Let us not squander this once-in-a-lifetime opportunity.

LET US KEEP OUR SENIOR CITIZENS FROM POVERTY AND SUPPORT SOCIAL SECURITY

(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. Madam Speaker, before the implementation of social security, so many of our senior citizens in America simply died in poverty. Let me make myself perfectly clear. Before we had social security, so many of our senior citizens died in poverty. Yet, our Republican friends choose to give away tax dollars, if you will, without realizing the importance of saving social security as the most successful anti-poverty legislation ever passed into law by Congress.

Social security is not broken. For millions of Americans, it is the only means of sustenance that is available to them. For millions of others, it is a necessary supplement to their pension plans and retirement funds. Without social security, I have no doubt that the life of older Americans and the disabled will be stark and unforgiving.

That is why we must reinvest our budget surplus into social security, to make sure they will be there for our future. Under the President's budget for the next fiscal year, we will take 62 percent of our budget surplus and put it back into social security, helping extend the life of the program decades beyond 2032.

Madam Speaker, let us take our senior citizens out of poverty and support the continuation of social security.

THE PRESIDENT CANNOT HAVE IT BOTH WAYS

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

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, last year in the President's proposed budget, he proposed saving all surpluses in the future for social security. Then he went on in his proposal and had enough new spending to eliminate all surpluses.

The President cannot have it both ways. This year he is proposing 62 percent of future surpluses for social security, and everybody is applauding that;

15 percent of surpluses to save Medicare, and many are applauding that. Then he went on with a spending plan that would take 75 to 80 percent of proposed surpluses and spend them.

When we add that up, that is 150 to 160 percent. The President cannot have it both ways. If he is serious about saving social security and Medicare, he cannot have all of these new spending programs that will eliminate all surpluses that will allow us to fix social security and Medicare.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of 15 U.S.C. 1024(a), the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Joint Economic Committee:

Mr. SAXTON of New Jersey.
There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that she will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Such rollcall vote, if postponed, will be taken later in the day.

EXTENDING THE AVIATION WAR RISK INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 98) to amend chapter 443 of title 49, United States Code, to extend the aviation war risk insurance program, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 98

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF INSURANCE PROGRAM.

Section 44310 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking "March 31, 1999" and inserting "December 31, 2003".

SEC. 2. CENTENNIAL OF FLIGHT COMMISSION.

(a) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) APPOINTMENT.—Section 4(a)(5) of the Centennial of Flight Commemoration Act (36 U.S.C. 143 note; 112 Stat. 3487) is amended by inserting ", or his designee," after "prominence".

(2) STATUS.—Section 4 of such Act (112 Stat. 3487) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(g) STATUS.—The members of the Commission described in paragraphs (1), (3), (4), and (5) of subsection (a) shall not be considered to be officers or employees of the United States.".

(b) DUTIES.—Section 5(a)(7) of such Act (112 Stat. 3488) is amended to read as follows:

"(7) as a nonprimary purpose, publish popular and scholarly works related to the his-

tory of aviation or the anniversary of the centennial of powered flight.".

(c) CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.—Section 6 of such Act (112 Stat. 3488-3489) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(e) CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.—At its second business meeting, the Commission shall adopt a policy to protect against possible conflicts of interest involving its members and employees. The Commission shall consult with the Office of Government Ethics in the development of such a policy and shall recognize the status accorded its members under section 4(g).".

(d) EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.—The first sentence of section 7(a) of such Act (112 Stat. 3489) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: "or represented on the First Flight Centennial Advisory Board under subparagraphs (A) through (E) of section 12(b)(1).".

(e) EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO NAME, LOGOS, EMBLEMS, SEALS, AND MARKS.—

(1) USE OF FUNDS.—Section 9(d) of such Act (112 Stat. 3490) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: ", except that the Commission may transfer any portion of such funds that is in excess of the funds necessary to carry out such duties to any Federal agency or the National Air and Space Museum of the Smithsonian Institution to be used for the sole purpose of commemorating the history of aviation or the centennial of powered flight.".

(2) DUTIES TO BE CARRIED OUT BY ADMINISTRATOR OF NASA.—Section 9 of such Act (112 Stat. 3490) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(f) DUTIES TO BE CARRIED OUT BY ADMINISTRATOR OF NASA.—The duties of the Commission under this section shall be carried out by the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, in consultation with the Commission.".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, in the last Congress the war risk insurance program was reauthorized only through March 31 of this year, so we must move quickly to reauthorize a program which has been operating successfully for over 47 years. This bill would reauthorize the war risk insurance program through December 31, 2003.

It is essential that we do this because commercial insurance companies usually will not insure flights into high-risk areas, such as countries at war or on the verge of war. In many cases, the flights into these dangerous situations are required to further United States' foreign policy or national security objectives.

Commercial airlines have been used in such operations as Desert Shield, Desert Storm, and other conflicts to ferry troops and equipment. Without this war risk program, the commercial airlines would not have flown these dangerous military flights.

In addition, the provision has been added that amends the Centennial of Flight Commemoration Act as passed last year. This provision is a technical

amendment that corrects deficiencies in the act. The provision cures minor technical deficiencies in the war risk insurance program. It is indeed a very important part of our military support system, and I strongly urge passage of this bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 98, a bill to extend the Department of Transportation's aviation war risk insurance program. The war risk insurance program, which was created in 1951, has operated successfully to serve the foreign policy interests of the United States during the difficult times of war.

Commercial insurance companies usually will not insure commercial airline flights to high-risk areas, such as countries at war or on the verge of war. The aviation war risk insurance program provides insurance to commercial airlines for such high-risk flights, which are often needed for national security reasons.

For example, commercial air carriers have transported U.S. troops and supplies during the Vietnam War, the Persian Gulf War, and most recently, the deployment in Bosnia. In fact, since 1975, there have been over 5,000 flights covered by the war risk insurance program.

The bill we are considering today under suspension of the rules, H.R. 98, is a bill to extend the war risk insurance program for 5 years through the year 2003. This is truly a noncontroversial bill. Congress has routinely reauthorized the war risk insurance program in the past.

The Omnibus Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1999 includes a reauthorization of the war risk insurance program, and even modified the program to ensure prompt payment to the airlines in the event of a crash. Unfortunately, the omnibus bill only authorized the war risk insurance program through March 31, 1999.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this noncontroversial bill to authorize the war risk insurance program through the year 2003. We cannot afford to let this program expire. The war risk insurance program has protected U.S. national security interests by addressing the high-risk insurance needs of commercial airlines.

Without the war risk insurance program in place, commercial airlines will not be able to get insurance for high-risk flights and would be reluctant to fly into high-risk areas, even though it would be in the interests of U.S. foreign policy and national security needs.

H.R. 98 has the bipartisan support of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. As an original cosponsor of the bill, I again strongly urge my colleagues to support it. The war risk