

it will do seniors and the rest of us. He is proposing this to play politics, to try to thwart tax cuts, and try to have a bigger, more powerful government.

RETURN THE BUDGET SURPLUS TO THE PEOPLE IT BELONGS TO

(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, government or the people; that is the question. Should the projected budget surpluses be kept in Washington, D.C., or should it be returned to the people it belongs to?

On the liberal side of the aisle, they say, trust politicians. We won't spend it. We'll invest it wisely for you.

On the conservative side of the aisle, we look at human nature. All of our history, and especially the track record of these very same people making these promises and we say, nice try. Let's give it back to the taxpayers before politicians in Washington spend it.

The idea that the same people who blocked Ronald Reagan's attempts at cutting spending and then blamed Reagan for budget deficits, the same people who call Republicans extremists every time we try to cut spending, the same people who become hysterical every time Republicans insist on fiscal discipline are now asking us to trust they will not spend the budget surplus. I find that completely absurd, and in any case, that money belongs to the people, not to the government.

THREE THINGS WE HAVE TO DO WITH THE SURPLUS

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, we now have a surplus for the first time since 1969, and there are two reasons for this: number one, Congress has brought in the rein on spending; but number two, and more importantly, hard-working Americans have worked their tails off, and tax revenues have increased as a result of it.

I believe there are three things we need to do with that surplus and there are three things that the Republican bill did do last week.

Number one, protected and preserved Social Security and Medicare. This bill set aside \$1.9 trillion in Social Security and Medicare and used a lockbox device. Keep in mind the President not only wanted to preserve 62 percent of Social Security, the Republican bill preserves 100 percent.

The number two thing this bill does is pays down the debt. For 40 years, liberal Washington spending programs have given us a \$5.4 trillion debt. This bill pays it down by over \$2 trillion.

And then number three, it gives Americans their refund for overcharge on the government. It gives 792 billion

in tax relief, and as liberal Senator BOB KERREY says, it is not reckless; it is not irresponsible when you are looking at the surpluses that we are.

I hope that the demagoguery in Washington will stop and we can pass this very important bill for the sake of Social Security, Medicare, and the debt.

STOP THEM BEFORE THEY SPEND AGAIN

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, it is a rather interesting argument that the Republicans make so that they can pass their tax bill to give the vast majority of its benefits to the wealthiest people in this country, and that is they must give the money to the wealthy so that the Congress will not spend the money. It is interesting because there can be no expenditures of that money without Republican votes.

Last time I looked this morning, the Republicans controlled the Senate and the Republicans controlled the House, but they keep saying, You have to stop me before I spend again. It is the Republicans' Committee on Appropriations that is coming up with phony emergencies. They now want to say that the census was an emergency. We could not predict it, we could not see it, we did not know it was coming. That is funny; it has come every 10 years. For the last 200 years of this country we have had a census in this country, but somehow now it is an emergency spending so that they can break the caps, so they can spend the surplus supposedly there for Social Security. Every day now they are dipping into the Social Security Trust Fund to spend more and more money.

So the Republicans are saying, You got to give a tax cut to the wealthiest people, otherwise they will spend the money. Sort of like the son of Sam who was saying, Stop me before I kill again.

Stop them before they spend again.

ABOLISH DOE

(Mr. ROYCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, \$30,000 should be enough to purchase a nice car or make a down payment on a house or pay for a couple of years of college, but \$30,000 should not be enough to buy a \$9 million supercomputer especially when the technology has the potential to be exported for nuclear weapons research. But that is exactly what the Department of Energy has allowed to happen, and when the DOE officials realized their mistake, they scrambled to buy the computer back for three times the sales price.

Now this just does not compute.

The Department has proven time and time again that it does not put a pre-

mium on national security, and that is why I have introduced my bill, H.R. 2411, which would eliminate this multi-billion-dollar bureaucracy with confused missions and questionable priorities. Frankly, these are responsibilities that should be handled again by the Department of Defense. We should abolish this agency.

It is time we stopped the Department of Energy from turning our national labs into garage sales. I urge my colleagues to take a closer look at this risk to America's national security interests.

TRADE POLICY TOWARD THE COMMUNIST REGIME IN CHINA

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

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, in a few brief minutes this House will consider the issue of what trade policy we shall have towards the Communist regime in China.

□ 1030

It is a bipartisan issue. It is an issue in which there are some Republicans on one side and some Republicans on the other; some Democrats on one side, some Democrats on the other.

I would ask the American people to pay close attention to the debate that we will have on this issue. This debate will determine whether or not this country is remaining true to its principles as stated by our Founding Fathers; whether or not that is indeed our highest value, that freedom and democracy and human rights remain the highest value for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, if we are not committed to those fundamental principles, we will lose in the end, because not only will we not prosper, but our country will be put in jeopardy, our national security will be compromised. This, perhaps, is one of the most important issues that we will discuss this year, and I would hope that the American people pay close attention to the upcoming debate.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the pending business is the question of agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. McNULTY. 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 352, nays 53, answered “present” 1, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 337]

YEAS—352

Ackerman	Ehrlich	LaTourette
Allen	Emerson	Lazio
Andrews	Engel	Leach
Archer	Eshoo	Lee
Bachus	Etheridge	Levin
Baker	Evans	Lewis (CA)
Baldacci	Everett	Lewis (GA)
Baldwin	Ewing	Lewis (KY)
Ballenger	Farr	Linder
Barcia	Fletcher	Lipinski
Barr	Foley	Lofgren
Barrett (NE)	Forbes	Lowey
Barrett (WI)	Fossella	Lucas (KY)
Bartlett	Frank (MA)	Lucas (OK)
Barton	Franks (NJ)	Luther
Bass	Frelinghuysen	Maloney (CT)
Bateman	Frost	Maloney (NY)
Becerra	Gallegly	Manzullo
Bentsen	Ganske	Martinez
Berkley	Gejdenson	Mascara
Berman	Gekas	Matsui
Berry	Gibbons	McCarthy (MO)
Biggart	Gilchrest	McCarthy (NY)
Bilirakis	Gillmor	McCollum
Bishop	Gilman	McCrery
Blagojevich	Gonzalez	McHugh
Bliley	Goode	McInnis
Blumenauer	Goodlatte	McIntosh
Blunt	Goodling	McIntyre
Boehlert	Goss	McKeon
Boehner	Graham	McKinney
Bonilla	Granger	Meehan
Bonior	Green (TX)	Meeks (NY)
Bono	Green (WI)	Menendez
Boswell	Hall (OH)	Metcalfe
Boucher	Hall (TX)	Mica
Boyd	Hansen	Millender-McDonald
Brady (PA)	Hastings (FL)	Miller (FL)
Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Miller, Gary
Bryant	Hayes	Minge
Burr	Hayworth	Mink
Buyer	Herger	Moakley
Callahan	Hill (IN)	Mollohan
Calvert	Hinojosa	Moore
Camp	Hobson	Moran (VA)
Canady	Hoeffel	Morella
Cannon	Hoekstra	Murtha
Capps	Holden	Myrick
Capuano	Holt	Nadler
Cardin	Hooley	Napolitano
Carson	Horn	Nethercutt
Castle	Hostettler	Ney
Chabot	Houghton	Northup
Chambliss	Hoyer	Norwood
Clayton	Hulshof	Nussle
Clement	Hunter	Obey
Coble	Hyde	Oliver
Coburn	Inslee	Ortiz
Combust	Isakson	Ose
Condit	Istook	Owens
Conyers	Jackson (IL)	Oxley
Cook	Jackson-Lee	Packard
Cooksey	(TX)	Pascarell
Cox	Jefferson	Paul
Coyne	Jenkins	Payne
Crowley	John	Pease
Cubin	Johnson (CT)	Pelosi
Cummings	Johnson, Sam	Petri
Cunningham	Jones (NC)	Phelps
Danner	Jones (OH)	Pickering
Davis (IL)	Kanjorski	Pitts
Davis (VA)	Kaptur	Pombo
Deal	Kasich	Pomeroy
DeGette	Kelly	Porter
Delahunt	Kennedy	Portman
DeLauro	Kildee	Price (NC)
DeLay	Kind (WI)	Quinn
DeMint	King (NY)	Radanovich
Diaz-Balart	Kingston	Rahall
Dickey	Klecza	Rangel
Dicks	Klink	Regula
Dingell	Knollnerberg	Reyes
Dixon	Kolbe	Reynolds
Doggett	Kuykendall	Rivers
Dooley	LaFalce	Rodriguez
Doolittle	LaHood	Roemer
Doyle	Lampson	Rogan
Dreier	Lantos	Rogers
Duncan	Largent	Rohrabacher
Dunn	Larson	Ros-Lehtinen
Ehlers	Latham	

Rothman	Simpson	Tiaht
Roukema	Sisisky	Tierney
Roybal-Allard	Skeen	Toomey
Royce	Skelton	Towns
Rush	Slaughter	Traficant
Ryan (WI)	Smith (MI)	Turner
Ryun (KS)	Smith (NJ)	Udall (CO)
Salmon	Smith (TX)	Upton
Sanchez	Smith (WA)	Velazquez
Sanders	Souder	Vento
Sandlin	Spence	Vitter
Sawyer	Spratt	Walden
Saxton	Stabenow	Walsh
Scarborough	Stearns	Wamp
Schakowsky	Stenholm	Watt (NC)
Scott	Stump	Watts (OK)
Sensenbrenner	Sununu	Waxman
Serrano	Talent	Weiner
Sessions	Tanner	Weldon (FL)
Shadegg	Tauscher	Wexler
Shaw	Tauzin	Weygand
Shays	Taylor (NC)	Whitfield
Sherman	Terry	Wilson
Sherwood	Thomas	Woolsey
Shimkus	Thornberry	Wu
Shows	Thune	Wynn
Shuster	Thurman	Young (FL)

NAYS—53

Aderholt	Hefley	Riley
Baird	Hill (MT)	Sabo
Bilbray	Hilleary	Sanford
Borski	Hilliard	Schaffer
Brown (FL)	Hutchinson	Stark
Brown (OH)	Johnson, E. B.	Strickland
Clay	Kucinich	Stupak
Clyburn	LoBiondo	Sweeney
Costello	Markey	Taylor (MS)
Crane	McGovern	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	McNulty	Thompson (MS)
English	Miller, George	Udall (NM)
Fattah	Moran (KS)	Visclosky
Filner	Neal	Waters
Ford	Pallone	Weller
Gephardt	Pastor	Wicker
Gutierrez	Peterson (MN)	Wolf
Gutknecht	Ramstad	

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Tancredo

NOT VOTING—27

Abercrombie	Deutsch	Oberstar
Armey	Edwards	Peterson (PA)
Bereuter	Fowler	Pickett
Burton	Gordon	Pryce (OH)
Campbell	Greenwood	Snyder
Chenoweth	Hinchey	Watkins
Collins	Kilpatrick	Weldon (PA)
Cramer	McDermott	Wise
Davis (FL)	Meek (FL)	Young (AK)

□ 1051

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall No. 337 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been here I would have voted “yea.”

DISAPPROVING EXTENSION OF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT TO PRODUCTS OF PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the previous order of the House, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 57) disapproving the extension of non-discriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the products of the People's Republic of China, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of H.J. Res. 57 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 57

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in

Congress assembled, That the Congress does not approve the extension of the authority contained in section 402(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 recommended by the President to the Congress on June 3, 1999, with respect to the People's Republic of China.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 22, 1999, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) and a Member in support of the joint resolution each will control 1½ hours.

Is the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) in favor of the joint resolution?

Mr. STARK. I am in favor of the joint resolution, Mr. Speaker.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) will state his inquiry.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, if all of these Members who are controlling time favor normal trade relations for China, I would ask unanimous consent to control half of the time on this side in opposition to normal trade relations for China.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise the gentleman from Ohio that the time has already been divided, half in favor and half opposed to the joint resolution.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on House Joint Resolution 57.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield one-half of my time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) in opposition to the joint resolution, and that he be permitted to yield further blocks of time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to yield half of my time in support of the joint resolution to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), and that in turn, he be allowed to yield blocks of that time so yielded.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of July 22 and the unanimous consent agreement of today, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK), the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) each will be recognized for 45 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER).