

\$500 million, not including court costs, taking R&D dollars out of the system. Reform is needed to prevent individuals from manipulating the system at great costs to others who are investing in research and innovation.

The U.S. should promote industries and sectors of our economy that provide the U.S. with the greatest relative competitive advantage in the global marketplace. The U.S. is a leader in research, innovation, and the development of intellectual property, but this advantage could be jeopardized if U.S. patent law is not reformed to create a level playing field with our competitors. U.S. patent law should be reformed to ensure that our businesses and researchers are well positioned to compete in the global economy today and into the future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1907, as amended.

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

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceeding on this motion will be postponed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT ON H.R. 1905, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 7(c) of House rule XX, I hereby notify the House of my intention tomorrow to offer the following motion to instruct House conferees on H.R. 1905, making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TOOMEY moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendments to the bill H.R. 1905 be instructed to insist upon—

(1) the House provisions for the funding of the House of Representatives under title I of the bill;

(2) the Senate amendment for the funding of the Senate under title I of the bill, including funding provided under the heading "JOINT ITEMS—ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL—Capitol Buildings and Grounds—senate office buildings";

(3) the House provisions for the funding of Joint Items under title I of the bill, other than the funding provided under the heading "JOINT ITEMS—ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL—Capitol Buildings and Grounds—senate office buildings"; and

(4) the House version of title II of the bill.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. NORTHUP). 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### VACATION OF SPECIAL ORDER AND GRANTING OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. DELAY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the time allotted to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) and take it myself.

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

There was no objection.

#### PRESIDENT IS REWRITING HISTORY

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

Mr. DELAY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to set the record straight. The President of the United States was in Chicago today taking all kinds of credit for the successes of the Welfare Reform Act that was passed by this Congress and signed by the President.

This President has taken a lot of credit for a lot of things over the last few years, particularly over the years that the Republicans had maintained a majority of this Congress. Frankly, Madam Speaker, I have had just enough.

This President, Madam Speaker, has not initiated one thing, one piece of legislation that he takes credit for.

□ 2230

I will grant him that he finally signed many of the pieces of the legislation, but he has not lifted one finger to pass any of this legislation that he takes credit for through this Congress.

There should be no mistake about it, the well-documented success of welfare reform is the work of the Republican majority in this Congress. Back in 1994, Republicans campaigned on a plan that included comprehensive welfare reform. The Contract With America put Republicans in control of Congress, and we delivered on our agenda.

History should not be rewritten. The President and the Democrats in Congress fought Republicans tooth and

nailed on welfare reform. And, frankly, Madam Speaker, the debate was not very civil. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle charged that Republicans wanted to kick desperate people out on the street to fend for themselves. Our opponents on welfare reform screamed that the Republicans would be responsible for countless starving people in this country. Our opponents maintained that reforming welfare would create an unmitigated social disaster.

Well, it is time to set the record straight. Americans are not starving due to the Republican insistence for welfare reform. Americans are not sleeping on park benches due to Republican insistence on welfare reform. And without question, there have been no social upheavals of any kind as a result of the Republicans' insistence to reform welfare.

In fact, quite the opposite is true. The results of Republican welfare reform have been so incredible that President Clinton has typically been taking credit for the success, despite the fact that he vetoed welfare reform twice before reluctantly signing it into law. That is right, President Clinton vetoed welfare reform not once but twice, and now he is trumpeting the success on his own and traveling around the country claiming all this success as being his success, his idea, his initiative.

Well, this tactic is nothing new. We are used to it. We have been used to it for 4½ years now. Republicans are accustomed to working hard to initiate commonsense reforms that the Democrats oppose only to watch Democrats adopt these ideas after they succeed. Democrats even tried to take credit for the budget surplus, even though everyone knows that it was the Republicans in Congress who rammed the balanced budget agreement through 2 years ago.

But the American people know better. The American people understand what separates the Republican philosophy from the Democrat philosophy. The Republican philosophy wants the government to do more with less. The Republican philosophy seeks to empower communities with more local control by freeing them from the restraints of big government spending in Washington. And the Republican philosophy places ultimate trust in the individual, who, in most cases, will succeed if he is cut free from the chain of dependence.

This stands in stark contrast to the big government philosophy of the liberal Democrats. They do not trust the strength and dedication of the average American. The Democrats do not think that individuals can succeed without the government holding their hands all throughout their life.

Well, the record speaks for itself, Madam Speaker. In the 3 years since welfare reform was passed, over 12 million Americans have moved from welfare to work. That is 12 million Americans who have moved from dependency

and despondency to independence and dignity.

By December of last year, welfare rolls had dropped by 45 percent. And that is a national average. Many of the States have much higher success rates. For example, caseloads are down by 81 percent in Idaho and over 70 percent in Wisconsin. And this is very important. Child poverty rates and overall poverty rates have declined every year since welfare was reformed. Beyond any doubt, these facts show that hope for those on welfare is found in more personal responsibility not more government bureaucracy.

So, Madam Speaker, the spirit of the American people is based on the freedom that comes from hard work and combating the odds. From the beginning of this Nation, Americans of all walks of life have fought uphill battles and won. The Republicans in Congress believe in the American spirit, and that is why we fought so hard to reform welfare reform and we should have the credit.

The President has no right to take credit. When the going gets tough, the tough get going, and the Republican Congress is responsible for welfare reform, not the President of the United States.

#### REVISING HISTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. NORTHUP). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I was constrained to rise and respond to my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY). The gentleman revises history. On a normal night, perhaps no one would rise to say that it was revisionist history at best, or at worst, depending upon one's perspective.

In 1992, Bill Clinton ran for President of the United States, and he put forward a document called The New Covenant. Not a contract on America, a new covenant, a new promise, a new commitment, a new cooperation, a new working arrangement with America. And in that new covenant he said that, yes, we expect government to do good things for people.

Government, in my perspective, is our community at large trying to work together trying to make lives better. But in that new covenant, that my Republican friends so quickly forget, I am sure, Bill Clinton said that we need to expect of each American personal responsibility; that they will commit themselves to use their best talents to enhance their own lives because that, in turn, would enhance the lives of our community, if each and every one of us carried our share of the load.

It was the President, in 1992, who said that personal responsibility ought to be a key word for America's revival. America heard that, and America elected him. And in that new covenant as well, when he talked about personal

responsibility, he said we need welfare reform. I guess the Republicans forget that.

They chuckle, Madam Speaker, but I will remind my colleagues of some history, for those who were not here, when every Democrat voted for a welfare reform bill sponsored by NATHAN DEAL. Does that name ring a bell? He was a Democrat at that time, but he had a bill that we worked on that demanded personal responsibility; the expectation that if we could, we would be expected to work, because the work ethic is critical to the success of a family, of a community, and of a society. That bill did not become law, but we had other bills.

Now, my colleagues, how many times have we all heard it complained, oh, if the President would only let us do this, we could have done great things? They know that they could not possibly have overridden the veto of the President of the United States. If he had not been committed, and if he had not led the fight for welfare reform, the Republicans could not have done it. And they know that. Period.

My friend, the majority whip, likes to say we did it, we get the credit. Very frankly, everybody in this House deserves the credit, and Americans deserve the credit, and governors deserve the credit, and State legislators deserve the credit. Why? Because we all perceived that there was a system that existed which did not encourage and have the expectation of work. But for the fact that Bill Clinton was president and led that effort, it would not have happened because he could have vetoed it. And all of my colleagues know that his veto would have been sustained because there were more than 146 Democrats in this House and more than 40 Democrats in the United States Senate.

Now, let me go on to balancing the budget. Frankly, my colleagues, what the Republican Party has been responsible for since I have been in Congress, since 1981, is the gargantuan deficits and debt that confronts our country. Period. Why? Because Ronald Reagan and George Bush proposed in their budgets those deficits.

Now, my Republican colleagues may say it is absurd that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) would say that. Well, look at the budgets. Presidents Reagan and Bush asked for more spending in those 12 years than the Congress appropriated. Now, if they did, obviously they planned for those deficits.

Now, were the priorities slightly different? They were. But the fact of the matter is Ronald Reagan never vetoed a bill for spending too much that was not sustained by the Congress. In other words, not a nickel could have been spent in this country that Ronald Reagan did not put his signature on. Not a nickel.

So the budget balancing came at the hands of Bill Clinton, when for 7 years in a row now the budget deficit has de-

creased, for the first time in this century.

#### ALL THE ARROWS ARE DOWN

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Madam Speaker, I keep a board in my office that lists the cash prices of the major commodities grown in my home State of Kansas. An arrow next to the price indicates whether the price is up or down, and for too long now, and for more days than not, all the arrows are down.

Prices for all our major commodities grown in the State of Kansas are at historic lows. The wheat crop in Kansas is worth \$500 million less this year than last, and prices for corn, soybeans, and milo paint a similar picture for the fall crops. The prices for beef and pork are depressed as well. And behind these numbers are real people. Every day, farmers and ranchers are being forced out of business and off the farm and ranch never to return.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the statements made on Friday about the crisis in agriculture and the call upon President Clinton to work with Congress to provide relief soon. I could not agree more. We need to do something and we need to do something now.

On July 21, I introduced H.R. 2568, the Market Loss Assistance Act. H.R. 2568 would provide supplemental farm income program payments equal to 75 percent of a producer's 1999 payment under the Agricultural Market Transition Act. This is the same mechanism that Congress used last year to provide emergency relief to farm country. Today, the need is greater and more urgent than it was a year ago.

I hope the House will honor my request to consider H.R. 2568 or other disaster relief before Congress goes home for the August recess. Our farm and ranch constituents are counting on us to do the right thing and to do it sooner rather than later. Farmers need assurance that Congress and this administration will respond to the crisis. Otherwise we will lose another generation of family farmers and rural America will continue its difficult struggle.

Over the long haul there are many things that Congress can and must do to get the price arrows up on the chart and pointed in the right direction. We need to open new markets and expand trade opportunities for U.S. producers. We need a farm policy that preserves flexibility and provides price protection. We need adequate risk management tools and research that enhances our competitiveness. But these are all long-term solutions to a near-term crisis.

H.R. 2568 can get assistance to farm country immediately. I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation. The time to respond is now, not later.