

ALLOCATIONS OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES—Continued
[Committees other than Appropriations]

Committee		Budget year					Total 1999–2003
		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	
Commerce Committee:							
Current Law	OT	2,744	3,829	4,366	4,927	5,230	21,096
BA	8,663	10,247	12,263	15,747	16,015	62,935	
OT	5,421	8,351	10,963	16,458	16,942	58,135	
International Relations Committee:							
Current Law	BA	10,924	9,888	9,982	9,557	8,711	49,062
OT	12,162	11,516	10,860	10,415	9,698	54,651	
Government Reform Committee:							
Current Law	BA	57,886	59,661	61,516	63,577	65,822	308,462
OT	56,644	48,365	60,164	62,174	64,396	301,743	
Discretionary Action	BA	0	2	4	4	4	14
OT	0	2	4	4	4	4	14
Total	BA	57,886	59,663	61,520	63,581	65,826	308,476
OT	56,644	58,367	60,168	62,178	64,400	301,757	
Committee on House Administration:							
Current Law	BA	93	90	90	90	93	456
OT	56	262	49	13	57	437	
Resources Committee:							
Current Law	BA	2,296	2,391	2,370	2,319	2,351	11,727
OT	2,253	2,254	2,332	2,205	2,326	11,370	
Judiciary Committee:							
Current Law	BA	4,759	4,548	4,550	4,539	4,631	23,027
OT	4,578	4,371	4,461	4,617	4,622	22,649	
Transportation and Infrastructure Committee:							
Current Law	BA	49,121	48,697	49,721	50,714	51,714	249,967
OT	16,114	16,021	16,026	15,834	15,722	79,717	
Discretionary Action	BA	1,205	2,410	2,410	2,410	2,410	10,845
OT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	BA	50,326	51,107	52,131	53,124	54,124	260,812
OT	16,114	16,021	16,026	15,834	15,722	79,717	
Science Committee:							
Current Law	BA	38	38	35	32	32	175
OT	33	36	36	36	34	175	
Small Business Committee:							
Current Law	BA	–414	0	0	0	0	–414
OT	–585	–156	–140	–125	–110	–110	–1,116
Veterans' Affairs Committee:							
Current Law	BA	1,182	1,144	1,077	990	931	5,324
OT	1,296	1,358	1,331	1,316	1,355	6,656	
Discretionary Action	BA	0	394	874	1,367	1,868	4,503
OT	0	360	833	1,325	1,824	4,342	
Total	BA	1,182	1,538	1,951	2,357	2,799	9,827
OT	1,296	1,718	2,164	2,641	3,179	10,998	
Ways and Means Committee:							
Current Law	BA	671,063	676,265	692,412	705,685	728,575	3,474,000
OT	659,770	666,279	684,407	696,184	721,486	3,428,126	
Reauthorizations	BA	0	0	0	0	19,553	19,553
OT	0	0	0	0	0	17,312	17,312
Discretionary Action	BA	0	–2	0	0	0	–2
OT	0	–2	0	0	0	0	–2
Total	BA	671,063	676,263	692,412	705,685	728,575	3,473,998
OT	659,770	666,277	684,407	696,184	721,486	3,428,124	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON 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 Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

UNITED STATES NEEDS TO FOCUS ON INDONESIA

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, one aspect of livable communities is the global connections that we are facing today as trade interrelates our economies, world peace is affected as one destabilized area can have serious consequences for others, how environmental exploitation has global consequences for us all as we have increasingly destructive capacity in an increasingly smaller world.

There is need for people who care about livable communities to focus on Indonesia, focus across four time zones, over 15,000 islands, and a population of over 210 million people. It is a spectacular, diverse, and extremely vulnerable region. It is one in political transition, moving from three political parties and really no Democratic election in the last 40 years, to approaching over 150 and its first election in two generations this June.

We have seen in East Timor, home of tragic violence, as it was invaded by the Indonesian military 25 years ago, we have seen the death of over 200,000 people in an island that still has only perhaps a population of 800,000 and a situation that cries for a peaceful resolution.

Indonesia is a nation of great financial turmoil today. Less than 2 years ago, it was one of those successful Asian financial tigers, so successful that we were on the verge of withdrawing our aid programs. Today, it is now an economic basket case, with half its population at or below the Indonesian poverty level and virtually not a single solvent financial institution in the entire country.

We have seen long simmering racial, ethnic and religious tensions bubble to the surface, aggravated by the serious economic difficulties that have led to the death of hundreds of its citizens.

Indonesia was the backdrop for the movie "The Year Of Living Dangerously" a third of a century ago when Sukarno lost power to Suharto.

Today, in the post-Suharto era, Indonesia is still living dangerously. We have serious potential for violence even as the ray of hope dawns on East Timor and the government is talking about a potential for independence. Yet at the same time there is pervasive evidence that the military has provided weapons to paramilitary agents on the island, and there could be the potential for bloodshed upon their withdrawal.

There continues to be the potential for violence in Indonesia's urban centers, and there is definitely violence that is being visited upon its ecology as the nation struggles to get economic gain at the expense of its forests, fishing stock, coral reefs and endangered species.

I sincerely hope that my colleagues will put Indonesia on the radar screen. It will be on the radar screen for the administration and for the American public. It is time for the United States to take a strong and aggressive action to help resolve the situation in East Timor so that the potential news of the military withdrawal is not an open invitation for greater bloodshed against the Timorees.

It is important that our Secretary of State, who is due to visit Indonesia

after a China visit later this month, is prepared to put the full force of American attention into this area. It is important that we be thoughtful in terms of our economic assistance so the world environment does not suffer as a result of this economic collapse.

We need to press for as much support, monitoring, and observation as possible for these critical elections taking place in June spread across over 100,000 polling places in a country that has no election infrastructure.

□ 1215

It may be a little effort, a little time, it may be a little trouble for the United States to be involved in Indonesia during these troubled times, but I can think of no place in the world where our investment would have more impact on the global economy and on the lives of ordinary men and women.

TAX REFORM

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

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak briefly this afternoon, in this raspy, cold-driven voice, about the need for tax reform in America today.

I would like to begin my remarks by reading part of a letter from one of my constituents, Mr. Gerald Racine, of Green Bay, Wisconsin. This letter is one that I believe speaks for a majority of people in northeastern Wisconsin and I trust and hope for a majority of Americans. He writes:

Representative Green: We just finished doing our 1998 Federal income tax returns and we agree with you that it must be simplified. Doing those calculations seems impossible and when we get done, we don't know if it makes sense. We just keep our fingers crossed that we did it right. Being a retired banker and accountant, we don't feel that we should have to go to a tax expert to file what should be a simple income tax return.

Mr. Racine, I agree. We have a frightful tax problem in America today, Mr. Speaker. Not only do our families pay nearly 40 percent, almost half, of their income in taxes, they are also forced to endure a difficult, frustrating and confusing maze of paperwork and bureaucracy that can challenge even a retired financial expert like Gerald Racine.

According to the IRS's own numbers, it will take an American who has a few investments and itemizes his deductions some 22 hours to file his Federal income taxes this year. That is more than a half a week of work, and it is 3 hours longer than it took just last year.

So, Mr. Speaker, as we get this session under way in earnest, let us remember that while tax relief is a key priority for us in Congress, tax reform is also an issue that must be addressed.

I am proud to be a supporter of the Date Certain Tax Code Replacement

Act. This bill would scrap the current Tax Code and enable us to replace it with a simpler, more reasonable tax system. It would ensure that we have a serious debate in this Nation, a long-overdue debate, about what our Tax Code should look like. I believe that new Tax Code will be simpler, more fair and less burdensome.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this proposal and in a larger effort to reduce and reform taxes for our working families.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for his excellent statement and remind him that last year the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) and I toured this country and debated in 30 of our great cities in America the issue of replacing the current Income Tax Code with a simple, fair code, either a flat income tax or no income tax and a national sales tax which is a plan that I have espoused. The crowds were enormous. Americans are ready for this Congress to act.

I just had a great conversation with the chairman of our Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), who is also a strong supporter of repealing the IRS and the Income Tax Code and replacing it with a consumption tax like a sales tax. He has assured me that before he leaves Congress this session he intends to give us a chance to not only debate this issue but perhaps even resolve it.

I want to congratulate the gentleman for being a soldier in this quest and wish him the best of luck because not only the people of Green Bay but the people of America are depending on us.

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 addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

DECENNIAL CENSUS

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Census Bureau announced a new plan to conduct the decennial census in the year 2000. It was disappointing. The Census Bureau has flip-flopped and now wants to have a two-number census.

What they want is that, after the Supreme Court ruled last month that you have to do a full enumeration as the Constitution clearly states, a full enumeration will be conducted and that is the good thing, they announced yesterday that they will go out and make every effort they can to count everybody in this country on April 1, 2000.

But what they want to do is, once they get that number and so we will have a Supreme Court-accepted number that every city, county, census tract, census block in the country will have, they then want to do a manipulation of that number. They want to take that actual count and manipulate it and get a second number. That second number they want to say, that is going to be the official number. It kind of baffles my mind.

I thought when the Supreme Court ruled, I thought when six Federal judges last year ruled that sampling was illegal that we would just move on and get the job done. But, no, this administration is playing politics with the census, and it is very clear now that they have flip-flopped to go to a second number. Because for the past 7 years they have been focused on one number and have said, "We can't do two numbers. We can't do two numbers." Now, yesterday, they say, "Oh, yeah, we want to do two numbers."

They argued against two numbers, because it will not be trusted by the American people, it will add tremendous confusion and it is the lawyers' dream. When every city, county and each census tract in this country sees two numbers, they are going to want the number that is best for them. If they do not get the best number, they are going to file suit. This is going to be tied up in the courts for years to come.

Every State's efforts to do redistricting, and this involves whether it is a city council, a county commission, a State legislature or the House of Representatives, if they use these manipulated numbers, that second census set of numbers, it is going to be thrown out, I feel quite confidently, by the court, but it is going to be tied up in the courts.

Why in the world are we wasting the time, the money and the effort to do that? Unless we really like to support trial lawyers to give them this area. In fact, at the Supreme Court hearing last November, Justice Scalia even raised the question, "Are we going to be creating a whole new area of law called census law?" I guarantee you we are if we go with the two-number census.

What they are going to do is take that original set of numbers, the real count, and then they are going to take another sample, a sample of 300,000. This was attempted in 1990. It failed in 1990. Now, they want to take the failure of 1990 and say we are going to do that in the year 2000.

In 1990, when they tried to do it, what they did is did regions of the country. That is what they are proposing now again. Instead of using 750,000, where they are going to have a sample in each State as originally conceived, now they are going to have to group States together. So my home State of Florida, it is very likely, and we do not know yet, lumped in with Georgia, Mississippi, Alabama and South Carolina.

They will get all these States together, and then they will use that