

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the gentleman from Illinois has yielded back his pro forma amendment.

Does the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded and sustained.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCHUGH) having assumed the chair, Mr. BEREUTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4577) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

1530

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCHUGH). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 3:45 p.m.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 3:45 p.m.

1545

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCHUGH) at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8, DEATH TAX ELIMINATION ACT OF 2000

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 519 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 519

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 8) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to phaseout the estate and gift taxes over a 10-year period. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The amendment recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill, as amended, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; (2) the further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this

resolution, which may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY); pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. REYNOLDS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us today provides for the consideration of H.R. 8, the Death Tax Elimination Act of 2000. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 519 is a modified closed rule which is a standard rule for all revenue measures.

The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. Additionally, the rule waives all points of order against the bill.

The rule further provides that the amendment recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted.

The rule also provides for consideration of the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the report if offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) or his designee, which shall be considered as read and shall be separately debatable for 1 hour, equally divided between the proponent and an opponent.

Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, Benjamin Franklin once noted that "in this world, nothing can be said to be certain except death and taxes." But while death may be certain, taxes are immortal. That is because our current tax system plays a cruel joke on farmers and small business owners.

After years of hard work and sacrifice, building their farm, ranch or business, working Americans hoping to pass on their legacy to their children and grandchildren often find their life's work will instead be passed on to the Federal Government.

The death tax is turning the American dream into The Nightmare on Elm Street.

The death tax is arguably the biggest threat to the future viability of small businesses, family farms, and ranches. It creates a disincentive to expand and create jobs. It often literally taxes family businesses right out of the family.

According to the National Federation of Independent Businesses, nearly 60 percent of business owners say they

would add more jobs over the coming years if death taxes were eliminated.

The death tax has turned Uncle Sam into the Grim Reaper, destroying family-owned farms and ranches with penalties reaching as high as 55 percent and forcing farmers and ranchers to sell off land, buildings, or equipment otherwise needed to operate their businesses.

When those farms and ranches disappear, the rural communities and businesses they support also suffer. A piece of community and family history is lost forever. The death tax impact on family farms is so devastating that the Farm Bureau has listed elimination as their number one priority.

Think about that. An industry association concerned with all aspects of farming and ranching lists the death tax as the number one threat to the viability of family farming. That is how repressive this tax is.

Now, many opponents of eliminating the death tax argue that estate planning is a viable alternative to changing our tax laws. Their theory that our farmers and ranchers should be huddled with accountants rather than growing food for America is both misguided and wrong.

They fail to take into account the high cost of estate planning tools, both the time spent away from their businesses and the high price tag that includes attorneys fees, life insurance premiums, and internal labor costs. Would not we rather have small business owners and farmers using their resources to operate and expand their businesses and to create jobs?

Too often there is a simplistic approach that we should soak the rich. The problem with that theory, as Ronald Reagan once said, is that everybody gets wet in the process. Nowhere is that more profound than in the death tax; for it is hard working middle American families who are most hurt.

But that is not all. The death tax actually raises relatively little revenue for the Federal Government. Some studies have found that it may cost the Government and taxpayers more in administrative and compliance fees than it raises in revenue.

Last year, the Public Policy Institute of New York State conducted a survey on the impact of the Federal estate tax on upstate New York. The findings were alarming. The study found that, in the past 5 years, family-owned and operated businesses on average spent nearly \$125,000 per company just on tax planning alone. These are costs incurred prior to any actual payment of Federal estate taxes.

The study found that an estimated 14 jobs per business have already been lost as a result of the Federal estate tax planning. For just the 365 businesses surveyed, the total number of jobs already lost due to the Federal estate tax is over 5,100.

Mr. Speaker, a clear majority of participants in this survey indicate that the death of an owner would put their

businesses at grave risk because they would be forced to take the purely tax-motivated steps of obtaining loans to redeem the owners stock or using the stock as collateral in order to meet their Federal estate tax obligations.

Simply put, death tax stifles growth, discourages savings, stymies job creation, drains resources, and ruins family businesses. It is time we phase out this unfair tax and allow the American dream to be passed on to our children and our future generations.

In conclusion, I would like to commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER), the bill's sponsors, for bringing this measure before the House today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying measure.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Those in the gallery are reminded that demonstrations of support or opposition are not allowed under the rules of the House. The Chair appreciate your cooperation.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS), my dear friend, for yielding me the customary half hour.

Mr. Speaker, once again, my Republican colleagues are doing their level best to help the rich get richer. Today's Republican bill will gradually repeal estate tax which affects the richest 2 percent of Americans. By repealing it gradually, my Republican colleagues will ensure that only the descendants of the very rich people who hold out 10 years before dying will benefit.

People who are not very rich or who die within the next 10 years do not get any benefit out of this bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, the result of the Republican bill will be to benefit a few very rich people. For a little while, it will cost the Government \$50 billion every year in lost revenue, and do nothing whatsoever to make sure baby boomers have Social Security and Medicare when they retire.

Mr. Speaker, as nearly everyone knows, Social Security and Medicare are headed for some very serious problems. When the baby boomers retire and we do not do something to shore it up now, there will be big problems later.

Thanks to this rule, Mr. Speaker, there is hope. This rule makes in order a Democratic substitute that will help people pass on their estates and still retain hope of fixing Medicare and Social Security.

The Democratic bill takes effect now so people who want to pass things along will not have to hold out for 10 years.

The Democratic bill says, if one's farm or business is worth up to \$4 million, then one can pass it on immediately, without any estate tax whatsoever.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the Democratic substitute will cost the Federal government much less in lost revenue. We will still be able to hold out hope of saving Medicare. We will still be able to hold out hope of saving Social Security, and not to mention the possibility of enacting a prescription drug program.

Now, the Democratic motion to recommit goes even further, Mr. Speaker. It makes in order the Doggett amendment to let the sunshine into political committees. My Republican colleagues, twice in the Committee on Ways and Means and once on the House floor, have decided to keep political committees secret. My Republican colleagues want to continue to allow political committees to raise and spend as much money as they want in complete secret, Mr. Speaker.

But the amendment of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) says it is time to lift up the shades and let the sunshine in. One cannot have the gift tax if one does not disclose one's contributors.

So I urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer the Sherman-Stenholm amendment which will make the repeal of the estate tax contingent upon the President certifying that we are on the path to reduce the debt, protect Social Security and Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN).

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, when our time on Earth is done, we want to know that our families and loved ones have been provided for and protected; we want to know that our hard work and diligence over the years will continue to positively affect those that we really care about.

Those who live the American dream, are successful in their profession, and have the ability to save a little money want to pass along the fruits of their labors on to their survivors. In Kansas and throughout the country, our farmers and business owners are being punished by the current tax system by following that dream.

The current death tax is in fact killing our family farms and businesses. Less and less farmland and fewer and fewer businesses are being passed along to our children and grandchildren due to this unnecessary and unjust tax.

It has been said that the deterioration of every government begins with the decay of the principles on which it was founded. If we look back at history, we are reminded that the unfair taxation triggered the revolution of

1776. We fought a war for freedom from such taxes. Mr. Speaker, we must cast a vote to end this oppressive taxation that falls heaviest on those who can least afford to pay it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me to vote yes on the rule and vote yes on H.R. 8.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), who is the co-author of the Sherman-Stenholm amendment.

(Mr. SHERMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, let us put this in context. This bill would actually cut roughly \$50 billion from Federal revenues once it is fully phased in. It affects only 2 percent of the richest American families, most of the taxes collected from those who have over \$10 million in assets. This bill provides not 1 penny in tax relief for those who make \$10 an hour, but total tax relief for those with assets of over \$10 million.

We went to the Committee on Rules with the Sherman-Stenholm amendment to say at least let us make this bill dependent upon the country being on the right fiscal track. At least do not give up the \$50 billion unless Social Security and Medicare are secure, unless we are going to pay down the debt by 2013, and unless we have eliminated deficits.

1600

And the Committee on Rules said no.

What is particularly severe is that just a few weeks ago this House considered the Miller-Young bill, which would protect the legacy of all Americans by providing roughly \$1 billion, one-fiftieth of the cost of this bill, \$1 billion, to acquire the lands that are environmentally sensitive and pristine and need to be protected for prosperity. And the Shadegg amendment was allowed by the Committee on Rules, requiring that protecting the legacy of all Americans to our great outdoors be contingent upon these same certifications, namely that the debt would be paid off by 2013 and Medicare and Medicaid would be secure.

So what we have here is a Committee on Rules that says, when we are trying to protect the legacy of all Americans, they will allow an amendment that limits that bill's effectiveness to only if certain fiscal certifications can be made. But when we are talking about the legacy of multimillionaires, literally heirs to multi-million dollar fortunes, then fiscal responsibility is not even an issue that this House can discuss on the floor.

I will point out that this bill will assure a dramatic cut in major contributions to universities and hospitals. Those institutions will be here asking for Federal help. We will not be able to give it to them because \$50 billion will be taken out every year of the funds available to the Federal Government.

And, finally, this bill means higher taxes for widows and widowers. Under the present law, widows and widowers pay no estate tax and get a full step up in bases of the assets they acquire for income tax purposes. Under this bill that step up in bases is severely limited. So if my colleagues want to deprive the country of \$50 billion and raise taxes for widows that is what this bill and this rule would do.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the death tax repeal.

Small farmers that lose their farms or are challenged after they die to pass it on to their children are giving them up.

My colleagues on the other side cannot stand any kind of tax cut whatsoever. Their mantra is tax breaks for the rich. Well, in 1993, when they had the White House, the House and the Senate, they had the highest tax increase in history, they raised the tax on Social Security, and they raised the tax on the middle class. They could not help themselves, because they wanted to spend. They even stole every dime out of the Social Security Trust Fund to put up here for extra spending.

Any time we want to take away that right or that control, they fight it. They fought a balanced budget because it limited their spending. They fought welfare reform because it limited their spending. They fought the Social Security lockbox because they used that money for socialized spending. And now the mantra is tax breaks for the rich.

Well, the small farmers in my district in California are not the rich.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO).

(Mr. CAPUANO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I could speak all day long on why this particular bill is a bad one and why this particular rule is a bad one, but I think we will hear lots of debate on it. No one will come to this well on either side asking that small businesses and small farmers be overtaxed. I think everyone here would be happy to work on those two issues. That is not the point, and everybody here knows it is not the point.

This bill goes way beyond that. On top of that, it does an additional thing no one seems to want to talk about. Many States in this country raise lots of money through the estate tax. That is their choice. Nobody makes them do it. Of our 50 States, 34 of them, plus the District of Columbia, raise estate tax money solely on the Federal income tax credit that is allowed for estate tax deductions. The maximum amount allowed. That is all they raise their money on. The taxpayer would have to pay the same amount of money no

matter what, it is just a matter of who they cut the check to.

Of those 35 States, right now approximately \$4 billion a year are raised out of that money; \$1 billion in New York, \$730 million in California, \$480 million in Florida, \$180 million in Massachusetts, \$200 in Illinois, \$200 million in Texas, \$130 million in Arkansas, et cetera. If this bill is passed, these States will lose that money.

Now, I understand fully well that there are philosophical differences, but I ask the people that propose this bill to then turn around and tell these States what they are going to do, how they are going to help them to educate their children, to put police on the street, and to do all the other things that States do. Because this bill, the way it is written, will take that money out of those State coffers.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I would say to my colleagues that there has never been a tax cut that we have discussed on the floor of this body where my friends from the Democratic side of the aisle have not gotten up here and talked about the revenue that we would lose and the parades of horrors that would happen if we cut taxes on the American people.

The fact is we cut taxes in 1997, and revenues have increased \$200 billion per year each year since then over and above what was projected by the Congressional Budget Office. And I predict that if this goes through, and it eventually will go through, we will see the economic return; and, actually, we will have more revenue.

But I am up here to talk, Mr. Speaker, about a friend of mine from Mississippi. He is not a small businessman, he is not a small farmer, he is an agent of the Internal Revenue Service. I had a conversation with him a while back, and he said, "Congressman, I have been doing this for a long time. You folks ought to go back up to Washington and abolish the death tax." He said, "I have had to be the one to go and enforce the law of the land and tell a small farmer or a small businessman that he has got to come up with this much money to pay the inheritance tax on his parents' farm or his parents' business. And I have seen that farm have to be sold and that small business have to go out of business because of what the estate tax does." And he said, "Congressman, it is wrong, and it does not make us that much money. When you add up all the compliance costs and all the nuisance costs and all of the heartache it causes families and to the economy, it is not worth it."

And besides that, Mr. Speaker, it is wrong in this country to tax the event of death. I commend the authors of this bill. I urge a vote "yes" in favor of the rule and for the underlying bill. Let us abolish the tax on death.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise against this rule on H.R. 8, the Estate Tax Bill. And once again I call on Congress to tackle the issue of section 527s. These so-called 527 groups are tax exempt political organizations which try to influence elections. They can spend millions of dollars on negative ads, direct mail campaigns, and phone banks.

I want to read to my colleagues directly from the Web page of a 527 loophole from my home State of California. This Web page tells a potential donor that they can make contributions in unlimited amounts. These can be from any source and they are not ever going to be a matter of public record.

These 527s pose a grave threat, I believe, to our current democratic process. Unfortunately, our House leadership will not give us a vote on this important issue. It is my hope that the next time I come to the House floor to discuss these 527s it will be to pass the bill authored by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT). Surely, in the House of Representatives, we can do something to close this loophole and to clean up our election laws, and we should do it now.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me this time.

I was not going to speak until I heard a speech a minute ago from the other side, and I just wanted to make a point as simply as I could as to why this is such an important law for all Americans.

There was a comment made about this bill being a legacy for the rich. Let me just, by using this piece of paper, give my colleagues an example. When a first generation American small business owner or family farmer passes to the second generation what he has, the United States gets this, and the family gets this. When the second generation dies, to pass to the third, this is what the government gets, and this is what the family has.

If we do the math, we expect an American family who works and toils and hires and pays taxes to grow a business eight times its original worth on the death of the first owner in order for the third family generation, 40 years later, to have the same thing, while the United States Government has received 150 percent of the production of that business.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I do not think 2 minutes is going to capture the frustration I feel in rising today to speak about this rule.

There is not one of us on this floor or in this House that does not recognize the value of giving relief to small business owners and family farms. I do know however, that the Democratic substitute that hopefully will be offered does address those family farmers and small businesses, by providing real estate tax relief, without the \$50 billion cost of the Republican proposal.

My frustration arises, because in the middle of a debate on Labor-HHS, we stop it to debate this, when \$1.25 billion has been taken out of the workers' programs to exclude help for homeless reform and help for incumbent workers along with youth summer jobs. We stop that debate to debate the rule on the estate tax. And then this rule does not include the amendment of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) on 527s, that deals with exposing which donors donate to groups organized around advocating for certain issues yet can use the funds for any campaign use without real limits. Why can't we debate frankly and fairly an amendment that will tell the American people who is contributing to what group for what political purpose—let's not hide behind the 1st amendment to avoid simple disclosure.

If we are not trying to take dollars from family farms and small businesses, why are we relying on big bloated individuals to fund these unknown entities with 527 funds, and we cannot even say who is it that is giving money.

I am frustrated because I think the debate on Labor-HHS should have continued. We should have been able to discuss youth opportunity grants, we should have been able to discuss training of incumbent workers. The Nabisco plant that was closed in my district had workers that should have the funds to benefit from worker training dollars that are now cut from the Labor-HHS appropriation bill. Such dollars could help these individuals to be trained for possible jobs in the technology industry. Homeless veterans should have been able to get the dollars that were needed, yet we stopped the debate on Labor-HHS to debate an estate tax provision that costs \$50 billion at the same time we will need the money to fund Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, the rule is unfair in several respects, one, that the Doggett amendment on 527 groups was not allowed under this rule; two, that we are debating this estate tax legislation with its 50 billion dollar price tag instead of proceeding with the Labor-HHS legislation; and then, thirdly, we have on the floor a \$50 billion bill that could have been done in a bipartisan manner at less costs that would have truly given estate tax relief to small businesses and family farmers.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY).

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the conversation today, and it is interesting that we are talking about

giving estate tax relief for American families yet my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are changing the subject to campaign finance reform. It is interesting today that DNC, the Democratic National Committee, begins airing soft money ads for AL GORE, but nonetheless we are still talking, as the majority party, about giving tax relief to families.

The premise was launched today about the rich getting a benefit under the bill. Well, let me tell my colleagues that the estates did not just materialize. The people who have created the businesses and the wealth in America paid excise taxes, paid property taxes, paid sales taxes, paid income taxes. And the wealthy that my colleagues are speaking of with such affection know how to avoid estate taxes. They buy high-dollar denomination insurance policies. But the small family business cannot afford them because they are paying ever larger taxes.

1615

I understand there is a substitute being offered by the minority. And it is interesting, they have had 40 years to eliminate seniors earning test, they have had 40 years to do something about estate relief tax, they have had 40 years to change the Tax Code. But know we are here today to try to rectify what is an egregious violation of hard work and equity on the American taxpayer.

Let us remember, my colleagues, that small businesses grew through hard work, entrepreneurialism, and strength of families; and, lo and behold, when the person who created the business and prayed to God that all that hard work would some day benefit their children, in steps the Government, their new partner. They were not there to assist them through the growing formative years. But, lo and behold, they are here today to take out not only their fair share but an excessive share.

Then we hear the howl and the cry from the other side about the diminution of revenue to the States. Well, let us cry for that today. Because the families who work their entire life have their businesses decimated, destroyed, subdivided, and sold off in pieces at auction to pay the Government's need for revenue. They are addicted to cash in the States and the Federal Treasury. We should do something today for the American families.

I always learned growing up, my parents told me to work hard, strive for success, reach for excellence, build equity, make a life for yourself, be independent. Under the assumption today, we are passing a bill that furthers that independence and creates self-worth and dignity. Under their approach, let me take it out of their pocket. I do not care how hard they work. It is my money, and I will spend their money as I see fit.

My colleagues, let us focus on estate taxes. Let us focus on families. We will

deal with 527 corporations. But let us not change the subject. Pull the ads on the air by the DNC, and then we will talk about 527s.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS).

(Mr. DAVIS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we are going to debate and adopt some form of estate tax relief today, as we should, as was pointed out by the previous speaker. But we also have an obligation to deal with an immediate problem that has developed in our campaign finance reform system which, we have to admit, is rancid. And that immediate problem is a gaping loophole that has developed that is referred to as the section 527 committee, a committee that solicits funds that are intended to be used to influence the outcome of an election and there is absolutely no disclosure whatsoever.

As has been alluded to, this is not just a Republican problem. It has started off that way. I am terribly concerned the Democrats will succumb to the temptation to engage in this abuse. We need to stop that before it happens.

What is at stake here? What is at stake here is that, when people go out to vote in elections this fall, they have the right to know who is talking to them. People should put their names on their ads if they are attempting to influence the outcome of an election.

What is the only substantive argument against this? There are groups that have said that if their names have to go on some of the ads they want to run, they will not run those ads. If they are not willing to put their name on a message that they are sending to the voters, they should not have a right in this country to be engaging in anonymous political advertising.

We can put a stop to that today. We can repeal the gift law exemption. With respect to these 527 acts, we can do that. And we can do estate tax relief. Let us do the right thing. Let us defeat the rule, and let us bring it back at the right time, and let us stop this abuse before it gets worse.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER).

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I have got to comment on the fact that the Democrats seem to rather talk about campaign finance reform on this than relieving America from an insidious tax, an immoral tax, a tax on what they accumulated through their lifetime and want to pass on to their children. Next to the gift tax, it is the least moral tax. But they would rather talk about 527 organizations that are used in campaigns.

Their indignation, while seeming real, seems also very selective. Where were they when the peace action 527 was hammering Republicans? Ben and

Jerry's has a 527 trying to cut the Pentagon budget. I did not hear them talk about them. The AFL/CIO has been using them for years, and the Sierra Club spent millions on issue ads in 1996 through their 527. I did not hear anybody up here hollering about them.

But guess what? The Republicans copied their practice, formed a 527, and all of a sudden it is a threat to democracy. It is a threat to democracy.

This indignation is too selective to be seen as real. Let us pass this rule and move on with doing the right thing for the American people.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN).

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I am rising in strong opposition to the rule, primarily because it has denied the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) the opportunity to offer an amendment that I believe was meant to protect Social Security, Medicare, and debt reduction. In fact, this was the same amendment that was offered on the CARIB bill that was just for \$3 billion on May 10.

Now, we could accept it on that one. Today we are looking at a bill that is going to cost us \$50 billion and for about 45,000 people.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. THURMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentlewoman, how did she vote on the Shadegg amendment?

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I voted "yes."

And I am certainly glad the gentleman did point that out because, yes, I did. And then, of course, we revoted that vote, with every Democrat and Republican on this floor except for three voting to protect Medicare and Social Security. And if the gentleman remembers, that was \$3 billion.

Today they want to spend \$50 billion. So today we are going to spend \$50 billion, and we are not going to be given the same opportunity to offer this amendment again.

The amendment basically says, and I will read it directly from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

By the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG):

"Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

"The American people have spoken. They agree that conservation funding is important. I commend the sponsors of this bill on that point. But there is a very important condition. They do not agree that we should raid the Social Security Trust Fund. They have made that position extremely clear last year and the year before. They want 100 percent of the surplus set aside. They also want to know that Medicare is funded and solvent. They have made that very clear. They want to know that it is there for their

health care as seniors. And they want to know that the public debt will be paid off by the deadline of 2013."

Why can we not have this amendment? I do not understand that. I think we should vote against this rule and allow the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) to have his day.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

(Mr. BUYER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I almost have to say that demagoguery is a serious ailment, an illness, to a democratic form of government. It is unfortunate that we cannot have serious dialogue and debate about the issue that we have. This is about a rule on the repeal of the death tax. It is not about campaign finance reform.

I served here under the minority in the 39th and 40th year of Democrat rule when this House was a sea of red ink, the debt exploding, deficits as far as the eye could see. Now they are trying to claim that they are the protectorates of the treasury, that they somehow are the protectorates of Social Security when they took the Social Security Trust Fund monies to grow Government? That is absurd.

What we have here today is to repeal the death tax. This is long overdue. This tax hits individuals who have worked hard all their lives, who have worked and saved in their efforts to fulfill the American dream.

My constituent from Marion, Indiana, wrote to me about her parents: "My parents were frugal and saved any large sum of money they ever got their hands on. My mother taught school. My father was a master pattern maker. They will were products of the Depression. They purchased land in Arkansas. And now their estate looks to total over \$1 million. Now this estate is forced with a 39-percent estate tax. What a disgrace. Surely we do not have to take from those of whom were frugal, made sure that they paid their way, and are now dead."

This tax hits the small business owner and the family farmer the hardest. These are the individuals who sacrifice, who invest their time and money in the family business and their farm, and they want to leave this world comforted with the knowledge that their children and grandchildren can also continue their labor and hard work.

The death tax collects for the Federal Government merely 1 percent of the revenues. Do my colleagues realize that if we cleaned up the fraud on the earned income tax credit we could more than offset this tax?

Yet compliance costs are nearly as much as the revenue collected. And the time a small business owner or farmer spends to plan for the inevitable coming of death, is time and energy and money that is not spent on growing the business. A dollar that goes to the accountant or lawyer is a dollar that does not go to new equipment or expansion.

This is a tax on the very behavior the government should be encouraging . . . Hard Work.

Only one-third of family-owned businesses survive into the next generation. All too often a family business or farm has to be liquidated so the heirs can pay the death tax. When a family has to sell the family farm to pay taxes, it can mean that open space, fields and forests, are lost to development. There is an indirect adverse impact to our environment from this tax.

The death tax is unnecessary, unfair and against the virtue of hard work. It is wrong to confiscate the savings of people who work hard all their lives.

I urge the adoption of the rule and support the repeal of the death tax.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I hope during the course of this debate someone will explain to me how a Nation that is \$5.7 trillion in debt; a Nation that squanders \$1 billion a day in interest on that debt; a Congress that during their lifetimes saw the debt rise by \$4.7 trillion; a Congress that is delaying the pay of the troops in the military from September 29 to October 1 in a budget game to move that \$2.5 billion expense to the next fiscal year, no big deal for a Congressman, big deal for an E2 or an E3 when they do not have money for diapers or formula that weekend; a Congress that will not vote on the Shows bill to help our Nation's veterans and military retirees because they say we do not have the \$5 billion, but this same Congress is now saying we are going to ignore the fact that we owe the Social Security Trust Fund \$800 billion, we are going to ignore the \$1 billion a day we are paying in interest on that debt, and we are going to give the wealthiest two percent of all Americans a tax break.

If they earn \$650,000, they pay taxes on it. But they can inherit \$650,000 and pay nothing. That is the present law. So we are really talking about things above that. And if it happens to be a couple, then it is \$1.3 million.

Yes, there are some farmers who are the unfortunate victims of the inflation value of their acreage. Yes, there are some small business owners. Let us gear this bill to take care of them instead of helping the folks who have the most, who, in all probability, benefit when we borrow money because they sell us the T bills, and they are already getting the interest on that debt and all we are going to do is pass this generation's bills on to our children.

I will not do that as an individual. I will not do that as a Congressman.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 8, the Death Tax Elimination Act of 2000. I urge my colleagues to lend this bill their full support.

The estate tax is an outmoded policy that has long outlived its usefulness. Alternatively known as the death tax, this tax was instituted back in the early 1900s, about 1960, to prevent too much wealth from congregating from the wealthy capitalist families in early 20th century America.

Regrettably, the law failed in its original purpose, as the truly wealthy are always able to shelter their income with the help of tax attorneys that the middle class cannot afford.

In recent years, the estate tax has been responsible for the death of 85 percent of America's small businesses by the third generation. Furthermore, countless number of farms have had to be sold in order to pay an outrageously high estate tax ranging as high as 55 percent of the farm's assessed value.

By forcing the sale of such farmland to outside buyers, often commercial developers, the estate tax has been a large contributor to suburban sprawl and unchecked growth in my congressional district in southern New York State.

The most indefensible point about the estate tax, however, is the cost associated with enforcing and collecting it. Recent estimates have placed the cost of collecting at 65 cents out of every dollar taken in.

Given this excessive cost, as well as the fact that the assets taxed under the estate tax have often already been taxed several times, it makes no sense for us to continue this nonsensical practice. Family-owned small businesses certainly will do better without the taxes, as would family farms that still operate from generation to generation.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this worthy legislation.

1630

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the cosponsor of the amendment.

(Mr. STENHOLM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, let me first say what I am for and what I will vote for tomorrow, and that is eliminating the death tax on every estate of \$4 million and less. I could be persuaded in the kind of debate that I would hope we would have to repeal the entire death tax if it was done in the context of total tax reform. But in the context of which we will discuss it today and tomorrow and in this rule, I oppose strongly this rule because it prevents the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) and I from offering an amendment to ensure that the estate tax repeal does not threaten Social Security and undermine the fiscal discipline that has produced our strong economy.

During the debate on the Conservation and Reinvestment Act, I joined with the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) to offer an amendment that made the new spending for conservation programs contingent upon certification that we were on a path to eliminate the debt by 2013 and protecting the integrity of the Social Security and Medicare funds. The gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) and I submitted an amendment applying this principle to phase-in of the estate tax repeal in H.R. 8. Our amendment is a very straightforward proposal which would simply require that this tax cut fit within the context of a fiscally responsible budget and maintain our commitment to eliminating the publicly held debt as quickly as possible.

Since the Shadegg amendment passed with strong bipartisan support, I would have hoped that my friends on the other side of the aisle who supported this principle when it applied to spending would support our effort to provide the same safeguards for tax cuts consuming the projected surplus.

Mr. Speaker, not only did I vote with the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU) and others, I enthusiastically supported them, and I will be very disappointed if not any of them today support a similar type of an amendment.

I do not understand how we can have this rhetoric going back and forth between the sides blaming us on this side when some of us are asking consistency and when most of us who are concerned about paying down the debt and protecting Social Security on both sides of the aisle agree that an H.R. 8 that is backend loaded that will provide a \$50 billion hole in the budget in 2010 is not the kind of fiscal responsibility that we stand up and talk about day after day. I do not understand how we can have such a dual purpose. When we can have bipartisan support for the Shadegg amendment but when we offer the same amendment or we ask under the rule to be allowed to have the same amendment voted on, you say no.

Mr. Speaker, I would yield any time to anyone on this side of the aisle right now to explain to me why they would not allow a simple up-and-down vote to say yes, we will have this repeal of the death tax if it does not materially affect the survival of Social Security beginning in 2010. I will be happy to yield to any Member right now to give me a reason why they would not allow the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) and I to offer this same amendment on this bill.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU).

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of rhetoric on the floor here today, but this is an important and a substantive issue. I believe firmly it is not a question about rich and poor, it is really a question of right and wrong. It is a question of fundamental fairness. Is it right to tax an estate, a family,

simply because the owner of that estate happens to pass away? Is it right to take up to half of what that family owns?

My colleagues here today are talking about their interest in protecting a small business. What does that really mean? Let us take a closer look. That means if your estate, your home, your business, your farm is only worth \$650,000 or \$1 million, and you die, well, they agree that should not be taxed. But if you are successful, if you are too successful in their eyes, and your business or farm is worth \$5 million or \$10 million or \$20 million, then the Federal Government should be able to take half, 55 percent of everything you own. The Federal Government is given a presumptive claim to all of it. Is that right? Never. It is wrong if your estate is worth \$50,000, it is wrong if your estate is worth \$50 million. It is wrong if you are Bill Gates and your estate is worth \$50 billion for the Federal Government to step in and say we get 55 percent of everything you have.

I think that cuts to the core of what this debate is all about. It is morally wrong to have written into the Tax Code that kind of power to confiscate any individual's property, rich, poor, farmer, small businessman, individual, or family.

I ask my colleagues to support the entire elimination of the death tax here on the floor tomorrow, not because of dollars and cents but because of right and wrong.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACC).

Mr. BALDACC. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the Joint Tax Committee estimates that only 2 percent of all estates will pay estate taxes. Only 3 percent of that 2 percent are estates where family-owned businesses and farms make up more than half the value of the estate. To put this in further perspective, in 1998, the Department of Treasury estimates that only 776 family businesses and 642 family farms were subject to the estate tax. As a small businessperson, I am very much aware of the burden under which many entrepreneurs and working families must operate.

My family has a family business, and I understand the concerns of those who want to pass their business on to the next generation. We have passed legislation in this Chamber which has exempted 98 percent of the family-owned family businesses and family farms. Still we are going to do more, and I support doing more. The plan that is before us today even in the 10-year period is \$50 billion a year, but really what we are talking about is over \$500 billion from 2011 to 2020, \$500 billion when the baby boomers are coming of age for Social Security, for Medicare, and Medicaid and talking about a prescription drug program.

I think that the lockbox that everybody promoted earlier and all of us

have supported, the lockbox will be empty when it is opened up and it is already going to be taken out for less than 2 percent of the estates in the entire country who are going to have those resources available to them. The substitute plan which we are supporting which is a common sense approach to continuing to reduce the burden on family businesses and family farms is a 20 percent reduction across the board in raising the level, further reinforcing tax relief for these families and to make sure that they have an opportunity to pass it on from one generation to the next.

It is something that is very important to me. We have reached across the aisle and tried to work bipartisanship, but the plan that the majority is supporting is going to break the bank and not going to leave any resources for any relief for any Americans.

I think one thing that I hear from my business friends which I would like to bring up here today is that if we could work on reducing the interest rates and reducing the debt and deficit, that there would be a lot more economic activity and a lot more purchases of homes, lower student loan interest rates, lower car loans and increasing economic activity throughout America. That is what we ought to be doing, is looking to reducing the debt and the deficit and not squandering it for a very few families who are very, very wealthy and taking up all of what is left for Social Security, Medicare, and a prescription drug program.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COX).

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, let us remind ourselves how we got here. When, in 1993, I introduced the first bill in the history of the income tax to repeal the death tax, we had just a few sponsors. By the 106th Congress, I had over 200 sponsors on my legislation to repeal the death tax. And last year the House and the Senate agreed on legislation that we sent to President Clinton to completely repeal the death tax. In September 1999, Bill Clinton vetoed death tax relief.

Now we are back here to do it again for one simple reason. The gathering momentum behind repeal of the death tax is a result of the increasing realization of where the burden of this tax falls. It does not fall on the dead rich person. That is the one person who does not care. It does not even fall on the wealthy people in the family of the rich person. They might have to pay 55 percent or 60 percent because of a 5 percent surtax that kicks in, but the real burden of this falls on the low-wage worker who pays a tax rate of 100 percent when he or she loses a job because that medium-sized business or small business that is not publicly owned has to be liquidated in whole or in part to pay the tax man.

That is why when in California we put this to an initiative of the people, even though the Los Angeles Times re-

peatedly said it is a tax break for the rich, almost two-thirds of voters agreed we should completely repeal California's death tax. Larry Summers, now the Secretary of the Treasury, when he was an economist at Harvard just a few years ago told us that we probably lose money on this tax, that we may not even make a penny even though it seems to raise 1 percent of our revenues because of all the tax avoidance schemes that people use to not pay it, such as lifetime gifts. That takes away from income tax they pay this year.

It is time for the death tax to die. I am thrilled we are bringing it to the floor again. Let us send it to the President again and this time ask him not to veto it, Mr. President, but to sign it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and also in opposition to the majority estate tax repeal bill that will be debated on the floor here tomorrow and in support of the Democratic substitute. I do not understand why the rule did not make in order the Stenholm amendment which merely demands some accountability to ensure that a \$500 billion 10-year tax cut that is going to benefit the wealthiest 2 percent individuals in our country does not jeopardize our chances for meaningful national debt reduction and the long-term solvency of the Social Security program. It is something that was demanded during the CARA bill just a couple of weeks ago when it came to conservation and environmental programs that will benefit the entire Nation and it should apply as equally well to a large tax cut bill which is going to be a boom to the wealthiest Americans in this Nation. The Democratic substitute on the other hand, will take care of the family farmers and small business owners but in a fiscally responsible manner.

I want to, however, take a few moments to also speak about the latest scourge in the campaign finance system and that is the creation of the 527 corporations that we are seeing in modern American politics. These are the unregulated, unlimited, unaccountable corporations that are being formed for the sole purpose of influencing the outcome of campaigns.

They are unaccountable in the fact that no one knows where these large contributions are coming from. In fact, they could be coming from foreign sources and it would be legal for foreign contributors make contributions to the 527s in order to influence the American political process. And that is wrong and it should be changed. For too long in this Chamber, the opponents of finance reform have always claimed that the only thing we need to demand is more disclosure in the system.

The Moore-Doggett bill does exactly that. All it requires is accountability

through disclosure to apply to 527s so we have an idea of where all this money is coming from. It is an outrage what is going on. It is unacceptable. If we are to live up to the words and the rhetoric that has been permeating these halls for too long, we should at least take this very sensible and practical approach. If we cannot pass comprehensive finance reform or even incremental reform with Shays-Meehan or the McCain-Feingold bill in the Senate, let us at least do the right thing and demand disclosure in the 527s.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that it is amazing to me that so much of the debate against this bill has been about campaign finance. I am for the rule, I am for the bill. If I was on the other side of it, I might be trying to talk about something else as well. Two weeks ago, we repealed a tax that we had put on the books in 1898 to fight the Spanish American War. This tax was put on the books in 1916 to fight World War I. It is time to get rid of these 100-year-old special purpose taxes and even the 86-year-old special purpose taxes. People do not have anything at their death that they have not paid taxes on many times. Death should not be a taxable event. You should not have to see the IRS agent and the undertaker the same week or you should not have to see the IRS agent because you saw the undertaker.

We need to eliminate this tax. We can do this. The American people know it is unfair. Let me make one final point. In terms of spending like we were talking about in the CARA bill and so often the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) and I are on the same side, we are talking about spending on Federal land or for more Federal land. If a family budget goes in the red, they cut their spending. They do not get a new source of income. There is nothing wrong with cutting taxes and giving the American family the tax break they need. If we have a shortfall, we ought to find that shortfall in spending just like we said on the CARA bill we were prepared to do.

1645

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, the problem with the underlying bill that repeals the estate tax is that it is backloaded. It provides the relief in the out-years and explodes in costs and is fiscally irresponsible. The substitute provides relief now and does it in a fiscally responsible way.

Let me just give my colleagues one example. Under current law, if one has a net estate of \$1 million, one pays \$125,000 in estate tax. Under the underlying bill, if one dies in 2001, it will be reduced to \$93,000. Under the Democratic substitute, one would pay zero



estate taxes in 2001. If one's estate is \$1.5 million under current law one would pay \$335,000 in taxes. Under the underlying bill, the repeal bill, one would still pay \$277,000, a 17 percent reduction. But under the Democratic substitute, one would only pay \$135,000, or a 60 percent reduction.

The problem is that we are trying to deal with family-owned businesses and family farms, which represents 3 percent of the 2 percent of the estates that are subject to the estate tax, .06 percent of the estates. We spend a lot of money to do it. The substitute deals with it directly by raising that to \$4 million before it is subject to estate tax.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, thanks to this full, wholesome, and hard-hitting debate, one might conclude that this is a partisan issue when, in fact, it is very bipartisan. There are 46 Democrats who have joined with the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN) as cosponsors of this very important legislation.

As has been pointed out several times, death should, in fact, not trigger a tax; and it is very, very unfortunate that there are many people who, upon facing death, family members have to, along with visiting the undertaker, visit the IRS agent, visit the tax lawyer, visit their accountant, and that is wrong. We want to end that.

There are many people here who have been arguing that this is somehow going to create a drain on the flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury. That is clearly wrong. Empirical evidence has shown that if we would have repealed the death tax back in 1971, by 1991, the gross domestic product growth would have been 1 percentage point higher, obviously generating an increase in the flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury.

As we look at a study that recently came out, it showed that 75 percent of successful businesses failed after the death of the owner, and lack of capital has been the reason that 70 percent of those businesses reported that they failed and obviously, the death tax, which has created real uncertainty and great problems and a drain, have played a role in jeopardizing economic growth.

So it seems to me that we have a very important obligation to realize that this is the responsible thing to do; the American people want us to do this. Double taxation is wrong, and this is a first step towards repealing that. This is a fair rule. We have turned ourselves inside out to make sure that we provided for a substitute that is going to be offered by the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and we also suspect that there

may be a motion to recommit. It is a tax bill. We do not open up the Tax Code. The Democrats never did it, we are not doing that, and yet we have provided 2 bites at the apple for Members of the minority; so it is a very fair measure, and I urge my colleagues to support the rule and to support the bill itself.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California and the other Republican members of the Committee on Rules have now joined their Republican colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means, who have twice voted, on a strictly partisan basis, to ensure that this House does nothing to clean up the mess in our political system.

My amendment that they rejected is to the gift tax, a critical part of this estate and gift tax bill. I believe that it is time for taxpayers to stop subsidizing those, who make unlimited, secret contributions to section 527 political organizations.

What is a 527? Not some new kind of aircraft. A 527 political organization, quite simply, is a political hit squad. It relies on contributors who are hidden: they can be foreign, they can be Iraqi, Cuban, Chinese, whatever, or just home-grown special interest corporate treasury money. Its operations are secret, and its mission is character assassination. These are the groups that pollute the airwaves and fill our mailboxes with hate ads attacking one side or the other.

Last week, before we recessed for Memorial Day, 201 Democrats and 6 Republicans stood on this floor and said, enough of that nonsense. They voted to clean up this mess, and at least get disclosure, nonpartisan disclosure. This amendment applies to everyone, regardless of political philosophy or association or allies, to see that all of them meet the simple, narrow requirement of merely answering: "who gave you the money" and "what did you spend it on."

Today, as we speak on this floor, on the other side of this Capitol, Republican Senators are rising to say they cannot do anything about cleaning up 527 political organizations because it is a tax measure, the very reason I offer the amendment here, and that the House must act first. So we have on one side, the Republican leadership saying the House must act first, while the House leadership hammers into submission the members of its caucus to keep them from doing what they know is right. Our Republican colleagues know that their leadership, and some have said this, they know their leadership's position is absolutely indefensible, that one cannot defend relying on secret, hidden money to produce these hate ads, and yet that is what the leadership insists that they do.

Those who say that the Republicans, as some reports have suggested, now

have a proposal to deal with this problem are wrong. They do not have a bill, they do not have a hearing, they do not have a proposal for which they will even provide an outline. All that they are doing is trying to provide their caucus some cover, because they also do not have any good excuse for not resolving this problem. As Senator JOHN MCCAIN has said, this is "the latest manifestation of corruption in American politics," and we can do something about it with this bill.

Tomorrow, there is going to be a moment of truth, a motion to recommit and an opportunity to vote up or down to stand and show whether we are in favor of more deceit, of more character assassinations on the television airwaves paid for with hidden money, or whether we are in favor of cleaning up this corruption of the American political system.

The Washington Post said it best today in its editorial, "In Love With the Dark": "It is hard to believe that a majority of the House, including the leadership, cannot be shamed into voting at least for sunlight. Why would they prefer the dark?"

Mr. Speaker, I would challenge my Republican colleagues to answer that question.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed the special orders during the rule that we are now debating.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman, I would be pleased to set the record straight on his comments. The gentleman has raised a very substantial, interesting, and I think important issue in his proposal to require disclosure by 527 groups, and I believe the gentleman is aware that the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigation of the Committee on Ways and Means is, as we speak—and has been back only 2 days since this was discussed at the Committee on Ways and Means full committee meeting—is preparing a proposal that goes beyond the gentleman's proposal in a very important way. It goes beyond the gentleman's proposal by treating all tax-exempt entities that are allowed under the law to engage in political activity the same way.

I agree with the gentleman's proposal. I just do not believe that it is evenhanded tax law, because it does not treat in an evenhanded, equitable, fair way all entities that are tax-subsidized, that is, citizen-subsidized, but allowed to engage in political activity the same way.

So we are going to do a very good job on this, in my estimation. Sunshine is important. Entities that engage in political activity with taxpayer subsidies should be required, in my estimation, to report their contributors and their expenditures; and I believe that we will have the opportunity in committee and on this floor, to pass legislation that



builds on the gentleman's proposal, and does what is necessary, and that is, treats 501(c)(3)s, 4s and 5s and 6s the same way.

So I urge support for the rule and opposition to the previous question motion.

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

Mr. Speaker, if the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule. My amendment will make in order the Sherman-Stenholm fiscal responsibility amendment. The fiscal responsibility amendment requires that the estate tax relief will not take effect until, one, the OMB certifies that the public debt will be retired by the year 2013; and, two, that the trustees certify that plans are in place to keep solvent the Social Security and the Medicare trust funds. Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my amendment be printed in the RECORD immediately before the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCHUGH). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA).

(Mr. FOSSELLA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding, and I thank the gentleman from Washington (Ms. DUNN) for bringing this bill to the floor, and I support the rule.

The story of Alvin Conklin and his idea of opening up a small lumber shop on Staten Island represents one man's hope of securing the American dream for himself and his family. Established in 1888, Farrell Lumber remains a family-owned and family-operated business in its truest sense. For 112 years, Alvin Conklin and then Harry Farrell and his wife, and today, their children, Bob and Don, and grandchildren all helped make Farrell Lumber a thriving small business with an impeccable reputation for quality and service. They are a proud member of the Staten Island community.

However, the estate tax threatens their small business much like it threatens so many small businesses in America today. For the Farrells, the estate tax could potentially confiscate the valuable family business and, worse, strip the Farrells of their dream to pass it on to their children and grandchildren. It is evident that the death tax discourages savings and investment and entrepreneurship and punishes families like the Farrells who work 7 days a week, 15-hour days to grow and expand their business.

Repealing the estate tax would ensure economic fairness for all Ameri-

cans, while encouraging expanded growth and prosperity for our country as a whole. Let us not forget the 35 people who work for the Farrells. Those are the guys who load the truck with lumber, who drop it off at your house, or the lady who helps you select a door. If the Farrells are forced to close their doors, those 35 people will be out of work.

There is a story like that across America. Let us end it and make it a good one for the Farrells.

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

The death tax stifles growth, discourages savings, stymies job creation, drains resources, and ruins family businesses and farms. It is time we phase out this unfair tax and allow the American dream to be passed on to our children and future generations.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the material previously referred to.

#### PREVIOUS QUESTION VOTE TO MAKE IN ORDER THE SHERMAN-STENHOLM FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY AMENDMENT

On page 2, line 13, strike "and" the second place it occurs and after "(3)" insert the following:

"The further amendment printed in section 2 of this resolution, which may be offered only by Representative Sherman of California or Representative Stenholm of Texas, or their designee, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and by an opponent; and (4)"

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

"Section 2. Amendment to be Offered by Representative Sherman of California or Representative Stenholm of Texas, or their designee:

At the end of the bill (page , after line ), add the following new title:

#### TITLE VI—ENSURING DEBT RETIREMENT AND INTEGRITY OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE TRUST FUND SURPLUSES

##### SEC. 601. ENSURING DEBT RETIREMENT AND INTEGRITY OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE TRUST FUND SURPLUSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or of an amendment made by this Act, a reduction in the rate of tax (including the repeal thereof) under section 2001(c), and an increase in the exemption amount under section 2001(b), of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 which is scheduled to take effect in a calendar year shall not take effect unless the certifications specified by subsection (b) for the fiscal year in which such calendar year begins are made before the beginning of such fiscal year.

(b) CERTIFICATIONS SPECIFIED.—The certifications specified in this subsection are the following:

(1) The Director of Office of Management and Budget has certified that a law has been enacted which—

(A) ensures that a sufficient portion of the on-budget surplus is reserved for debt retirement to put the Government on a path to eliminate the publicly held debt by fiscal year 2013 under current economic and technical projections, and

(B) ensures that, under current economic and technical projections, the unified budget surplus for the fiscal year in which such calendar year begins shall not be less than the surplus of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors

Insurance Trust Fund and Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund for such fiscal year.

(2) The Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund has certified either—

(A) that outlays from such trust funds are not anticipated to exceed the revenues to such trust funds during such fiscal year and any of the next 5 fiscal years, or

(B) that legislation has been enacted extending the solvency of such trust funds for 75 years.

(3) The Board of Trustees of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund has certified either—

(A) that the outlays from such trust fund are not anticipated to exceed the revenues to such trust fund during such fiscal year and any of the next 5 fiscal years, or

(B) that legislation has been enacted extending the solvency of such trust fund for 25 years.

(c) CONTINUATION OF PRIOR RATE OF TAX.—If a reduction in the rate of tax (including the repeal thereof), or an increase in the exemption amount, under section 2001 of such Code does not take effect for a calendar year by reason of subsection (a), the rate of tax and exemption amount under such section in effect immediately before the beginning of such calendar year shall continue in effect.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a cosponsor and strong supporter of the measure before us to eliminate the unfair Death Tax.

The Death Tax destroys a fundamental American dream—being able to pass on the success we have earned to our children. Currently, more than 70 percent of family businesses do not survive to the second generation, and 87 percent do not make it to the third. My own family worked to build a family-owned car dealership, and we felt the punitive blow of the Death Tax.

How can we continue to impose a tax that forces the sale of family businesses and throws Americans out of work? How can we continue to tax the very values we should be encouraging—work and saving for our families?

Mr. Speaker, the American people understand that this tax is unfair and should be eliminated. The Death Tax forces families to expend resources on burdensome estate planning.

Small businesses understand that it forces them to cut back operations, sell income-producing assets, lay off workers and sometimes liquidate the business.

Conservation groups understand that the Death Tax damages the environment by forcing families to sell land to developers to pay the onerous tax.

Mr. Speaker, the Death Tax deserves to die. This bill will kill the anti-family, anti-job and anti-environmental tax, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. 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 SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 199, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 248]

#### YEAS—225

Aderholt	Gilchrest	Paul
Archer	Gillmor	Pease
Armey	Gilman	Peterson (PA)
Bachus	Goode	Petri
Baker	Goodlatte	Pickering
Ballenger	Pitts	Pommo
Barr	Gordon	Porter
Barrett (NE)	Goss	Portman
Bartlett	Graham	Pryce (OH)
Barton	Granger	Quinn
Bass	Green (WI)	Radanovich
Bateman	Gutknecht	Ramstad
Bereuter	Hansen	Regula
Biggert	Hastings (WA)	Reynolds
Bilbray	Hayes	Riley
Billirakis	Hayworth	Rogan
Bliley	Hefley	Rogers
Blunt	Hergert	Rohrabacher
Boehlert	Hill (MT)	Ros-Lehtinen
Boehner	Hilleary	Roukema
Bonilla	Hobson	Royce
Bono	Hoekstra	Ryan (WI)
Brady (TX)	Horn	Ryan (KS)
Bryant	Hostettler	Salmon
Burr	Hulshof	Sanford
Burton	Hunter	Saxton
Buyer	Hutchinson	Scarborough
Callahan	Hyde	Schaffer
Calvert	Isakson	Sensenbrenner
Camp	Jenkins	Sessions
Campbell	Johnson (CT)	Shadegg
Canady	Johnson, Sam	Shaw
Cannon	Jones (NC)	Shays
Castle	Kasich	Sherwood
Chabot	Kelly	Shimkus
Chambliss	King (NY)	Shuster
Chenoweth-Hage	Kingston	Simpson
Coble	Knollenberg	Skeen
Coburn	Kolbe	Smith (NJ)
Collins	Kuykendall	Smith (TX)
Combest	LaHood	Smith (WA)
Cook	Largent	Souder
Cooksey	Latham	Spence
Cox	LaTourette	Stearns
Crane	Lazio	Stump
Cubin	Leach	Sununu
Cunningham	Lewis (CA)	Sweeney
Davis (VA)	Lewis (KY)	Talent
Deal	Linder	Tancred
DeLay	LoBiondo	Tanner
DeMint	Lucas (OK)	Tauzin
Diaz-Balart	Manzullo	Taylor (NC)
Dickey	Martinez	Terry
Doolittle	McCollum	Thomas
Dreier	McCrery	Thornberry
Duncan	McHugh	Thune
Dunn	McInnis	Tiahrt
Ehlers	McIntosh	Toomey
Ehrlich	McIntyre	Trafficant
Emerson	McKeon	Upton
English	Metcalf	Vitter
Eshoo	Mica	Walden
Everett	Miller (FL)	Walsh
Ewing	Miller, Gary	Wamp
Fletcher	Moran (KS)	Watts (OK)
Foley	Morella	Weldon (FL)
Forbes	Myrick	Weldon (PA)
Fossella	Nethercutt	Weller
Fowler	Ney	Whitfield
Franks (NJ)	Northup	Wicker
Frelinghuysen	Norwood	Wilson
Gallegly	Nussle	Wolf
Ganske	Ose	Young (AK)
Gekas	Oxley	Young (FL)
Gibbons	Packard	

#### NAYS—199

Abercrombie	Gutierrez	Neal
Ackerman	Hall (OH)	Oberstar
Allen	Hall (TX)	Obey
Andrews	Hastings (FL)	Olver
Baca	Hill (IN)	Ortiz
Baird	Hilliard	Owens
Baldacci	Hinche	Pallone
Baldwin	Hinojosa	Pascrell
Barcia	Hoefel	Pastor
Barrett (WI)	Holden	Payne
Becerra	Holt	Pelosi
Bentsen	Hooley	Peterson (MN)
Berkley	Hoyer	Phelps
Berman	Inslee	Pickett
Berry	Jackson (IL)	Pomeroy
Bishop	Jackson-Lee	Price (NC)
Blagojevich	(TX)	Rahall
Blumenauer	Jefferson	Rangel
Boniore	John	Reyes
Borski	Johnson, E.B.	Rivers
Boswell	Jones (OH)	Rodriguez
Boucher	Kanjorski	Roemer
Boyd	Kaptur	Rothman
Brady (PA)	Kennedy	Roybal-Allard
Brown (FL)	Kildee	Rush
Brown (OH)	Kilpatrick	Sabo
Capps	Kind (WI)	Sanchez
Capuano	Klecza	Sanders
Cardin	Kucinich	Sandlin
Carson	LaFalce	Sawyer
Clayton	Lampson	Schakowsky
Clement	Lantos	Scott
Clyburn	Larson	Serrano
Condit	Lee	Sherman
Conyers	Levin	Shows
Costello	Lewis (GA)	Sisisky
Coyne	Lipinski	Skelton
Cramer	Lofgren	Slaughter
Crowley	Lowe	Snyder
Cummings	Lucas (KY)	Spratt
Davis (FL)	Luther	Stabenow
Davis (IL)	Maloney (CT)	Stark
DeFazio	Maloney (NY)	Stenholm
DeGette	Mascara	Strickland
Delahunt	Matsui	Stupak
DeLauro	McCarthy (MO)	Tauscher
Deutsch	McCarthy (NY)	Taylor (MS)
Dicks	McDermott	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	McGovern	Thompson (MS)
Dixon	McKinney	Thurman
Doggett	McNulty	Tierney
Dooley	Meehan	Towns
Doyle	Meek (FL)	Turner
Edwards	Meeks (NY)	Udall (CO)
Engel	Menendez	Udall (NM)
Etheridge	Millender	Velazquez
Evans	McDonald	Visclosky
Farr	Miller, George	Waters
Fattah	Minge	Watt (NC)
Filner	Mink	Waxman
Ford	Moakley	Weiner
Frank (MA)	Mollohan	Wexler
Frost	Moore	Weygand
Gedensson	Moran (VA)	Wise
Gephardt	Murtha	Woolsey
Gonzalez	Nadler	Wu
Green (TX)	Napolitano	Wynn

#### NOT VOTING—10

Clay	Istook	Vento
Danner	Klink	Watkins
Greenwood	Markay	
Houghton	Smith (MI)	

1718

Messrs. HALL of Texas, DICKS, ROTHMAN, BLAGOJEVICH, SANDLIN and FORD and Ms. KAPTUR changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. GILLMOR and Mr. LAZIO changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCHUGH). The question is on the resolution.

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

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 242, noes 180, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 249]

#### AYES—242

Aderholt	Gallegly	Pease
Archer	Ganske	Peterson (PA)
Armey	Gekas	Petri
Bachus	Gibbons	Pickering
Baker	Gilchrest	Pitts
Ballenger	Gillmor	Pommo
Barcia	Gilman	Porter
Barr	Goode	Portman
Barrett (NE)	Goodlatte	Pryce (OH)
Bartlett	Goodling	Quinn
Barton	Gordon	Radanovich
Bass	Goss	Rahall
Bateman	Graham	Ramstad
Bereuter	Granger	Rangel
Berkley	Gutknecht	Regula
Biggert	Hansen	Reynolds
Bilbray	Hastings (WA)	Riley
Billirakis	Hayes	Rogan
Bishop	Hayworth	Rogers
Blagojevich	Hefley	Rohrabacher
Bliley	Hergert	Ros-Lehtinen
Blunt	Hill (MT)	Roukema
Boehlert	Hilleary	Royce
Boehner	Hobson	Ryan (WI)
Bonilla	Hoekstra	Ryun (KS)
Bono	Horn	Salmon
Boucher	Hostettler	Sandlin
Brady (TX)	Hulshof	Sanford
Bryant	Hunter	Saxton
Burr	Hutchinson	Scarborough
Burton	Hyde	Schaffer
Buyer	Isakson	Sensenbrenner
Callahan	Jenkins	Sessions
Calvert	Johnson (CT)	Shadegg
Camp	Johnson, Sam	Shaw
Campbell	Jones (NC)	Shays
Canady	Kasich	Sherwood
Cannon	Kelly	Shimkus
Castle	King (NY)	Shuster
Chabot	Kingston	Simpson
Chambliss	Knollenberg	Skeen
Chenoweth-Hage	Kolbe	Skelton
Clement	Kuykendall	Smith (NJ)
Coble	LaHood	Smith (TX)
Coburn	Largent	Smith (WA)
Collins	Latham	Souder
Combest	LaTourette	Spence
Cook	Lazio	Stearns
Cooksey	Leach	Stump
Cox	Lewis (CA)	Sununu
Cramer	Lewis (KY)	Sweeney
Crane	Linder	Talent
Cubin	LoBiondo	Tancred
Cunningham	Lofgren	Tanner
Davis (FL)	Lucas (KY)	Tauscher
Davis (VA)	Lucas (OK)	Tauzin
Deal	Manzullo	Taylor (NC)
DeLay	Martinez	Terry
DeMint	McCollum	Thomas
Diaz-Balart	McCrery	Thornberry
Dickey	McHugh	Thune
Dicks	McInnis	Tiahrt
Dooley	McIntosh	Toomey
Doolittle	McIntyre	Trafficant
Dreier	McKeon	Upton
Duncan	Metcalf	Vitter
Dunn	Mica	Walden
Ehlers	Miller (FL)	Walsh
Ehrlich	Miller, Gary	Wamp
Emerson	Moran (KS)	Watts (OK)
English	Morella	Weldon (FL)
Eshoo	Myrick	Weldon (PA)
Everett	Nethercutt	Weller
Ewing	Ney	Whitfield
Fletcher	Northup	Wicker
Foley	Norwood	Wilson
Forbes	Nussle	Wise
Fossella	Ose	Wolf
Fowler	Oxley	Young (AK)
Franks (NJ)	Packard	Young (FL)
Frelinghuysen	Paul	

NOES—180

Abercrombie	Hill (IN)	Neal
Ackerman	Hilliard	Oberstar
Allen	Hinchey	Obey
Andrews	Hinojosa	Olver
Baca	Hoeffel	Ortiz
Baird	Holden	Owens
Baldacci	Holt	Pallone
Baldwin	Hooley	Pascarell
Barrett (WI)	Hoyer	Pastor
Becerra	Inslee	Payne
Bentsen	Jackson (IL)	Pelosi
Berman	Jackson-Lee	Peterson (MN)
Berry	(TX)	Phelps
Blumenauer	Jefferson	Pickett
Bonior	John	Pomeroy
Borski	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)
Boswell	Jones (OH)	Reyes
Boyd	Kanjorski	Rivers
Brady (PA)	Kaptur	Rodriguez
Brown (FL)	Kennedy	Roemer
Brown (OH)	Kildee	Rothman
Capps	Kilpatrick	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Kind (WI)	Rush
Cardin	Klecza	Sabo
Carson	Kucinich	Sanchez
Clayton	LaFalce	Sanders
Clyburn	Lampson	Sawyer
Condit	Lantos	Schakowsky
Conyers	Larson	Scott
Costello	Lee	Serrano
Coyne	Levin	Sherman
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Shows
Cummings	Lipinski	Sisisky
Davis (IL)	Lowe	Slaughter
DeFazio	Luther	Snyder
DeGette	Maloney (CT)	Spratt
Delahunt	Maloney (NY)	Stabenow
DeLauro	Mascara	Stenholm
Deutsch	Matsui	Strickland
Dingell	McCarthy (MO)	Stupak
Dixon	McCarthy (NY)	Taylor (MS)
Doggett	McDermott	Thompson (CA)
Doyle	McGovern	Thompson (MS)
Edwards	McKinney	Thurman
Engel	McNulty	Tierney
Etheridge	Meehan	Towns
Evans	Meek (FL)	Turner
Farr	Meeks (NY)	Udall (CO)
Fattah	Menendez	Udall (NM)
Filner	Millender	Velazquez
Ford	McDonald	Visclosky
Frank (MA)	Miller, George	Waters
Frost	Minge	Watt (NC)
Gejdenson	Mink	Waxman
Gephardt	Moakley	Weiner
Gonzalez	Mollohan	Wexler
Green (TX)	Moore	Weygand
Gutierrez	Moran (VA)	Woolsey
Hall (OH)	Murtha	Wu
Hall (TX)	Nadler	Wynn
Hastings (FL)	Napolitano	

NOT VOTING—12

Clay	Houghton	Smith (MI)
Danner	Istook	Stark
Green (WI)	Klink	Vento
Greenwood	Markey	Watkins

1730

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 249, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

# DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCHUGH). Pursuant to House Resolution 518 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4577.

1735

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4577) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, with Mr. BEREUTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the amendment by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) had been disposed of and the bill was open for amendment from page 2, line 3 to page 3, line 4.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman PORTER) if he would yield to me for the purpose of engaging in a brief colloquy.

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, on April 12, 2000, I testified in the subcommittee chaired by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) with a group representing the bipartisan Congressional Women's Caucus about a problem that affects women slightly more than men but has become a major national health problem across the entire population for children and for men and women of every age group and background.

Alarming increases in overweight and obesity increasingly have become a major American health problem. More than 50 percent of Americans are overweight or obese.

Surgeon General David Satcher says that overweight and obesity are major contributors to many preventable diseases and causes of death, including cardiovascular diseases, stroke, high blood pressure, high cholesterol, Type II diabetes, arthritis, gallbladder disease, asthma, and some cancers, including breast, endometrial, prostate, and colon cancers. The incidence of overweight and obesity is the worst in our history.

Obesity trends are particularly serious among the youngest Americans. Almost 25 percent of young people ages 6 to 17 are overweight, and the percentage who are seriously overweight has doubled in the last 30 years. The responsibility of lifestyle for this troubling trend, especially fast food and lack of exercise, is very clear.

I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman PORTER) for including \$125 million in this Labor, HHS appropriations bill that will allow the Centers for Disease Control to begin a more aggressive national effort against overweight and obesity.

I want to especially thank the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman PORTER) for his support of the bill I introduced, the Lifelong Improvements in Food and Exercise Act, building on the work his subcommittee has already done in making grants to the CDC. I am also pleased that the CDC supports my bill.

As the gentleman knows, Mr. Chairman, the LIFE bill authorizes the CDC to address overweight, obesity, and sedentary lifestyles in three ways: by training health professionals to recognize the signs of obesity and to recommend prevention activities and several other ways.

Would the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman PORTER) agree that some of the \$125 million in this Labor HHS bill be spent on the activities specified in the LIFE legislation?

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support the LIFE bill, and I believe that the goals of the national campaign to change children's health behaviors will address the initiatives in the LIFE legislation.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will further yield, toward that end, will the gentleman join me in requesting the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman BLILEY) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), ranking member of the authorizing committee of jurisdiction, the House Committee on Commerce, to support inclusion of the LIFE bill in the conference agreement on this bill?

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to do so.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman PORTER) for his support and for the leadership on this vital health issue he has shown throughout his career here in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to this portion of the bill?

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. BASS

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. BASS:

Page 2, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$42,000,000)".

Page 2, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$42,000,000)".

Page 20, line 11, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$134,000,000)".

Page 22, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

Page 24, line 7, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$130,000,000)".

Page 31, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$75,000,000)".

Page 51, line 21, after each dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$78,000,000)".

Page 52, line 12, after each dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$480,000,000)".

Page 52, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$450,000,000)".