

doing is reporting what is in the newspaper.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is addressing the standard of decorum in debate on the House floor.

Mr. STEARNS. Well, Madam Speaker, if you are quoting from a newspaper, like the New York Times, can you do that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No.

Mr. STEARNS. You cannot quote from the New York Times newspaper?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Member makes the words his own by quoting from the newspaper.

Mr. STEARNS. But I have used the word "quotation." I have actually put the word "quotation" in there to signal that these are not my words but these are words from the newspaper.

I mean, it appears to me, Madam Speaker, that if you cannot quote the newspapers on the House floor and use "quotation," that seems to be a denial of the right for a Member to use newspapers in an edifying way.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is a settled precedent that the standard is the same whether the Member speaks on his own account or quotes another source.

Mr. STEARNS. Out of deference to you, Madam Speaker, yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. STEARNS. So, Madam Speaker, it is time for the Attorney General to disclose Mr. LaBella's report. That is all I am asking here today.

The American people have a right to know what is in that report. In fact, they should have an opportunity to know what the FBI director said when he also recommended that an independent counsel be appointed.

□ 1245

I think at this point, I think that the newspapers speak for themselves and so now, Madam Speaker, I think the Attorney General should come forward and tell us when she is going to make that report available.

#### MAKING ATLANTA, GEORGIA A MORE LIVABLE COMMUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, one indication of how the momentum for the efforts across the country to promote livability has been gaining speed is the comments from governors who are talking about smart growth and livability in their State of the State addresses. One State deserves special attention and that is Georgia, where we have been watching a renaissance in our cities and inner suburbs taking place.

Atlanta, which some have sort of dismissed as the poster child of sprawl, is making significant progress under the

leadership of Governor Barnes and with the assistance of business leaders like John Williams, who was recently profiled in the New York Times.

Atlanta has been characterized by some as the area of the most rapid growth in the history of human settlement. A more than 25 percent increase in population since 1990, the city in that time frame has grown from north to south from 65 miles to 110 miles, and the results have been devastating, frankly. The average Atlanta commuter drives 36½ miles daily, the average, the longest work trip commute in the world.

This has had serious problems in terms of their air quality to the point that Federal transportation officials have withheld resources because it is not meeting air quality standards. Over 60 percent of the State's rivers and streams do not meet water quality standards, almost twice the national average.

It is losing business. In 1998, Atlanta lost a bid for the Harley Davidson plant. Hewlett Packard decided not to expand its Atlanta facilities; and in fact, the city lost its 1997 top rank as the country's best real estate market and is now 15 among 18 cities that are monitored.

There are even concerns about the health implications. Last fall, the Centers for Disease Control reported amongst the alarming national increase in obesity rates that the greatest percentage increase occurred in Georgia, over 100 percent in the last 10 years. Some of these experts were speculating that it may be related to the bad air that discourages exercise and the poor urban design that makes it hard to find places to walk, bike, and otherwise exercise.

Asthma is the number one reason for childhood hospitalization in Atlanta, but there are very positive signs on the horizon. As I mentioned, the leadership of Governor Barnes, with the business community, was able to create the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority to coordinate and oversee for the first time metropolitan Atlanta's fight against pollution, traffic, and unplanned growth. There is an exciting 138-acre redevelopment in the old Atlantic Steel site that is combining residential, retail, office and entertainment space in a transit-oriented development on a brownfield site in midtown Atlanta.

Recently, we have seen another business, Bell South, decided to relocate from 75 different suburban office areas to three centers for 13,000 employees inside the perimeter and all adjacent to transit. In no small way, this has been the result of business leadership exemplified by Mr. Williams, head of Post Properties. In fact, he has been here on Capitol Hill meeting with senators and representatives talking about how, in fact, his business, which was built on the development of suburban luxury office, has discovered a significant opportunity to move this new

housing into the increased demand closer in central cities, growing at more than 10 percent a year as opposed to 2 percent in the suburbs. They have shifted their focus from development on existing farm lands and wood lots to more urban locations and expanding to make a profit in in-town housing, not just in projects in Atlanta but also the real estate markets in Texas, Florida, and Virginia.

One of the reasons why the livable communities initiatives are being successful is not just because of political leadership but because business leaders, like Mr. Williams, the president of the chamber of commerce for metropolitan Atlanta, understand what is at stake and they have practiced their civic leadership in the broader sense of the community and with their personal business practices. This is a very positive sign for those of us who want more livable communities so that our families can be safe, healthy, and economically secure.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY MUST BE SAVED FOR THE NEXT GENERATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I would like to discuss for the next 4 or 5 minutes why everybody is talking about Social Security, why they are concerned that Social Security is in trouble some time in the future, why young people today think the chances of their getting any Social Security are pretty remote. It is the young people today, probably under 35 years old, that are most at risk in not having Social Security in their retirement years if we continue to fail to do anything to keep Social Security solvent.

The chart that I brought in represents where we are now. If we look at the top left part of the chart, the little blue area in the top left is the current surpluses coming in to the Social Security trust fund, in other words, the amount of taxes that are in excess of benefits payments going out. That is going to stop around 2011 or 2012. At that point, there are going to be fewer Social Security taxes coming in than are needed to pay current benefits. Of course, Social Security, since it started in 1935, has been sort of a Ponzi game where current workers pay in their taxes that is immediately sent out to current retirees, and so it is a pay-as-you-go program.

The red portion represents where we are in terms of what is going to be the additional amount of dollars needed to pay current Social Security benefits in future years. We get down to 2019, and we are going to need something like \$400 billion additional money from some place, either increased taxes or

increased borrowing, to pay promised Social Security benefits. It is a problem.

We are now looking at probably the best economic times in the history of the United States, where we are having a surplus of total revenues coming into the Federal Government. The question is now, do we use those revenues to spend on new expanded social programs and expand the size of Federal Government? Do we use those monies to start solving the Social Security problem? Here is what is needed: right now the average retiree that retires from now on is not going to get the money back that they and their employer put into Social Security, so essentially a zero-percent return on their finances unless they are lucky enough to live into their 80s and 90s or to be 100 years old.

So what do we do? I think one thing we have to do in the first place is to understand the seriousness of the problem. To demonstrate how serious it is, I projected what is going to be needed in payroll taxes if we do nothing in the next 30 or 40 years. If we are going to have a FICA tax, a payroll tax, that accommodates the needs of Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid, Social Security taxes are projected to go up to be 40 percent of one's income within the next 35 to 40 years.

All we have to do to verify that kind of serious situation, increasing the cost of producing everything we produce in this country, is to look at what is happening in Europe, in Japan. Several countries now in Europe are up to that 40 percent mark. Japan is approaching it. A country like France, the effective payroll deduction to pay for the senior programs in France now is approximately 70 percent of payroll. It is no wonder that France is finding it very difficult to compete in the world market.

If we do nothing in this country, if we keep putting these proposed solutions off because it is easy to demagog, because really there is only two ways, Madam Speaker, to fix Social Security and to fix Medicare. We either bring more revenues into the program or we reduce the amount of money coming out. That means increasing taxes or reducing benefits. One way to increase revenues, though, is starting to get a better return on the investments coming in to Social Security, coming into Medicare. That means investing some of that money in real returns with real investments. That is why I have advocated for the last several years that we have personal retirement savings accounts that can draw real interest returns so that modest-income workers today can retire wealthy because of the magic of compound interest.

My grandson painted our fence this last summer, and I tried to convince him to put his money into a Roth IRA, and we figured what that money would be worth 50 years from now. He said, Grandpa, I want to really buy a car with that money and save up for a car. So we went step by step, year after

year to see if that money would return revenues and we found out that \$160 would turn into \$70,000 by the time he was ready to retire.

We have to have some real retirement accounts. We have to start getting real returns on the money that is coming in from Social Security.

#### TUBERCULOSIS, A WORLDWIDE EPIDEMIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, remember when we were children, in some cases 30, 40, 50 years ago, tuberculosis clinics were closing in virtually every community in America. I remember growing up in Mansfield, Ohio, in the 1950s and 1960s; and I remember that tuberculosis clinic was closed there because Americans realized that tuberculosis was not really much of a problem in the United States of the 1960s or 1970s or 1980s.

People are surprised in this country. Members of Congress are surprised, citizens are surprised, to learn that tuberculosis in 1999 killed 2 million people around the world. It killed more people in 1999 around the world than in any year in history. Tuberculosis is one of the greatest infectious disease killers of adults worldwide, killing someone every 15 seconds. It is the biggest killer of young women around the world. It is the biggest killer of people with HIV/AIDS. Of the deaths from AIDS in Africa, literally one-third of those deaths actually are from tuberculosis.

The World Health Organization estimates that one-third of the world's population of the 6 billion people in the world, some 2 billion are infected with the bacteria that causes tuberculosis, including an estimated 10 to 15 million people in the United States.

In India, 1,300 people a day in India, 1,300 people a day die from tuberculosis. An estimated 8 million people around the world develop active TB each year. It is spreading as a result of inadequate treatment, and it is a disease that knows no national borders; and it is becoming more and more of a problem in the United States. The threat that TB poses for Americans derives, one, from the global spread of tuberculosis and, second, from the emergence and spread of strains of tuberculosis that are multidrug resistant.

In the U.S., TB treatment is normally only about \$2,000 per patient in the United States and in developing countries as little as \$15 or \$20 or no more than \$100 per patient, regular, sort of standard tuberculosis. The costs can go up to as much as \$250,000 a patient to treat multidrug resistant tuberculosis, and the treatment is much less likely to be successful.

Multidrug-resistant TB kills more than half those infected even in the

United States and other industrialized nations.

Madam Speaker, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), Republican from Maryland, and I are bipartisanly sponsoring legislation which will authorize an appropriation of \$100 million to U.S. Agency for International Development, USAID, for the purpose of diagnosing and treating TB in high-incidence countries. The director general of the World Health Organization, Secretary General Gro Brundtland, said that tuberculosis is not a medical problem, it is a political problem. We know how to take care of people with tuberculosis. We know how to treat tuberculosis. The question is the political will to do it, the resources available to do it.

Tuberculosis experts estimate that it will cost an additional \$1 billion each year worldwide to control this disease.

□ 1300

The great majority of funds are used for the direct implementation of DOTS Tuberculosis Control Program, DOTS stands for directly observed treatment, where a person infected with TB must take medication every day for up to 6 months, and, if they stop taking it, then even when they stop coughing up blood or stop showing symptoms of TB, their multi-drug-resistant TB can come back. That is why it is simple to treat, but difficult to make sure that people take their medicine every day.

The medicine is there. The will needs to be there, the outreach workers need to be available, whether it is in the United States or India or Nigeria or wherever across the world.

Resources under our legislation will be used primarily in those countries having the highest incidence of tuberculosis. It is a problem worldwide that we as a wealthy country have a moral obligation to deal with. It is a problem worldwide that we have a practical reason to deal with, because tuberculosis, with more tourism, travel, with more business development, with more trade, with more airplanes, tuberculosis has come into our country in greater and greater incidence, unless we in fact try to deal with tuberculosis internationally.

That is why we already have bipartisan support for the legislation that the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) and I are working on. That is why I ask other Members to join us in cosponsoring this legislation which I will be introducing next week. March 24 is International Tuberculosis Day. We will be introducing the bill next week, the week of March 24, and ask other Members to cosponsor it.

TRIBUTE TO COMMANDER PETER GUMATAOTAO, COMMANDING OFFICER, U.S.S. "DECATUR"

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) is recognized for 2 minutes.