

Borski	Goss	Manzullo	Schakowsky	Stenholm	Udall (NM)
Boswell	Graham	Markey	Schiff	Strickland	Upton
Boucher	Granger	Mascara	Schrock	Stump	Velazquez
Boyd	Graves	Matheson	Scott	Stupak	Visclosky
Brady (PA)	Green (TX)	Matsui	Sensenbrenner	Sununu	Vitter
Brady (TX)	Green (WI)	McCarthy (MO)	Serrano	Sweeney	Walden
Brown (OH)	Greenwood	McCarthy (NY)	Sessions	Tancredo	Walsh
Brown (SC)	Grucci	McCollum	Shadegg	Tanner	Wamp
Bryant	Gutierrez	McCreery	Shaw	Tauscher	Waters
Burr	Gutknecht	McDermott	Shays	Tauzin	Watkins
Buyer	Hall (OH)	McGovern	Sherman	Taylor (MS)	Watt (NC)
Callahan	Hall (TX)	McHugh	Sherwood	Taylor (NC)	Watts (OK)
Calvert	Hansen	McInnis	Shows	Terry	Waxman
Camp	Harman	McIntyre	Simmons	Thomas	Weiner
Cannon	Hart	McKeon	Simpson	Thompson (CA)	Weldon (FL)
Cantor	Hastings (FL)	McNulty	Sisisky	Thompson (MS)	Weldon (PA)
Capito	Hastings (WA)	Meehan	Skeen	Thornberry	Weller
Capps	Hayes	Meek (FL)	Skelton	Thune	Wexler
Capuano	Hayworth	Meeke (NY)	Slaughter	Thurman	Whitfield
Cardin	Hefley	Menendez	Smith (NJ)	Tiahrt	Wicker
Carson (IN)	Herger	Mica	Smith (TX)	Tiberi	Wilson
Carson (OK)	Hill	Millender-McDonald	Smith (WA)	Tierney	Wolf
Castle	Hilleary	Miller (FL)	Solis	Toomey	Woolsey
Chabot	Hilliard	Miller (VA)	Spence	Towns	Wu
Chambliss	Hinojosa	Moakley	Spratt	Trafficant	Wynn
Clay	Hobson	Mollohan	Stark	Turner	Young (FL)
Clayton	Hoefel	Moore	Stearns	Udall (CO)	
Clement	Hoekstra	Moran (KS)			
Clyburn	Holden	Moran (VA)			
Coble	Holt	Morella	Filner	Nadler	
Collins	Honda	Murtha			
Combust	Hooley	Myrick			
Condit	Horn	Napolitano	Hinchev	Sabo	
Conyers	Hostettler	Neal	Mink	Snyder	
Costello	Houghton	Nethercutt			
Cox	Hoyer	Ney			
Coyne	Hulshof	Northup			
Cramer	Hunter	Norwood			
Crane	Hutchinson	Nussle			
Crenshaw	Hyde	Oberstar			
Crowley	Inslee	Obey			
Cubin	Isakson	Olver			
Culberson	Israel	Osborne			
Cummings	Issa	Ose			
Cunningham	Istook	Otter			
Davis (CA)	Jackson (IL)	Owens			
Davis (FL)	Jackson-Lee (TX)	Oxley			
Davis (IL)	Jefferson	Pallone			
Davis, Jo Ann	Jenkins	Pascarell			
Davis, Thomas M.	John	Pastor			
Deal	Johnson (CT)	Paul			
DeFazio	Johnson (IL)	Pelosi			
DeGette	Johnson, E.B.	Pence			
Delahunt	Johnson, Sam	Peterson (MN)			
DeLauro	Jones (NC)	Peterson (PA)			
DeLay	Jones (OH)	Petri			
DeMint	Kanjorski	Phelps			
Deutsch	Kaptur	Pickering			
Diaz-Balart	Keller	Pitts			
Dicks	Kelly	Platts			
Dingell	Kennedy (MN)	Pombo			
Doggett	Kennedy (RI)	Pomeroy			
Dooley	Kerns	Portman			
Doyle	Kildee	Price (NC)			
Dreier	Kilpatrick	Pryce (OH)			
Duncan	Kind (WI)	Putnam			
Dunn	King (NY)	Quinn			
Edwards	Kingston	Radanovich			
Ehlers	Kirk	Rahall			
Ehrlich	Kleczka	Ramstad			
Emerson	Knollenberg	Rangel			
Engel	Kolbe	Regula			
English	Kucinich	Rehberg			
Eshoo	LaFalce	Reyes			
Etheridge	LaHood	Reynolds			
Evans	Lampson	Riley			
Everett	Langevin	Rivers			
Farr	Lantos	Rodriguez			
Fattah	Largent	Roemer			
Ferguson	Larsen (WA)	Rogers (KY)			
Flake	Larson (CT)	Rogers (MI)			
Fletcher	Latham	Rohrabacher			
Foley	LaTourette	Ros-Lehtinen			
Ford	Leach	Ross			
Fossella	Lee	Rothman			
Frank	Levin	Roukema			
Frelinghuysen	Lewis (CA)	Roybal-Allard			
Frost	Lewis (GA)	Royce			
Gallely	Lewis (KY)	Rush			
Ganske	Linder	Ryan (WI)			
Gekas	Lipinski	Ryun (KS)			
Gibbons	LoBiondo	Sanchez			
Gilchrest	Loftgren	Sanders			
Gillmor	Lucas (KY)	Sandlin			
Gilman	Lucas (OK)	Sawyer			
Gonzalez	Luther	Saxton			
Goode	Maloney (CT)	Scarborough			
Goodlatte	Maloney (NY)	Schaffer			

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES AND COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 37) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 37

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Financial Services: Mr. Sanders of Vermont;

Committee on Government Reform: Mr. Sanders of Vermont.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAKING IN ORDER ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2001 A MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time on the legislative day of Wednesday, February 14, 2001, for the Speaker to entertain a motion that the House suspend the rules relating to H.R. 524.

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

There was no objection.

MAKING IN ORDER ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2001 CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 559, RAIL PASSENGER DISASTER FAMILY ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time on the legislative day of Wednesday, February 14, 2001, without intervention of any point of order, to consider in the House H.R. 559; that the bill be considered as read for amendment; and that the previous question be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except for 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and one motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order

NAYS—2

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4

NOT VOTING—19

□ 1833

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "To establish a procedure to safeguard the surpluses of the Social Security and Medicare hospital insurance trust funds."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall votes Nos. 12 and 13 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been here I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote No. 12 and "yea" on rollcall vote No. 13.

JOINT SESSION OF THE CONGRESS—STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 28) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The Clerk will report the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 28

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, February 27, 2001, at 9 p.m., for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

INTRODUCTION OF FEDERAL JUDICIAL FAIRNESS ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Federal Judicial Fairness Act of 2001.

This morning, the American Bar Association and the Federal Bar Association released a report detailing a fundamental problem that has been escalating over the past decade, the erosion of fair and adequate compensation for the Federal judiciary.

These two well-respected groups found that the current salaries of Federal judges have reached such a level of inadequacy and quality that the independence of the third branch of our Federal Government is threatened. I agree with these findings.

Since 1993, Congress has granted Federal judges only three of a possible nine cost-of-living adjustments, leaving our judges with a 13.4 percent decline in purchasing power. Not coincidentally, 54 Federal District Court and Circuit Court judges have left the bench in the 1990s, compared to only three during the entire 1960s.

Yes, the salaries of Federal judges are higher than the average salary in many occupations. But, yes, the salaries that our Federal judges could earn in the private sector could be exponentially higher than what they earn as judges.

No individual agrees to serve in the Federal judiciary because of the pay. Individuals seek and accept nominations to the bench because they want to serve their country. But this does not mean that they should forego fair compensation for their critical work. It should be Congress' goal to ensure that the judges can afford to commit to public service and make certain that the judiciary is not open only to those with the financial means to do so.

Absent a change in the way we compensate these judges, I fear that the superior quality of our Federal judicial system may deteriorate over time.

This is why I am introducing the Federal Judiciary Fairness Act. The bill restores the six cost-of-living adjustments that Congress failed to grant the Federal judiciary in the 1990s, amounting to an immediate 9.6 percent salary increase.

My bill also fixes the annual pay adjustment problems for Federal judges. Unlike other Federal employees, Members of Congress and the President's Cabinet, Federal judges receive a COLA only if Congress specifically authorizes it. Under the Federal Judiciary Fairness Act, Federal judges will receive an annual COLA not subject to the approval of Congress. The size of the COLA would be determined by the Employment Cost Index, but it would not

be larger than one received by other Federal employees under the General Schedule pay rate.

Together, these provisions will do much to remedy a problem, disparity in pay between the private and public sectors, that plagues one of the three branches of the Federal Government. But, Mr. Speaker, this legislation is about more than just fairly compensating the individuals who sit on the Federal bench. We must ensure that our Federal judiciary can attract and retain the best and the brightest. Passing the Federal Judicial Fairness Act is a small but important step in achieving this goal.

I want to thank my colleagues, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), for agreeing to be original cosponsors of this legislation; and I urge all my colleagues to support the Federal Judicial Fairness Act.

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

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

THE ECONOMY

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, many government and Federal Reserve officials have repeatedly argued that we have no inflation to fear; yet those who claim this define inflation as rising consumer and producer prices. Although inflation frequently leads to price increases, we must remember that the free market definition of inflation is the increase in supply of money and credit.

Monetary inflation is seductive in that it can cause great harm without significantly affecting government price indices.

□ 1845

The excess credit may well go into the stock market and real estate speculation, with consumer price increases limited to such things as energy, repairs, medical care and other services. One should not conclude, as so many have in the past decade, that we have no inflation to worry about. Imbalances did develop with the 1990s monetary inflation, but were ignored. They are now becoming readily apparent as sharp adjustments take place, such as we have seen in the past year with the NASDAQ.

When one is permitted to use rising prices as the definition for inflation, it is followed by a nonsensical assumption that a robust economy is the cause for rising prices. Foolish conclusions of this sort lead our economic planners and Federal Reserve officials

to attempt to solve the problem of price and labor cost inflation by precipitating an economic slowdown.

Such a deliberate policy is anathema to a free market economy. It is always hoped that the planned economic slowdown will not do serious harm, but this is never the case. The recession, with rising prices, still comes. That is what we are seeing today.

Raising interest rates six times in 1999 to 2000 has had an effect, and the central planners are now worried. Falsely, they believe that if only the money spigot is once again turned on, all will be well. That will prove to be a pipe dream. It is now recognized that indeed the economy has sharply turned downward, which is what was intended. But can the downturn be controlled? Not likely. And inflation, by even the planners' own definition, is raising its ugly head.

For instance, in the fourth quarter of last year, labor costs rose at an annualized rate of 6.6 percent, the biggest increase in 9 years. What is happening to employment conditions? They are deteriorating rapidly. Economist Ed Hyman reported that 270,000 people lost their jobs in January, a 678 percent increase over a year ago.

A growing number of economists are now doubtful that private growth will save us from the correction that many free market economists predicted would come as an inevitable consequence of the interest rate distortion that Federal Reserve policy causes.

Instead of blind faith in the Federal Reserve to run the economy, we should become more aware of Congress' responsibility for maintaining a sound dollar and removing the monopoly power of our central bank to create money and credit out of thin air, and to fix short-term interest rates, which is the real cause of our economic downturns.

Between 1995 and today, Greenspan increased the money supply, as measured by MZM, by \$1.9 trillion, or a 65 percent increase. There is no reason to look any further for the explanation of why the economy is slipping, with labor costs rising, energy costs soaring, and medical and education costs skyrocketing, while the stock market is disintegrating.

Until we look at the unconstitutional monopoly power the Federal Reserve has over money and credit, we can expect a continuation of our problems. Demanding lower interest rates is merely insisting the Federal Reserve deliberately create even more credit, which caused the problem in the first place. We cannot restore soundness to the dollar by debasing the dollar, which is what lowering interest rates is all about, printing more money.

When control is lost in a sharp downturn, dealing with it by massive monetary inflation may well cause something worse than the stagflation that we experienced in the 1970s; an inflationary recession or depression could result.