

We believe there is a need to increase overall retirement security, which must include leveraging of private sector dollars by expanding pensions. The Portman-Cardin bill knocks down barriers to savings by raising limits for all Americans, allowing Americans to set aside more of their earnings tax free. It untangles complex and irrational rules and cuts through red tape that burdens retirement plans and their participants, and it creates new incentives for small businesses to establish plans.

The Portman-Cardin bill also allows a special catch-up contribution for older Americans who have been out of the workforce for a while perhaps, working in part-time positions, particularly important for working moms who have returned to the workforce after raising their children and want to have more of a nest egg for retirement. We also respond, as I mentioned earlier, to the new realities of a mobile workforce by allowing portability.

If enacted, all these changes will expand retirement savings and make the difference between retirement subsistence and real retirement security for millions of Americans. I urge the Congress to focus on this issue and to address this problem through the Portman-Cardin bill and other legislation to reform and expand our private pension system.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE JACK KINGSTON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JACK KINGSTON, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 7, 1999.

Hon. J. Dennis Hastert,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule VIII (8) of the Rules of the House that I received a subpoena (duces tecum) issued by the Superior Court of Bulloch County, Georgia, in the case of Griffin v. Zimnavoda.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

JACK KINGSTON,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

CRISIS IN KOSOVO

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, I rise this evening to address the crisis that is ongoing now in Yugoslavia. For a war to be moral, we must have a reason to go in. National defense is a moral justification. If we are attacked, it is a moral war. Getting involved in any other kind of war is not considered to be moral.

A legal war in this country is one that is declared, declared by the Congress. Any other war is illegal. The war in Yugoslavia now pursued by our administration and with NATO is both immoral and illegal and it should not be pursued. We will be soon voting on an appropriation, probably next week. There may be a request for \$5 billion to pursue the war in Yugoslavia. I do not believe that we should continue to finance a war that is both immoral and illegal.

It has been said that we are in Yugoslavia to stop ethnic cleansing, but it is very clear that the goal of the NATO forces is to set up an ethnic state.

□ 1945

It is totally contradictory. There is a civil war, and it is horrible, going on in Yugoslavia today, but this is no justification for outsiders, and especially United States of America, to become involved without the proper proceedings.

I believe that our colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), deserves to be complemented because he is making a determined effort to put the burden on the Members of Congress to vote one way or the other. Since World War II we have fought numerous wars, and they have never been fought with a declaration of war, and it is precisely for that reason, because they have not been fought for truly national security reasons, that we have not won these wars. If a war is worth fighting, it is worth declaring, and it is worth winning.

I am delighted that this effort is being made by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) and others here in the Congress because for so long, for 50 years now, we have permitted our Presidents to casually and carelessly involve our troops overseas. So I see this trend as putting more pressure on the Congress to respond to their responsibilities. I think this is a very, very good move and going in the right direction.

It has been asked why in the world might we be there if it is not a concern for the refugees, because obviously we have hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of refugees in many, many places around the world. We do not go to Rwanda to rescue the refugees, we did not go into Yugoslavia to rescue the Serbian refugees when they were being routed from Bosnia and Croatia, but all of a sudden the refugees seem to have an importance.

Most people know why we went to the Persian Gulf. It was not because we were attacked. It was because of a financial commercial interest: oil. But

what is the interest in this area in Yugoslavia? I am not sure exactly what it is. There has been a lot of postulations about this, but I am not convinced that it is all of a sudden the concern for the refugees.

Yesterday in the Washington Post an interesting article occurred on this subject, but it was not in the news section; it was in the business section. There was a headline yesterday in the Washington Post that said: Count Corporate America Among NATO's Staunchest Allies. Very interesting article because it goes on to explain why so many corporations have an intense interest in making sure that the credibility of NATO is maintained, and they go on to explain that it is not just the arms manufacturers but the technology people who expect to sell weapons in Eastern Europe, in Yugoslavia, and they are very interested in making use of the NATO forces to make sure that their interests are protected. I think this is not the reason for us to go to war.

There is talk now of calling up all our Reserves or many of our Reserves at the same time there are hints now that there may be the institution of the draft. So this is a major problem that this country is facing, the world is facing, and up until now we, the Congress, have not spoken.

On February 9 of this year I introduced a bill that would have prohibited this by prohibiting any funds being spent on a war in Yugoslavia. I say it is too bad we did not pass that legislation a long time ago.

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

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER
TIME

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time previously allotted to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? There was no objection.

NEW DEMOCRATS FOR FISCAL
DISCIPLINE

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

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to the Republican budget that the House passed this afternoon.

As a member of the New Democratic Coalition when I came to Congress, I was very proud of the vote that I made

last year in the last session to help lead my party in this Congress back to fiscal responsibility and be able to vote on the first balanced budget in a generation.

I say that with a heavy heart today because I think we have just passed one, the majority has, that is not a budget but a political document.

Prior to my service in public office, Mr. Speaker, I spent 19 years running a small business in North Carolina, where you have to balance the budget, you have to meet a payroll every week, and if you do not balance your books, you will go broke.

When I served in the General Assembly where I served for 10 years, I chaired the appropriations committee for 4 years where I helped write a balanced budget for 4 straight years. You have to balance the budget to make sure you do not have to raise taxes.

As State Superintendent of Schools of the State of North Carolina for 8 years I had responsibility for running a large agency with a huge budget; I cut a bureaucracy, and it helped improve the quality of education, with others in my State.

The people of North Carolina sent me to Congress 2 years ago to help with balancing the Federal budget and to put our national financial house in order, and I was tremendously proud to serve in that first session and vote to balance the budget. But that discipline is difficult. It is difficult to keep your budgets balanced. It is difficult to do the things you need to do to make sure you do not overspend. But it is economically wise, and it is a moral imperative.

Mr. Speaker, that is why the Republican resolution that passed today is so disappointing. It returns to those irresponsible promises, in my opinion, and the tax cut binges that helped create the annual deficits, and it crippled this country's economy and piled up a huge national debt in the 1980s that our children and grandchildren could be forced to pay.

In order to push this risky scheme, the Republican leadership has passed a budget that fails to protect Social Security and Medicare, threatens needed investments with our priorities in education and abandons our new-found fiscal discipline. This misguided attitude captured on this floor by Members of the majority who said there is nothing, there is no such thing, as an irresponsible tax cut, that is the kind of attitude we ran into in the 1980's that got us in such bad trouble. We should not return to those attitudes.

Let me state for the record that I support tax cuts, I am in favor of them, but I think we ought to keep our financial house in order.

One of the first bills that I signed as a Member of this Congress when I came was the tax cut for the middle class, for estate tax relief for small businesses and farmers, for the \$500-per-child tax credit, for HOPE scholarships

so that our children could go to school and have an opportunity to blossom in the 21st century, and to help families pay their college tuitions, and for tax credits or to deduct interest on the money they borrowed to go to college.

In this Congress I have introduced legislation for school construction, to provide tax free interest bonds at the State level to build new schools in our communities, which in turn would provide relief to a lot of our local communities that are feeling the strain of tremendous growth.

So I am for tax cuts, but they must be responsible, they must be paid for. We must save Social Security and Medicare first before we jump off the cliff. We must pay down the national debt to keep the interest rate down and encourage economic growth.

We are now enjoying one of the largest, longest and greatest periods of economic prosperity in our Nation's history, and we should not do anything to undermine it. We must make careful investments in education and in health care and scientific research that will provide the basis for the future for our tremendous growth. We have had that already. We need to continue so that we will enjoy the bounty of a new economy in the 21st century.

ECONOMIC ISSUES

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

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we did have an opportunity to vote on the budget; call it the Republican budget if you will; and, just as a matter of response to my friend from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) who expressed his criticism of that budget, I would like to, if I might, set the record straight because I think the American people have a right to know for the first time in a long time we are being honest.

This is a honest budget. This says to the American people that we are going to set aside Social Security and Medicare taxes, payroll taxes, and leave them there, lock them up, wall them off and not touch that because the surplus that we are running today, most of it is in Social Security and Medicare and the payroll tax side of the budget. After that is done, after those dollars are walled off and we get into the future years when there are surpluses on the overall budget, in other words, coming off the income tax and other sources of government revenue, then we can engage in a debate in this Chamber, in the Congress, about how best to use those revenues.

Now our side happens to believe we said in our plan that we think we would like to see those dollars go back in the form of tax relief because the American people worked hard to produce those dollars, and they ought to be able to keep more of what they earn. But the fact of the matter is, and

make no mistake about it, the American public has a right to know that all this demagoguery and all this hype, and we have heard it before and we are going to hear it again, but the Republican budget that was passed today sets aside 100 percent of the Social Security and Medicare payroll tax and walls it off and locks it up.

Now everybody on the other side is talking about the President's great budget which got two votes in the House, two votes in the Senate because it was a statement of priorities, it was a statement of values. The President's budget raised taxes by \$172 billion over 5 years. The President's budget sets aside less for Medicare and Social Security than does the Republican budget, and again we do it by being honest with the American people and saying when you pay the payroll tax at the payroll, it ought to go into the Social Security Trust Fund to be used for Social Security and Medicare.

The President's budget also talked about debt repayment. The plan that we voted on today actually retires more debt, pays off more debt than does the President's budget, substantially more debt over the course of the next 10 years. And then again at end when we are actually generating a surplus above and beyond Social Security, then we have a national debate in this country about whether the hard-working people of America ought to be able to keep more of what they earn or we ought to spend more here on Washington bureaucracies and programs.

Mr. Speaker, that is a honest debate, but do not fall for the lies because you are going to hear them over and over again. The fact of the matter is that the budget that we passed today sets us on a path and on a course that is consistent with protecting the retirement earnings of America's hard workers.

Let me just, if I might today, also address an issue which is very important in my State. Last week, or during the course of the recess, I traveled in western South Dakota in places like Spearfish, and Belle Fourche, and Buffalo, and Lemmon, and McIntosh and Timber Lake, and Mo Bridge, and Mound City, and Eureka, and Leola, and Aberdine and Watertown, and one of the things that I found out, and I already knew but I heard more, and I got a really good earful on my travels across South Dakota about the crisis affecting agriculture because that part of the State, the northwestern part of South Dakota, has been as hard hit as any place in the country, and I believe that we have a responsibility to recognize the incredible crisis that is affecting our agricultural producers and to address it, and there are a series of initiatives that we will be rolling out over the course of the next several weeks which I think do just that. But I believe we need to have a debate in this Congress on mandatory price reporting. Our producers need to know in making decisions what the market information is that the packers are using