



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, APRIL 10, 2000

No. 44

## House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WICKER).

□

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
April 10, 2000.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ROGER F. WICKER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

□

### MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 19, 1999, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

□

### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There being no Members seeking recognition, pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□

□ 1400

### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT) at 2 p.m.

### PRAYER

The Reverend Dr. Ronald Christian, Lutheran Social Services, Fairfax, Virginia, offered the following prayer:

O God, with these words and our thoughts, we acknowledge Your almighty power and recognize our ultimate dependence on Your great mercy.

So we pray, deliver us in Your might this day from callous hearts so that we may be agents of your goodness and orderlies of Your compassion.

Grant that from Your great storehouse of grace, we may receive the blessings of seasonal weather for the spring planting, comity for all communities in their life together, and joy in our pursuit of liberty and justice for all.

Gracious God, dispose our days and our deeds in Your peace.

□

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

□

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TRAFICANT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

□

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which the concur-

rence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1832. An act to reform unfair and anti-competitive practices in the professional boxing industry.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a joint resolution of the following title in which concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 43. Joint resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President of the United States should encourage free and fair elections and respect for democracy in Peru.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 89 (106th Congress), the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators to the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies—  
the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT);  
the Senator from Kentucky, (Mr. MCCONNELL); and  
the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD).

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 96-114, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, announces the appointment of the following individuals to the Congressional Award Board—

Blaine L. Chao, of Kentucky; and  
Linda Mitchell, of Mississippi.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 93-415, as amended by Public law 102-586, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, after consultation with the Democratic Leader, announces the reappointment of the following individuals to serve as members of the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention:

Michael W. McPhail, of Mississippi, to a one-year term;

Dr. Larry K. Brendtro, of South Dakota, to a two-year term; and

Charles Sims, of Mississippi, to a three-year term.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1961

## WASTEFUL SPENDING

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, bureaucracy is a word we hear every day. The Federal Government has become so large that it is difficult to follow how individual agencies are spending taxpayer dollars.

Take the Federal Aviation Administration, for example. The FAA spent \$4 billion on an air traffic control modernization program that was unreliable, did not work, and was shut down before it was completed. Mr. Speaker, \$4 billion just flew out the window.

The General Accounting Office remains concerned about the agency's poor accounting and lack of control over costs, as the agency proceeds with its new \$42 billion air traffic modernization program. The GAO has every reason to be concerned about the FAA's decision-making process.

According to the Department of Transportation's report, FAA employees are using programs designed to acquaint air traffic controllers with cockpit operations for personal travel. And as my friend and colleague, the gentleman from the 17th district of Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT), would say, "Just beam me up, Scotty."

One employee took 12 weekend trips in a 15-month period to visit his family in Tampa, Florida, at taxpayers' expense.

Mr. Speaker, the waste of taxpayer dollars just will not fly any more.

□

## NEED FOR INVESTIGATION AT WACO

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, infrared video technology has proven beyond a reasonable doubt that rapid-fire semiautomatic weapons were fired into the Branch Davidian compound after the explosive fire had ignited. Yet all this time, the Justice Department and the FBI have maintained in their knowledge they never fired into the compound after or before the fire had started.

Janet Reno further said she believed the FBI was telling the truth. Beam me up. 80 Americans were killed, many of them innocent women and children. They continued to lie. Stop the lies. Stop the coverup. Stop lying to Congress and Congress stop letting agencies get away with it. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the need for an investigation into the lies at Waco.

□

## BREAST AND CERVICAL CANCER TREATMENT ACT

(Mrs. MORELLA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, as you know, on May 14, we will celebrate Mother's Day. To honor that day, I am pleased that the leadership has agreed to schedule a vote on H.R. 1070, which is the Breast and Cervical Cancer Treatment Act.

This legislation will provide treatment for low-income, uninsured working women who are diagnosed with breast or cervical cancer. H.R. 1070 will give States the option of providing Medicaid coverage for these women if they are screened by the CDC's early detection program and found to have cancer, that is, the Centers for Disease Control. The program now provides screening for breast and cervical cancer, but can you believe it does not provide for treatment? H.R. 1070 will correct this. If we offer this screening, we must offer the treatment.

Mr. Speaker, the funding for H.R. 1070 is included in the budget resolution that the House recently passed. It enjoys strong bipartisan support. Let us do the right thing.

In honor of Mother's Day, let us pass H.R. 1070.

□

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record votes on postponed questions will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules but not before 6 p.m. today.

□

## AUTHORIZING THE 2000 DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SPECIAL OLYMPICS LAW ENFORCEMENT TORCH RUN TO BE RUN THROUGH THE CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 280) authorizing the 2000 District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run to be run through the Capitol Grounds.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 280

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),*

## SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF RUNNING OF D.C. SPECIAL OLYMPICS LAW ENFORCEMENT TORCH RUN THROUGH CAPITOL GROUNDS.

On June 2, 2000, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate may jointly designate, the 2000 District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run (in this resolution referred to as the "event") may be run through the Capitol Grounds as part of the journey of the Special Olympics torch to the District of Columbia Special Olympics summer games at Gallaudet University in the District of Columbia.

## SEC. 2. RESPONSIBILITY OF CAPITOL POLICE BOARD.

The Capitol Police Board shall take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the event.

## SEC. 3. CONDITIONS RELATING TO PHYSICAL PREPARATIONS.

The Architect of the Capitol may prescribe conditions for physical preparations for the event.

## SEC. 4. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.

The Capitol Police Board shall provide for enforcement of the restrictions contained in section 4 of the Act of July 31, 1946 (40 U.S.C. 193d; 60 Stat. 718), concerning sales, advertisements, displays, and solicitations on the Capitol Grounds, as well as other restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds, with respect to the event.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

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

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 280 authorizes the 2000 District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run to be conducted through the grounds of the Capitol on June 2, 2000, or on such date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration jointly designate.

The resolution also authorizes the Architect of the Capitol, the Capitol Police Board, and the D.C. Special Olympics, the sponsor of the event, to negotiate the necessary arrangement for carrying out the event in complete compliance with the rules and regulations governing the use of the Capitol Grounds.

The sponsor of the event will assume all expenses and liabilities in connection with the event and all sales, advertisements, and solicitations are prohibited.

The Capitol Police will host the opening ceremonies for the run starting on Capitol Hill and the event will be free of charge and open to the public. Over 2,000 law enforcement representatives, Mr. Speaker, from local and Federal law enforcement agencies in Washington will carry the Special Olympics torch in honor of the 2,500 Special Olympians who participate in this annual event to show their support of the Special Olympics.

For over a decade, the Congress has supported this worthy endeavor by enacting resolutions for the use of the grounds. I am proud to support this resolution and urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to join forces with my neighbor, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE), in supporting this legislation. Rather

than being redundant, I will not give my entire statement because I believe the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) has described the legislation quite thoroughly.

I would like to add that this was started by Eunice Kennedy Shriver, however, in the mid-1960s as a summer camp for handicapped children; and now this event has grown to involve, as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) has stated, 2,500 Special Olympians competing in more than a dozen events. So I think it is worthy. I support it.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) for yielding to me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate my strong support for the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Special Olympics Torch Run. It is very important and I wholeheartedly support it.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I would urge passage of the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 280.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□

#### DEEPEST SYMPATHIES TO THE FAMILIES OF DR. GARY POLIS AND MICHAEL ROSE FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT DAVIS

(Mr. OSE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my deepest sympathies to the families of Dr. Gary Polis and Michael Rose. The University of California at Davis community lost two valuable members when these two men were involved in a tragic boating accident in Mexico's Sea of Cortez.

Dr. Polis chaired and taught at UC Davis' Environmental Science and Policy Department. He traveled to Mexico to lead a research expedition with a group of UC Davis students, Japanese visiting scholars, and Earth Watch study tour participants. Michael Rose, postgraduate researcher at the university, was also on that trip. After a routine visit to a nearby island, the boat they were in capsized. Dr. Polis, Mr. Rose, and three advising Japanese scholars drowned.

While we understand that words cannot ease the pain everyone experienced during this tragic time, let us take solace in the fact that these people died doing the work they so loved and so willingly shared with the world. Both Dr. Polis and Michael Rose shared the passion for adventure and learning that epitomizes the spirit of the university. We were blessed by their distinguished academic accomplishments.

Mr. Speaker, please join me and the entire Davis community in offering our deepest heartfelt condolences to the family and friends of Dr. Polis and Michael Rose. Please know that our thoughts and prayers are with you during this difficult time.

□

#### AUTHORIZING USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR GREATER WASHINGTON SOAP BOX DERBY

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 277) authorizing the use of the Capitol grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 277

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).*

#### SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF SOAP BOX DERBY RACES ON CAPITOL GROUNDS.

The Greater Washington Soap Box Derby Association (in this resolution referred to as the "Association") shall be permitted to sponsor a public event, soap box derby races, on the Capitol Grounds on June 24, 2000, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate may jointly designate.

#### SEC. 2. CONDITIONS.

The event to be carried out under this resolution shall be free of admission charge to the public and arranged not to interfere with the needs of Congress, under conditions to be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board; except that the Association shall assume full responsibility for all expenses and liabilities incident to all activities associated with the event.

#### SEC. 3. STRUCTURES AND EQUIPMENT.

For the purposes of this resolution, the Association is authorized to erect upon the Capitol Grounds, subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, such stage, sound amplification devices, and other related structures and equipment as may be required for the event to be carried out under this resolution.

#### SEC. 4. ADDITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS.

The Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board are authorized to make any such additional arrangements that may be required to carry out the event under this resolution.

#### SEC. 5. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.

The Capitol Police Board shall provide for enforcement of the restrictions contained in section 4 of the Act of July 31, 1946 (40 U.S.C. 193d; 60 Stat. 718), concerning sales, displays, and solicitations on the Capitol Grounds, as well as other restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds, with respect to the event to be carried out under this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and the gen-

tleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

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

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 277, as amended, authorizes the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby qualifying races to be held on June 24, 2000, or on such date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration jointly designate. The resolution also authorizes the Architect of the Capitol, the Capitol Police Board, and the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby Association, which is the sponsor of the event, to negotiate the necessary arrangements for carrying out the event in complete compliance with the rules and regulations governing the use of the Capitol Grounds.

□ 1415

The event is open to the public and free of charge, and the sponsor will assume responsibility for all experiences and liabilities related to the event. In addition, sales, advertisements, and solicitations are explicitly prohibited on the Capitol Grounds in this event.

The races are going to take place on Constitution Avenue between Delaware Avenue and Third Street, N.W. The participants are residents of the Washington Metropolitan area and range in age from 9 to 16. This event is currently one of the largest races in the country, and the winners of these races will represent the Washington metropolitan area in the national finals to be held in Akron, Ohio.

I support this resolution. I urge my colleagues' support.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), as well as the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), and certainly the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the sponsor, for working together. Certainly there is some bipartisanship on this committee for sure.

But I want to take a couple minutes to filibuster, hopefully, so that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who would like to speak, might make it here. But if he does not, then he can speak on the next one.

So taking that minute, I would like to thank Mr. Rick Barnett and Ms. Susan Brita of the staff. They probably do more work in the Congress than any other committee. This little subcommittee passes more legislation

than anybody. They laugh when I say that, but there is an awful lot of work attached to it.

But I would like to talk about the efforts of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER). For years, he has taken this upon himself to make sure that that soap box derby is conducted, and he does it with a passion. As my colleagues can see, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), she was right there, and there are other Members probably who want to speak on it, too.

But I want to just say that the heavy hitter has come in, and I want to personally pay him that respect, because he has made it a personal issue. Everybody joins together with him.

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support this resolution. I am delighted to join the sponsors of this resolution, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), in supporting House Concurrent Resolution 277; and that, as we have heard, allows for participants in the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby to use the Capitol grounds and race along Constitution Avenue on June 24.

For the past 8 years, I have cosponsored this resolution, and it has gotten the almost unanimous support of this House, along with the rest of the Greater Washington Metropolitan Delegation, to promote this annual community service, which is now in its 63rd year of running.

From 1992 to 1999, the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby has been considered one of the largest races in the Nation, averaging over 40 contestants each year.

This year, the first Greater Washington Soap Box Derby of the new millennium expects to top previous enrollment numbers with 50 cars. Participants in the derby, ranging from ages from 9 to 16, live in communities in the great State of Maryland, the District of Columbia, and Virginia. The winners of the local events in June will have the honor of representing the Washington metropolitan area at the National Derby Race in Akron, Ohio on July 22.

The derby truly is a community event, with scores of children, parents, and volunteers working tirelessly to construct and operate the soap boxes. The region's youth have the opportunity to learn the lessons of teamwork, competition, and sportsman and sportswomanship, as well as the phys-

ics and mechanics that are involved in building an aerodynamically-shaped soap box car.

I also want to applaud one of my constituents, George Weissgerber of Rockville, Maryland, for his work this year as the derby director. I invite the Members of the House to, not only support this resolution today, but also to attend the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby on June 24.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me say this before I introduce my only speaker, from what I understand, there are many volunteers involved in this derby that give of their time, and time is money. I think the entire delegation has worked to really bring in those types of volunteers. I think that is where they deserve a lot of credit.

I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for his efforts for all of the young people who are involved in this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, timing is important, and I had the opportunity to come into the room just as the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) was talking about my efforts on this matter.

But I would like to mention as well one additional person who sits to the chairman's right, or to the ranking member's right, chairman-in-exile, as I call him, Susan Brita, who has been an extraordinary asset to the House and, frankly, to the committee, the full Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for an awful lot of years.

She probably knows as much about these matters, about construction matters and the General Services Administration and so many other matters related to our infrastructure as any staffer on this Hill. I want to thank her for all the efforts she has made. I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT), the ranking member, too, for working very closely with her so he does not make mistakes. It is always a good judgment that all of us make to have good staff.

Also, I want to thank the chairman, who is not in exile, but who is on the job, for his efforts and my colleague from Montgomery County, Mrs. MORELLA, for rising in support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, we have obviously, as the House of Representatives, responsibility for this hallowed Hill, this center of democracy in the world. It is, I think, extraordinarily appropriate that, for the last few number of years, we have made available a part of this Hill over which we have authority for an enterprise that has literally taught thousands and thousands of young people, entrepreneurial spirit, competitive spirit, family working together, because, although those young people are responsible for building their carts,

they do get some advice from and counsel from dad and mom and brothers and sisters from time to time, I know.

But this is truly an American enterprise. The Soap Box Derby is something that I think all of us have known about for almost all of our lives. It is an enterprise that takes the contributions of American business, of American volunteers, and certainly of the young people and their families.

This will be the 63rd running of the greater Washington Soap Box Derby, and it will take place as my colleagues have heard, Mr. Speaker, on June 24 of this year.

This resolution authorizes the Architect of the Capitol, as is necessary, as I have said, as well as the Capitol Police Board and the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby Association to negotiate the necessary arrangements for carrying out the running.

That obviously will not be, I think, a difficult job, although the concerns of the Capitol Police and the Architect must be met and, in fact, are met. In the past, the full House has supported this resolution, of course, unanimously.

But I do want to thank all of those in the Washington metropolitan area. This is not a partisan issue, obviously. The gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) who has spoken, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), and others spoke supporting this resolution.

From 1992 to 1999, the greater Washington Soap Box Derby welcomed over 40 contestants per year which made the Washington, D.C. race one of the largest in the country. Participants, as my colleagues have been told, I am sure, range from approximately 9 years of age to 16 years of age and come from communities in Maryland, the District of Columbia, and Virginia.

The winners of this local event will represent the Washington metropolitan area in the national race which will be held, as it has been through history, in Akron, Ohio on July 22 of this year.

The derby provides our young people with an opportunity to gain valuable skills, not only in those that I mentioned, but in practical skills of engineering, aerodynamics, and other skills necessary to make that go-cart go faster than any other go-cart down that hill. Of course this is a beautiful Hill, Capitol Hill, to use as they go down on the west side of our Capitol.

Furthermore, the derby promotes teamwork, a sense of accomplishment, sportsmanship, leadership, and responsibilities. These are attributes that we should encourage our young people to carry into adulthood. That is why this enterprise, like so many others, is critically important.

I, Mr. Speaker, like so many in this Chamber, have the opportunity to be

very much involved in the Boys and Girls Clubs of America. They have a national charter from this Congress, and they report to us annually.

Like the Boys and Girls Club, this enterprise gives young people a positive focus and positive way to participate in directing their energy in ways that will result in benefits to themselves and to our community.

Mr. Speaker, I am more than honored to have been involved in this effort and thank all of the corporate sponsors, all of the volunteers, all of the parents, and, yes, certainly all of the young people who participate in this event. It is right that we give them the opportunity to do so on this historic Hill. I rise in strong support of the resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the efforts of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and the entire delegation. I urge an "aye" vote.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as the great chairman of our committee says, there is no such thing as a Republican soap box and no such thing as a Democratic derby. I urge passage of the resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 277, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□

EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN CONTINUED SYMPATHY FOR VICTIMS OF OKLAHOMA CITY BOMBING ON OCCASION OF 5TH ANNIVERSARY OF BOMBING

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 448) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives in continued sympathy for the victims of the Oklahoma City bombing on the occasion of the 5th anniversary of the bombing.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 448

Whereas on April 19, 1995, as the result of an act of terrorism, a bomb exploded in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, collapsing the north face of the 9-story Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building;

Whereas April 19, 2000, marks the 5th anniversary of this tragic event;

Whereas the explosion killed more than 168 people, including 19 children, and injured

more than 700 others in the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building and in and around surrounding buildings;

Whereas the explosion destroyed a childcare facility located in the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building, killing 15 children;

Whereas 320 surrounding buildings were impacted from the explosion;

Whereas flying glass and debris from the explosion were a major cause of injury; and

Whereas greater awareness and sensitivity to the safe design and operation of buildings could help make the people who live and work in and around the buildings safer: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the countless acts of goodwill by the thousands of volunteers (including those who donated goods and services), rescue workers, and Federal, State, and local officials who assisted in the rescue and recovery efforts following the bombing in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, on April 19, 1995;

(2) sends continued condolences to the families, friends, and loved ones who still suffer from the consequences of the bombing;

(3) pledges to make Federal buildings safer, while still maintaining a level of openness to the citizens served by the buildings;

(4) pledges to create an awareness of the dangers of flying glass and debris resulting from an act of terrorism, an explosion, or a natural disaster; and

(5) pledges to support efforts to make buildings more secure for people from flying glass and debris and to promote the use of available technology to protect people from such glass and debris.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

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

House Resolution 448 expresses the sense of the House of Representatives in continued sympathy for the victims of the Oklahoma City bombing on the occasion of the fifth anniversary of that bombing.

On April 19, 1995, one of the worst acts of terrorism in the United States took place. A bomb exploded in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, collapsing the north face of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building. The explosion resulted in the death of 168 people, including 19 children, and injuring more than 700 other people in the area.

This resolution recognizes the countless acts of goodwill, of thousands of volunteers, including those donating goods and services, who aided in rescue and recovery efforts following the bombing. It also sends continued condolences to the family, friends, and loved ones who still suffer from the consequences of that act. It also pledges to make Federal buildings safer while maintaining a level of openness to its citizens.

This resolution also pledges to create an awareness of the dangers of flying glass and debris in the case of such tragedies.

Finally, it pledges to support efforts to make buildings more secure for peo-

ple by promoting the use of available technology to protect people from flying glass and debris.

Two weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, our subcommittee received testimony from Aren Almon-Kok, a young mother who lost her 1-year-old daughter, Baylee, in this senseless act. This woman has put aside her grief over this loss to speak out on the dangers of flying glass and to promote safety in child care centers.

Ms. Almon-Kok has also established a Web site for individuals concerned about flying glass and child safety at [www.protectingpeople.com](http://www.protectingpeople.com).

This awareness is slow in coming to the government; but with the help of citizens like Aren, those who attend child care centers can be made safer through conscious efforts on our part. I wholeheartedly support this resolution. I urge our colleagues to do the same.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to echo the comments and associate myself with the words of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) whom I believe has spoken the predicate elements of this particular resolution.

I would just like to add that the events of April 19, 1995 have forever changed the ways in which we shall view the safety of American citizens and all visitors in public places. The tragedy of the bombing of the Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City has regrettably become part of an American history we would prefer not to have to remember.

In the aftermath of this senseless act, however, we saw numerous acts of great bravery and countless acts of sacrifice and goodwill by many people. Thousands of volunteers, including Federal, State, and local personnel and workers, as well as rescue teams from all across this great Nation, provided immediate help and support. Even today as Congress convenes, condolences continue to be sent to the victims and their families.

We are here today to join once again in offering our sympathy and our prayers to the victims of this tragic bombing.

Mr. Speaker, I close by saying that the Committee on Ways and Means is working to better secure and make our buildings safe for the visiting public.

I urge an "aye" vote, and I compliment my neighbor, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) for his efforts in this regard as well.

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

□ 1430

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago on April 19, America was glued to radio and TV broadcasts for the latest news, sights and sounds for Oklahoma City. The minutes, hours, and days that followed the senseless destruction of the Murrah Federal

Building filled our citizens with shock, horror, anger, rage, and sadness. Each story of pain and loss was shared by everyone in America, each story of heroic rescue by Federal and State safety officials made us proud, and each memorial service caused us to pause and mourn as a Nation.

The character and resilience of the Federal workforce posted in the Murrah Federal Building and the people of Oklahoma City remain a symbol of courage for the Nation, and it is only fitting and appropriate that the Congress of the United States remember, honor, and commemorate the 5th anniversary of this insane act of terrorism.

And since I have so much time left, Mr. Speaker, if it is not inappropriate, I ask my neighbor and colleague from Ohio to join me in a moment of silence for the victims in Oklahoma City.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, on April 19, 1995 the greatest act of domestic terrorism occurred in my home state of Oklahoma. This heinous bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah building was supposed to strike fear and terror into the hearts of every Oklahoman and every American. 168 people were killed. Including 19 innocent children. To this day the image of little Baylee Almon lying lifeless in the arms of an Oklahoma City firefighter brings tears to my eyes.

However, despite this tragic loss of life, the men who were responsible for this bombing did not succeed in terrorizing America. In the aftermath of the bombing, Oklahomans and Americans did not show signs of fear or terror, they showed signs of love and compassion. I saw Americans respond not as Republicans or Democrats, not as rich or poor, not as black or white, not as man or woman, but I saw this country respond in a difficult time as unified Americans. When I look back on that terrible day 5 years ago, the first thing I remember is not the pain, I remember the compassion.

Today, this House stands together to let you know we will never forget. We will never forget the events that transpired on April 19, 1995, we will never forget the pain we felt, but most importantly we will never forget the overwhelming love that overcame the pain.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the resolution. And, Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 448.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material

on House Concurrent Resolution 277, as amended, House Concurrent Resolution 280, and House Resolution 448, the measures just approved by the House.

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

There was no objection.

□

#### DECLARING "PERSON OF THE CENTURY" FOR 20TH CENTURY TO HAVE BEEN AMERICAN G.I.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 282) declaring the "Person of the Century" for the 20th century to have been the American G.I., as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 282

Whereas the 20th century was a century of conflict between forces of totalitarianism and dictatorship and forces of democracy and freedom;

Whereas American soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines (collectively referred to as "G.I.'s") fought, bled, and died in a number of conflicts during the 20th century, including two World Wars, to secure peace and freedom around the world;

Whereas in large measure due to the heroic efforts of the American G.I., more people around the world enjoy the benefits of freedom at the end of the 20th century than at any other time in history;

Whereas the American G.I., in fighting the forces of totalitarianism and dictatorship, had a strong personal sense of right and wrong and did not want to live in a world where wrong prevailed;

Whereas it may truly be said that during the 20th century the American G.I. accomplished great things while doing good things, becoming recognized throughout the world as a representative of freedom and democracy and, fundamentally, as a force for good in the face of evil;

Whereas at the end of the 20th century numerous organizations and publications sought to identify and designate a "Person of the Century" based upon achievements and contributions during that century; and

Whereas in light of the accomplishments of the Armed Forces of the United States during that century both in defeating the forces of tyranny and dictatorship and in embodying a sense of honor, decency, and respect for mankind, it is appropriate that the American G.I. be recognized as the single most significant force affecting the course of the 20th century: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).* That Congress hereby declares the "Person of the Century" for the 20th century to have been the American G.I.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES) and the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Concurrent Resolution 282, now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, as a part of the honor of serving North Carolina's 8th district in the U.S. Congress, I represent Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base. I am continually impressed and made proud by their dedication, commitment, and patriotism.

We are just turning the corner on a period in which we ask the American G.I. to do more and more with less and less. As I have gotten to know these brave men and women, one statement continues to ring in my ears, the statement made during a military personnel hearing at the Norfolk Naval Base was, "Sir, whatever you give us, we will get the job done." The spirit of the American G.I., soldier, sailor, airman, and Marine, that "can do spirit," is why we honor today the American G.I. as the Citizen of the Century.

To help make clear why we honor these men and women, let me quote Stephen Ambrose, author of *Citizen Soldiers*. "American soldiers fought hard to win the war, but strove every step of the way to create peace." My friend and colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), said in a hearing held before the Committee on Armed Services that this should be the Year of the Troop. I could not agree more. And it is in that same spirit that I offer this resolution honoring the American G.I. as the Citizen of the Century.

Quoting Stephen Ambrose again, "At the core, the American citizen soldiers knew the difference between right and wrong, and they didn't want to live in a world in which wrong prevailed. So they fought and won. And we, all of us living and yet to be born, must be forever profoundly grateful."

We are grateful but must never forget what has been done for us, the Nation and the world, by the American citizen soldier known affectionately as the American G.I.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. THOMPSON of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I commend my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES), for introducing this resolution and for bringing it to the House floor today. As he stated, the 20th century was a century marred by conflict between forces of totalitarianism and dictatorship and the forces of democracy and freedom. It was a century of tremendous turmoil, bloodshed, destruction, and displacement.

But by the end of that century, freedom and democracy flourished in more places than at the century's start. And this was due most of all to the courage and the bravery of millions of American G.I.'s: soldiers, sailors, Marines,

airmen, merchant mariners and coasties, both active and reserve.

It was the American G.I., known at different periods of the century by names such as doughboys, Yanks, Buffalo soldiers, Rough Riders, or the American Expeditionary Force, who carried America's value system abroad and demonstrated unselfish courage aiding those who struggled against tyranny and oppression.

It was the American G.I. who helped defeat fascism, Nazism and Communism.

And it was the American G.I. who undertook the great offensives along the Western Front, who scoured up the beaches of Normandy and across the bloody Solomon Islands into Okinawa. It was the American G.I. who fought in the deserts of North Africa and the jungles of Burma, the Philippines and Indochina.

It was the American G.I.'s who secured air superiority against the Germans and continuously supplied an embattled Britain before finally mastering the sea lanes of the North Atlantic.

The American G.I. secured an uneasy peace on the Korean Peninsula and, for members of my generation, fought in Vietnam.

Reflecting on the last quarter of the 20th century, it is clear that the plight of the people of Grenada, Kuwait, Haiti, Bosnia, and Kosovo would have been considerably different had it not been for the intervention of America and the American G.I.

Indeed, there is probably not a region of the world whose people have not benefited from the presence of the American G.I. during the 20th century.

The role of the American G.I., of course, was not limited to intervening during crises and war. In fact, we cannot forget it was the American G.I. most often called to ensure the peace and who most often delivered and distributed humanitarian aid around the world, whether following a war or internal crisis, or after a natural or man-made disaster.

We also cannot forget the hundreds of thousands of American men and women who served as sentinels of peace and gave their lives defending freedom and Democratic values.

Many of us have personal friends we served with who are buried in cemeteries near and far. Some were childhood friends. Others, men and women that fate and war introduced to us. Each paid another installment of the great debt that will never be erased as long as there is tyranny in the world.

Just like the generations before them, they kept up the payments for all of us. And like their predecessors, they paid in time and effort and in blood.

I do not know any soldier who went to war for personal gain. They did not indulge in parlor room debates about politics or the economies of conflict. They did not engage in finger-pointing or scapegoating.

They reported for duty, and they did so with an intuition about history and a clear understanding about the Hitlers and the Husseins who turn up to remind us all that there are things worth sacrificing for.

General Sherman said, "War is hell and combat is worse." Nobody wants peace more than the veterans and the G.I.'s. Those of us who have been there know that there is a better alternative to war. Bobby Kennedy said that he believed "many Americans share the broad and deep hope of a world without war, a world where the imagination and energy of mankind is dedicated not to destruction but to the building of a spacious future."

Mr. Speaker, that is patriotism in the truest, most unadulterated sense of the word. Let us also hope that the bloodshed and the conflict that came to characterize the 20th century does not characterize the 21st century.

As my colleague said when he began, the course of the 20th century was changed for the better as a result of the unselfish courage and sacrifice of the American G.I. Today, we recognize the contributions of these men and women by passing a resolution declaring the person of the 20th century to have been the American G.I. I urge support of this resolution.

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

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS), a steely-eyed fighter pilot. But before he begins, I wish to identify myself with the most kind and appropriate and very worthwhile remarks of my airborne friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, as a veteran of two wars, on active duty during Vietnam and as a National Guard pilot called to active duty during the Persian Gulf War, I rise to lend my voice to the chorus of those who urge this body to honor the American G.I. as the person of the 20th century.

The United States, through two hot World Wars and a long Cold War, and numerous wars and conflicts in all the far-flung reaches of this troubled globe, has been called the arsenal of democracy. Mr. Speaker, the American G.I. was the bearer of those arms and our American flag. He was, and still is, the guardian of our and our allies' security and freedom.

It is fitting that we are here to honor the G.I., the "Government Issue" soldier, the average and anonymous American citizen who became a soldier by setting down his tools of trade and picking up the unfamiliar weapons of war. And upon completion of his glorious and historic task, set them down again and to regain his primary status of citizen, to enjoy the rights of freedom he secured for others, secured with his life, his liberty and his sacred honor.

When the call went up, the Nevada ranch hand, the railroad worker, and the miner answered that call. To stop fascism in its evil tracks in Europe and the Pacific, the young man rose from his job in the subways of New York or the fields of California and went to the nearest recruiting station. And he returned to Asia later on to valiantly struggle to return peace to the Korean Peninsula. The jungles and skies of Vietnam rang with the bravery of North Carolina farm boys and the California college students. And in the hot desert sands of the Middle East, the young woman from Ohio toiled mightily for our Nation alongside her fellow soldiers.

Through it all, the sacrifice, dedication, and honor of our soldiers has been a lamp unto the world, the shining beacon of liberty. The American G.I. kept our flame of freedom burning brightly through the grim and dark skies; through blood, sweat and tears; through times of adulation and, sadly, through times of unreasonable contempt. But stand they did.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking member on the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) for yielding me this time so that I might have this moment to support this concurrent resolution declaring the American G.I. to be the person of the century.

I commend the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES) for introducing this resolution and the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) for the work that he has done to further its cause today.

Last December, I joined more than 100 of my House colleagues in urging Time Magazine to select the American G.I. as its Person of the Century. And although the magazine did not select the G.I. for its end-of-the-century cover story, it is more than fitting that the Congress of the United States recognize our Nation's men and women in uniform for their contributions.

□ 1445

The American G.I. changed the course of world history in helping to defeat fascism and communism. Victorious in World War I, World War II, down through Operation Desert Storm, bravely fighting in Korea, Vietnam, and confronting the struggles of the Cold War, U.S. soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines have protected our freedom and given hope to freedom-loving people around the world.

The American G.I. has played an indispensable role protecting freedom and preserving the peace through the course of the 20th century. I have no doubt the American G.I. will continue to make all of us proud in the next hundred years.

On a more personal note, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that my

family has been represented in the first World War, as my father was aboard the U.S.S. *Missouri* in 1918 and our son was in Operation Desert Storm as a member of the First Cavalry Division. So I am pleased to say that our family has, through this century, been a part of the opening and the closing of those victorious moments that made the American G.I. the person of the century, in my opinion.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KUYKENDALL), a former Marine.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, these remarks are to some extent for me off the cuff because I did not know this was coming up right before I was supposed to have some floor duty here.

But the point I would like everyone to think about in honoring these young G.I.s of America is they are young. Because we do not fight wars with old people. They are always young. They are young men and young women who serve in the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Air Force, Merchant Marines. And they have all been recognized in various times for combat actions that they were involved in, or some were recognized because they showed up. And thank goodness they did not have a combat action during their time in the service.

We all need to think and look around. If we look at some of us now, we are a little older, we are a little wider, our hair is a little grayer, or we have lost some of it. But today there are young men and women doing the same thing that these veterans did starting clear back at the turn of the 19th century to the 20th.

And it was America's commitment, America's commitment of its youth all across the world, that defended freedom and democracy. We were never committed in an imperialistic mode. We were always committed to keep a country free, regain its freedom, retain the right to have a free election in their country.

That is the reason these young men and women should be America's person of the century. They were young. They did not necessarily know what they went to do, and yet they stood tall when called and voluntarily put themselves in harm's way in many cases.

The Nation should recognize this, and I am glad we are doing so and urge the passage of this resolution.

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

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to commend the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. THOMPSON) for introducing this resolution. It is most appropriate. I support it wholeheartedly. I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) for his leadership in that regard.

We recently had an event here on Capitol Hill for those veterans in my

congressional district who had served in Normandy who were not able to go to Normandy for the anniversary 50 years after it had occurred in 1944. Of that number, I was surprised I had almost 100 in my own district who had served in Normandy. And of the group that attended, about 65 of those who were able to attend, they brought their families. We had over 250 people on the Hill.

When I spoke to these veterans and their families, they were so appreciative of the simple acknowledgment that they had received. The genuine thanks that these veterans conveyed to us reminded me of how important it is to take time out to recognize and honor these heroes from the past. Their sacrifices resulted in the promising future that is now before us.

I can remember my three older brothers served in the Second World War, and I remember as a child how we used to have a little banner in the window with the three stars indicating that they served. There were some families that had gold stars, which indicated that they had lost someone in the war who had totally sacrificed. We recognize that the people in this resolution played an important role in victory.

Now, I want to mention that in 1941 to 1945, over 16 million American women and men joined forces to combat the Axis powers. Of the 16 million, there were two segments of the population that had never before been properly integrated into a war effort and had played significant roles, African Americans and women.

While both groups played a crucial role in the defense of our country since the Revolutionary War, their efforts during World War II were especially important. For example, the Tuskegee Airmen and the Women Army Corps demonstrated their fortitude in battle and forever dispelled any notions of the capabilities of African Americans and women in battle.

I enjoyed Brokaw's book "The Greatest Generation," and I think this resolution confirms and underlines that and says that we in Congress do recognize those people, the American G.I., whose sacrifices produced an extended period of peace and warrants our eternal praise.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that, once again, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES) for bringing this measure forward. I would like to thank all the Members who spoke and those who would have spoken had they been able to today.

But, most important, I would like to thank everyone who sacrificed and served in our U.S. military over the last century and those who are serving today. I ask for an "aye" vote on this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) for his leadership and for his cooperation and for being a part of this memorable resolution.

Let me pause for just a moment, if I may, to particularly thank the moms and the dads, the husbands, the wives, the children who lost loved ones fighting the wars of this and other centuries.

I lost an uncle flying the Hump in Burma, Charles A. Cannon, Jr. I never will forget that my grandfather never forgot. When the door bell rang or the phone rang, he always hoped it was some word that they had found his son.

So in closing, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to bring to the floor a resolution that declares the American G.I. the person of the 20th century. As we reached the end of 1999, people throughout the world had reason to celebrate. Mankind had progressed into a new year, a new century, and a new millennium. Such occasions provide an opportunity to reflect upon our past so that we may remember the people, places, and events that have shaped our culture and our future.

Over the past 100 years, we have enjoyed advancements in almost every facet of our daily lives. In our Nation in particular, the end of the 20th century served occasion to celebrate an era marked by American accomplishment. We, as a Nation, tackled and overcame challenges deemed insurmountable by our forebearers. Most notably, the American commitment to liberty, justice, and freedom has served as a model for democracy for peoples around the globe.

Our achievement has not come without its price, however. As former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Colin Powell has expressed, the 20th century can be called many things, but it was most certainly a century of war. Throughout this period, the forces of tyranny and dictatorship rose time and again to wage war on an unsuspecting world. How easy it is to forget those dark moments of our past. But we must not. We can never take for granted the freedom we, as Americans, enjoy. Our liberty is not free and always comes with a price. It has been secured through the years of American sacrifice and American bloodshed.

That is why I put before the Congress a resolution to recognize the American G.I. as the most influential figure of the 20th century. I offer this legislation not to glorify war and the atrocities that accompany it. To do so would be an insult to every American who made the ultimate sacrifice in service to our Nation.

Instead, I wish to commemorate the soldiers, sailors, airmen, Marines and coasties, collectively referred to as the American G.I., who left their families and their homes to fight on foreign soil for a nobler cause. I offer my resolution to celebrate generations of Americans who refused to live in a world

where wrong prevails. Without their sacrifice, the history of the 20th century would have taken a very different course.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to represent the soldiers and airmen stationed at Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base. I visit these installations regularly and over the last 18 months have enjoyed getting to know the young men and women who proudly serve our Nation. Their patriotism and sense of duty reflects the same spirit of generations who served before them. These young men and women would in a moment's notice defend our Nation from her foes. In honoring these courageous Americans who fought for this Nation during the 20th century, we also honor all those who serve today.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 282, which recognizes the American G.I. as the Person of the Century.

This resolution recognizes the defining role that American soldiers have played in charting a safe course for our nation and for democracy around the world. Unlike a certain magazine which recognizes the discrete accomplishments of individuals in its annual "Man of the Year" issue, the contributions of American soldiers cannot be so easily defined. The Americans who have served their country in the last 100 years as soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines are many, and the sum of their combined contributions defy a simple summary. Nor should the heroism of this group be reduced to a brief summary, for this would only serve to minimize the depth of American sacrifice over the last century.

Americans fought in two world wars for the basic principles of self-determination, democracy, and liberty. In both wars, Americans fought abroad to preserve values that transcended national interest, creating a foundation for a peaceful Europe and Asia that would have been unthinkable in the early years of the century. The rejection of totalitarianism evident in the defeat of the Third Reich continued to define the contributions of the American GI throughout the century. Bloody conflicts in Korea and Vietnam tested American resolution, but the GI unflinchingly carried forward the flag in support of liberty and democracy. The stalwart resolves of the American GI checked Soviet aggression in Western Europe and contributed directly to the collapse of the Soviet Empire.

And the fight continues even today. While the official Cold War may be faded into history, Americans stationed on the front lines in South Korea, Saudi Arabia, Bosnia, or any of a myriad of other countries continue to play an important role as guarantors of peace and stability.

Fifty years ago, the second half of the Twentieth Century was dubbed "America's Century," because of the formative role the United States has played in reshaping the world in our image at the conclusion of World War Two. I join my colleagues today in recognizing that we owe the American Century to the steady, faithful efforts of the American GI, the Person of the Century.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I am in support of this resolution. Throughout this sad and bloody century, it was the GI—the American citizen soldier—who left hearth and home, put

his or her personal plans on hold, and traveled to every corner of the world to save the concept of democracy and preserve the value of freedom. Despots and dictators throughout this century were halted in their tracks and driven back to their lairs because Americans were not, as they thought, too soft and decadent to resist their battle-hardened armies.

The warlords of Imperial Germany were the first to learn that the American fighting man was not a pushover. American soldiers at Chateau Thierry and United States Marines at Bellau Wood brought the German's last chance offensive in 1918 to a halt. Later, the Doughboys would be sent into the most difficult terrain in Northern France—the Argonne Forest—to drive the Germans out of positions that had stymied the Allies for over four years. Meanwhile the United States Navy was helping to sweep the seas clear of U-boats and the American Air Service was dueling in the skies with the students of the Red Baron.

The Nazis of Germany, the Fascists of Italy, and the militarists of Japan were the next to try to, in Churchill's words, "plunge the world into a new Dark Age." And again, it was the New World, with all its power and might, stepping forth to the rescue and liberation of the Old. Hitler had nothing but contempt for American fighting prowess. From Kassarine Pass, through Salerno and Anzio, to the maelstrom of Normandy, all the way to final victory in the heart of Europe—the GI shattered the same Wehrmacht that had marched through the Arc de Triomphe and past the Acropolis. In the air, Americans devastated the Luftwaffe that had terrorized Warsaw and destroyed Rotterdam, and then laid waste to the Nazi industrial complex.

The Japanese believed that their troops, culturally imbued with the spirit of Bushido, would easily outfight the soft Americans. They did not expect that Americans would fight in places such as Guadalcanal, Tarawa, New Guinea, or Iwo Jima—where uncommon valor was a common virtue.

The GI managed to do this at the end of supply lines stretching thousands of miles. They could only do this because their colleagues in the Navy kept those sea-lanes safe against submarines, surface raiders and aircraft. The merchant mariners who manned those supply and transport ships were the unsung heroes of that mission—suffering great travails as they got their vital cargoes through. Very few stories of the Second World War are as compelling as the ordeal of Convoy PQ-17, which suffered terrible losses on its way to Murmansk.

As a result of these sacrifices, most Americans believed that tyranny was decisively defeated, that the second half of the century would be free of the perils that marked the first. Instead, the GI was forced to wage a long twilight struggle against another form of totalitarianism—Soviet Communism—and stand on guard for nearly another 50 years.

American troops were forced to remain in Europe, to hold back the Iron Curtain from sweeping the entire continent into darkness. Millions of American families grew to recognize places such as the Fulda Gap and Rhein-Main air base. The Sixth Fleet patrolled the Mediterranean to a degree not dreamed of by their ancestors that had stormed the shores of Tripoli.

In Asia, the Cold War grew hot in Korea, where the term "Frozen Chosen" entered the

lexicon. Even now, GI's remain on alert to keep the North Korean Peoples Army on their side of the DMZ. Further south, Americans fought, bled, and died in Vietnam—America's longest war—and our most divisive since our Civil War. At last, all recognize that the GI's service there was honorable.

Even now, after the global threat of Communism has collapsed, it is the GI who is called upon when freedom is seriously threatened. From Kuwait to Kosovo, it is only when the American fighting man arrives, that the world knows that aggression will be resisted.

There have been many great people this century who have symbolized the struggle for freedom in the twentieth century—Churchill, Roosevelt, Reagan—but it is the millions of people behind them, the American GI's, who actually delivered on that promise. I ask my colleagues to join me in passing H. Con. Res. 282, to declare that the "Person of the Century" is truly the American GI. He enabled us to be debating in this chamber today.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 282—Declaring the "Person of the Century" for the 20th century to have been the American G.I.

As a co-sponsor of this resolution, I strongly believe that the United States House of Representatives must officially be on record as supporting it.

Mr. Speaker, there is not enough time on this floor today for us to pay full tribute to the importance the American G.I. played in the history of this century. Our democracy, freedom, and liberty owe themselves to the sacrifices of the American G.I.

From World War I to the Persian Gulf, the American G.I. has always stood proud and tall. Ordinary men and women from across every walk of life, when asked, answered the call to duty.

When we think of the darkest moments of the 20th century, it was always the American G.I. that stepped into the breach to defend freedom. It was the G.I. that huddled low while crossing the beach at Normandy. It was the G.I. that bravely fought in the cold at Cho-San. It was the G.I. that did their duty, with honor, at Da'Nang. It was the G.I. that was the lightning in Desert Storm. And, it was the G.I. that has always stood guard between freedom and tyranny. It is for these very reasons that the American G.I. should be recognized as the person of the century.

Defending the Constitution of the United States on foreign soil is the greatest duty the nation can ask of its citizens. The American G.I. answered the call to duty and performed it to the highest standard. What Winston Churchill said of his soldiers rings true for ours, "Never have so few given so much for so many".

Mr. Speaker, as we speak today we must never forget our duty to our veterans. Our veterans were there when the nation called; now we must be there when they need our help. There can be no compromise when it comes to veterans' health care. I am proud of the actions we have taken so far and to the fact that we will not let our veterans down.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am supporting H. Con. Res. 282, a bill to declare the American G.I. as "The Person of the Century for the 20th Century." I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this timely, appropriate measure.

As the year 1999 drew to a close, it became fashionable among pundits and academicians to

nominate a person of the century, for the outgoing 20th century. Many such people were selected, including Time magazine's choice of Albert Einstein. Writing for the New York Times, columnist Charles Krauthammer presented an eloquent defense of his nominee, Winston Churchill, without whom, he argued, Britain would have eventually sought a separate peace with Nazi Germany, drastically altering history. Many other distinguished journalists and pundits offered their own choices for this honorable position.

H. Con. Res. 282 takes a different approach to this nomination. Instead of presenting an individual for the award, it makes a collective nomination in declaring the American G.I. to be the best choice for person of the 20th century. Mr. Speaker, I can think of no better choice for this honor.

In the past century, no group of people have given more of themselves in the cause of defending freedom and liberty than the American people. Twice this century the American citizen-soldier left his family and occupation to take up arms in defending freedom on the continent of Europe.

The arrival of the first members of the American expeditionary force served as a vital morale boost to their exhausted British and French counterparts on the western front in 1917. Later, more than 2 million American soldiers arrived in France to check the last desperate offensive of the Kaiser's army and eventually broke the back of imperial Germany's war effort. Without the contributions of the American G.I. the western allies surely would have fallen to the German offensive of 1918 and the U-boat campaign against the British shipping lifeline.

Twenty-five years later, the American G.I. led the first western counteroffensive against Nazi Germany and took on imperial Japan almost single-handedly. Beginning in North Africa, American soldiers rolled back the German war machine, through Algeria, Sicily, the Italian peninsula and later from Normandy to Paris to Germany itself. In the Pacific, American Marines launched a two-pronged island-hopping campaign from springboards in Hawaii and Australia, supported by our Nation's Air Force, against Imperial Japanese forces, culminating in the bitter hard fought conquest of Iwo Jima and Okinawa. Backed by an industrial base with overwhelming production capacity, the American G.I. liberated Europe from the grip of Nazi totalitarianism and the Pacific from Imperial Japanese tyranny.

The American G.I. spent the second half of the 20th century defending freedom from Communist aggression, in Europe, the Middle East, Latin America and in the Far East. While many during the cold war questioned American defense of nations with little or no democratic government in practice, history has vindicated the cold war American G.I. through today's examples of South Korea, Taiwan and most Latin American countries, where democracy is both alive and well.

Mr. Speaker, the world would indeed be a much different place today, were it not for the contributions of the millions of courageous American citizen-soldiers, who, when called upon by their country, selflessly put aside their personal interests and stepped forward to defend freedom and democracy. While we have not done it alone, the American contribution has almost always meant the difference in ultimate victory for the United States and her allies.

Accordingly, I strongly support this as befitting legislation, and strongly urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, I cannot support H. Con. Res. 282. I take a back seat to no one in my support, appreciation, and admiration for the individuals who served our Nation in the military over the course of the 20th century. I would support a resolution which recognized their contributions, although I would far prefer a more tangible showing of appreciation, such as fulfilling the promises of health care made to those who served.

I cannot support this resolution, however, for several reasons.

First, it seems to me that the House has enough business on its plate fulfilling its responsibilities under Article I of the Constitution and need not enter into an interesting but purely theoretical debate fostered by a magazine topic.

Secondly, if we were to offer an opinion on the "Person of the Century," it should actually be a person, not a class or category of persons. Words have meaning, and as we alter or stretch those meanings, we may well encourage inaccuracy or stretching of the truth. We have had enough of that recently.

I also believe that we should not diminish the importance of the individual human being. The contributions to world history by American service men and women were accomplished by individuals. A man or woman is brave; an organization or class of persons is not. We should not diminish the importance of what a brave individual can do by redefining "person" to mean an entire category of persons.

The key question to ask in assessing "Person of the Century" is how would things have been different without him or her. I have my personal view on who that should be, but my views are better argued in a magazine article rather than on the floor of the House of Representatives.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 282, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□

HONORING MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AND FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES WHO SERVED NATION DURING VIETNAM ERA AND FAMILIES OF THOSE INDIVIDUALS WHO LOST THEIR LIVES OR REMAIN UNACCOUNTED FOR OR WERE INJURED DURING THAT ERA

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 228) honoring the members of the

Armed Forces and Federal civilian employees who served the Nation during the Vietnam era and the families of those individuals who lost their lives or remain unaccounted for or were injured during that era in Southeast Asia or elsewhere in the world in defense of United States national security interests.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 228

Whereas the United States Armed Forces conducted military operations in Southeast Asia during the period (known as the "Vietnam era") from February 28, 1961, to May 7, 1975:

Whereas during the Vietnam era more than 3,403,000 American military personnel served in the Republic of Vietnam and elsewhere in Southeast Asia in support of United States military operations in Vietnam, while millions more provided for the Nation's defense in other parts of the world;

Whereas during the Vietnam era untold numbers of civilian personnel of the United States Government also served in support of United States operations in Southeast Asia and elsewhere in the world;

Whereas May 7, 2000, marks the 25th anniversary of the closing of the period known as the Vietnam era; and

Whereas that date would be an appropriate occasion to recognize and express appreciation for the individuals who served the Nation in Southeast Asia and elsewhere in the world during the Vietnam era: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—*

(1) honors the service and sacrifice of the members of the Armed Forces and Federal civilian employees who during the Vietnam era served the Nation in the Republic of Vietnam and elsewhere in Southeast Asia or otherwise served in support of United States operations in Vietnam and in support of United States national security interests throughout the world;

(2) recognizes and honors the sacrifice of the families of those individuals referred to in paragraph (1) who lost their lives or remain unaccounted for or were injured during that era, in Southeast Asia or elsewhere in the world, in defense of United States national security interests; and

(3) encourages the American people, through appropriate ceremonies and activities, to recognize the service and sacrifice of those individuals.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. KUYKENDALL) and the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. KUYKENDALL).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 228.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 228 to recognize and honor members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees

who served this Nation during the Vietnam era and the families of those individuals who lost their lives, remain unaccounted for, or were injured during the Vietnam war.

Twenty-five years ago, we ended our involvement in the Vietnam War. And unlike World War II or Korea, our objectives for being in the conflicts in Southeast Asia were not very clear. Why were we there? What forces of evil or wrongdoing compelled the potential sacrifice of American lives? What national security or economic interests of the United States were at stake?

Our involvement in Vietnam sparked tremendous domestic controversy, largely because we could not answer those questions. Our soldiers came home without fanfare or ticker-tape parades or their hero's welcome we have historically showered on returning veterans. Our veterans became an easy target for those who questioned our participation in Vietnam; and, as a country, we turned our backs on them.

As a Nation, we struggle to find solutions to world issues that do not require military force. However, when needed, the young men and women of this Nation answer our call to service.

□ 1500

We must never again let the popularity of any war effort be the measure of when we honor our veterans' service. I will say that again. We must never again let the popularity of any war effort be the measure of when we honor our veterans' service. We cannot rewrite our past, but we can correct those mistakes by acknowledging the service of our Vietnam veterans, military and civilian.

Let me quote Dan Mauro, a Vietnam veteran, to reintroduce my colleagues to our Vietnam patriots. In Dan's words, our Vietnam veterans "are men and women. We are dead or alive, whole or maimed, sane or haunted. We grew from our experiences or we were destroyed by them or we struggle to find some place in between. We lived through hell or we had a pleasant, if scary, adventure. We were Army, Navy, Marines, Air Force, Red Cross and civilians of all sorts. Some of us enlisted to fight for God and country, and some were drafted. Some were gung-ho, and some went kicking and screaming.

"Like veterans of all wars, we lived a tad bit—or a great bit—closer to death than most people like to think about. If Vietnam vets differ from others, perhaps it is primarily in the fact that many of us never saw the enemy or recognized him or her. We heard gunfire and mortar fire but rarely looked into enemy eyes. Those who did, like folks who encounter close combat anywhere and anytime, are often haunted for life by those eyes, those sounds, those electric fears that ran between ourselves, our enemies and the likelihood of death for one of us. Or we get hard, calloused, tough. All in a day's work."

We recognized the heroism of those who lost their lives in Vietnam with

the creation of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in 1993. Today, with 2.5 million visitors annually, this memorial is the most visited place in the Nation's capital. This memorial is a fitting tribute to the men and women who served in Vietnam. The wall has helped family members and friends say a final farewell. It has helped others come to terms with their Vietnam service. It has taught a generation about the heroism of those who lost their lives in Vietnam.

It is time now to embrace the service of all our Vietnam veterans, those who lived, those who died, those still missing, and all of us whose lives were unalterably changed by the experience. It is for this reason that House Concurrent Resolution 228 is so important.

May 7, 2000, marks the 25th anniversary of the end of the Vietnam era. House Concurrent Resolution 228 marks this historic anniversary by honoring the duty, courage, service and love of family and country demonstrated by the 2.7 million Americans who served in Vietnam. Let this resolution also stand as notice to those who serve us now, in places like the Balkans, Korea, and the Persian Gulf and for the next generations of patriots: America will stand by you and will praise your service, bravery, and commitment.

I am proud to have served my country in Vietnam and am honored to be recognized as a veteran of that war. Today, I am deeply privileged to salute all who served, lost their lives, were injured or are still missing in Southeast Asia by supporting this resolution. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California, for his service in Vietnam and his efforts to acknowledge the contributions of Vietnam veterans and their families. I urge my colleagues in Congress and people across the Nation to recognize the contributions of these heroes.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. KUYKENDALL) for bringing House Concurrent Resolution 228 to the floor today. This resolution allows Congress and the American people to commemorate the service of the men and women who served in both uniformed and civilian roles during the Vietnam era. On May 7, 2000, our Nation will observe the 25th anniversary of the end of that era. This resolution's genesis are the veterans that I have the honor of representing who live today at the California veterans home in Yountville in my district. I thank all of them and, in particular, John Schmucker, Tom Sarciapone, Sam Hollis, Jr., Robert Moak, and the other members of the Allied Council of the Yountville veterans home for their generous suggestion for honoring Vietnam-era service members and Federal civilian workers.

Like so many others before us, my generation was called to arms. Most of

us responded, notwithstanding the controversy and the turmoil the Vietnam War caused. Seventy-nine of our current House colleagues and 16 Senators served, and several served with extraordinary bravery and courage. The images of Vietnam are still vivid in our individual and collective memories. But what is most surprising is the passage of time since our service.

As I mentioned, May 7 will mark the 25th anniversary of the departure of the last U.S. servicemen from Vietnam, a departure that closed the Vietnam era and for many of us an important chapter in our lives. Between 1961 and 1975, more than 3.4 million Americans served in the armed services in Vietnam and throughout Southeast Asia. Elsewhere in the world, other U.S. forces stood as sentinels. Whether it was along the 38th parallel, at Checkpoint Charlie, the DEW line, Diego Garcia, or patrolling undetected under the world's oceans, U.S. servicemen and women ensured the peace.

The Departments of Defense and Veterans Affairs estimate that more than 9.2 million active duty, reserve, and guard personnel protected U.S. national security interests throughout the world during the Vietnam era. Untold millions of Federal civilian workers also contributed to our Nation's defense at a time tensions were growing between world superpowers. On the eve of this anniversary, we pause to commemorate their service and their sacrifice as well.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution commemorates the sacrifice of every individual who served our Nation during that period called the Vietnam Era. As important, the resolution expresses appreciation to the families of those who died, remain unaccounted for, or who were injured during the course of their service during this era. While it is defined in the statute by specific dates, until the last of our missing service members is found or accounted for, the Vietnam era will never be completely closed.

I again thank the majority leader, the Democratic leader, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE), the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) for their help in making sure this resolution came to the floor at this particular time. I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. KUYKENDALL) for his leadership and urge the support of House Concurrent Resolution 228.

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

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS).

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. KUYKENDALL) for introducing this and the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) for their support of this issue as well. As a Vietnam veteran and former fighter pilot, I stand in this well honored and privileged to speak out in support of this issue.

As my colleagues said, it was just 25 years ago that the Vietnam era officially ended with the infamous fall of Saigon. Although many Americans have turned away from this sad chapter in our national history, this country cannot and it will not turn away from those young men and women who wrote that history with their blood, their pain, and their heroic sacrifices. I am proud, as I said, to join my fellow veterans of the Vietnam War and the rest of our country in honoring the service and the sacrifice of all these men and women wearing our Nation's uniform during that very trying time. Let us not forget to honor the families, those who sacrificed with the parent, the child, the brother or a sister off in a distant land defending their Nation, defending our freedom. Some are still in pain with loved ones still missing and unaccounted for but never forgotten.

Honoring these men and women is the least we can do as we start a new millennium, as we start a new era. But one thing is and always will be certain: our need for the types of men and women like these brave soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines in Vietnam. We need types that are as dedicated and selfless as those who were sacrificing their lives in Vietnam for us.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and thanks I urge all my colleagues to support this issue. I urge unanimous passage of this humble recognition and fitting commemoration of our fellow citizens, Vietnam-era veterans and their families.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I wish to pay special commendation to my friend and my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), for introducing this resolution. I might also note, besides being a very active member of our committee, he was a member of the 173rd Airborne Brigade in Vietnam and served his country well and with dedication during the Vietnam era and during that conflict. I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. KUYKENDALL) for his strong support of this resolution.

Although it may not seem it, 25 years have elapsed since the United States military forces fought in Vietnam. While not everyone may agree that the United States should have participated in the conflict, the matter is we did. More important, hundreds of thousands

of patriotic Americans gave their lives or were wounded while serving this country. Still others remain unaccounted for. It is only fitting that we recognize their sacrifice on behalf of our great Nation.

This resolution honors the service of the military members and civilians who served during the Vietnam era and also recognizes and honors the families who suffered during this conflict. The heroism and sacrifices made by these individuals deserve to be recognized, and this resolution takes that step.

In these days when we consider how best to improve access to health care for our service members and our military retirees, we must not forget that our efforts are really aimed at fulfilling a commitment to servicemen and women who served not just in Vietnam but also in the Second World War and Korea and the Persian Gulf and elsewhere around the globe. We owe them for their service and for the promises our government made to them. We cannot and must not let them down regarding the very serious issue of health care.

Mr. Speaker, our soldiers, sailors, airmen, Marines, and civilians who served in Vietnam did their duty to protect our freedom and gave hope to the oppressed people of that country. As we approach the 25th anniversary of the Vietnam conflict, it is wholly appropriate that we commend the service and sacrifice of those who served. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The newspaper back in my district had a front page story this weekend with many pictures in the body of it talking about the Vietnam War's 25th anniversary. For each group of people that served in whatever time period you were in, you cannot help but have your memories come flooding back when you see these newspaper stories, seeing it now with the hindsight of history. It is much different than the day we lived it, when we were serving in that particular capacity.

It is great today as a Member of Congress to be able to recognize on the Vietnam War's 25th anniversary the service of those men and women who served with the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) and myself in that Southeast Asian conflict. Today, I now have a daughter who serves, and I now recognize what my parents must have thought when they put me on a plane for several trips to Asia. It is a different feeling and yet it is the same feeling you get whether you are doing it today or you were doing it 25 years ago or 25 years before that. That is the reason we have these recognitions, because a Nation that ever forgets to recognize that service has taken one step down a path we do not want to be on.

I would like to encourage everybody, today in this resolution, to recognize Vietnam veterans. Just a few minutes ago, we recognized G.I.'s for the 20th century.

□ 1515

But everybody should look around and say "thank you" to that uncle or that grandfather or that son or daughter or brother or sister that you saw serve in the military.

I was proud of my service. All of us that served were proud of our service, and today Congress has a chance in this resolution to recognize on the 25th anniversary the service of veterans, both military and civilian, who served in Southeast Asia. I urge the passage of this resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 228, a bill to recognize and honor the sacrifice and service of those members of our Nation's Armed Forces and their civilian defense counterparts who served during the Vietnam era. I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this worthy legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the Vietnam war was neither a popular nor a fully supported conflict among the American public, for a large number of reasons. The remote location of the fighting, the apparent hesitancy of two successive administrations to seek a decisive victory, the deterioration, over time, of the United States' established commitment to fighting communism in southeast Asia, and the gradual increasing unpopularity of the war among the Nation's youth all contributed to the eventual withdrawal of United States forces from South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. A similar, but not quite as severe outcome had occurred in the earlier Korean conflict.

While the returning G.I.'s from the Korean war had encountered indifference from the American population, those returning from Vietnam were often met with outright hostility. Moreover, it took more than a decade for proper recognition, in the form of a national memorial, to be provided for our Vietnam veterans.

There are still a number of unresolved issues from the Vietnam war. Chief among these is the POW/MIA issue. There still remain over 2,000 unaccounted for servicemembers from the conflict in southeast Asia. Regrettably, in recent years, many have sought to downplay the need for the fullest possible accounting of those missing personnel in pursuit of the establishment of commercial interests in southeast Asia. May this resolution be of some solace to the families and loved ones of our missing and POW's that there are many of us in the Congress committed to a full and final accounting of our missing.

It bears noting that for today's generation entering college, the Vietnam war is as distant as World War II was to the baby boomer generation. It is my hope that this resolution will help to preserve the memory of the dedicated service and ultimate sacrifice made by the members of our Armed Forces who chose to serve their Nation at a time when military service was decidedly unpopular.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 228. This Resolution honors the sacrifice that so many Americans gave during the Vietnam conflict.

There is no way that any American can view the Vietnam Wall without their heart becoming heavy with both pride and sadness. Although this war caused so many different views from so many different people, the one thing that we all can and should agree upon is the honor of the service of those who served in Vietnam.

They served with the same commitment to honor, duty, and country as every American has in wars past. They served during a particularly difficult time in our history. But despite the times, they never wavered from their devotion to duty. Their actions speak volumes about their character when you consider that the average age of the American service person in Vietnam was 19.

Anyone who has read the letters from home between service members and their families know the tremendous toll that the war took on both. We must never forget their sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, there are still open wounds of the heart that have not healed yet. That is because there is the unresolved cases of our missing MIAs and POWs. Our families can not be at peace until we know the whereabouts of their loved ones' remains. Our government must take every action necessary to resolve these cases as soon as possible.

In sum, Mr. Speaker, today I offer praise and respect to all the Americans, both military and civilian that served in Vietnam. Their sacrifice will never be forgotten.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. KUYKENDALL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 228.

The question was taken.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□

**FREEDOM TO E-FILE ACT**

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 777) to require the Department of Agriculture to establish an electronic filing and retrieval system to enable the public to file all required paperwork electronically with the Department and to have access to public information on farm programs, quarterly trade, economic, and production reports, and other similar information, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 777

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the "Freedom to E-File Act".

**SEC. 2. ELECTRONIC FILING AND RETRIEVAL.**

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF INTERNET-BASED SYSTEM.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall establish an electronic filing and retrieval

system that uses the telecommunications medium known as the Internet to enable farmers and other persons—

(1) to file electronically all paperwork required by the agencies of the Department of Agriculture specified in subsection (b); and

(2) to have access electronically to information, readily available to the public in published form, regarding farm programs, quarterly trade, economic, and production reports, price and supply information, and other similar information related to production agriculture.

(b) COVERED AGENCIES.—Subsection (a) shall apply to the following agencies of the Department of Agriculture:

- (1) The Farm Service Agency.
- (2) The Risk Management Agency.
- (3) The Natural Resources Conservation Service.

(4) The rural development components of the Department included in the Secretary's service center initiative regarding State and field office collocation implemented pursuant to section 215 of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6915).

(c) TIME-TABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(1) to the maximum extent practicable, complete the establishment of the electronic filing and retrieval system required by subsection (a) to the extent necessary to permit the electronic information access required by paragraph (2) of such subsection;

(2) initiate implementation of the electronic filing required by paragraph (1) of such subsection by allowing farmers and other persons to download forms from the Internet and submit completed forms via facsimile, mail, or related means; and

(3) modify forms used by the agencies specified in subsection (b) into a more user-friendly format, with self-help guidance materials.

(d) INTEROPERABILITY.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall ensure that the agencies specified in subsection (b)—

(1) use computer hardware and software that is compatible among the agencies and will operate in a common computing environment; and

(2) develop common Internet user-interface locations and applications to consolidate the agencies' news, information, and program materials.

(e) COMPLETION OF IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete the establishment of the electronic filing and retrieval system required by subsection (a) to permit the electronic filing required by paragraph (1) of such subsection.

(f) PROGRESS REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report describing the progress made toward establishing the electronic filing and retrieval system required by subsection (a).

**SEC. 3. AVAILABILITY OF AGENCY INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY FUNDS.**

(a) RESERVATION OF FUNDS.—From funds made available for each agency of the Department of Agriculture specified in section 2(b) for information technology or information resource management, the Secretary of Agriculture shall reserve an amount equal to not more than the following:

- (1) For fiscal year 2001, \$3,000,000.
- (2) For each subsequent fiscal year, \$2,000,000.

(b) TIME FOR RESERVATION.—The Secretary shall notify Congress of the amount to be reserved under subsection (a) for a fiscal year not later than December 1 of that fiscal year.

(c) USE OF FUNDS.—Funds reserved under subsection (a) shall be used to establish the

electronic filing and retrieval system required by section 2(a). Once the system is established and operational, reserved amounts shall be used for maintenance and improvement of the system.

(d) RETURN OF FUNDS.—Funds reserved under subsection (a) and unobligated at the end of the fiscal year shall be returned to the agency from which the funds were reserved, and such funds shall remain available until expended.

**SEC. 4. CONFIDENTIALITY.**

In carrying out this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture—

(1) may not make available any information over the Internet that would otherwise not be available for release under section 552 or 552a of title 5, United States Code; and

(2) shall ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that the confidentiality of persons is maintained.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

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

Mr. Speaker, the Freedom to E-File Act, introduced by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), requires the United States Department of Agriculture to establish an electronic filing and retrieval system to enable the public to file with the Department all required paperwork electronically. In doing so, the act would allow producers, farmers, and rural America to have access to information on farm programs, quarterly trade, economic and production reports and other similar information. The bill of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) allows farmers to do business with the Department of Agriculture over the Internet.

The rapidly evolving e-commerce economy of the 21st century continues to assert itself as the future of worldwide commerce. Like any business today, farmers are using computers and the Internet for a variety of purposes, including financial management systems and market information. It is becoming increasingly important to ensure that all segments of our economy are technologically efficient.

Currently, the United States Department of Agriculture operates in a progressively antiquated computer environment. The continued use of such a system threatens to disable producers and farmers from access to a maturing information technology market. Rural Americans face the very real potential of being left behind in this era of sweeping technological advances. It is vital to empower producers and farmers by providing them with the technological tools to do business via the Internet with the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The continued absence of a viable common computing environment at the Department will result in the failure to assist the very constituency it is obliged to serve. The Freedom to E-

File Act achieves the most important objective of allowing the public the access and freedom to do effective, better business with the U.S. Department of Agriculture via the Internet.

The globally integrated e-commerce economy demands that private and public entities move quickly to establish efficient avenues of commerce. This legislation forces the USDA in the right direction, the direction of enabling producers, farmers, and rural Americans to benefit in an age of technological revolution.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Congressional Internet Caucus, I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois for his leadership on this issue. This legislation is badly needed. Changes at the Department of Agriculture to get up to speed, even with other government agencies, much less with what is happening in the private sector, is long overdue. I also thank the gentleman from Texas for his support of this bipartisan legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 777 as amended by H.R. 852, the Freedom to E-File Act. H.R. 852 was sponsored by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), and I, too, commend him for his leadership in this area. It was approved by the House Committee on Agriculture on March 29. It would require the Secretary of Agriculture to establish an Internet-based system to allow farmers and ranchers and other persons to complete and submit program applications electronically and to have electronic access to all relevant economic and administrative program information and data.

The legislation before us today also contains a provision that will ensure that the Secretary of Agriculture maintains the confidentiality of persons, and ensures that that information is released only in accordance with current law.

Mr. Speaker, I have long been a proponent of initiatives at USDA to provide better service to farmers and ranchers through streamlining and the use of new technologies, while at the same time saving taxpayer dollars.

To date, USDA's progress in the information technology arena has been disappointing. For example, a February 2000 General Accounting Office report states that USDA's progress in implementing its initiatives, reorganization, and modernization efforts has been mixed. The report then identifies two primary reasons for its lack of success, the lack of a comprehensive plan to guide the modernization effort and the lack of a management structure with the accountability and authority to resolve differences among the agencies. These findings give me little confidence and further validate my concerns that USDA cannot overcome its stovepipe culture without the intervention of Congress. USDA recognizes this,

and, at certain levels, supports this bill.

Growing numbers of farmers and ranchers are using home computers. This fact, coupled with budget demands, is putting enormous pressure on USDA's field service employees. It is, therefore, imperative that USDA take advantage of the Internet for the efficiencies it can offer. Doing so will benefit overworked field service staff, save taxpayer dollars, and allow farmers and ranchers to spend more time on their operations and less time visiting USDA offices.

For these reasons, I believe USDA must improve electronic access to its programs and services. Consequently, I support the goals of S. 777, as amended, otherwise known as the Freedom to E-File Act. While I would prefer a more comprehensive look at USDA reorganization and modernization needs, it unfortunately appears that changes at USDA are only going to be made on an incremental basis.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), the author of the legislation.

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank very much the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) for his leadership as the chairman of the subcommittee that held hearings on the bill; and the ranking member of that subcommittee, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON), also for her leadership and support; and certainly the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the ranking member of the full committee, for his encouragement over the last year to move ahead with this important legislation.

To put it simply, this legislation will bring the Department of Agriculture into the 21st century by allowing farmers, producers, and people in rural America to do their business with the USDA over the Internet. Like any business, farmers are using computers for a variety of purposes, including financial management, accessing market information, and utilizing precision agriculture management systems.

As I have traveled around the 14 counties that I represent in central Illinois, much of which is agriculture, and visited farm families and visited farm homes, every farmer has a computer today. Every farmer in America has access to the world. One of the first things that farmers do in the early morning hours is they get on their computer and they check the weather. Then in my area they check the price of corn and beans and livestock. Then they look and see how their stocks are doing, if they have the good fortune of having that kind of capability to own stocks.

But then what we are offering them under this legislation is the fact that they do not have to hop in their truck and go down to the FS office to file their forms or to find out what the USDA has to offer them. All of this information will be available to them. After they check the price of corn and beans and after they check the weather, they can find out what else is going on at USDA, a marvelous opportunity. I believe, if given the opportunity, many farmers would choose to file necessary farm program paperwork from their home or office computer.

The interesting thing is that, this year alone, 34 million taxpayers have already filed or will file their income taxes before April 15th over the Internet, electronically. The Internal Revenue Service has moved taxpayers into the 21st century; and we should be doing that for our farmers and ranchers, and particularly for those who represent large masses of agriculture area, Wyoming, the Dakotas, areas where farmers and ranchers have to travel long distances. This will avail them of wonderful opportunities to save time and energy by having access to this information and filing their forms electronically.

Mr. Speaker, I say that the Freedom to E-File Act is a reasonable, sensible way to help farmers spend less time filling out paperwork and more time doing what they know how to do best, which is farming and ranching. This legislation will not only increase the efficiency of farmers and ranchers, it will also increase the efficiency of the USDA, as has been mentioned, by reducing the amount of paperwork that needs to be filled out in local county offices.

USDA has already started down the road to providing some of the benefits of the Internet to the American farmer. Freedom to E-File will provide the Department with the necessary flexibility and resources to allow USDA to bring agriculture into the Internet age.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Chairman COMBEST), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) and all the staff people on both sides for your help in crafting this legislation, and also to USDA. We have kind of brought them along kicking and screaming in this process, but we think they are with us now; and we hope that they will be able to implement this legislation after it is signed by the President.

Finally, Senator PETER FITZGERALD from the other body was most helpful in having this legislation pass there; and I want to acknowledge his work and encourage all Members to support this very, very important legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just say in conclusion, I encourage our colleagues to support this bill. We have heard from

the gentleman from Illinois all of the reasons why this is needed. The disappointment is that we have not been able to move it faster within USDA, but it is certainly my hope that all of those who may be in the category of "foot-draggers" within the various agencies and various employees of USDA might take this legislation and the support of many at USDA and recognize that we will have some additional opportunities this year to do more in this area of information technology, and, in doing more, we will be able to serve our farmers more efficiently.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all of those who have been involved in this legislation; and I urge the support of it.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would join in urging my colleagues to support this legislation. It is very true that farmers in many respects are some of our best users of computer technology and the Internet, and it is time that the Department that is designed to support their efforts moves into the 21st century, as the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) indicated.

□ 1530

So I strongly support this bill. I thank the gentleman for his efforts in this matter.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 777, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 777, the Senate bill just considered.

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

There was no objection.

□

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5 p.m.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 5 p.m.

□

□ 1703

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.

□

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 290. Concurrent Resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2005.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the resolution (H. Con. Res. 290) "Concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2005," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BOND, Mr. GORTON, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. CONRAD, and Mr. WYDEN, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

□

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 1501, JUVENILE JUSTICE REFORM ACT OF 1999

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 1501 tomorrow.

Pursuant to clause 7(c) of rule XXII, I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 1501. The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Conyers moves to instruct conferees on the part of the House that the conferees on the part of the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 1501, be instructed to insist that the committee on conference meet and report a committee substitute that includes both:

One, measures that aid in the effective enforcement of gun safety laws within the scope of conference and, two, common sense gun safety measures that prevent felons, fugitives, and stalkers from obtaining firearms and

children from getting access to guns within the scope of the conference. Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Congresswoman JULIA CARSON, Congresswoman JUANITA MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Congresswoman CAROLYN MCCARTHY are cosponsors of this motion.

□

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H. CON. RES. 290, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XXII, and by the direction of the Committee on the Budget, I move to take from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 290) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2005, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH).

The motion was agreed to.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. SPRATT  
Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct the conferees on the budget resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SPRATT moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 290 be instructed, within the scope of the conference,

(1) to insist that the tax cuts set forth in the reconciliation directives in the concurrent resolution be reported on September 22, 2000, the latest possible date within the scope of the conference, and to require that the reconciliation legislation implementing those tax cuts not be reported any earlier, thereby allowing Congress sufficient time to first enact legislation to reform and strengthen Medicare by establishing a universal Medicare prescription drug benefit, consistent with section 202 of the Senate amendment and provisions in section 10 of the House concurrent resolution, recognizing that more than half of Medicare beneficiaries without drug coverage have income above 150 percent of poverty as officially defined; and

(2) to recede to the lower and less fiscally irresponsible tax cuts in the Senate amendment, which do not include a reserve fund for additional tax reduction contingent on improved projects of future revenues, in preference to tax cuts of \$200 billion or more as embodied in the House-passed Resolution, which Chairman Kasich identified during Budget Committee markup and House debate on the budget resolution as a paydown' on the tax cuts proposed by Governor George W. Bush, in order to conserve the budgetary resources needed for the universal Medicare prescription drug benefit and for debt reduction.

Mr. KASICH (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent

that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

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

Mr. Speaker, I am offering this motion to instruct the House conferees on the budget resolution, basically to say to the conferees, let us put the Medicare drug prescription benefit first and foremost, ahead of everything else. Let us do it ahead of the tax cuts. Let us put it on a priority schedule, let us go first with it.

Just today we read in the newspaper that Medicare beneficiaries who do not have drug coverage typically pay at least 15 percent more than those who have the benefit of insurance. I have the experience just a week or two ago with visiting a pharmacist in my district who by mistake had received a billing from an HMO intended for an HMO in Atlanta, Georgia. And when he opened it up, he saw what the HMO was paying for drugs like Zocor and Vasotec and Cumadin, as opposed to what he was paying, and the difference between what he was paying and charging his customers at his pharmacy and what the HMO was paying was as much as 65 or 70 percent in favor of the HMO in certain cases. That is not right.

Mr. Speaker, when we combine that with the fact that drug costs are going up at a rate that is two or three times the rate of the increase in health care generally and the elderly, those over 65 and on Medicare have a greater need for prescription drug benefits than anybody else, we have a crisis on our hands. One cannot go to any senior citizen center in my district, and I dare say this is true across America, without having someone relate some really sad and affecting story about their problem with obtaining prescription drug benefits.

We just had a study done by Boston University School of Public Health, they found that a significant fraction of the prescriptions that are written by doctors for their Medicare patients are never filled, they cannot afford it. This is a problem that is not only pressing, it is becoming urgent.

We need to deal with it now. Before we turn to tax cuts, before we turn to other major budget decisions, we should put this one first and foremost and try to fit it into our budget. In our budget, the Democratic budget, we did it the standard and time-honored way. We said let us have reconciliation directions to the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Commerce, the two committees with jurisdiction, and tell them, "By a date cer-

tain, get your act together. Here is \$40 billion for the first 5 years, \$155 billion for the second 5 years; within the limits of these resources, report to the floor a prescription drug benefit that will begin to take effect next year for Medicare beneficiaries." That is the way to do it.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) chose a less compelling way of doing it. He put \$40 billion in a trust fund, so-to-speak, a reserve fund, and said if the Committee on Ways and Means is able to come up with a bill that reforms Medicare structurally or does Medicare reform, then it can also use this \$40 billion to report a drug bill. I would have preferred and did prefer something much more compelling than that, but at least the gentleman put the \$40 billion on the table. The Senate has done something similar.

What we are saying now is let us not just do this for show, let us not just do this to tantalize the elderly citizens in our district with the prospect of getting prescription drug coverage. Let us do it in earnest. We can do it right now by passing a motion to instruct our conferees to go to conference and say to the conferees, prescription drug coverage will come first, and principally this will come first ahead of tax cuts.

One of the problems I have with the Republican budget resolution is it puts tax cuts first and foremost, ahead of everything else. Now, our budget resolution provided for \$50 billion in net tax cuts in the first 5 years, and \$201 billion over the 10-year period of time. We are for tax reduction and tax relief too, but we also had other priorities that we wanted to serve, and not to do tax cuts to the exclusion of those.

The problem we had with their resolution as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) presented it, their budget resolution, the tax cut could easily go up to \$250 billion over the next 5 years. We showed by charts in the well of the House, if it went that high, if it went over \$200 billion, we not only could not fund the \$40 billion for the prescription drug benefit, you would risk putting the Social Security trust fund in danger again.

We are saying, put the tax cuts second. Do the prescription drugs first. Get in earnest about prescription drug coverage. Do that, and then by a date certain, report your tax bill to the floor; and we will take it up in due course. But, in first course, let us do prescription drugs.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we want to go back just for a second and review precisely what was contained in this Republican budget proposal that passed the other day.

As Members will recall, the first thing we did was to protect 100 percent of the Social Security surplus. That is the first time, I believe in my lifetime, that that has been done, where the government will not take money from the

Social Security surplus to fund any other programs.

The second item that we did was we strengthened Medicare and, in fact, created a \$40 billion fund. And this fund is available for the purposes of funding a prescription drug program that will pass through the Committee on Ways and Means.

First of all, I would hope that the wealthiest of our seniors would not qualify for this program. Children in many respects have the lowest priority in America, and it is a tragedy that our children are neglected. I begin to wonder if they are neglected because they do not vote or we do not value them. We value them with our rhetoric, but many times we do not value them with our actions.

The fact is that a prescription drug benefit for seniors that are in need of that benefit because they cannot afford it would be right. But what we would not want to do was take resources that can be used either to make families stronger through tax cuts or other programs that may be developed to help our children, to use those dollars to fund the Medicare program for wealthy senior citizens.

□ 1715

We would not want to do that. This does not make any sense here in the 21st century. Members might also recall that we had other actions in there, including paying down \$1 trillion of the national debt, and in addition to that, tax fairness.

I must say that it would be a mistake for us not to have passed that earnings limit exclusion program so that our seniors who want to go out, who want to work, who want to be independent, do not lose social security in the process. Thank goodness we pushed that program through. We intend to push other programs like that through, including the easing of the marriage penalty.

So we want to be able to have a process that allows us to pass these tax bills that help various segments of our society, and we believe that is consistent with our program to strengthen Medicare and to provide a prescription drug benefit.

What is interesting is that President Clinton himself has no prescription drug benefit in 2001 and 2002. In fact, he makes very significant reductions in Medicare in order to pay for what program he is going to create in 2003. Frankly, Democrats ought to be embracing this program if they would like to see a strengthening of Medicare. They ought to be really embracing the Republican budget, because we get about it right away.

Also contained in the Democrat motion to instruct are the incendiary words "irresponsible tax cuts." To me, that is an oxymoron. There is no such thing as an irresponsible tax cut. There are plenty of irresponsible government spending programs, but I do not think there is such a thing as an irresponsible tax cut.

I do not know what we would call an irresponsible tax cut. Is it something that lets families keep more of what they earn? Is it something that lets a senior keep more of what he or she earns, rather than being penalized through reductions of their social security benefits? Is a fiscally irresponsible tax cut one that provides relief to married couples? If people get married today, they can get punished because they get married. They pay more in taxes. Is that fiscally irresponsible?

How about for a small businessman who works a lifetime to build a pharmacy, like my friend, Max Peoples in Westville, Ohio, or friends of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) in Janesville, Wisconsin? They work a lifetime, and then when they die, they have to visit the undertaker and the IRS on the same day.

How about reducing or eliminating the death tax so people who work a lifetime can pass their legacy on to their children, rather than having to pass it on to the Federal government?

I do not know what it even means when we talk about a fiscally irresponsible tax cut. It does not make any sense to me. It seems to me as though we ought to stay with the Republican budget plan. That Republican budget plan will keep our mitts off of social security, something that my friends in the majority party were not able to do for 40 years. It is going to strengthen Medicare and provide a prescription drug benefit starting in 2001.

I am told it will be very soon that Republicans in the House will unveil their bill. I hope it will be means-tested. We will pay down \$1 trillion of the publicly-held debt by 2013. We will continue to promote tax fairness for families, farmers, and small businesses.

There is no reason to fix something that is not broken, so I would request that the Members on both sides of the aisle defeat the motion to instruct the conferees offered by my good friend, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), who I have, by the way, a lot of regard for. He is a very smart man, a very nice man, and I wish everybody would know him and be the recipient of his kindness and intelligence.

But on this motion, I am forced to say that we should object, stick with the Republican budget. It will be the better budget for our seniors, for our children, and frankly, for Americans across the country.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his compliments, but I would point out that a tax cut that precludes us from obtaining the very priorities they set out in their budget is potentially an irresponsible tax cut. A tax cut, which we showed here in the well of the House, which would take us perilously close to invading social security again surely is not one that we want to un-

dertake. Yet, we are concerned that the gentleman's resolution leads us in that very direction.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to instruct conferees. We simply say, before any tax cut, and certainly it is irresponsible to make sure that we have a tax cut before we achieve the goals that we want to achieve.

One of the goals stated was that we would have a prescription drug benefit. Therefore, before any tax cut is enacted, we must make sure that our senior citizens, especially those rural citizens who live in rural communities without access to health care, and who pay, by the way, for their medicine higher rates than those in other urban areas, we make sure that they have the medicine and the ability to pay to be free of pain and to live a comfortable life. That is essentially basically and fundamental, that we make sure that our program is enacted before we have a serious and a large tax cut.

Older Americans and people with disabilities without drug coverage typically pay 15 percent more for the same prescription drugs as those with insurance. Many seniors do not have drug coverage at all, and therefore, this particular bill is essential for life and the quality of life that seniors deserve.

The gap between drug prices for people with and without insurance discounts nearly doubled, from 8 to 15 percent, between 1996 and 1998. Uncovered Medicare beneficiaries purchased one-third fewer drugs than those who are covered, but they paid twice as much money. They are denying themselves a prescribed prescription for their health care, but yet, they pay twice as much out of pocket.

Overall, all of these beneficiaries have an annual out-of-pocket cost that is twice as high as those, and with fewer medications.

Chronically ill uninsured Medicare beneficiaries spend over \$500 out of pocket for that same coverage. Rural beneficiaries are particularly, particularly vulnerable because the infrastructure to provide that health care is not there.

From what I am hearing, if there is to be an insurance model, I can tell the Members that we do not have the structure, the HMOs, nor do we have other structures that can make this accessible to rural citizens. Rural Medicare beneficiaries are over 50 percent more likely to lack prescription drug coverage for the entire year than urban beneficiaries.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this motion to instruct. It is urgent, it is timely, and it is vital to the health and welfare of many millions of senior citizens.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

(Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to first discuss what this motion to instruct actually does. The motion to instruct right now talks about having a prescription drug plan immediately, but I find it interesting to note that the minority side, when advancing prescription drug legislation in the Committee on the Budget, was proposing a prescription drug plan very similar to the President's plan which did not begin until the year 2003.

More importantly, it dedicated a little over \$34 billion to enacting prescription drug legislation when the Committee on the Budget, the majority's plan, dedicates \$40 billion for prescription drugs beginning immediately.

Let us go back and remember that the minority side was proposing a prescription drug plan dedicating less resources starting in 2 years versus the Republican plan, which dedicated \$40 billion starting immediately.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about some of the benefits of this budget plan. For 30 years, for 30 years this institution, Washington, D.C., has been raiding the social security trust fund. People have been paying their FICA taxes, it has been going into social security, and people in Washington have been taking that money and spending it on other totally unrelated items.

This budget seals that trust fund. This budget says, not a penny of money should come out of social security. Instead, we are going to pay off the debt and fix the problems we have with social security. That is what we are trying to do here.

So what happened last year when the President brought his budget here on the House floor in the State of the Union Address? He called for dedicating 62 percent to the social security surplus, and 38 percent of social security would go to finance other government programs.

Last year we said, that is enough. We should dedicate 100 percent of the social security surplus to social security. That is in fact what we have achieved. If we take a look at what we have done over the last 2 years with this Congress, we have paid back so much debt that we have actually stopped the raid on the social security trust fund beginning last year.

This budget completes that. This budget says no longer will we go back to the days of red, no longer will we go back to the days of taking money out of the social security trust fund to spend on other programs that have nothing to do with social security. Instead, we are going to pay off our national public debt, we are going to put money back into social security, and we are not going to let politicians dip into the social security trust fund.

Last year when the President brought his budget to the floor, he wanted 62 percent in social security and 38 percent out of it. He called for

creating 84 new government programs, 84 new government programs in this year's budget, and significantly increasing 160 other government programs, for a grand total of 244 new programs and higher spending on new programs in Washington coming from the social security trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, we have actually achieved a historic goal here. We have stopped the raid on the social security trust fund. Let us build on that success. Let us continue to do that. Let us pass the Republican budget and say no to the motion to instruct.

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

Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman has done is, with his charts there, he has set up a straw man. He has attacked a budget that was never before the House. The minority side's budget, the Democratic side's budget, called for \$40 billion beginning in 2001 for a Medicare prescription drug benefit. And not only that, to say it once again, we did it the good old-fashioned way that worked. We said to the Committee on Ways and Means, by a date certain, here is \$40 billion. Report out, bring to the floor a resolution, a bill that will provide prescription drug coverage.

They did not have that kind of language in their resolution. Theirs was totally iffy. That is what we are trying to do here today, stiffen the resolve of the conferees and see to it that we do indeed get some legislation that will provide a drug benefit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the reason this is such an important set of budget instructions is that this House is balanced on a very interesting policy point: Should we provide a tax-supported prescription benefit package for all senior citizens, or should we do what the Republicans are talking about, and that is, find the poorest ones and say, here is a little welfare program. Go on and down and register at the welfare office, and you can get the drug benefit?

The President has proposed that we put a package that covers all senior citizens. Some of us are not very satisfied with the President's plan because it is not very generous, but at least, at least it covers everyone. For us to come out and pass a budget and say that, in the last resort, if we have a little money left after we have passed all these tax cuts we are going to give a little drug benefit, that is simply not good public policy.

The Senate has picked the number of \$140 billion in tax cuts. I personally think that is too much. I do not think we need that. I would rather pay down the debt.

However, if they are going to do it, let us take the conservative number in the Senate, the conservative number in

the Senate, instead of this liberal wild spending on the Republican side in the House, and use that money to give a benefit for all senior citizens.

Now, when we go out and realize what the average senior citizen spends out-of-pocket, my mother is a perfect example. She lives on the minimum social security benefit, along with 9 million other widows in this country, \$888 a month. She spends \$400 for where she lives and where she gets her food, okay?

□ 1730

Now she has \$400 and she on average across this country is spending \$200 a month, \$2,500 out of pocket, for pharmaceutical costs in this country. That is simply inexcusable.

We can fix it, but it should be for all senior citizens because even those who have the benefit now, because of the fact that they work for some company or they have the insurance policy or whatever at the moment, may lose it and then where are they? My view is that we should not drive seniors into poverty before we help them with their pharmaceutical costs.

Any sensible person looking at the Medicare program today would say the single biggest problem that we have not dealt with has been the issue of pharmaceutical costs.

I think that it makes sense to take the Senate number. The Senate is not overly generous, but at least we would have the \$40 million for a universal benefit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Without objection, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), will control the time allocated to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH).

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), a member of both the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, it is pretty obvious that over the weekend the Democrats did a poll. They rush in here with a motion to instruct conferees on the budget resolution with a time stamp on here of 3:45, not too long ago. The ink is not even dry on this. They rushed in here with this motion to instruct conferees. What does it say? It says, know what? We are getting our brains beat in on this prescription drug benefit. The Republicans beat us when it came to the budget resolution; they are beating us when it comes to public relations on prescription drugs because they know that our original proposal did not have a thing.

The President's proposal did not have a prescription drug benefit. The original proposal that the Democrats brought forth in the Committee on the Budget did not have a prescription drug benefit that started until the

third year. In fact, it cut Medicare. Oh, no, we didn't cut Medicare on beneficiaries. We cut it on providers is what they will say.

In my area, as the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) was saying, in rural areas those kind of cuts will be devastating. They may say in the third year that they have a prescription drug benefit; but when all the rural hospitals close, they do not have health care.

Well, this is the situation: we put into our plan instructions that suggest that there is only one thing that the Committee on Ways and Means can do with this \$40 billion. It can either reform Medicare and provide a prescription drug benefit or nothing else can happen to that money except it can be used to pay down the debt. That is it.

What do the Democrats suggest? They came in with a technicality on the floor right at the end of the budget debate, and they said but we have a better motion to instruct. They say the Committee on Ways and Means has to use it. Guess what? If they do not, it does not go to debt reduction; it does not go to tax relief. Guess where it can go? To a risky spending scheme that the Democrats have put in place for the last 40 years that wasted social security, that brought us to the point in time where we had this massive debt in the first place, and now they want to start all over again.

Mr. Speaker, this is the situation: this is not just a little drug benefit, as my friend, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), suggested. This is the only drug benefit that is going to pass this particular year because we are not going to pass a drug benefit where the money, if not spent, can be used for other risky spending schemes. We are not going to use this money for anything else except for reform of Medicare and for prescription drugs, different than what the Democrats' plan does.

So instead of voting for this motion to recommit that was drafted just a few hours ago, after it is obvious the Democrats took a poll this weekend, let us vote against this motion to instruct conferees, which would gut the Medicare reform proposal, which would gut the prescription drug proposal, and which would not recognize that in 5 days we have tax day and Americans all over the country have been paying their taxes. This thumbs their noses at the taxpayers of America.

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

Mr. Speaker, once again let me inform the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) that we in committee we did not offer a resolution. We brought our resolution to the floor, and it had \$40 billion over 5 years; \$150 billion over 10 years for prescription drug coverage; and it was in reconciliation, mandates to the Committee on Ways and Means, with a date certain for getting it done.

When we were in committee marking up their budget resolution, we took

their iffy, mushy language and we said let us convert this to a mandate, let us send it to the Committee on Ways and Means, and we offered to make it reconciliation language and they refused it. They rejected it in committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, let me make a couple of points. First of all, to my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), I took no poll over the weekend; but I can say when I was running for Congress 6 years ago, going to senior citizen centers throughout southeast Harris County, Texas, I ran into more and more seniors who said the biggest concern they had was the cost of prescription drugs, and the problems that they had of having to choose between buying their groceries at the end of the month or buying the pharmaceuticals that were being prescribed to them by the doctors. That was the issue, and that was the poll. That was a real poll.

Now let us talk about what this motion to instruct is. I do not think my friends on the other side have read it. All we are saying, if they look at the budget resolution, throughout the budget resolution it is very clear on which dates the Committee on Ways and Means shall, shall report tax reconciliation language. When we look at the Medicare language in there, it says if, it says whenever, but it certainly says nothing about a date certain of what it should be.

My colleagues on the other side have felt the need to use placards. I do not like these. I wish that we would ban these from the floor; but if we are going to use them, I am going to show what the Republican prescription drug plan under Medicare is. It is right here, right here. Now the American people can see it as well. It is laid out pretty clearly what the Republican plan is. There is no Republican plan.

Here is the problem: there are about 70 legislative days left in this Congress. We still have not passed a budget resolution. We have not passed any appropriations bills. We passed a number of tax cutting bills, generally scoped toward the upper-income levels, but we do not even have a prescription drug bill from the Republican side. So I do not know how they think we are going to get this done; and, in fact, their budget resolution does not think we are going to get it done because it says if, whenever.

What Democrats are saying today, what Democrats are saying is let us make prescription drug benefits for all senior citizens as certain as they want to make tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans among us. That is what this resolution is about today. I do not see how they can be against this. It all fits within the budget numbers that both

sides use. It does not touch one dollar of the Social Security surplus, we are quite certain on our end.

Their tax cut plan, it can get into the Social Security surplus later on, but most of my colleagues will be gone by then so all we are saying right now is let us put prescription drug benefits for senior citizens on par with their tax cuts, and let us tell the Committee on Ways and Means that they have to come up with a bill and bring it up before this Congress adjourns.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for offering this resolution, and I commend it to all of my colleagues.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU).

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take the debate back to the fundamentals of this budget resolution and away from a lot of the rhetoric, some of which we have just heard.

Let us talk about what is really in the budget resolution and what is not. First and foremost, we set aside every penny of the Social Security surplus. Now there is a lot of rhetoric on the other side about whether do we protect all of Social Security, do we not protect all of Social Security? This budget resolution does it, and it does it for the second year in a row.

We had a budget that was put up by the minority last year that spent 40 percent of the Social Security surplus. We have ended that problem in budgeting, set aside every penny of the Social Security surplus. We set aside \$40 billion for prescription drug coverage for Medicare beneficiaries.

Now it is true there is no formal piece of legislation before this body right now, but that is reflective of the fact that we know we have to work on a bipartisan basis to try to put together a good piece of legislation, not just one that provides prescription drug coverage for Medicare beneficiaries but one that reforms and strengthens the program and hopefully gives those beneficiaries more options and more choices.

We pay down the debt. We actually set a course to pay down the entire public debt by 2013. We have tax relief in this legislation. Of course, we do. We try to make the Tax Code more fair by getting rid of the marriage penalty, getting rid of death taxes, repealing the Social Security earnings limit, and giving individuals full deductibility for their health insurance, and we also invest in defense and education.

I want to focus a little bit in the minute or so remaining, however, on the debt relief I spoke about, because if one travels anywhere in this country, people recognize that it is important that we continue the process of paying down the public debt.

Here is what we have done in just the past 3 years: in 1998, we paid down over

\$50 billion in public debt; in 1999, last year, we paid down over \$80 billion. This year we will pay down \$163 billion; and, in fact, over the 4 years, including this budget year that we are debating now, 2001, we will pay down over \$450 billion in debt.

That is because of the determination of this Republican Congress to set aside funds, not just for social security but also for debt retirement and to keep that debt going in the right direction.

Now the minority has said repeatedly in this very debate we should get rid of all of these tax cuts, get rid of any tax cuts and pay down more debt. Of course we could do that. We could decide not to repeal the penalty that seniors pay if they choose to continue working and pay down a little bit more debt, but if we did that it would be wrong. We could decide not to eliminate the marriage penalty, to keep penalizing married couples simply because they choose to get married, and pay down a little bit more debt, but if we did that it would be wrong. It would be wrong to sustain a Tax Code that is so unfair.

We could refuse to give individuals health insurance deductibility, but that also would be wrong. We could decide not to give individuals health insurance deductibility and pay down a little bit more debt, but again that would simply be the wrong approach to take.

We need a Tax Code that is more fair. We need to continue to pay down debt, and we need to recognize that what is important is that just as one views their home mortgage, if they have additional income, additional funds, they do not pay down their entire home mortgage in one year. They might put a little bit more toward that mortgage, but what is most important is that they pay down a little bit every year, a little bit with every payment. They reduce the size of the mortgage gradually, and they keep the country and their own budget on a course of fiscal responsibility.

I urge my colleagues to reject the motion to instruct.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would respond to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU) by saying that if he has a \$250 billion-plus tax cut instead of \$147 billion, which is what the Senate has proposed, that is \$103 billion less debt reduction and \$103 billion less to work with, fewer resources to work with to provide for a Medicare prescription drug benefit, and that is what this debate is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. WEYGAND).

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

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Republican members of the Committee on the Budget were not there during the process they were going through then when we actually passed a resolution that they promoted, but they refuse to understand the actual alternative that we have proposed.

I offered the amendment, I offered the budget amendment in the committee that actually would provide for the prescription drug benefit. Nowhere in our amendment, nowhere in our resolution, did we require this program to begin in 2003.

My dear colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), talked about that this would not start for another couple of years. That is not the truth. The Democratic amendment, the proposal that we put forth, would simply instruct the Committee on Ways and Means to begin immediately to provide a \$40 billion benefit for prescription drugs for our seniors.

What came out was a plan that I referred to here as the Bentsen plan that he referred to earlier. This chart that I show right here is the Republican plan for prescription drugs. It was mushy, as our ranking member said. It had nothing to it, no substance whatsoever. They proposed a plan that did nothing for prescription drugs.

Back in Rhode Island where I come from, many seniors who have worked all their lives are facing now \$5,000, \$6,000, \$7,000 and even \$8,000 a year with prescription drug costs. A small contractor by the name of Paul Smith and his wife Judy came to me and said, I am 70 years old and my wife is 66. I have to go back to work part time to pay for my \$8,300-a-year worth of prescription drugs.

We as Democrats and Republicans should not tolerate that whatsoever. We should be working together to make a plan that is truly a plan, not a white piece of paper.

What we have proposed is simple. Give the money to the Committee on Ways and Means to come up with a proposal right now. We are not adverse to tax cuts. As a matter of fact, our proposal was to have over \$50 billion worth of small business tax cuts, but prioritize our business before the Committee on the Budget; put our seniors first.

Those people who cannot afford prescription drugs should have a plan, not a blank piece of paper, and that is what the Republican proposal is.

□ 1745

It has no substance, no plan, no direction.

Today, what we are asking with this motion with regard to instructing conferees is put our seniors first, put our seniors above all of those other groups that really are begging us for tax cuts, but provide our seniors with a benefit for the prescription drugs.

I recently completed a commission to report on Rhode Island that showed the comparison between what our seniors

pay and what our pets pay for the very same prescription drug. The very same prescription made by the same manufacturer, the same FDA requirements, the same dosage was 83 percent cheaper for my dog than my mother. We treat our pets better than we treat our senior citizens when it comes to prescription drugs.

How can we not have a plan? How can we tolerate a white piece of paper? How can we tolerate what my colleagues have put forward? Vote to approve the motion to instruct conferees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Does the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) claim the time from the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) who claimed the time from the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH)?

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time for purposes of control.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is we are going to protect 100 percent of Social Security. We did that last year, the first time since 1960. We are doing it in this year's budget, and we are going to do it in next year's budget, the plan that we are bringing forward.

We are strengthening Medicare and prescription drugs. We are setting aside \$40 billion to implement our ultimate plan. It is no different than the motion to instruct the conferees. It is basically a blank paper. It sets aside money like we do. We retire the public debt by the year 2013, and we promote tax fairness for families, farmers, and seniors, and restore America's defense and strengthens support for education and science.

Our GOP plan ends the marriage penalty. It is interesting, the Democrats voted for it, but I guess they do not want to cut taxes, but they voted for it. It repeals Social Security earnings test. They voted for it but say they do not want to set aside money for a tax cut. We reduced the death tax. They voted for that, many of them. We expand educational savings accounts. We increase health care deductibility. We provide tax breaks for poor communities. We strengthen private pension plans.

What interests me, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) called this an irresponsible tax cut. It is interesting because, in the next 5 years, we have \$10 trillion of revenue. We want a tax cut of \$200 billion. That is 2 percent of all revenue. What is irresponsible about reducing taxes 2 percent? Maybe it is irresponsible that we are not doing more.

Then I heard this was wild spending. Only the gentleman from Washington

(Mr. MCDERMOTT) could call tax cuts spending.

I will tell my colleagues what I think is irresponsible. The President increases taxes by \$10 billion in the first year of his plan. We cut it by \$10 billion. We ultimately set aside \$200 billion for a tax cut. We lock in \$150 billion. We set aside a reserve of \$50 billion. If there is a potential surplus, we will have another \$50 billion, just slightly over 2 percent of all revenues that will come in the next 10 years.

No, a tax cut is not irresponsible unless it is not enough. It is certainly not spending, as the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) would call it. It is a tax cut. We give it back to the American people.

The bottom line, we set aside \$40 billion for the Committee on Ways and Means to bring forward a Medicare plan, a Medicare plan that will have prescription drugs payments for our seniors. That is what we do, and that is why we are so strongly in support of our plan.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I stand in favor of this motion to instruct, which would tell the conferees to make a Medicare prescription drug benefit a higher priority than a tax cut that would override all other priorities.

This motion to instruct conferees rejects the House's fiscally irresponsible \$200 billion tax cut which our Republican friends describe as a down payment on the \$483 billion plan outlined by Governor Bush, a tax cut that would eat up the entire non-Social Security surplus and begin to eat into funds borrowed from Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, we can afford a modest tax cut, but we cannot afford the kind of tax cut that would compromise the future of Social Security and Medicare. We need to address the future of Medicare. We need to address the deficiencies of Medicare. The most striking deficiency is its failure to cover prescription drugs.

We need a prescription drug benefit now, not later. Prescription drugs now account for about one-sixth of all out-of-pocket health spending by the elderly. Almost 40 percent of those over age 85 do not have prescription drug coverage.

Spending and utilization of prescription drugs is growing at twice the rate of other health spending. Between 1993 and 1998, spending for prescription drugs increased at an annual rate of 12 percent compared to about 5 percent for other kinds of health spending.

So this motion to instruct conferees takes the lower tax cut number in the Senate resolution so that the tax cut does not use all of our budgetary resources. Then it instructs conferees to use the latest date possible for tax cuts, September 22, so Congress will have time and will have the resources

to enact a Medicare prescription drug benefit before it acts on the tax cuts.

Mr. Speaker, let us put first things first. Let us support this motion to instruct conferees.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, seniors in my district are very concerned about the costs of prescription drugs, and they are glad that we will be addressing that issue this year. But seniors in my district are also very concerned about being able to pass along the fruits of their labors to their children, because many of the seniors in my district are farmers and ranchers and small business people, and they are weighed down by the effects of the death tax and their inability to pass along what they have worked for all their lives to their children and grandchildren. Many of them are still involved in their farms and ranches and small businesses. So as taxes go higher and higher, their costs of production go higher, and it is harder for them to make a living. So tax relief is an important part of this bill for seniors and for their children and for their grandchildren.

The budget resolution that the House passed is a good balance that includes a prescription drug benefit and tax relief, and it also includes strengthening our country's defense. This budget resolution increases defense spending 6 percent over last year. It helps us do a better job of taking care of our people.

But we know that more money alone doesn't solve all of our problems. We also have to reexamine our commitments and all of the deployments around the world. We have to address the fact that, in fiscal year 1998, \$24 billion of defense spending is in unreconciled transactions. We do not know where it was spent.

We have got to do a better job of making sure our money is spent smarter and more effectively, and this budget resolution as well as the continuing activities of this committee will help get us in that direction.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, America is completely entranced by the television show, "Who Wants to be a Millionaire?" I think that is the game that is being played out here on the floor today. The Republicans, they are starting the game kind of with the faster finger contest.

So what they do is they put a chart together, and they list six things that they want to accomplish. They want to protect 100 percent of Social Security. They want to strengthen Medicare. They want to retire the public debt. They want to promote tax fairness. They want to restore America's defense, and they want to promote education.

Now, the trick in the fastest finger contest is which order does one think the Republicans are going to put the answers in. Because we think and the

American people think that the Republicans are really playing a different game. They think, as we do, that the real game on the Republican side is who wants to help a millionaire?

So number four down here, yes, they want tax fairness for families, but the families they are talking about are the families in the country club. They want big tax breaks. So answer number one for them is helping the wealthiest families in the country with a big tax cut. But the Democrats, we are saying our answer is, who wants to help the elderly? Who wants to help the sick? Who wants to help kids get an education.

So we are moving up those issues up to number one, two and three. That is what the Democratic resolution says out here on the floor.

Let us make sure that we get this answer correctly, because there should be no taxation breaks before medication benefits for senior citizens in our country. We should ensure that the list, which is up here as a wonderful set of objectives that the Republican Party is listing, but they do not tell us what their priorities are. It tells us nothing about what they want to do first.

If we look back to past history, their first and primary objective is cutting social programs, especially for senior citizens in our country so they can have the biggest tax breaks for those that have been most benefited by the enormous prosperity of the 1990s.

So do not kid ourselves. This is all about who wants to make more money for more millionaires in our country. That is the game which the Republicans are playing. The Democrats are just making sure that we get the order first, prescription drugs to senior citizens before more tax breaks for millionaires.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) seek unanimous consent to reclaim his time?

Mr. SHAYS. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) controls the time.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I remind the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) that the first two tax cuts that went through were ending the marriage penalty so that young couples would not have to pay \$1,400 more, and ending Social Security penalty, which I think the gentleman voted for, hardly cuts tax for the wealthy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA).

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Connecticut for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the budget passed by this Chamber provides the framework and the foundation for continued prosperity. We know where the Republican priorities are. In 1993, I came to Wash-

ington. I came to Washington because I watched the other side spend the Social Security surplus for 40 years. We are now on our way to the 3rd year balancing the budget by not spending one dime of Social Security.

The Republicans have their priorities right. We are going to strengthen Medicare by setting aside \$40 billion for a prescription drug program. We are going to work at retiring public debt rather than accumulating public debt as we did for 40 years. We are going to promote tax fairness for families, farmers, and seniors. We are going to restore American defense. We are going to strengthen education in America.

I want to talk a little bit more about how we strengthen education in America. We have seen one approach to strengthening education, which is creating program after program after program here in Washington, throwing \$35 billion into an agency that cannot even keep its own books. It cannot balance its own books.

What does that mean? It means that it does not even think enough about our kids to make sure that every dollar that we invest in education makes it into a classroom, makes it to a child where it actually can make a difference.

There is a better way. Rather than having an education bureaucracy in Washington which is mandating to local school districts and to parents how to spend their educational dollars, the Republican plan, we maintain the funding, we increase the funding, but we give it to the school districts in a way that gives them maximum flexibility.

We increase funding for the Individuals With Disabilities Act. As we give the school districts and local districts more money, it frees up their money to move those dollars to the areas that they feel are most important.

We preserve funding for the Innovative Education Program Strategies. What is this? This is a very flexible block grant back to local school districts. It says we trust them to take some of this money and allocate it to the things that they think are most important. The President has not even requested funding for this program since 1994.

We reject cuts in impact aid. This is where money flows to local school districts because they have a significant impact because of Federal programs and facilities in their districts. We increase spending for Pell Grants. The Pell Grant program helps lower income students attend college.

□ 1800

There is a clear difference. One program says we are going to invest in Washington; the other says we are going to invest in our local schools and our local kids.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on this side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentleman from South

Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 6 minutes remaining; and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ 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 wish to congratulate the gentleman from South Carolina for this motion. I rise to endorse it and ask my colleagues to accept it.

My district showed a definitive difference in the amount of monies paid by senior citizens for prescription drugs. It was higher in the 18th Congressional District in Houston than in Canada and in Mexico.

We find that those who are 85 years old, 40 percent of them do not even have the ability to pay for any drugs. They have no benefit whatsoever, and we must realize that seniors are living longer.

We also find that seniors are paying twice as much for their prescription drugs if they are Medicare beneficiaries and they do not have that provision, and so they are buying one-third less drugs. What does that mean? It means sicker seniors. That is what it means. Mr. Speaker, these are individuals who have worked hard in our communities.

Then we find the cost of our prescription drugs, the amount of money our seniors pay, is far more than any other health need that they have. And this, I would say to my colleagues, begs for us to have a prescription drug benefit under the Medicare provisions.

I do not know why it is so difficult. This is something we should support. I cannot go home and tell my seniors in the 18th Congressional District that in the United States of America they cannot have a drug benefit; but yet in Mexico and Canada prescription drugs are cheaper.

I would say it is time now to support this motion to instruct, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the Spratt motion to instruct the conferees on the budget resolution. The Spratt motion sets the stage for enacting a Medicare prescription drug benefit or other legislation to improve Medicare before the reporting date for a tax cut reconciliation bill by setting September 22 as the date for reporting a tax cut bill protected by reconciliation. Furthermore, the Spratt motion recedes to the Senate's slightly smaller tax cut and also recede to the Senate by dropping the reserve fund language in the House-passed resolution that provides for an additional \$50 billion in tax cuts.

While the Republicans propose large tax cuts over the next 5 years and reconcile the Finance and Ways and Means Committees to report legislation, Republicans do not show the 10-year cost of this tax cut which could be as large as the \$792 billion that the Republicans proposed and the American people rejected in 1999. Moreover, the Republicans do not intend to strengthen or support Medicare due to the fact that there are no reconciliation instructions to require legislation that would

actually use the \$40 billion "reserve" earmarked in the budget resolution. In addition, the Republicans have cut non-defense appropriations while defense significantly increased.

For the third consecutive year Republicans have chosen to provide large tax breaks for the wealthy. This budget resolution provides at least \$200 billion in tax breaks over the next 5 years for the financial elite of America. Furthermore, this resolution is a major down payment for George W. Bush's proposed trillion-dollar tax scheme. I will not stand by while our children's future is bankrupted to fund this irresponsible budget resolution.

This budget contains deep cuts in domestic spending by \$114 billion over the next 5 years; fails to provide anything to strengthen Social Security or Medicare; cuts nondefense discretionary spending by \$19.7 billion in 2001 and \$138 billion over the next 5 years below the level needed to maintain purchasing power after adjusting for inflation; and pretends to reserve \$40 billion for a Medicare prescription drug benefit contingent upon essentially turning Medicare into a voucher program. Republicans have used slight of hand to hide the facts of their irresponsible budget by showing the effects of proposed tax cuts for only the first 5 years and not the full 10-year projections commonly used during the last 4 years.

I am disappointed in the budget resolution because I do not believe that it provides adequate investment in our Nation's future. America's future depends on that of her young people—in providing them adequate resources and opportunities to become our future leaders including providing them education and access to adequate health care.

The budget resolution provides inadequate resources for the education of our young people. I firmly believe that we must focus our attention and our energy on one of the most important challenges facing our country today—revitalizing our education system. Strengthening education must be a top priority to raise the standard of living among American families and to prolong this era of American economic expansion.

Education will prepare our nation for the challenges of the 21st century, and I will fight to ensure that the necessary programs are adequately funded to ensure our children's success.

We must provide our children access to superior education at all ages from kindergarten to graduate school. Recent studies emphasize the importance of quality education early in a child's future development. And yet despite these studies, the Budget Resolution still inadequately funds programs that would provide for programs targeting children in their younger years.

In addition, we need to open the door of educational opportunity to all American children. It is well known that increases in income are related to educational attainment. The Democratic budget alternative rejects the Republican freeze on education funding and allocates \$4.8 billion more for education for fiscal year 2001, than the Republican budget. Over 5 years, the Democratic Party demonstrates its commitment to education by proposing \$21 billion more than the Republican budget resolution.

The Congressional Black Caucus [CBC] offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute that promised to invest for the future of our Nation. The CBC substitute is a budget

that maximizes investment and opportunity for the poor, African-Americans, and other minorities. This Budget for Maximum Investment and Opportunity supports a moderate plan to pay down the national debt; protects Social Security; and makes significant investments in education and training.

The CBC budget requests \$88.8 billion in fiscal year 2001 for education, training, and development. This is \$32 billion more than the Republican budget provides. The CBC substitute proposed a \$10 billion increase over the President's Budget for school construction. Other projected increases include additional funding for Head Start, Summer Youth Employment, TRIO programs, Historically Black Colleges and Universities, and Community Technology Centers. In an age of unprecedented wealth the CBC has the vision to invest in the American family and not squander opportunities afforded by a budget surplus.

I will not support the failed policies of the past. Senator MCCAIN has best characterized this budget resolution as one that is fiscally irresponsible. I support a budget that invest strengthening Social Security; provides an affordable prescription drug benefit for all seniors; helps communities improve public education with quality teachers, smaller classes, greater accountability and modern schools; and pay down the national debt. These are the policies that invest in our children and in the future of our Nation in the 21st century.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 20 seconds to just remind my colleagues that I was here for 13 years, and I never saw in a Democrat budget any prescription drugs. In the Republican budget we have prescription drugs.

It is interesting to note that my colleagues on the other side want to make it universal, so they want to give millionaires prescription drugs. Somehow that does not bother them. So I guess they like some millionaires and not others. I guess taxes, whatever.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER).

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to outline the six points of the Republican budget plan and compare it a bit with the Democrat plan, or the plans they have had over the last 30 years when they were in power.

Number one. Last year the House of Representatives passed a measure that I sponsored, the Social Security Lockbox, by an overwhelming 416 to 12 vote. This budget reinforces that effort by ensuring that Social Security dollars will not be spent on unrelated programs. It protects 100 percent of the Social Security.

In this budget all of the \$166 billion Social Security surplus is off limits to Clinton-Gore spending. This will be the second year in a row that Republicans have protected the Social Security surplus.

Secondly, we are strengthening Medicare with prescription drugs. It sets aside \$40 billion to help needy seniors to be able to afford their prescription drugs; and at the same time, it rejects the \$18.2 billion Clinton-Gore Medicare cuts. The other side would like to cut Medicare.

Point three. Our Federal public debt stands now at \$3.6 trillion. This equates to \$56,000 for the average family of four. This year, nearly \$1,000 in taxes from every man, woman, and child in the United States will be used just to pay the interest on the debt. The Republican budget resolution leads our Nation on the path towards eliminating public debt by paying off \$1 trillion over the next 5 years. Our budget discipline has already repaid \$302 billion since 1998.

Mr. Speaker, those are numbers; but paying off the public debt is not just about numbers, it is about people. It is about the future of our Nation. It is about children living in my northern California district and elsewhere in our Nation that are saddled by this debt unless we pay it off. This budget takes the bold step for ourselves and future generations by taking on the challenge to pay off this national public debt.

The next point it promotes, point number four, is tax fairness for families. Farmers and seniors. This is not for fat cats, as the other side would have us believe. It provides for those in the House-passed marriage tax penalty provision who, on average, pay \$1,400 extra just because they are married.

It also provides for a small business tax relief and education and health care assistance amounting to \$150 billion, and it rejects the \$96 billion growth tax increase over the next 5 years in the Clinton-Gore budget.

Number five. It restores American defense 6 percent more than last year for our overdeployed armed forces. The GOP defense budget provides \$1 billion more than the Clinton-Gore plan.

And finally, number six, it strengthens support for education and science, 9.4 percent more for elementary and secondary education, and IDEA increases of nearly \$2 billion. Also, it fights cancer, AIDS, diabetes, and other diseases with \$1 billion more for NIH, as well as \$1 billion extra for basic research in biology, science, engineering, and math.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good budget resolution; and I urge my colleagues to reject this motion to instruct.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCI).

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, let us put first things first. First things first are the seniors who cannot afford their medications; who are cutting their pills in half, cutting the potency, thereby running the risk that they do not get better earlier. Those are the people who we are trying to put first; the people who cannot afford their prescription drugs because they are too expensive.

We have developed all this taxpayer-funded research, and the people who are supposed to be benefiting from it cannot even afford the drugs once they are developed. We need to put first

things first, and this motion puts first things first.

Our seniors are being forced to choose between food, fuel, and prescription drugs. A study that just came out showed that those paying 15 percent more than anybody else are the ones who do not have the insurance or on Medicare. The ones that are the most vulnerable are the ones paying the most.

Mr. Speaker, these are individuals who have contributed to their communities. They have sacrificed; they have worked for their families and lived their whole lives and tried to make their families and their communities better. They are the most vulnerable amongst us, and they are the ones we should help first. Not a very large tax break providing for the very wealthy people to be able to enjoy, but the most vulnerable amongst us who need our care and support in their prescription medication, who have led a full and productive life for their families and their communities.

Mr. Speaker, this motion is putting first things first.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I believe I have the right to close.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) is recognized for 2¼ minutes.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I would have to say this is the most overused chart I think I have seen on the House floor in maybe a dozen years. It is used by the Republicans and the Democrats alike. And we would like the Democrats to use it more and keep repeating our themes because we think it is really a good message.

In fact, I was in Reading, Pennsylvania, the other night and I made a talk; and I never really talk about the budget but I talked about the budget, and I said, "I want you to know what is in it because I am so amazed that we were able to accomplish the fact that we are going to keep our mitts off Social Security and keep that surplus there and use it to fix Social Security for three generations of Americans. Not just the seniors, but the baby-boomers and particularly the kids, who are really at risk."

And we are going to strengthen Medicare. Frankly, Medicare has got to become a much more free market program. And we have to provide supplements in private savings accounts in order to really solve the Medicare problem long term. But at this point we want to strengthen it, and we want to make sure our seniors have access to the prescription drugs because, frankly, we may be able to avoid surgeries, for example, and have a more inexpen-

sive way of keeping people healthy through the use of prescription drugs.

But we certainly do not want people of real means to qualify for another entitlement program offered by the Federal Government that, frankly, takes away from people who are more needy.

We pay down \$1 trillion in the publicly held debt. That is better than Regis Philbin did if we add up all his shows together. We are going to pay down \$1 trillion in the publicly held debt, and we are going to cut taxes. And we are going to cut taxes for people who pay taxes.

I am in favor of that. I am not a big fan of cutting taxes for people who do not pay any taxes. So we are going to have a program that will help the family farmer and the small businessperson. We are going to help the married couples. We are going to help everybody who is out there paying taxes and let them pay a little less and get this government to clean itself up a little bit.

We are going to restore America's defense. We do not want our troops to be up against the wall without the training money they need, the basic supplies that they need.

And, finally, we are going to strengthen support for education. We believe in basic science. We love the human genome project. As one philosopher once said, advanced science is sometimes indistinguishable from magic. And the fact is that human genome project almost looks like magic; it is so amazing and it offers so much hope to everybody.

So with these six principles, we do not think we ought to change course. We think we are headed in the right direction. We think this will strengthen America, will strengthen our families, our communities; and so I would ask my colleagues to reject the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina.

Let us stay the course and get this budget done and offer something to the American people that I believe will improve their lives.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

This whole debate began when the President sent us a budget and said let us do prescription drug coverage; there is a gaping hole in the comprehensive care we ought to provide in Medicare. And I absolutely agree with that.

When the Republicans brought their resolution to the Committee on the Budget, they provided for prescription drug coverage in an iffy conditional kind of way. The usual procedure in a budget resolution, the one tool we have to get something done on the Committee on the Budget, is to impose reconciliation instructions on the committees of jurisdiction, to tell them by a date certain to report out language to the House floor so that we can act upon the purpose that we have set for ourselves.

We, in our resolution on the Democratic side, did just that. We resorted to the time-honored tool of reconciliation and said to the Committee on

Ways and Means and to the Committee on Commerce, reconcile the budget; here is \$40 billion for the first 5 years, \$155 billion over the next 10 years, establish a prescription drug benefit for Medicare.

That is all we want to do today. We want to take this iffy, mushy language now in this resolution and stiffen it up. We want to stiffen the spine and resolve of the conferees and tell them, go to conference determined to see that the first order of business of this House is not tax cuts, it is a prescription drug benefit. Then they can turn to tax cuts. We do not rule that out.

We provide in our budget resolution for tax reduction of \$50 billion over the next 5 years, \$201 billion over the next 10 years, and we say in this resolution recede to the Senate tax proposal, which is \$147 billion.

Why do we say that? Because, Mr. Speaker, going back to a chart I used repeatedly when we argued this resolution, we think that the other side is coming perilously close to putting us in the position of being back in the red, back into the Social Security surplus once again.

The budget resolution the Republicans brought to the floor produces, according to their numbers, a surplus of \$110 billion over 5 years, provided they can hold discretionary spending below the rate of inflation to the tune of \$117 billion over 5 years. A very big proviso.

□ 1815

But if they then go from a \$150 billion tax cut to a \$200 billion tax cut, that \$110 billion is reduced by 50. And then if they do the prescription drug

benefit at 40, they take another 50 off. They are down to a \$110 billion surplus over the next 5 years. By our calculation, Mr. Speaker, they will have a \$10 billion surplus next year, but every year thereafter they will have a zero surplus.

They are skating on thin ice. They are putting us in danger of invading the Social Security surplus again. And when that crunch comes, prescription drug coverage will never get done. That is why we say do it first.

Now, this is simply a test of their sincerity. If they are earnest, if they are sincere, if they really want to do prescription drugs, vote for this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following chart for the RECORD:

THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET RESOLUTION USES UP THE ENTIRE SURPLUS—AND MAYBE MORE

[All figures exclude the Social Security surplus; negative signs indicate savings; dollars in billions]

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	Five years	Ten years
CBO Surplus w/o Social Security .....	27	15	29	36	42	48	171	893
Tax cuts (before use of "reserve") .....	10	22	22	31	42	45	150	750
Non-defense cuts including timing shifts .....	12	-16	-13	-21	-30	-37	-117	-377
Defense .....	3	2	2	2	3	2	12	23
Farm payments .....	6	1	1	2	2	2	7	18
Extend expiring Customs Service fee .....					-1	-2	-3	-13
Medicaid/CHIP access and benefits .....		(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	1	2
Interest costs of policies .....	(1)	1	1	2	3	4	11	75
Surplus claimed by Republicans .....	8	17	16	20	24	33	110	415
Reserve for \$50 billion additional tax cuts .....		5	10	10	10	15	50	250
Reserved for Medicare "reform" and drugs .....		2	5	8	11	14	40	155
Interest cost of reserves .....		(1)	1	2	3	4	10	80
Surplus/Deficit(-) when reserves are used .....	8	10	0	0	0	0	10	-70

<sup>1</sup> means "less than \$½ billion".

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules and then on the motion to instruct conferees on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Con. Res. 282, by the yeas and nays; H. Con. Res. 228, by the yeas and nays; S. 777, by the yeas and nays; and the motion to instruct conferees on H. Con. Res. 290, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

□

DECLARING AMERICAN G.I. "PERSON OF THE CENTURY" FOR 20TH CENTURY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 282, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 282, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 397, nays 0, answered "present" 1, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 111]  
YEAS—397

Abercrombie  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Andrews  
Archer  
Armey  
Baca  
Bachus  
Baird

Baker  
Baldacci  
Baldwin  
Ballenger  
Barcia  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)  
Barrett (WI)  
Bartlett

Barton  
Bass  
Bateman  
Becerra  
Bentsen  
Bereuter  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry

Biggert  
Billirakis  
Bishop  
Blagojevich  
Bliley  
Blumenauer  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonior  
Bono  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Bryant  
Burr  
Burton  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardin  
Carson  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Chenoweth-Hage  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Collins  
Combest  
Condit  
Conyers  
Costello  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crowley  
Cubin  
Cummings  
Cunningham

Danner  
Davis (FL)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (VA)  
Deal  
DeFazio  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
DeMint  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
Engel  
English  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Evans  
Everett  
Ewing  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Fletcher  
Foley  
Forbes  
Ford  
Fossella  
Fowler  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (NJ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Ganske

Gejdenson  
Gekas  
Gephardt  
Gibbons  
Gilchrist  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gonzalez  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Gordon  
Goss  
Graham  
Granger  
Green (TX)  
Green (WI)  
Greenwood  
Gutknecht  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hansen  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Herger  
Hill (IN)  
Hill (MT)  
Hilleary  
Hilliard  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hobson  
Hoefel  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Hooley  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde

Inlee  
Isakson  
Istook  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee (TX)  
Jefferson  
John  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kasich  
Kelly  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind (WI)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Klecza  
Klink  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
Kucinich  
Kuykendall  
LaFalce  
LaHood  
Lampson  
Lantos  
Largent  
Larson  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Lazio  
Leach  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Lucas (KY)  
Lucas (OK)  
Luther  
Maloney (CT)  
Maloney (NY)  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCrery  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Menendez  
Metcalf  
Mica  
Millender-  
McDonald

Miller (FL)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Minge  
Mollohan  
Moore  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Morella  
Murtha  
Myrick  
Napolitano  
Nethercutt  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Ose  
Packard  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor  
Paul  
Payne  
Pease  
Pelosi  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Phelps  
Pickering  
Pickett  
Pitts  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Portman  
Price (NC)  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Regula  
Reynolds  
Riley  
Rivers  
Roemer  
Rogan  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rothman  
Roukema  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Rush  
Ryan (WI)  
Sabo  
Salmon  
Sanchez  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Sanford  
Sawyer  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schakowsky  
Scott  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions

Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Sherman  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Shows  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sisisky  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Souder  
Spence  
Spratt  
Stabenow  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Strickland  
Stump  
Stupak  
Sununu  
Sweeney  
Talent  
Tancredo  
Tauscher  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Terry  
Thomas  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thune  
Thurman  
Tiahrt  
Tierney  
Toomey  
Towns  
Traficant  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Upton  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Vitter  
Walden  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Waters  
Watkins  
Watt (NC)  
Watts (OK)  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Weldon (FL)  
Weller  
Wexler  
Weygand  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Wynn  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on each additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

□

HONORING MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AND FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES WHO SERVED NATION DURING VIETNAM ERA AND FAMILIES OF THOSE INDIVIDUALS WHO LOST THEIR LIVES OR REMAIN UNACCOUNTED FOR OR WERE INJURED DURING THAT ERA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 228.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. KUYKENDALL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 228, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 399, nays 0, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 112]

YEAS—399

Ackerman  
Bilbray  
Blunt  
Borski  
Buyer  
Campbell  
Canady  
Cannon  
Clement  
Coburn  
Cook  
Cooksey

Cox  
DeGette  
Frost  
Gutierrez  
Jenkins  
Jones (OH)  
Martinez  
McCollum  
McIntosh  
Mink  
Moakley  
Nadler

Neal  
Owens  
Oxley  
Pryce (OH)  
Reyes  
Rodriguez  
Ryun (KS)  
Schaffer  
Stark  
Tanner  
Weldon (PA)  
Wise

□ 1837

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut and Mr. SMITH of Michigan changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Abercrombie  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Andrews  
Archer  
Armey  
Baca  
Bachus  
Baird  
Baker  
Baldacci  
Baldwin  
Ballenger  
Barcia  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)  
Barrett (WI)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Bateman  
Becerra  
Bentsen  
Bereuter  
Berkeley  
Berman  
Berry  
Biggart  
Bilirakis  
Bishop  
Blagojevich  
Bliley

Blumenauer  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonior  
Bono  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Bryant  
Burr  
Burton  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardin  
Carson  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Chenoweth-Hage  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Collins

Combest  
Condit  
Conyers  
Costello  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crowley  
Cubin  
Cummings  
Cunningham  
Danner  
Davis (FL)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (VA)  
Deal  
DeFazio  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
DeMint  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Doyle  
Dreier

Duncan  
Dunn  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
Engel  
English  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Evans  
Everett  
Ewing  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Fletcher  
Foley  
Forbes  
Ford  
Fossella  
Fowler  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (NJ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gejdenson  
Gekas  
Gephardt  
Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gonzalez  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Gordon  
Goss  
Graham  
Granger  
Green (TX)  
Green (WI)  
Greenwood  
Gutknecht  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hansen  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Herger  
Hill (IN)  
Hill (MT)  
Hilleary  
Hilliard  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hobson  
Hoeffel  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Hooley  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Inslee  
Isakson  
Istook  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee (TX)  
Jefferson  
John  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kasich  
Kelly  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind (WI)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Klecza  
Klink

Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
Kucinich  
Kuykendall  
LaFalce  
LaHood  
Lampson  
Lantos  
Largent  
Larson  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Lazio  
Leach  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Lucas (KY)  
Lucas (OK)  
Luther  
Maloney (CT)  
Maloney (NY)  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCrery  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Menendez  
Metcalf  
Mica  
Millender-  
McDonald  
Miller (FL)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Minge  
Mollohan  
Moore  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Morella  
Murtha  
Myrick  
Napolitano  
Nethercutt  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Ose  
Packard  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor  
Paul  
Payne  
Pease  
Pelosi  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Phelps  
Pickering  
Pickett  
Pitts  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Portman  
Price (NC)  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel

Regula  
Reynolds  
Riley  
Rivers  
Roemer  
Roukema  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Rush  
Ryan (WI)  
Sabo  
Salmon  
Sanchez  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Sanford  
Sawyer  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schakowsky  
Scott  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Skean  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Souder  
Spence  
Spratt  
Stabenow  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Strickland  
Stump  
Stupak  
Sununu  
Sweeney  
Talent  
Tancredo  
Tauscher  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Terry  
Thomas  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thornberry  
Thune  
Thurman  
Tiahrt  
Tierney  
Toomey  
Towns  
Traficant  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Upton  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Vitter  
Walden  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Waters  
Watkins  
Watt (NC)  
Watts (OK)  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
Wexler  
Weygand  
Whitfield

Wicker	Woolsey	Young (AK)
Wilson	Wu	Young (FL)
Wolf	Wynn	

NOT VOTING—35

Ackerman	Cox	Neal
Bilbray	DeGette	Owens
Blunt	Frost	Oxley
Borski	Gutierrez	Pryce (OH)
Buyer	Jenkins	Reyes
Campbell	Jones (OH)	Rodriguez
Canady	Martinez	Ryun (KS)
Cannon	McCollum	Schaffer
Clement	McIntosh	Sisisky
Coburn	Mink	Tanner
Cook	Moakley	Wise
Cooksey	Nadler	

□ 1845

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, my flight from San Diego, California to Washington, D.C. was delayed this evening, and I was unable to record my vote for H. Con. Res. 282 and H. Con. Res. 228. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on H. Con. Res. 282 and "aye" on H. Con. Res. 228.

□

FREEDOM TO E-FILE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate bill, S. 777, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 777, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 397, nays 1, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 113]

YEAS—397

Abercrombie	Berman	Camp
Ackerman	Berry	Capps
Aderholt	Biggart	Capuano
Allen	Bilbray	Cardin
Andrews	Bilirakis	Carson
Archer	Bishop	Castle
Army	Blagojevich	Chabot
Baca	Bliley	Chambliss
Bachus	Blumenauer	Chenoweth-Hage
Baird	Boehler	Clay
Baker	Boehner	Clayton
Baldacci	Bonilla	Clyburn
Baldwin	Bonior	Coble
Ballenger	Bono	Collins
Barcia	Boswell	Combest
Barr	Boucher	Condit
Barrett (NE)	Boyd	Conyers
Barrett (WI)	Brady (PA)	Costello
Bartlett	Brady (TX)	Coyne
Barton	Brown (FL)	Cramer
Bass	Brown (OH)	Crane
Bateman	Bryant	Crowley
Becerra	Burr	Cubin
Bentsen	Burton	Cummings
Bereuter	Callahan	Cunningham
Berkley	Calvert	Danner

Davis (FL)	Jackson-Lee	Pease
Davis (IL)	(TX)	Pelosi
Davis (VA)	Jefferson	Peterson (MN)
Deal	John	Peterson (PA)
DeFazio	Johnson (CT)	Petri
Delahunt	Johnson, E. B.	Phelps
DeLauro	Johnson, Sam	Pickering
DeLay	Jones (NC)	Pickett
DeMint	Kanjorski	Pitts
Deutsch	Kaptur	Pombo
Diaz-Balart	Kasich	Pomeroy
Dickey	Kelly	Porter
Dicks	Kennedy	Portman
Dingell	Kildee	Price (NC)
Dixon	Kilpatrick	Quinn
Doggett	Kind (WI)	Radanovich
Dooley	King (NY)	Rahall
Doolittle	Kingston	Ramstad
Doyle	Kleczka	Rangel
Dreier	Klink	Regula
Duncan	Knollenberg	Reynolds
Dunn	Kolbe	Riley
Edwards	Kucinich	Rivers
Ehlers	Kuykendall	Roemer
Ehrlich	LaFalce	Rogan
Emerson	LaHood	Rogers
Engel	Lampson	Rohrabacher
English	Lantos	Ros-Lehtinen
Eshoo	Largent	Rothman
Etheridge	Larson	Roukema
Evans	Latham	Roybal-Allard
Everett	LaTourette	Royce
Ewing	Lazio	Rush
Farr	Leach	Ryan (WI)
Fattah	Lee	Sabo
Filner	Levin	Salmon
Fletcher	Lewis (CA)	Sanchez
Foley	Lewis (GA)	Sanders
Forbes	Lewis (KY)	Sandlin
Ford	Linder	Sawyer
Fossella	Lipinski	Saxton
Fowler	LoBiondo	Scarborough
Frank (MA)	Lofgren	Schakowsky
Franks (NJ)	Lucas (KY)	Scott
Frelinghuysen	Lucas (OK)	Sensenbrenner
Gallegly	Luther	Serrano
Ganske	Maloney (CT)	Sessions
Gejdenson	Maloney (NY)	Shadegg
Gekas	Markey	Shaw
Gephardt	Mascara	Shays
Gibbons	Matsui	Sherman
Gilchrest	McCarthy (MO)	Sherwood
Gillmor	McCarthy (NY)	Shimkus
Gilman	McCrery	Shows
Gonzalez	McDermott	Shuster
Goode	McGovern	Simpson
Goodlatte	McHugh	Skeen
Goodling	McInnis	Skelton
Gordon	McIntyre	Slaughter
Goss	McKeon	Smith (MI)
Graham	McKinney	Smith (NJ)
Granger	McNulty	Smith (TX)
Green (TX)	Meehan	Smith (WA)
Green (WI)	Meeke (FL)	Snyder
Greenwood	Meeke (NY)	Souder
Gutknecht	Menendez	Spence
Hall (OH)	Metcalfe	Spratt
Hall (TX)	Mica	Stabenow
Hansen	Millender-McDonald	Stark
Hastings (FL)	Miller (FL)	Stearns
Hastings (WA)	Miller, Gary	Stenholm
Hayes	Miller, George	Strickland
Hayworth	Minge	Stump
Hefley	Mollohan	Stupak
Hill (IN)	Moore	Sununu
Hill (MT)	Moran (KS)	Sweeney
Hilleary	Moran (VA)	Talent
Hilliard	Morella	Tancredo
Hincheey	Murtha	Tauscher
Hinojosa	Myrick	Tauzin
Hobson	Napolitano	Taylor (MS)
Hoeffel	Nethercutt	Taylor (NC)
Hoekstra	Ney	Terry
Holden	Northup	Thomas
Holt	Norwood	Thompson (CA)
Hoolley	Nussle	Thompson (MS)
Horn	Oberstar	Thornberry
Hostettler	Obey	Thune
Houghton	Olver	Thurman
Hoyer	Ortiz	Tiahrt
Hulshof	Ose	Toomey
Hunter	Packard	Towns
Hutchinson	Pallone	Traficant
Hyde	Pascrell	Turner
Inslee	Pastor	Udall (CO)
Isakson	Paul	Udall (NM)
Istook	Payne	Upton
Jackson (IL)		Velazquez
		Vento

Visclosky	Waxman	Wilson
Vitter	Weiner	Wolf
Walden	Weldon (FL)	Woolsey
Walsh	Weldon (PA)	Wu
Wamp	Weller	Wynn
Waters	Wexler	Young (AK)
Watkins	Weygand	Young (FL)
Watt (NC)	Whitfield	
Watts (OK)	Wicker	

NAYS—1

Sanford

NOT VOTING—36

Blunt	Frost	Neal
Borski	Gutierrez	Owens
Buyer	Herger	Oxley
Campbell	Jenkins	Pryce (OH)
Canady	Jones (OH)	Reyes
Cannon	Maloney (NY)	Rodriguez
Clement	Martinez	Ryun (KS)
Coburn	McCollum	Schaffer
Cook	McIntosh	Sisisky
Cooksey	Mink	Tanner
Cox	Moakley	Tierney
DeGette	Nadler	Wise

□ 1852

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the Senate bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to establish an electronic filing and retrieval system to enable farmers and other persons to file paperwork electronically with selected agencies of the Department of Agriculture and to access public information regarding the programs administered by these agencies."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the House chamber for roll call votes held the evening of Monday, April 10. Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on H. Con. Res. 282, H. Con. Res. 228, and S. 777.

□

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 290, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2001

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES OFFERED BY MR. SPRATT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of agreeing to the motion to instruct on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 290) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2005, offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from South

Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 198, nays 201, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 114]

YEAS—198

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

NAYS—201

Archer	Brady (TX)	DeLay
Armey	Bryant	DeMint
Baker	Burr	Diaz-Balart
Ballenger	Burton	Dickey
Barr	Callahan	Doolittle
Barrett (NE)	Calvert	Dreier
Bartlett	Camp	Duncan
Barton	Castle	Dunn
Bass	Chabot	Ehlers
Bateman	Chambliss	Ehrlich
Bereuter	Chenoweth-Hage	Emerson
Biggert	Coble	English
Bilbray	Collins	Everett
Billirakis	Combest	Ewing
Bliley	Crane	Fletcher
Boehlert	Cubin	Foley
Boehner	Cunningham	Fossella
Bonilla	Davis (VA)	Fowler
Bono	Deal	Franks (NJ)

Frelinghuysen	LaTourette	Sanford
Gallegly	Lazio	Saxton
Gekas	Leach	Scarborough
Gibbons	Lewis (CA)	Sensenbrenner
Gilchrest	Lewis (KY)	Sessions
Gillmor	Linder	Shadegg
Gilman	LoBiondo	Shaw
Goode	Lucas (OK)	Shays
Goodlatte	Manzullo	Sherwood
Goodling	McCrery	Shimkus
Goss	McHugh	Shuster
Graham	McInnis	Simpson
Granger	McKeon	Skeen
Green (WI)	Metcalfe	Smith (MI)
Greenwood	Mica	Smith (NJ)
Gutknecht	Miller (FL)	Smith (TX)
Hansen	Miller, Gary	Souder
Hastings (WA)	Moran (KS)	Spence
Hayes	Myrick	Stearns
Hayworth	Nethercutt	Stump
Hefley	Ney	Sununu
Herger	Northup	Sweeney
Hill (MT)	Norwood	Talent
Hilleary	Nussle	Tancredo
Hobson	Ose	Tauzin
Hoekstra	Packard	Taylor (NC)
Horn	Paul	Terry
Hostettler	Pease	Thomas
Houghton	Peterson (PA)	Thornberry
Hulshof	Petri	Thune
Hunter	Pickering	Tiahrt
Hutchinson	Pitts	Toomey
Hyde	Pombo	Upton
Isakson	Portman	Vitter
Istook	Quinn	Walden
Johnson (CT)	Radanovich	Walsh
Johnson, Sam	Ramstad	Wamp
Jones (NC)	Regula	Watkins
Kasich	Reynolds	Watts (OK)
Kelly	Riley	Weldon (FL)
King (NY)	Rogan	Weldon (PA)
Kingston	Rogers	Weller
Knollenberg	Rohrabacher	Whitfield
Kolbe	Ros-Lehtinen	Wicker
Kuykendall	Roukema	Wilson
LaHood	Royce	Wolf
Largent	Ryan (WI)	Young (AK)
Latham	Salmon	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—35

Blunt	Frost	Neal
Borski	Gutierrez	Owens
Buyer	Jenkins	Oxley
Campbell	Jones (OH)	Pryce (OH)
Canady	Lee	Reyes
Cannon	Martinez	Rodriguez
Clement	McCollum	Ryun (KS)
Coburn	McIntosh	Schaffer
Cook	Mink	Sisisky
Cooksey	Moakley	Tanner
Cox	Mollohan	Wise
DeGette	Nadler	

□ 1903

Mr. BOEHLERT changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on the following: H. Con. Res. 282; H. Con. Res. 228; S. 277; and H. Con. Res. 290.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Without objection, the Chair names the following conferees: Messrs. KASICH, CHAMBLISS, SHAYS, SPRATT, and HOLT.

There was no objection.

□

COMMUNICATION FROM HON. JOE SCARBOROUGH, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following commu-

nication from the Honorable Joe Scarborough, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, March 27, 2000.

Hon. DENNIS J. HASTERT,  
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a deposition subpoena for documents issued by the Circuit Court for Escambia County, Florida.

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

Sincerely,

JOE SCARBOROUGH.

□

INTERNATIONAL ABDUCTION—KENNETH AND JODI CARLSEN

(Mr. LAMPSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to tell a story of Kenneth and Jodi Carlsen, the father and step-mother of one of the 10,000 American children who have been abducted internationally.

The United States court system awarded Mr. Carlsen custody of his daughter and gave visitation rights to the mother. In September of 1993, her mother and her boyfriend picked up Mr. Carlsen's daughter from school and abducted her to Germany.

When Mr. Carlsen filed for a court hearing in Germany, he was asked by the German authorities to pay 1,400 to initiate proceedings. Fourteen months later, he got a hearing and the German Youth Authority testified that his daughter was settled in her new environment and objected to being returned to the United States. The Youth Authority never interviewed Mr. Carlsen and the lower court in Germany denied the return of his daughter.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Carlsen's daughter was 8 when she was abducted and now is 15 years old. Since then, she has seen her father only twice and both times were under strict supervision of the German Youth Authority.

Mr. Speaker, this House has the responsibility and the duty to help American parents bring their children home. I urge my colleagues to support H.Con.Res. 293, American children need our help.

□

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

### TRAIN WHISTLES TO DISRUPT MILLIONS OF LIVES

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to highlight a serious problem that all of America will soon experience. As early as next January, thousands of cities, towns, villages, and hamlets will be deafened by the wail of a train whistle. That is right, if the Federal Railroad Administration's proposed rule on the sounding of locomotive horns at every highway crossing goes into effect as planned, the ear-splitting sounds of train whistles will wake people at night and generally disrupt people's lives.

Unfortunately, few Members of Congress know about the problem that confronts us. As mandated by the Swift Rail Act of 1994, the FRA came up with rules on train horns, and in January the FRA came out with a proposed rule.

While I understand that the rule is intended to save people's lives, the way in which the rule was written will severely impact millions of people in a negative way. For instance, although the FRA states that over 74,000 people in Illinois currently living near a crossing that does not allow whistle-blowing will be severely impacted by this rule, in reality, according to the Chicago Area Transportation Study, 2.5 million residents in Illinois live within one quarter mile of a crossing, and would be severely impacted.

This is a tremendous number of people that will be impacted by train whistles that range from 92 decibels to 144 decibels, an unhealthy level that rises above the threshold of pain.

So what can be done about this rule? I and other Members of the Illinois delegation could argue that Illinois, and specifically Chicago, should have an exception from the FRA's rule because Illinois has done a good job in reducing accidents at crossings.

In northeastern Illinois, injuries have declined by 70 percent and fatalities have declined by 65 percent since 1988. During the same period of time, the number of incidents dropped. Train traffic and average motor vehicle miles have both increased by 45 percent. Clearly, Illinois has been doing a good job with a tough assignment, and they should be allowed to continue with their rail safety program.

But what if this rule does go into effect? In order to avoid the disruption of the whistles, money is needed to implement alternatives to whistle blowing, money that local communities do not have. The FRA estimates costs of \$116 million for whistle ban communities based on assumptions that every community will install the lowest-cost alternative to whistles.

The Chicago Area Transportation Study estimates the cost of reality-based alternatives to be between \$440 million and \$590 million for whistle ban

communities across the Nation. This is a huge amount of money that our local communities simply do not have, and they will turn to their Congressmen to help them find the funding.

So I say to my colleagues, join me and others in finding a solution that is available to everyone. Let us work on this rule so crossings could be made safer and so people can go along with their lives in a livable manner.

At the very least, let us increase the amount of money going to grade crossings by passing my rail safety bill, H.R. 2060, that will double the amount of money that DOT gives to States for grade crossing safety. Because when next January rolls around, we had better be prepared for the train that is coming down the track for all of us.

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

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

□

### THE NAVY'S MANIPULATIVE USE OF PREVAILING WAGES ON GUAM FOR THE PWC BOS CON- TRACT

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I speak again on the issue of the implementation of a commercial study, the A-76 program, which basically is designed to outsource a number of jobs in my home island of Guam.

I rise again to point out some very serious difficulties with this process, and point out to the Members and especially the Members of the Committee on Armed Services that these kinds of problems which we are experiencing in Guam will inevitably be experienced by everyone as they undergo this A-76 process.

Yesterday on Guam, Raytheon Technical Services commenced their contract with the U.S. Navy for base operation support functions. Approximately 800 Federal civil service workers were laid off, and most of them were immediately rehired by Raytheon under the so-called right of first refusal to perform the very same jobs as they did last week, only they will be paid a salary of 40 to 60 percent less.

The Navy has told us that the wages that the contractor is required to pay are based on a "prevailing wage determination," as is calculated by the U.S. Department of Labor. These are calculated by a prevailing wage survey. This survey is a composite of job-specific wage rates by industry in a particular community. They do not, however, account for the price of local consumer goods and foodstuffs which must be purchased in order to survive in that community, so Federal jobs also include a cost-of-living allowance that makes up this difference.

□ 1915

The private contractor is not required to pay this. In attempting to comprehend the situation on Guam between the high cost of consumables and the depressed prevailing wage rates, we spoke with the Prevailing Wage section of the Guam Department of Labor. We were informed that the Guam Department of Labor is responsible for the wage determination for foreign laborers under the H-2 program and is based on survey results done on Guam and reflective of local conditions.

Furthermore, the Guam Department of Labor noted that the wages established as a result of these surveys have complied with the requirements of the Davis-Bacon Act. The Guam Department of Labor is aware that the Navy contract with Raytheon is neither in line with Guam Department of Labor prevailing wage, nor mainland wage standards. Guam DOL has said that the wage survey for the Navy contract was not done on island and thus questions the survey's methodology.

Mr. Speaker, the question now begs where did the Navy get this wage data from? Well, one conclusion that we can draw from these depressed wages is that they pick the lowest possible salaries as determined from a whole range of areas of unofficial wage-study areas.

Now, I provide an example. We will use a real live Raytheon job offer against similar positions on Guam, using the Guam DOL prevailing wage survey, again a survey that is done under U.S. DOL supervision and is intended for foreign workers. For administration and accounting services, under the Navy service contract an accounting clerk is now being offered a wage of \$5.80 an hour, compared with the Guam prevailing wage rate of \$8.48 an hour. For a data entry operator, Raytheon has offered \$11.86 an hour versus the Guam prevailing wage of \$13.25 an hour.

Mr. Speaker, this is outrageous. Not only does it seem that the Navy was utilizing faulty data of an unknown source, but the Navy is taking advantage of the fact that the U.S. Department of Labor does not have sufficient oversight capabilities to enforce the requirements made on the Navy under the Services Contracting Act.

In fact, under the provisions of the Services Contracting Act, the Navy is required to request the U.S. Department of Labor to conduct a wage determination by filing a notice with the U.S. DOL for such a survey, and I believe that the U.S. Navy has violated this requirement and thus created an environment whereby wage busting could occur.

Let me just summarize here. What has happened on Guam has happened in other communities, perhaps unbeknownst to those communities, and will continue to happen, and that is if the Navy is allowed to compute their own prevailing wages apart from the actual wages in that community, they will continue to not only pay the people less than they would have under

civil service, they will continue to pay them less than even the prevailing wages in that community.

This has happened on Guam, and it is ironic that if one was a foreign worker coming to Guam, and this disincentive that is created under the Guam prevailing wage one would be getting more money today than they would under this Navy-induced contract with Raytheon. It is an outrage.

I call again upon the Department of the Navy and the Pentagon to halt this contract, to call for an Inspector General investigation, and I call for a congressional hearing on this matter.

□

ANY PARTICIPATION IN MULTILATERAL ORGANIZATIONS THAT AFFECTS THE INDEPENDENCE AND SOVEREIGNTY OF UNITED STATES IS WRONG AND SHOULD BE DISCONTINUED

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

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, many have asked me why I have cosponsored House Joint Resolution 90, which gives Members of this body the opportunity to vote on the United States continued participation in the World Trade Organization. A simple answer: I firmly believe that any participation in multilateral organizations that in any way affects the independence and sovereignty of these United States is wrong and should be discontinued.

Unfortunately, it has become obvious that the WTO will be able to remove jurisdiction over virtually any economic activity from Federal, State, and local governments. Global elitists have gravitated to the new centers of power, the transnational corporations, believing that we are evolving beyond the nation state. If that is the case, we are moving from a condition of rule under law, created by representative government, representing all the needs and interests of society, toward rule by unelected elites representing only the most powerful of interests, the only entities which have the power and reach across the world to really influence new international forms such as the WTO.

Corporate governance, in fact, is the newest concept being pressed forward at the WTO, the OECD, the IMF, and the World Bank. There has been little written on the topics outside the confines of independent governance organizations. The independent state is to be replaced with the corporate state; the concept of the people as sovereigns replaced by the notion of corporations as the new sovereigns.

The increasing centralization of industries, through monopoly mergers and acquisitions, has been given much of its global impetus through the mechanism of the WTO. This anti-competition evolution, when far enough along, will end any sense of free enter-

prise being the normal global market norm. Corporations are not good or evil, but corporate boards prioritize actions that increase the profitability and power of the corporation. Their officers increasingly speak and act as if they do not affiliate or identify with any one country or any one home.

Do the large transnational corporations have the same degree of concern for the defense of the United States as the average citizen? What about environmental standards which are the product of our system of governance, or hard-fought labor protections jeopardized by drastic wage and labor standard differentials between the United States and the Third World? What decisions will be made by the unelected, corporate-influenced members of the WTO in the long run?

Corporatism never implied a need for democracy. We hear about the WTO adhering to recognized international core labor standards, but we do not hear how little the wages of foreign workers have increased, how often they have fallen to new lows, just how little the standards of living have changed for the average citizens of these countries. The only way to protect American jobs from further disappearing to lesser developed countries is by foreign workers receiving higher wages. Lowering trade barriers is lowering standards, period.

When we read about the growing irrelevancy of national governments in dealing with the transnational corporations, we must ask where does that leave the citizens of our Nation? Every nation that is a free republic, based upon democratic principles, has a citizenry who are the sole sovereigns. If they are not sovereign, there is no true democracy. This is why the word sovereignty has real meaning. This is why this fight for the sovereignty of the United States, challenged by the emergence of the WTO, is a real fight for the constitutional rights of each and every American. Many believe the undemocratic WTO, ruling far from our homeland, can be reformed. I sincerely doubt this, and I ask, are we really willing to take that kind of a gamble with American independence, with the liberty that we aspire to for each citizen? I hope not.

□

OUR DEEPEST SYMPATHIES ARE EXTENDED TO THE FAMILIES OF MAJOR GRUBER AND ALSO STAFF SERGEANT NELSON

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have been coming to the floor once a week for the last 2½ months to talk about our men and women in uniform that are on food stamps and how I think it is unacceptable that this Congress, and this government quite frankly, would ask anyone that would be willing to die for this Nation to be on food stamps; but

tonight, Mr. Speaker, I am here on the floor because there was a tragedy on Saturday night. I think we all know that a V-22 Osprey on a training mission in Arizona went down and 19 Marines were killed. It so happens that two of those Marines were from eastern North Carolina.

Major Brooks Gruber was a pilot on the mission and also there was a Staff Sergeant William B. Nelson, who was stationed at New River Air Station in Onslow County, North Carolina.

I just started thinking, as I heard about the terrible tragedy, that many of us, not just talking about Members of Congress but those of us around this Nation, we do take our military for granted. I do not think we intend to do that, but it is just maybe because out of sight out of mind. But when we hear about a training accident where men and women are killed, in this case it was 19 men, that it does remind us that our freedoms are guaranteed by those who are willing to serve.

I just wanted to come to the floor tonight, and I am sure all Members of Congress would join me in extending our deepest sympathy to the families of Major Gruber and also Staff Sergeant Nelson, as well as the other 17 men that were killed on this training flight in Arizona.

I think that it is a reminder to all Americans that the members of the United States military make the ultimate sacrifice on a daily basis, whether it is here in this country or outside of the borders of the United States of America. It is a tragedy, because we think that our men and women in training are always going to be safe and protected, but it does not always happen that way. Certainly there is an investigation going on now. We will find out soon what happened to the V-22 that made it fail in the air and kill these wonderful, brave American military Marines, it happens to be in this case.

I am going to cut my remarks short tonight because, again, I sense the sadness from talking to the Marines in the liaison office today as I am saddened myself; and again I am sure each and every Member on the floor tonight is saddened. I do hope, as I close, after extending my deepest sympathy to the families of these 19 Marines, that those of us in the House will remember that we do have those on food stamps and that we will do something before this session of Congress ends to make sure that we do show those 7,000 men and women in uniform on food stamps that we care about them and we are going to do something to help them so they will not be so dependent on food stamps.

Mr. Speaker, I do again extend to the families of these 19 my deepest sympathies on behalf of my colleagues who serve on the floor of the United States, the House of Representatives, and in a very trivial way say thank you for giving that son to this country and may God be with you and God bless you through this time of sadness.

## CENSUS DAY PLUS 10

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this is census day plus 10. My message to the American people is, if they have not already filled out their form, please do so now and mail it in. Be part of this great civic ceremony.

As of today, over 61 percent of Americans have responded to the census, with 39 percent to go. This is a critically important milestone for the 2000 Census, and I am extremely encouraged by the American people's effort and by the Census Bureau's transparent tabulation efforts. Just months ago, the General Accounting Office warned that the initial response rate for the 2000 Census might peak at 61 percent. Well, with 8 days still to spare, the 2000 Census has reached this point and forms continue to flow in daily.

I am extremely heartened by the response thus far, and tonight I say to the remaining 39 percent, please complete your forms. Do it today. Put it in the mail. As always, this is our main message. Fill out your form today.

Unfortunately, we have reached 61 percent despite the amazing comments of some of my Republican colleagues and even Members of the Republican leadership. With 39 percent of the American people still not heard from, we have Members of Congress who should all know better telling the American people that the census is optional. We have Members of Congress saying that they, and I quote, "believe in voluntarily cooperating," end quote, with the government; but beyond that they will not follow the law. Since when did following the law in this country become a voluntary, optional thing?

□ 1930

Others have compared the long form to a college exam where some questions can be skipped. Is it because some people do not know the answers? I certainly hope not. Do they want participation, or do they want to make participation optional?

Last week, Census Director Ken Prewitt testified that the initial response rate for the long form has been almost 12 percent below the response rate for the households receiving the short form. This is almost double the differential from the 1990 census and could seriously threaten the accuracy of the final count.

What is really disheartening is the fact that most of the questions on the long form have been around for decades. They were part of the Bush and Reagan census. Even more astonishing about this new-found concern about the census is that, over 2 years ago, the content of the long and short forms, while they were being finalized, absolutely every Member of Congress re-

ceived a detailed list of the questions to be asked, including a description of the need for the asking of it, along with the specific legal requirements supporting it.

Notification of Congress is required by title 13 for a very good reason, to prevent the very situation we face today, a census effort at risk because Members of Congress simply do not know or do not care about the importance of the census data.

Members of Congress received this information with all of the questions in 1997 and 1998. I know that all of the Members who are complaining about the census got a copy. Did they not read their mail? The time for input on the questions was then, not now when they will do more harm than good.

Even last week, the Republican leadership convened a press conference supposedly in support of the census. But they went on to urge Americans to skip questions they were uncomfortable with. Maybe the Republican leadership should be reminded that the questions asked by the census represent a balance between the needs of our Nation's communities and the need to keep the time and effort required to complete the form to a minimum. Only information required by Congress to manage or evaluate programs is collected by the census.

Federal and State funds for schools, employment services, housing assistance, road construction, day care facilities, hospitals, emergency services, programs for seniors, and much more are distributed based on census figures.

Also, the Census Bureau uses data acquired from the long form to establish the baseline for many of the economic reports they release year-round, including data on the Consumer Price Index and unemployment. Without accurate data, we would be forced to manage our economic policies with even less information than we currently have available.

We should remember that the Census Bureau has gone to great efforts to make both the short and long forms as brief as possible. The 2000 Census short form contains eight questions, down from nine in 1990. The 2000 Census long form contains 53 questions, down from 57 in 1990, the shortest long form in decades.

The only new question in the census, which was added with my support as part of welfare reform, asked for information on grandparents as care givers.

I am a bit confused, too, because the same people who today are making such a fuss over the long form just 6 months ago tried to add a question to the short form which everyone has to complete.

I have a series of editorials from around the country urging Americans to stand up and be counted for their communities, for their representation, for their distribution of Federal funds. I would like to put in the RECORD an editorial from the Daily News from New York City, the city that I am

proud to represent. The editorial is as follows:

## STAND UP AND BE COUNTED

That's the slogan of Census 2000, and nowhere is that cry more urgent than in New York. Last time around—10 years ago—New Yorkers sat down. There was an undercount. And the state lost out on everything from political representation to new schools. New York, particularly New York City, must not let this happen again.

The filing deadline came and went April 1. But the "Be counted" Web site doesn't shut down until tomorrow. So if you haven't returned your census form, take a few minutes (or a few seconds, if you have the eight-question short form) and do so. Now.

And, please, try not to get your dander up about how nosy some of the questions seem to be. Answers on how you get to work and what time you leave each morning, for example, can be used by local officials for highway and mass-transit improvements. Nobody's tracking your movement. Other answers will aid in planning for health, housing, education, employment, police and so forth. As for those racial-identification categories, just follow the Census Bureau's advice: Put down whatever race or ethnicity you identify with. It's simply a part of drawing an accurate population profile in this multicultural nation.

So far, returns here are hovering about 55%—with some areas (like central Brooklyn, with a dismal 37%) considerably lower.

A study by Price Waterhouse Coopers after the 1990 census determined that New York State was undercounted by 277,000 residents—245,000 of them in New York City. That cost the city three Assembly seats, a state Senate seat and half a congressional seat.

As Rep. Carolyn Maloney (D-Queens), the ranking member of the House census subcommittee put it: "It's your future, don't leave it blank."

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), an outstanding leader and actually a new Member of Congress, representing the City of Chicago. She has been very active on the Subcommittee on Census and has worked very hard to bring up participation.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from New York for her tremendous leadership on assuring a complete count of all Americans.

I wish I could be as optimistic. Unfortunately, in the city of Chicago, we are 10th out of the 10 largest cities in the response to the census so far. My hope is that all responsible elected leaders will be encouraging people from our States, from our cities and communities to fill out that census form.

I have heard a lot of political pandering, we all have in our days, but rarely have I heard anything quite as irresponsible as the trashing that is going on of the census long form. One would think that some of those elected officials who are doing it, Members of this body on the Republican side of the aisle who are doing that, one would think that they had never seen that form before.

As the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) pointed out, every single Member was able to scrutinize every single question. As a consequence, we came up with a form, a long form that is, in fact, shorter than

it was in 1990 and adds only one question. All of us are interested in knowing how many grandparents now are taking care of children. We hear that all the time from our constituents.

They had total control over what was going to be in there. There were no complaints in 1990 from them.

How long does it take to get to work? People say, oh, why do you have to know that? Well, why does one think that we want to know that, so that we can understand where we need transportation dollars. Do we need a new road? Do we need more transit to shorten that time? Do we need more affordable housing so that people can live near the jobs?

Employment questions. What is this new economy about? Let us use the census to understand that better. Is our prosperity really being shared? Are there more people who are working for themselves, and are they making a decent living when they are working at home?

In Illinois, in the Chicago area, in Cook County, we undercounted enough children in 1990 to fill 78 schools. That is why we need an accurate count, so that we can make sure that we get the educational opportunities to our kids.

Now, one listens to John Stossel on 20/20 last Friday night, and one would think that the census is simply a tool of big government, in fact, he said a government that is selling dependency, that is his word, that is what the census is about in his conspiratorial tone.

But who really is using this census data? I would posit that ABC, the very station he was on, that 20/20 probably uses the census data to figure out who the audience is, where to sell advertising. The private sector surely as much as the public sector uses the census data to figure out where investments should be made, where are we going to put our money in communities, who is living out there.

This is not a conspiracy of government. This is a partnership with the people of the United States so that we can distribute public dollars and private dollars.

We need to be doing the census form for ourselves. This is not a favor to anybody. This is going to bring results to every single community. There is not a district in this country that will not be better served if there is a complete count.

So for any politician to get up and pander and say, oh, you do not have to fill this out, it is really intrusive, is counterproductive for their own constituents. Leadership is about explaining to constituents why this is important, why it is in their interest to fill it out. When people complain, we encourage them to understand what the real meaning of this complete count is.

I am so proud to join with the gentlewoman from New York in her work and so many of us who are trying every single day to make sure that the people in this country get what they deserve. Anyone who has ever said, "I send my

tax dollars to Washington, what do I get back, am I getting my fair share?", if they have not filled out the census form, then that is not an appropriate question, because if they do not fill out this form, then they will not be counted.

So I join my colleagues in urging all Americans to get this census form in. They have got a few more days to do it. I encourage my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to inform their constituents about the importance.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO), another leader for a complete count.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to add to the comments that my colleagues have made in just the last few minutes. But I, most of all, want to thank everyone who has completed their census form so far. Wherever you are, whether you are an American citizen, a recent immigrant or whoever, you are making a difference for your community and setting our Nation on the best path for the new century.

For those of you who have not yet filled out and returned your census questionnaires, please, you have 10 days to finish. Do it today. Do it now. Do it this very minute. It is not too late.

As of last night, over 60 percent of Americans have completed and sent in their census form. This is very exciting news. But we must keep working with the census, with our communities, with our neighborhoods across the Nation to reach out to the remaining 40 percent of Americans who have yet to return their census questionnaire.

As we have heard, 61 percent return has already been received. In my district alone, 68 to 71 percent of the people in the 34th Congressional District have completed and returned their census form. The City of Norwalk completed 71 out of 78 percent targeted; Whittier, 70 out of 72; Montebello, 70 out of 73; Pico Rivera, 68 out of 77 percent; Santa Fe Springs, 71 out of 78 percent; Industry, 69 out of a targeted 33 percent; and La Puente, the best in the area, 70 percent out of a targeted 67. They have overpassed their target. This is better than the anticipated rate out of California and nationwide.

However, there are a lot of people that still have to be counted. If 30 percent of our people go uncounted, that is 30 percent less money to pay for schools. That is less money for repairing our roads, for funding hospitals, for providing services to our senior citizens and for our recreational programs for our youth.

Now, we all know that some people have had difficulties with our census forms, especially the long form which asked 53 questions. Some people find some of those questions intrusive and awkward. Personally, I question the way in which the form asked about my race and my ethnicity. But what I do not question is that it is vitally impor-

tant to my community of Norwalk and to my surrounding communities, that I be a responsible citizen and complete and return my census form.

An important fact to remember, whether one is filling out the long form or the short form is that one's responses are confidential. The information one gives is not, I repeat, it is not sold to marketing firms. It is not handed over to the IRS, nor to the INS, nor to the FBI. In fact, it is against the law for the Census Bureau to give or sell information to anyone. That is including this House. The law works. In the last census of 1990, not one single case of information leaking occurred.

The Census Bureau has gone to great effort within the mandates of Congress to make the forms as brief as possible. The 2000 Census short form contains eight questions, down from nine in 1990, and the long form contains 53, down from 57 in 1990, the shortest form in history.

The Census Bureau uses long form data as a baseline. That means the bottom line for every single economic indicator they publish. Without this accurate baseline, we cannot produce any economic information needed to run our Nation's economy effectively, to identify the areas in need, and take on other indicators to be able to help our communities.

We need a more accurate count of America's blacks, America's Hispanics, America's Asians, and American Indians. Regardless of what my colleagues on the other side, regardless of their arguments or what they state, for us, it is not optional. For us, it is a necessity.

Republicans have done everything possible to harm Census 2000 effort. We must not fall for their rhetoric. This latest effort to paint questions which had been on the long form for over 50 years as intrusive and unneeded is just another attempt to derail the accurate count of census.

To the people in my district, to the people of the United States and across this great land of ours, I ask that they please remember how important it is to their community, to our community. So I plea again, please complete and return your census form.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK), a great leader on a complete count. She even hosted a public hearing in her district and has been a leader here on the floor and in the committee work, and I welcome here tonight.

□ 1945

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. I thank my dear colleague, the gentlewoman from New York. The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) hails from New York, but her influence on the census has gone throughout this country, and we thank her for that leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to come back again tonight. If the gentlewoman were to call us in tomorrow, if she were

to call us in every day this week, I would be here, because we do not have enough voices speaking out for the census.

Regrettably, we have had some ill winds. They came in during the Ides of March and they are still here, they are still talking. We are trying our very best to say to the country that the census is a good thing. It is in the Constitution. It is something that we should do. We keep talking about we are a Nation of laws. Well, if that is the case, why can we not stick to our laws? Let us not just use them when they are customized to fit our political ideas, but to use them at all times.

It is extremely disappointing to see some of my good friends in the Republican Party saying to all of our constituents that the census is optional; that they do not have to fill out all the questions; that it is not mandatory; that citizens do not have to do this. Well, it is. It is important that all of our constituents fill out the census forms.

Now, it is not too late. We do not have the return I would like to see in my district. We have, like, 53 percent. I would like to see 66, 76, 90 percent return. But we still have time. We are still going to churches; we are going to wherever people congregate and saying to them, fill out the forms. For those who have not filled theirs out yet, please fill it out and return it. We are doing our very best to help.

I am just really astounded to see that our most noble elevated body, the Senate, passed a Sense of the Senate Resolution essentially reinforcing the idea that not completing your form is okay. This is completely unacceptable. It is completely irresponsible. The Senate should set a standard for the country instead of undermining an effort which this Congress has seen fit to participate in.

Now, this thing about the questions, maybe we should not have to go over that over and over again because the questions are there and they are not that hard. They are only asking those kind of questions every 10 years. Americans are used to answering questions, particularly questions that will lead to good representation in their community. It is going to lead to a good school board member, it will lead to some good elected representatives, it will lead to some good Congress persons. Now, that is not a trivial thing.

But there are some radio announcers and disk jockeys and pundits in this country who are making that just a trivial thing. It is not trivial when it affects your elected representatives that will go into a governing body and represent you. People keep saying, We don't have a voice. You do have a voice. Be counted and you will have a voice, because there will be enough of you to say, yes, we do deserve another Congressperson in our area; yes, we do deserve another State representative in our area; yes, we do deserve another school board member.

So it is irresponsible and irrational, as far as I am concerned, to tell people that it is optional; that they should not fill out all the forms or they should not fill out any of the forms. The time has come now. We have been talking about the census, and the gentlewoman from New York has led this thing notably and with great merit throughout this process. It is time now that our people step up to the plate.

They will not be able to talk, the pundits will not be able to talk about government does not do what it is supposed to do. They are the first to criticize government. They say government is not doing what it should do. Government wants to do it. It is a good thing if people go out and turn in their census form.

Now, I am a little embarrassed because the governor of my State has come out saying, "I take the same position as other Republicans do." Well, it is not a good idea, Mr. Governor, to say that you take that same position and that it is optional. Florida now has 23 representatives in this Congress. If our people do not go out and be counted, Mr. Governor, you may not have 23 Congresspersons another year from now.

So we are saying to all the people, support the census. Fill out the forms. It is not a cursory thing; it is not something that is fly by night and you can just flippant say, oh, no, we are not going to do it. It is important. Not only does the lifeblood of your community depend on it, your roads, your transportation, and your representation.

And particularly poor people and underserved people. My voice goes out to them every time I stand up. Turn the forms in. You will probably benefit from it more than a lot of other people because you depend on government for most of your basic services. Go to it; turn in those forms. If you need help, call the Census Bureau. If you need help, call your local Congressperson; wake them up. They are the ones depending on this count as well as you are.

So I do hope that everyone within the sound of our voices tonight will go out and be counted. The ball is in their court.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentlewoman will suspend.

The Members will be reminded that it is not in order to characterize Senate action, nor is it in order during debate to specifically urge the Senate to take certain action.

Members will be also reminded that they should make their comments to the Chair and not to the listening or the viewing audience.

The gentlewoman may proceed.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, another of our colleagues, the gentlewoman from the great State of Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), had a conflict and could not stay with us. She

was here, however, and I will submit her statement later for the RECORD.

Another colleague from Texas, however, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), is here. This Member holds many leadership positions in this body. He is the ranking member on the Committee on Agriculture and is the policy chair of the Blue Dogs, in addition to being a leader in this body on getting a complete and accurate count during the census.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding to me to talk tonight about the general subject we have already heard our colleagues from California and Florida speaking about, and that is encouraging, Mr. Speaker, encouraging all Americans to fill out the form and to send it in.

I guess one of my disappointments tonight is that we do not have the time equally divided between Democrats and Republicans so that we might all stand up tonight and encourage people to fill out the forms and to send them in, instead of some divided voices that we have been hearing from lately, Mr. Speaker. I think that is not in the best interest of this House of Representatives. I hope that we, under the Speaker's leadership, will find ways to encourage all Americans to return their census forms.

As we have already heard, current figures indicate that 61 percent of all citizens have returned their forms. This is good news. But that means 39 percent have not. In Texas, unfortunately, we are running a bit behind the national average. As of last night, 57 percent of Texans have responded.

I want to single out a few counties in my district back home that are not doing as well as California was doing a moment ago, but we are exceeding the national averages: Hood County, Taylor County, Tom Green County, and Young County. So to those people living in towns like Granbury and Tolar, and Abilene and Merkel, and San Angelo and Graham and Olney, I commend you and encourage you to continue to publicize and to work to see that your neighbors in fact send their forms in.

It is all the more important for people in rural areas to respond to the census. In 1990, the census missed approximately 1.2 percent of all rural residents. We must have an accurate count for rural America also in order that we might receive our fair share of representation and tax dollars.

It is very disturbing to me when I look at my rural district and see that when we get outside of the more populated counties that I mentioned, that we are way behind in our response rate. This is disturbing and something that I hope we will in fact be counting soon.

The editors of the San Angelo Standard Times wrote about the importance of responding to the census in their March 15 editorial they wrote:

Texas probably lost a congressional seat in 1990 because an estimated 483,000 Texans either refused to be counted or were missed by

census takers. The State also lost nearly \$1 billion Federal funding, which is the other primary purpose of the census now, to determine how much money each State will receive for roads, education, health care and other programs.

Mr. Speaker, I would provide the full text of the editorial for the RECORD.

Now, I know there are some citizens that are concerned about the long form. The data is extremely important to administering Federal programs, everything from housing programs and community development grants to highways, education and health care. The Census Bureau uses long-form data as a baseline for every single economic indicator. Without an accurate baseline, we cannot produce the economic information to better serve our citizens.

The San Angelo Standard Times editors hit on this point as well when they wrote:

It is helpful to have a detailed snapshot of the country and the conditions its citizens are living in, because such information can be useful to policymakers. While it may be annoying, there is no real down side. All census information is confidential and by law cannot be shared either with other government agencies or private entities.

I think the important thing to point out to our constituents is the extensive privacy constraints that we, the Congress, have imposed on the census. Anyone who violates the law and discloses any individual household data will be subject to 5 years in prison and \$5,000 in fines. The Census Bureau has a great track record of protecting this data. In 1990, millions of questionnaires were processed without any breach of trust.

So, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to encourage all Americans, and in particular my constituents in west Texas, who have not returned their census forms to send them in today. It is not too late. You deserve to be counted, and it is in your community's best interest and it is in our Nation's best interest that we count every individual citizen of America so that our representation in this body and in the State legislatures around the country will be based on the most accurate information.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back to the gentlewoman from New York and submit herewith the text of the article I referred to above:

[From the San Angelo Standard Times, Mar. 15, 2000]

#### TAKE TIME TO FILL OUT CENSUS QUESTIONNAIRE

Some West Texans already have received their 2000 census forms, and the rest will be receiving them in the coming days.

Those who are ambivalent about filling out the forms need to remember a couple of things: There are many reasons to participate and, aside from the time it takes, not a single reason not to. And considering that the short form—which will go to 80 percent of households—takes only about 10 minutes to complete, the time argument doesn't hold much water for most people.

The census has occurred once each decade since the country's beginning. Originally the

purpose was to ensure proper representation—that is, since congressional seats are apportioned based on population, it was necessary to know how many people lived in each state to determine how many representatives it would send to the U.S. House of Representatives.

Texas probably lost a congressional seat in 1990 because an estimated 483,000 Texans either refused to be counted or were missed by census-takers. The state also lost nearly \$1 billion federal funding, which is the other primary purpose of the census now—to determine how much money each state will receive for roads, education, health care and other programs.

Both arguments for participating matter in San Angelo and Tom Green County as well. The local share of funding is lost for each person who fails to respond to the census. And with West Texas being tremendously outgrown by the rest of the state, our clout in this part of the state is diminished with each person that is missed.

For the first time, a local committee will undertake an aggressive outreach effort to try to limit the number of people who fall through the census cracks. Plans call for having offices where people can go to get help in filling out their census forms, and interpreters will be available for those newer arrivals who need assistance.

It's unfortunate that the Census Bureau got off to a bad start, putting an extra digit on addresses for letters that went out recently informing people that their forms would be arriving and erroneously sending out some information in foreign languages.

Still, that doesn't alter the importance of filling out and returning the forms, which, when compiled, will tell much about the nation at the turn of the century.

Some 15 million homes will receive the long form, which does take longer to fill out (about 38 minutes, the U.S. Census Bureau estimates) and does ask some questions that will cause many to wonder why they are necessary.

The answer is that it is helpful to have a detailed snapshot of the country and the conditions its citizens are living in, because such information can be useful to policymakers. While it may be annoying, there is no real downside—all census information is confidential and by law cannot be shared either with other government agencies or private entities.

Consider it a civic duty that pays dividends—and that only has to be performed once every decade.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his statement, and I would now like to yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS). He represents the 7th Congressional District in Maryland. The gentleman from Maryland chairs the Complete Count Committee for Baltimore and has served on really the oversight committee for the census, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and I thank him for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for all that she has done. Ever since the subcommittee was first formed, I remember that she made it clear that she was going to do everything in her power to make sure that we had a complete count, and she has continued to do that. I really thank her not just on behalf of the Congress of the United States of America but for all Ameri-

cans for what she has done. I really do appreciate it.

I also want to take a moment to recognize the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK), who just spoke. She has brought this matter to the attention of the African American people over and over again. It has been a major, major concern of the gentlewoman from Florida, and I want to thank her.

This morning, Mr. Speaker, I visited Windsor Hills Elementary School, and this is a school in my district which has a number of young people who are in special education, beneficiaries of Title I funds.

I watched those little children as they put their hands up to their hearts and said, "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic," and I watched them as they talked about this one Nation under God. As I watched them, I thought about a great writer who once said, "Our children are the living messages we send to a future we will never see," and I could not help but think about the census, because the census affects them. It will affect them for the next 10 years.

The fact is those first graders will, in the future, 10 years from now, be 11th graders. The question is how will they have benefited from our actions or fail to benefit from our inactions?

□ 2000

Sadly, we have Members of Congress and prominent leaders of the Republican party telling the American public that the census is optional. I could not believe that.

On Friday, the Senate passed a sense of the Senate resolution essentially reinforcing the idea that not completing one's form is okay. It is not.

Further, Republican Presidential Nominee, Governor Bush has sided with the Republican majority in Congress that has objected to the use of modern scientific methods to provide accurate census data.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentleman must be reminded not to characterize Senate actions.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, as a candidate for the presidency, his opposition to using modern scientific methods sends a strong message that has outreached a minority community those traditionally undercounted is not genuine.

It is unfortunate but not surprising that compassionate conservatism does not include the community I represent. Currently, Baltimore City has a dismal 48 percent response rate. The target was 68 percent. Despite our best efforts, we cannot improve this rate nor ensure a complete and accurate census when constituents are bombarded with messages from elected officials that they do not have to fill out the form.

I urge naysayers to stop spreading these negative messages and encourage residents to fulfill their civic duty by completing and returning their census

forms. A complete and accurate Census 2000 will ensure that education, accessible health care, child care, access to jobs, and the protection of civil rights are available for all.

Again, those first-graders sitting there and then standing and pledging allegiance to the flag, where will they be in 10 years? What will they have accomplished if we do not do what we are supposed to do and fill out our forms? It is a simple act. And as I told some constituents the other day, when they fail to fill out that form and they have five people in their house, that means six people are not counted.

And so, Mr. Speaker, again our citizens deserve no less. I want to thank again the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) for yielding.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, our next speaker will be the gentleman from the 42nd Congressional District of California (Mr. BACA) the inland empire. But before he speaks, I would like to read a short quote from an editorial published in the Minneapolis Star Tribune on April 2.

A handful of conservative lawmakers in Washington have come up with a creative response. They're urging constituents to simply ignore the questions they don't like. That's a cynical and irresponsible approach from elected officials who should know better. The census long form might be a nuisance, but there is no question that it provides useful, sometimes required, information for Federal agencies to allocate taxpayer's money for private scholars to conduct research and for the government to serve citizens more effectively.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think anybody could have said it any better.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following entire editorial for the RECORD:

[From the Star Tribune, Apr. 2, 2000]

CENSUS RUCKUS; DON'T BOYCOTT THE LONG FORM

One in six American households has received the Census Bureau's dreaded "long form" in recent weeks, and most are reacting to its 52 detailed questions with an understandable combination of patience, impatience and procrastination.

But a handful of conservative lawmakers in Washington have come up with a more creative response. They're urging constituents to simply ignore the questions they don't like.

That's a cynical and irresponsible approach from elected officials who should know better. The census long form might be a nuisance, but there is no question that it provides useful—sometimes required—information for federal agencies to allocate taxpayers' money, for private scholars to conduct important research and for the government to serve citizens more effectively.

Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott has led the attack, arguing that the census questionnaire is overlong and intrusive. But the Census Bureau has added only one item since 1990, and it provided all the questions for congressional review two years ago, as required by law.

Rep. Tom Coburn, R-Okla., says the questions are too personal. When pressed for an example last week, a Coburn aide cited a question about bathing habits. But it turns out that the question is actually about mental and physical disability. As a series of examples, the question asks whether the re-

spondent has a disability severe enough to interfere with schooling, holding a job or conducting normal household activities such as eating and bathing.

Granted, that's personal. But it's also a perfectly good example of the census' value. Washington hands out billions of dollars every year to disabled Americans, and every year skeptical lawmakers ask how many Americans are truly so disabled that they need government assistance.

The same could be said for the billions of dollars that Washington spends every year on highways, parks, mortgage subsidies, tuition assistance and so forth. It would be irresponsible for Congress to spend the money without good data on the nation's housing stock, travel habits, recreation needs and educational deficiencies. And that says nothing about the small army of scholars who will dig into census data in coming years to conduct important research on health care, mobility, poverty, education and countless other subjects.

Lott and Coburn say their constituents don't trust the Census Bureau to keep their answers confidential. But responsible leaders would not inflame groundless suspicions. They would remind their constituents of the Census Bureau's excellent 200-year records of vigorously protecting the confidentiality of personal information.

What's most depressing about the Lott-Coburn critique is that it's one more effort to depict the government as an enemy of the people, not an extension of their will. Americans who want their government to function more effectively should support a thorough census. A sophisticated society cannot function without good information about itself. And for those busy souls who haven't labored through the long form yet, we trust they'll approach the task more responsibly than some of their leaders in Washington.

Last Friday, the Senate passed a misguided Sense of the Senate resolution that will only encourage more Americans not to participate in this critically important civic ceremony.

Ironically, many of the Senators raising questions also cosponsored an amendment offered by Senator HELMS which would have asked every American what their marriage status was. Those Senators should realize that they cannot have it both ways.

It is much too late to be raising these questions.

At this time, I would like to read a few quotes from an editorial published in the Minneapolis Star-Tribune on April 2nd.

A handful of conservative lawmakers in Washington have come up with a creative response. They're urging constituents to simply ignore the questions they don't like. That's a cynical and irresponsible approach from elected officials who should know better. The census long form might be a nuisance, but there is no question that it provides useful—sometimes required—information for federal agencies to allocate taxpayer's money, for private scholars to conduct research, and for the government to serve citizens more effectively.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA).

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) for doing an outstanding job in getting out the word to all American people of the responsibility that we have in assuring that every American is counted. It has taken a lot of effort and a lot of time on her part. I commend her for her part, because she realizes the impor-

tance of what it means to our Nation to have everyone counted. She is to be commended for her leadership, her vision, and her foresight in assuring that every State receives its fair share of dollars. And the only way that it is going to be done is by doing an accurate count.

By doing an accurate count, I am really appalled at what is going on and am outraged by what is going on or has been suggested by parties on one particular side that has said that it is optional to count. It is not optional. It is our responsibility, it is everybody's responsibility, it is Americans' responsibility to make sure that we all are counted. It is irresponsible and unpatriotic not to be counted.

Let me tell my colleagues I stand here as a veteran, a veteran who has served our country, and many other veterans who have served us, they believe they have fought to assure that we enjoy those freedoms that we enjoy today because they were willing to put themselves and to sacrifice, that we enjoy those freedoms today to make sure that everyone is counted, that everyone enjoys the freedom that we have to assure they participate in our American democracy.

They cannot participate in that American democracy if they do not participate and they are not counted. I ask every individual to participate. We now have had 61 percent of individuals that participated at this point. That is not enough. We need 35 percent additional of the total of Americans to participate in filling out their forms. We need every individual to fill out their form.

We are in an information age. We need reliable information in order to make good decisions for this Nation. Without good data, we cannot administer the laws of this country fairly.

The Census Bureau has long forms on a baseline for every single economic independent indicator to be published. Without an accurate baseline, we cannot produce economic information needed to run this Nation's economics effectively.

Not too long ago, I came here and was elected during a special election. I voted for the budget at that time. It was the first budget that I ever voted for. It was approximately a \$790 trillion budget. When I look at that budget, I am saying, how much of that money is coming back to California? In California we have continued to do an undercount.

In Fontana recently, we have had a lot of growth and development in that area. We need to make sure that we do have an accurate count in that immediate area. We are going to lose a lot of funding that goes back, monies that need to go back for education, monies that need to go back for parks and recreation, monies that need to go back for special ed, monies that need

to go back for infrastructure and transportation, monies that need to go back for health services, monies that need to go back for senior citizens.

If we do not do an accurate count, we will not get the monies that we deserve. It is our responsibility to make sure that we receive the funding that is necessary for all of us. It cannot happen unless we take our responsibility.

I urge all Americans to make sure they fulfill their obligation, they take that responsibility. We are in a country where we have those freedoms. Many other individuals do not have those freedoms. We have the freedom to complete the form and look at every dollar that we reserve.

If California wants to reserve its dollars to get back what it deserves, we need to make sure that an accurate count is done. The only way that California will get the additional dollars is that we make sure we do that count.

We have 52 Members in the State of California. We need to continue to make sure we ask for an accurate count. We need to make sure that blacks, Hispanics, Asian-Americans, the American-Indian population, and the total population is actually counted. We need all of them to participate, to make sure they do fill out their forms, that they are not frightened and sabotaged by anyone telling them not to complete the form. I ask them to please complete the form. We urge them. It is important for this Nation. It is important for our country.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I put a brief quote in from the Atlanta Journal Constitution on April 3. It says, "Participation in the census may also be harmed by the political grandstanding it continues to inspire." Presidential candidate George W. Bush has criticized the long census sent to one in six American households as some sort of government intrusion on privacy.

However, the Census Bureau takes very seriously its responsibility to keep individual responses absolutely confidential. Leakers inside will be sought out and prosecuted. And hackers on the outside have not been able to get in. If they were caught, they would be prosecuted. In fact, the Bureau is working with leading computer security experts to make sure its data remains untapped.

Mr. Speaker, I include the entire article for the RECORD:

[From the Atlanta Journal Constitution, Apr. 3, 2000]

CONSTITUTION: KEEP THE CENSUS FROM BECOMING POLITICAL FODDER AND PARTICIPATE

Roughly half of America's households did their civic duty and answered the U.S. Census Bureau's Year 2000 postal survey by its April 1 deadline. That level of participation is not nearly good enough if America is to get the accurate picture of itself essential to governing fairly and efficiently at local, state and federal levels.

Fortunately, the bureau still has a "final, final deadline" for mail and e-mail replies. It's April 11, the day it will send out its enumerators to count Americans who didn't re-

spond. So if you have yet to fill out your census form, please do so and mail it this week.

Participation in the census may also be harmed by the political grandstanding it continues to inspire. Presidential candidate George W. Bush and Senate Majority Leader TRENT LOTT (R-Miss.) have criticized the long census—sent to one in six American households—as some sort of government intrusion on privacy.

However, the Census Bureau takes very seriously its responsibility to keep individual census responses confidential. Leakers inside will be sought out and prosecuted, as will hackers on the outside. In fact, the bureau is working with leading computer-security experts to make sure its data remain untapped.

Is this year's census survey exceptionally burdensome or intrusive, as its critics suggest? No, the questions on the long form are almost all similar to those asked in previous censuses, including the 1990 census conducted when Bush's father was president. And every question on this year's long form was presented to members of Congress for their comments two years ago. To find fault with those queries at this late date is a cheap shot.

The information being gathered will be used to redraw political districts, calculate how government benefits like Medicare are to be shared equitably, and predict public needs such as mass transit, roads, libraries, schools, fire and police protection. Census figures from 1990 helped federal emergency officials determine quickly where shelters were most needed after Hurricane Andrew smashed south Florida in 1993.

The alternative, as urged by Bush, Lott & Co., would be to operate government uninformed of its people's needs.

Mr. Speaker, the next speaker is the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) a leader not only in the census but in the Women's Caucus. She is the co-chair of the Women's Caucus.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank this outstanding Member out of the State of New York (Mrs. MALONEY) who not only leads the census and has been absolutely strong in her deliberations on this issue but is the chairwoman of the Woman's Caucus. She, too, understands, Mr. Speaker, that of the 4 million people who were undercounted, 50 percent of those were our children.

And so, this is why, Mr. Speaker, I am appalled a leading presumptive presidential candidate, a man aspiring to lead this great Nation, cannot figure out whether he will fill out his own confidential census form. This is the same man who wants to take charge of the American people and its government to make public policy based on population figures that affect our daily lives in health, education, transportation, appropriations, and other public responsibilities.

Carrying out his own education proposal unveiled last week would depend upon, Mr. Speaker, accurate data that all of the census produces. How does he plan to produce an accurate Consumer Price Index without accurate long form data? Still, he has not committed enough to government fairness to fill out one of these forms himself.

Now, I have worked with the Census Bureau now for about 2 years to make

sure that they count every hard-to-count group. I spearheaded a special project to make sure Africans and Caribbean residents in the Diaspora understood the importance of the census and trusted our laws of confidentiality governing the process.

I also called on homeless shelters, battered women shelters, colleges, universities, and families with children to make sure that we count them, because they will have been historically undercounted individuals.

Shame on any elected official who would undermine our Nation's effort to gather vital information we need for appropriations and planning. The census numbers are extremely important to Government leaders.

In 1990, the census undercounted 486,000 persons in the State of Texas, causing that State to lose about \$1 billion in Federal funding for health care, housing, transportation, and other Federal programs. Even California lost \$2.3 billion, Mr. Speaker, and a congressional seat.

Children, the target of this presidential candidate's education reform package, are one of the most undercounted groups in America. How many of them fell through the cracks in Texas this past decade because of underfunded public services? It seems, out of self-interest, one would want an accurate assessment of one's home State.

Remember, these same officials who do not want residents filling out census forms oppose using modern scientific methods for a more accurate census count.

Come now, they cannot have it both ways. If all public leaders, no matter what party affiliation, would encourage every resident to fill out and return their forms, we could get the results we need, Mr. Speaker.

Maybe those now questioning the census have other motives for spoiling an accurate census count. Maybe they do not want a true accurate count. Frankly, this reminds me of the 1980s, when South African apartheid government decided not to count the majority of African people as South Africans. Did undercounting tens of thousands of residents who were not acceptable but lived in Johannesburg make them go away? Did it drive down actual unemployment figures and increase the real infant mortality rate? Of course not. This statistical chicanery only lets those in power fool themselves to the realities they need to face.

The Census Bureau has done a great job and has gone to great lengths to carry out the mandates of Congress to make sure the forms are as brief as possible. In fact, the long form is shorter than the 1990 form by four questions and it is the shortest form in history.

My friends, this is the information age. We need the data from these forms to administer our public duty in this country fairly. Those encouraging citizens to voluntarily suppress an accurate count are doing it as a grave disservice to their State and to Americans across this Nation.

As leaders, they should know the laws of confidentiality governing the census in our great country. This is our process governed by our laws that our courts have upheld. Reasonable and sensible officials swear to uphold the law. And this law has never been violated. Let us stop playing games, my friends, with America's future. Follow the advice of sensible leaders in all political parties. Fill out that census form, and encourage everyone who comes within their purview to do the same.

I thank again the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) for her leadership.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), a member of the Census Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Reform. He has been fighting for an accurate census through two threatened government shutdowns and a flood relief bill held hostage. He fought against the designation of the census as an emergency.

The census has been around since the beginning of our Nation, and he fought every day to get the funding for the census. He is continuing as one of our outstanding leaders for a complete and accurate count. I thank him for all of his hard work.

□ 2015

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as I have listened to the discussion this evening, I have been thrilled and delighted. First of all, I want to commend the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) for her continuing outstanding leadership day after day, night after night. The gentlewoman talks about leaving no stone unturned. She is talking about taking a message to the American people. I really do not think, I say to the gentlewoman, that anybody has ever put more into an issue, into an idea, into a concept than what she has displayed during these last 2 years of trying to make sure that there is an accurate count, an honest count, and that everybody person in this country is, indeed, counted.

Mr. Speaker, I thank her, along with all of those who have expressed all of their appreciation. Listening to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD), I said to myself, if I was not going to fill out the form, listening to the gentlewoman from California that would have caused me to grab up a pencil, a pen, or whatever it was that I could get my hands on, and run to that form and fill it out.

Unfortunately, there are many people in our country who do not understand the importance. I represent a district that has over 165,000 people who live at or below the level of poverty. Obviously, many of these individuals are at the lower end of the socioeconomic scale, many of them, obviously, are not as well-educated as some other people. Obviously, many of them do not understand. I want to thank all of the people in my community, the

churches who have been making the announcements, who have been trying to convince people on a regular basis, the volunteers who went out with me on Saturday.

We ran into people who just did not understand. I ran into one woman who said to us, you know, I am saved and sanctified and filled with the Holy Spirit, and I am not going to fill out these forms. I said to myself, yes, you will be saved and sanctified and broke, filled with the Holy Spirit and your children cannot get daycare. And the Holy Spirit is going to help you do a lot of things, but the Holy Spirit is not going to put a daycare center in your neighborhood so that your grandchildren can go and get early childhood education.

Mr. Speaker, I ran into people who said to us that they did not get the forms, and I looked in their hallways, and there were the forms on the floor. I said, well, you did not get it, but it is here; you have got to pick it up and fill it out and send in the information.

I ran into people who said that we filled it out on the first floor, but the people on the second floor, I am not sure that they got one.

I make a plea to all Americans, notwithstanding anything that anybody else might say, and, yes, I have some problems with those who would encourage people not to fill the forms out, but the real responsibility is on each and every one of us.

We have an old saying in my community that if you fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me. Notwithstanding what anybody might say, whether they are elected, appointed, community activists who just do not understand, anybody that is encouraging you or suggesting that you should not fill out your form, then, they do not have your interests at heart.

You have got to say the way that they say at the church that I attend: it is not my mother, it is not my father, but it is me oh, Lord. It is not the deacon. It is not the preacher, but it is me. It is not the Democrats. It is not the Republicans. It is not the House. It is not the Senate, it is my form, and if I do not fill out my form, then it means that I do not count.

So I thank the gentlewoman from New York for her leadership, for all that she has done. Please, Americans, please, residents of the 7th Congressional District in the State of Illinois, please make absolutely certain that you count by filling out the form, because if you do not, then all of America loses.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois. I think what he just said he said it beautifully. Added to his words are Senator JOHN MCCAIN who recently exhibited the kind of leadership all Members of Congress should emulate, when he urged all Americans to fill out the entire census form.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. I congratulate certain Members of the other

body who are urging everybody to fill out the form.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will suspend. The gentlewoman may not characterize legislative positions of Members of the other body.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the House that many of the questions are essentially the same questions approved by former President Ronald Reagan and President Bush, except that they are less than the questions in 1990. I would ask some of my more conservative Members to think about that before they criticize the census.

In the information age, we need reliable information in order to make good decisions for this Nation. Some Members of Congress must be stuck in the 18th century. They do not seem to want to know how America is doing. Without good data, you cannot administer the laws of this country fairly. Their comments are rash and inappropriate.

The good news for the census is that the Census Bureau is following the law. It will try to get the long form questions answered, because the professionals at the bureau do what the law says, the law Congress passes. They go out and try to get an accurate picture of this country and report back to Congress. I guess we now know why the 2000 census was designated an emergency in last year's budget. We just did not know that some Members of Congress were the ones who would be creating the emergency.

On average, the long form takes a little over half an hour to complete. Only information needed to manage or evaluate government programs is collected by the census. Just a half an hour every 10 years for good data on your country, a photograph of where your country is going. The short form just takes several minutes, just several minutes to be a good citizen. \$180 billion a year in Federal money depends on census data. That is close to \$2 trillion over the decade. Clearly that is reason enough to fill out the long form which, by the way, goes to only one in six American households.

As I said, Members should remember that they were informed of the questions that would be in the census over 2 years ago. Every single Member got a book that had every question, they had the reason for the question, and they had the congressional law that required it. They had an opportunity to criticize or complain then. But that

time has passed. Now is the time to urge everyone to participate in this civic ceremony together as one Nation. It is your future. Do not leave it blank. Please fill out the form.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a series of editorials across the country from Seattle to Washington, Sacramento, Palm Beach, Minneapolis, Atlanta; David Broder in the Washington Post; Gail Collins, New York Times; Los Angeles, USA Today, Atlanta Journal; along with many, many other articles that have come out in support of being good citizens and filling out the long form, being part of an accurate census.

[From the Seattle Times Company, March 29, 2000]

#### OVERLY OVERWROUGHT ABOUT THE 2000 CENSUS

On any given day, citizens are bombarded with dozens of legitimate, stress-producing worries. The U.S. Census Bureau, even its much-maligned long-form questionnaire, ought not be one of them.

Census questionnaires have been mailed to 120 million American households. The seven-question short form was sent to most households; a longer, more-detailed, 52-question form was delivered to one in six households.

Then the yowling began—The Snoops! The invasion of privacy!

The complaints are nine parts hype, one part hoey.

Two important developments have occurred since the last census was taken in 1990. The long form got shorter by four questions, and talk radio got louder.

In fairness to those with census jitters, more people nowadays are concerned about personal privacy. Frequent calls by solicitors and marketing companies wear down a person's patience and goodwill.

Remember, though, the census is the head count prescribed by the Constitution.

The people who make money by whipping up fear—and those who buy into it—substitute paranoia for logic.

The loudest concerns focus on question 31 on the long form, which asks people to report wages, salaries, commissions, bonuses or tips from jobs. This is not a scary question. The federal government, the Internal Revenue Service, already knows the answer for individuals. The Census Bureau is looking for data to report in the aggregate.

Before people allow themselves to be whipped into an unnecessary froth, remember the manner in which the data is reported. It is much like a series of USA Today headlines, "We're older," "We're more mobile, more diverse" and so on. The census doesn't announce that Joe Dokes at 123 Pine Street does or says anything. Nor does the Census Bureau share personal information with other agencies.

The questions provide a telling snapshot of America and help determine how large pots of tax dollars are spent on social programs, highways and mass transit, and how congressional seats are distributed among the states. Smile. A big family portrait is being painted with numbers. Nothing scary about that.

[From the Tulsa World, March 30, 2000]

#### COBURN: DOWN FOR THE COUNT

Rep. Tom Coburn is never going to come to his census. Count on it.

But the Second District Republican congressman should admit that the appropriate time to protest queries on the long form of the Census 2000 questionnaire was more than

two years ago when the questions, all required by law (and who passes law?) were circulated among members of Congress.

On Wednesday, Coburn essentially urged his Second District constituents to violate federal law by refusing to complete certain portions of their long-form questionnaires. One in six homes receives the long form.

"The Census Bureau's desire for information is out of control and a violation of privacy rights," Coburn said, adding, however, that his constituents should answer the "essential" questions on the short form covering a person's name, sex, age, relationship, Hispanic origin and race.

The long form asks 27 more questions about 34 subjects, including marital status, income, mode of transportation to work and work status for the past year.

Coburn said that if a census worker shows up to collect omitted information, Oklahomans should "politely refuse" to give it.

Coburn's position doesn't square with that of Gov. Frank Keating and other leaders who have encouraged Oklahomans to fill out the forms so that the state can receive the largest share possible of the \$2 trillion in federal funds that are handed out on the basis of census figures. Some of the questions in the long form help agencies calculate the specific needs of a community.

"While I understand the reservations that some Oklahomans may have with regard to some of the questions on the long-form census questionnaire, I urge them to complete and promptly return the entire form to the census bureau," Keating said.

Coburn took his position after receiving complaints that long forms were invasive. He accused the census bureau of being "out of control" and of violating Americans' privacy.

Even some other conservative members of the Oklahoma congressional delegation, including Rep. Steve Largent and U.S. Sens. Don Nickles and James Inhofe, do not appear to embrace Coburn's position.

If the Census Bureau is asking too many nosy questions, the time to protest is before the questions become law, not in the middle of a census. We should be able to count on our elected officials to know what's going on in time to do something about it.

[From the Virginian-Pilot (Norfolk, VA), March 30, 2000]

#### HEAD COUNT: YOU'VE GOT UNTIL SATURDAY TO TACKLE THOSE CENSUS QUESTIONS

I am one of the army of people hired to help answer questions about the 2000 census. Many people receiving the long form understand the questions but are reluctant to provide answers. They feel the government "already knows too much about my personal life and income. And why do they want to know how many flush toilets I have or how much it costs to heat my home?"

There are reasons for including these questions as an adjunct to the main purpose of the census, which is to get a head count of all people residing in the United States on April 1, 2000. Let me try to allay some of the misconceptions.

First, the data is absolutely confidential. Nobody, not the President, the Supreme Court, the FBI, the INS or any local police department, will ever have access to your individual questionnaire. All census workers are sworn to maintain the confidentiality of the data provided, under penalty of a stiff fine and a prison term. This confidentiality has not been breached since the census started in 1790.

Second, the answers that you provide are compiled into statistics, which are then made available to the public and all governmental agencies. These statistics are used to determine how to distribute about \$200 bil-

lion per year of federal funds to schools, employment services, housing assistance, highway construction, hospital services, child and elderly programs.

When the data show, for instance, that the city of Chesapeake has had phenomenal growth since the past census, additional funding to Chesapeake will be forthcoming in many of the above categories.

Why the questions about toilets and heating costs? The statistical data on plumbing facilities is used by the U.S. agriculture and housing departments to determine rural development policy, grants for residential property rehabilitation and identification of areas for housing rehabilitation loans.

Knowledge derived from the census is essential also to the drawing of samples for all kinds of surveys, for the computation of birth and death rates and the making of actuarial tables, and for the analysis of economic development and business cycles. Above all, the census makes possible the estimation of future trends and is therefore part of all kinds of planning—national, state, local, tribal, citizen groups, business and industry.

Please take the extra time to answer the seemingly "personal" questions on your census long form. The official deadline is Saturday. After April 11, you may be visited by a census enumerator if you failed to return your questionnaire. Please don't shoot the messenger. We'll only be doing our job because you didn't do yours.

EDWARD SAMSON,  
Chesapeake.

[From the Washington Post, March 31, 2000]

#### CENSUS BASHING

The Census always produces complaints that an intrusive government is asking for more information than it has a right to know. Usually the complaints are scattered and come the fringe. But this year some radio show hosts have taken up the issue, and now some national politicians who otherwise yield to none in insisting on law and order are telling constituents not to answer questions they feel invade their privacy.

The Senate majority leader, Trent Lott, is one such. He believes that people ought to provide "the basic census information" but that if they "feel their privacy is being invaded by [some] questions, they can choose not to answer," his spokesman says. Likewise Sen. Chuck Hagel, whose "advice to everybody is just fill out what you need to fill out, and [not] anything you don't feel comfortable with." Yesterday, George W. Bush said that, if sent the so-called form, he isn't sure he would fill it out, either.

And which are the questions that offend these statesmen? One that has been mocked seeks to determine how many people are disabled as defined by law, in part by asking whether any have "difficulty . . . dressing, bathing, or getting around inside the home." When it mailed the proposed census questions to members of Congress for comment two years ago—and got almost no response—the bureau explained that this one would be used in part to distribute housing funds for the disabled, funds to the disabled elderly and funds to help retrain disabled veterans. Are those sinister enterprisers? A much-decried question about plumbing facilities is used in part "to locate areas in danger of ground water contamination and waterborne diseases"; one about how people get to work is used in transportation planning. All have been asked for years.

Earlier this year, Mr. Lott's Senate complained 94 to 0 that a question about marital status had been removed from the basic census form. That was said to be a sign of disrespect for marriage. Come on. This is a critical period for the census. All kinds of harm

will be done if the count is defective. A politician not seeking to score cheap political points at public expense might resist the temptation to demagogue and instead urge citizens to turn in their forms. But in an election year such as this, that's apparently too high a standard for some.

[From the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, March 31, 2000]

#### CENSUS TOO IMPORTANT TO IGNORE

It seems that lots of people are complaining about having to answer what they claim are invasive questions on this year's census form. Of course, some of these are people who willingly give their credit card numbers to telemarketers offering the latest in siding or to Internet sites that sell really cool lava lamps.

There are also plenty of members of Congress who are now all in a huff, saying they sympathize with citizens who are threatening to refuse to fill out the forms. One wonders what these guardians of the public good were doing when they reviewed—and apparently approved of—the same census questions they are now complaining about. And where they were 10 years ago, when the questions were virtually the same.

The fact is, it's important to fill out the census so the government has an accurate count and so the average citizen has adequate representation in Washington and receives his or her fair share of federal funds.

Admittedly, some of the questions are goofy, and threats to privacy should be of concern to everyone. But asking how many toilets you have is hardly sinister. Besides, the government already knows. Just ask your local assessor.

Government also already knows what race you are and whether you are a veteran. It keeps records on those kinds of things, just as businesses keep records of your commercial transactions.

It's easy to rail against government, but the greatest threat to privacy is not found in government census forms, but in the vast databases being built by private companies about their customers and potential customers.

Want something to worry about? Go to the Internet and search for information about yourself. What some of you may learn there is really scary.

And since the census gives the nation a profile of itself, determines the number of representatives a state has in Congress and decides where federal funds are distributed, the information serves a larger public purpose than that gathered by eBay or Amazon.com.

It is OK to be annoyed by the government for asking all these fool questions. But it's important to fill out the form and make sure the annoying information is at least accurate. Besides, the Census Bureau is barred by law from sharing its information about individuals for three-quarters of a century.

So the information on your toilets will be safe for at least that long.

[From the New York Times, April 1, 2000]

#### CIVIC DUTY AND THE CENSUS

Some Congressional Republicans are seriously undermining the 2000 census by suggesting that the national head count, which officially takes place today, is an invasion of privacy. That bizarre complaint could discourage the public from participating in a project that is crucial to the functioning of state and federal government. The questions on this year's census form—including questions on household income, plumbing facilities and physical disabilities—have been part of the census for decades. The only new question asks for information on grandparents

who are caregivers for children. In fact, this year's long form is the shortest one in 60 years. All answers on census forms are kept confidential. Yet Senator Chuck Hagel of Nebraska has suggested in recent days that people can simply ignore questions on the long form—which goes to one out of six American households—that they find intrusive. A spokesman for Senator Trent Lott, the majority leader, has made similarly inappropriate suggestions. Gov. George W. Bush of Texas has said that people should fill out the forms, but that if he received a long form, he was not sure he would want to fill it out either. These comments are irresponsible. Completing the census form fully and accurately is not optional; it is a civic duty that is required by law. Senator Hagel now says that he does not want to encourage people to break the law, but will introduce legislation to make most of the questions on the long form voluntary.

The federal government has spent billions of dollars trying to produce an accurate count as response rates have continued to decline with each decennial count. Accuracy is critical because the census is used to apportion seats in Congress, draw legislative districts within the states and distribute more than \$185 billion in Federal funds. The government uses information from the long form of the census to allocate money to communities for housing, school aid, transportation, services for the elderly and the disabled and scores of other programs. The data are also necessary to calculate the consumer price index and cost of living increases in government benefits.

When individuals fail to give complete information about their households, they risk shortchanging their communities of government aid that they may be entitled to. That is why many state and local government officials are working hard to increase census response rates in their communities. The mindless complaints of some politicians could well sabotage those efforts.

[From the Sacramento Bee, April 1, 2000]

#### TRASHING THE CENSUS: IRRESPONSIBLE BUSH COMMENTS COULD SABOTAGE COUNT

Just two days ago before Census Day, as U.S. Census Bureau officials were urging Americans to cooperate in the crucial once-in-a-decade national count, Texas Gov. George W. Bush made their job harder. If he had the long census form, Bush told a campaign crowd, he's not sure he'd want to fill it out either. How harmful to this important civic exercise, how irresponsible and unpatriotic.

Bush's remarks come on the heels of Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott's advice to his fellow Americans not to answer any questions on the census long form that they believe invade their privacy. Taken together, those remarks by the leading Republican in Congress and the likely Republican presidential nominee can easily be interpreted as a deliberate attempt to sabotage the 2000 census. They raise questions about the integrity of the census that are unwarranted, unfair and irresponsible.

Once in six households receives the census long form. Beyond the basic eight questions about the number, age, and gender and race or ethnicity of people living in the household, the long form asks other questions designed to measure the well-being of Americans, to help government agencies to plan where to put schools or highways or health funding. Included in the long forms are 53 questions such as. How many bedrooms in the house? Has anyone been disabled by health problems in the last six months? Is there a telephone? What is the income of the household? Is there indoor plumbing?

By law the responses are strictly confidential. The U.S. Census cannot share individual household answers with the IRS, FBI, INS or any other government agency or private entity.

Moreover, every single question on the long and short forms is there because of a specific statutory requirement. Most of these questions have been on the form for decades. The only new question added since 1990 was put there at the behest of Republicans in Congress, including Lott. It asks grandparents whether they are caregivers for their grandchildren. The wording of each question was reviewed by Congress in 1997 and 1998. Lott, who now raises objections, pushed a resolution urging the Census Bureau to return to the short form a question about marital status that it had moved to the long form.

The census is the law of the land, enacted by the first Congress. When Bush says he wouldn't fill out the form, he's saying he's prepared to break the law. When Lott advises Americans not to answer questions they don't want to answer, he's telling them to break the law. And although both Lott and Bush limit their specific objections to the long form, the impact will inevitably reverberate more widely—to those who only receive the short form.

In Sacramento, census officials report that the response to the census is already lagging. Only 39 percent of Sacramento households have returned the form so far. Every man, woman or child not counted costs \$1,600 in lost federal funds. That's money that would go to our schools and highways and mental health and police protection.

Participating in the census is a civic duty, like voting, serving on juries and defending the country. As duties go, it's not burdensome, for most people, filling out the long form is a once-in-a-lifetime chore. With their thoughtless comments that feed mindless anti-government sentiment—do they really think they can govern better by knowing less about America?—Bush and Lott have done a disservice to the census and the country.

[From the Palm Beach Post, April 1, 2000]

#### THE CENSUS FOLLIES

Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott, R-Miss., should just be quiet about the census. Greenacres has a complaint. Sen. Lott doesn't.

The Census Bureau, once again, overlooked at least 1,500 apartments in Greenacres, which were fairly new when it missed them 10 years ago. The city, apparently tucked out of government's sight in west-central Palm Beach County, worked with census officials to make sure everyone is counted. The city has a gripe.

Sen. Lott, and some others, now say the long census form, which went to one household in six, is terribly intrusive. Sen. Lott said recipients can list name and address but "choose not to answer" other questions. He didn't complain in 1997, when he and all members of Congress received a copy of this year's long form for gathering data that they had ordered. And guess who cosponsored the law requiring a line on the form for marital status?

But three years ago, Sen. Lott was in court with other Republicans insisting on an "actual enumeration," counting individuals, and no use of sampling techniques. If people take his advice now, the Census Bureau will have to get the information Congress requires in the off-years, by sampling. Maybe by then, it will be able to find Greenacres.

[From the Chattanooga Times/Free Press, Apr. 1, 2000]

DON'T LEAVE CENSUS FORM BLANK

After months of preparation, today marks Census Day, when our national head count moves into higher gear.

Questionnaires have been mailed to every household. With much riding on a full and accurate count, it's significant to look at how we are responding.

As of March 29, 46 percent of households across the country had already completed and returned their forms. Comparable rates of response were 43 percent in Tennessee and 41 percent in Georgia. Hamilton County, at 47 percent, leads the five counties in our metropolitan area. Within the county, the town of Signal Mountain shines with a 59 percent response rate. In contrast, the city of Chattanooga lags with 44 percent answering.

These are only preliminary reports and will be updated daily. The more meaningful measurements will come on April 27, when Census 2000 enumerators will initiate a series of follow-up visits and calls to households that have failed to complete their forms.

By that time, local Census officials expect to have over 60 percent of questionnaires returned. The higher the rate of response, the sooner they can focus their efforts on counting population groups and neighborhoods that are harder to reach.

There are plenty of excuses for not complying, but most of them are not valid. Some people just hate paperwork. Yet the short form that went to five out of six households takes only 10 minutes or less to complete.

Some fear creeping big-government intrusion. The longer forms include some questions that may be helpful for statistical purposes, but many citizens find them too nosy about their personal lives and home conditions.

Some census questions do go too far, arousing opposition. And some people will question the promised confidentiality of their records. By law, no individual response (only aggregated information) can be legally reported to any other agency of government.

An official count has taken place every 10 years since 1790. The census is required by the Constitution solely for the purpose of fairly dividing U.S. House of Representatives seats among the states on a population basis, and dividing among the states the votes in the Electoral College, which actually elects our presidents following the popular vote.

But also of great importance is the fact that billions of dollars of your tax money are distributed according to the census count, with more money going where the count is higher.

Amazingly, some heads of households will forget to include the names and ages of their children. An estimated 7,000 people were missed in Hamilton County alone during the last census. The children in those households, if counted, would have demonstrated the need for our new schools and 139 new teachers. Overcrowding of schools and classrooms seems a heavy price to pay for parental omission.

With Census Day upon us, let's resolve to do our personal part to get it right this time. Count us all in.

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal, Apr. 2, 2000]

CENSUS—POLITICAL BASHING WON'T HELP ACHIEVE FULL COUNT

Mississippi has the lowest response rate of any state so far to this year's federal census: 38 percent as of late last week—and 48 percent in DeSoto County—compared to a 50 percent national rate. (Memphis has nothing to brag about, either, just 39 percent of Memphians have returned their census forms.)

At the same time, Mississippi is threatened with the loss of one of its five U.S. House seats in the population-based reapportionment that will follow the 2000 Census. So you'd think that officials throughout the state would be bending over backward to urge residents to take part in the fullest and most accurate count possible.

Why, then, did Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-Miss.) propose that citizens refuse to answer any census questions they find too "invasive"? Although the senator insists he supports maximum participation in the census, it's easy to see how people who already are suspicious of the federal government might interpret Lott's suggestion as an invitation to blow off their civic—and legal—duty to take part in the national headcount.

Census bashing has become something of a national sport in recent days, as critics such as Lott allege that the initiative too often amounts to an invasion of privacy. Texas Gov.—and presumptive Republican presidential nominee—George W. Bush said last week that if he had gotten the long (53 question) census form that one of every six households has received, he wasn't sure he would fill it out.

These defenses of personal privacy ignore the fact that members of Congress reviewed each of the questions that appear on the long and short census forms two years ago. Instead of striking "intrusive" questions then, senators voted unanimously this year to protest the Census Bureau's removal of a question about martial status.

So it ill behooves lawmakers such as Lott to complain now about the questionnaire. Remember, too, that many lawmakers have opposed the use of statistical sampling to correct the census undercount of millions of Americans because they said it would violate the "integrity" of the process they now condemn.

It's understandable that some Americans might object to revealing their income on the census questionnaire, although individual census data must remain confidential as a matter of law. It's timeconsuming to gather the information needed to answer some of the long-form questions accurately, such as annual utility and insurance costs.

But many of the questions routinely ridiculed by census bashers—whether residents of a given household have indoor plumbing, whether they have difficulty dressing or bathing, how they commute to work—have been asked in previous censuses without generating controversy. This year's long form has six fewer questions than the 1990 version.

The questions will yield data that will help federal officials fairly distribute aid to help disabled Americans, to fight water pollution and to improve local transportation planning. Are these illegitimate activities?

Bush has proposed allowing parents to use federal Title I money under some circumstances to send their children to private or charter schools. That money is distributed according to census data.

Many Mid-South residents insist they haven't returned their census forms yet because they haven't gotten them. If that is a systematic problem, then the Census Bureau must deal with it, fast.

But that is different matter from encouraging citizens not to cooperate fully with the national enumeration.

Census officials are making special efforts to get millions of households to return their census forms this weekend. In light of the complaints, Census Director Kenneth Prewitt said he fears many Americans have decided "this information is not very important at all."

Americans have learned to their chagrin that there isn't an issue, even the constitutionally mandated census, that politicians

can't turn into a matter of partisan division, especially in an election year.

But how will Sen. Lott respond if Mississippi, because of a below-average census count this year, does wind up losing a House seat?

And what is it's Republican seat?

[From the Atlanta Journal Constitution, Apr. 3, 2000]

CONSTITUTION: KEEP THE CENSUS FROM BECOMING POLITICAL FODDER AND PARTICIPATE

Roughly half of America's households did their civic duty and answered the U.S. Census Bureau's Year 2000 postal survey by its April 1 deadline. That level of participation is not nearly good enough if America is to get the accurate picture of itself essential to governing fairly and efficiently at local, state and federal levels.

Fortunately, the bureau still has a "final, final deadline" for mail and e-mail replies. It's April 11, the day it will send out its enumerators to count Americans who didn't respond. So if you have yet to fill out your census form, please do so and mail it this week.

Participation in the census may also be harmed by the political grandstanding it continues to inspire. Presidential candidate George W. Bush and Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-Miss.) have criticized the long census—sent to one in six American households—as some sort of government intrusion on privacy.

However, the Census Bureau takes very seriously its responsibility to keep individual census responses confidential. Leakers inside will be sought out and prosecuted, as will hackers on the outside. In fact, the bureau is working with leading computer-security experts to make sure its data remain untapped.

Is this year's census survey exceptionally burdensome or intrusive, as its critics suggest? No, the questions on the long form are almost all similar to those asked in previous census, including the 1990 census conducted when Bush's father was president. And every question on this year's long form was presented to members of Congress for their comments two years ago. To find fault with those queries at this late date is a cheap shot.

The information being gathered will be used to redraw political districts, calculate how government benefits like Medicare are to be shared equitably, and predict public needs such as mass transit, roads, libraries, schools, fire and police protection. Census figures from 1990 helped federal emergency officials determine quickly where shelters were most needed after Hurricane Andrew smashed south Florida in 1993.

The alternative, as urged by Bush, Lott & Co., would be to operate government uninformed of its people needs.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 4, 2000]

DON'T TOY WITH THE CENSUS

(By David S. Broder)

Something about the census makes Republicans crazy. For the better part of two years, they battled the scientific community and the Clinton administration to prevent the use of statistical sampling techniques to correct for the undercount of people—mainly low-income, minority, immigrant, transient and homeless—that marred the 1990 census.

After reaching an impasse in Congress, the Republicans took the issue to court and had to be satisfied with a Supreme Court ruling that barred the use of sampling for apportionment of seats in the House of Representatives but approved it for everything else.

Then last week, just as the publicity effort to persuade people to return their census

forms was reaching its peak, several prominent Republicans said that Uncle Sam was getting too personal in some of the census questions and suggested that it would be okay for people to skip over those items they found offensive.

Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott told Mississippi reporters that if he had received one of the long forms (delivered to one of every six households) he might have demurred at answering some of the questions. Texas Gov. George W. Bush, the GOP's presidential choice, said he hadn't opened his census form yet but wasn't sure if he would fill out the whole thing.

Later, both men retreated part-way from their positions (Bush after learning that he was in the short-form majority) and said people should return the forms with as much information as they could in good conscience provide. But Rep. J. C. Watts of Oklahoma, chairman of the House Republican Conference, blamed the bureaucracy for including questions that "have raised an unprecedented level of concern," and other Republicans said they would introduce legislation to make responding to the census voluntary, rather than requiring it by law.

All of this is basically nonsense—the kind of politicians' talk that gives hypocrisy a bad name even as it has serious policy consequences. Every single question on the census 2000 form was vetted with Congress two years ago, and every one has its origin and justification in a requirement included in a law passed by Congress.

In my files on census topics, I have a March 1998 report (that's two years ago, folks) titled "Questions Planned for Census 2000." That same report, I am informed, went to every member of Congress. In the back of that report is a table showing the first census in which each category of questions was asked. One of the questions on census 2000 to which some Republicans have objected asks for the family income. That has been asked in every census since 1940.

Another, the subject of much ridicule, asks, "Do you have complete plumbing facilities in this house, apartment or mobile home, that is, hot and cold piped water, a flush toilet, and a bathtub or shower?" That question, too, has been on the long form since 1940.

The plumbing question is asked, along with other measures of housing adequacy, as a way of targeting federal grants to the communities where the need for decent housing is greatest. Is there anyone who doubts that more help should go to South Central Los Angeles than to Beverly Hills?

The income question is used for a much wider variety of federal programs. In all, more than \$185 billion of federal grants to state and local governments is distributed on the basis of census information. One of the major concerns about the 1990 undercount—which later surveys suggested may have missed 8 million people while double-counting 4 million others—is that it deprived areas with large numbers of low-income people of the assistance they deserved.

A study released last month by the U.S. Census Monitoring Board and done by the accounting firm Price-waterhouseCoopers estimated that in 169 metropolitan areas where the poorly counted demographic groups are concentrated, the likely net loss of federal assistance may well reach \$11 billion in a decade.

Some of the estimated losses are enormous. The Los Angeles-Long Beach area, where hospitals, schools and other public facilities are chronically facing financial crisis, could be a \$1.8 billion loser. Miami has a \$300 million stake in an accurate count; New Orleans, \$97 million. And it is not just the big cities. Flagstaff, Ariz., is at risk for \$25

million—in effect, a 3.5 percent local tax or penalty for the undercount.

There's not a bit of evidence to justify the expressed concerns that the Census Bureau professionals will violate the privacy of individual families' responses. There is all too much proof that a flawed census hurts the most vulnerable Americans.

It is time the politicians stop messing around with the census.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 4, 2000]

PUBLIC INTERESTS; DOWN FOR THE COUNT

(By Gail Collins)

How many of you out there have strong reservations about the United States Census? May I see a show of hands?

I thought so. Everybody's cool. Once again, the radio talk-show circuit has plunged us into a violent debate about an issue that stirs the passions of average Americans slightly less than the cancellation of "Beverly Hills 90210."

You have no doubt received a census form, probably the short one that takes just a few minutes to fill out. The long form, which goes to about one-sixth of all American households, contains 53 questions, including whether your toilets flush and your relatives are all in their right minds. The answers are going to remain confidential for the next 72 years; at that point a Ph.D. candidate may grant you immortality by writing a dissertation on your indoor plumbing.

Census opponents appear to be mainly opponents of government, period. (James Bovard, the author of "Freedom in Chains," called the census "a scheme for generating grist for the expansion of the welfare state.") But they've created some nervous roiling in Congress. Senator Chuck Hagel of Nebraska is working on legislation to remove the \$100 penalty for failure to answer the questions, even though the fine hasn't been imposed in decades. He's being assisted by Senator Charles Robb of Virginia, a Democrat up for re-election who's determined to leave no group unpandered to.

The census is actually a noble public enterprise. It represents the founding fathers' breakthrough concept that people should have power not because of their property or titles, but simply because they're there. If we cannot expect election-fevered politicians to be reasonable about, say, Elian Gonzalez, it does seem they could muster up the grit to tell folks that they should regard filling out census forms like voting, and pretend to appreciate the opportunity.

But George W. Bush regards the issue as too hot for rationality. First he announced that "all of us need to encourage people to fill out the census," then instantly added that he could understand why some "don't want to give all that information to the government. And if I had the long form I'm not sure I'd want to, either."

A spokesman for Mr. Bush said the governor had received the short form, this year's equivalent of announcing you got a high draft number. An aid to the Senate majority leader, Trent Lott, said recently that Mr. Lott was telling people to just skip over any question they felt was intrusive. Now, the senator's constituents in Mississippi make out like bandits when it comes to federal aid, receiving an average of about \$2,000 per person more than they pay in federal taxes. On behalf of all the states that pay more than they get back, let me say: Go to it, Mississippians. Skip the long forms, and the short forms too. We'll give the money to some less conflicted state, perhaps one that hasn't just received a contract to build a monster aircraft carrier the Pentagon doesn't even want . . .

. . . We interrupt this harangue to report that Mr. Lott's office now says the senator

wants everybody to fill out the forms, and tells people to skip questions only if they threaten to toss their forms into the river unless their objections are met. When it comes to penalties for non-compliance, his spokesman added, "the senator is completely agnostic."

This possibly the first time in history that Mr. Lott's name has been used in the same sentence with the word "agnostic."

For every politician who's trying to distance himself from the census, there are four others desperately trying to get their constituents to fill out the forms, and raise their chances of getting more Federal aid. The governor of Georgia has gone on television with an ad urging his state to cooperate "or our Georgia money will be educating New York children for another 10 years."

Now, I'm a little wounded by that. Certainly we New Yorkers disagree with Georgians about some minor matters, such as the relative charms of John Rocker. But our elected officials—appalling as they may be—don't try to scare us into doing what they want by threatening to give our tax dollars to kids in Atlanta.

Go yell at the Mississippians for a while.

[From the San Francisco Examiner, Apr. 4, 2000]

WHAT REALLY COUNTS; POCKETS OF NON-COOPERATION WITH THE TAKING OF THE U.S. CENSUS DEMONSTRATE AN OVERREACTION TO FEARS OF INVASION OF PRIVACY

In an age of prosperity and sophistication, it's odd but understandable that people have doubts about so many things. On subjects ranging from the sanctity of confidential information to the good will of government institutions, we have become a nation of skeptics.

We may live in the global village, but command central is in some place far away, information is collected by unseen hands and essential decisions about our lives are made without consulting us.

These disconnects are reasons some people choose to rebel against seemingly innocuous practices such as the taking of the federal census every 10 years.

The U.S. Census carries out the useful objective of counting the noses of the country's populace and collecting information about their living conditions and habits. But because individuals have no control over the information once it leaves their hands, and because governments have not always guarded privacy, a minor rebellion has erupted.

Five of every six households get the short census form, which has only seven basic, unintrusive questions. It isn't causing problems. Every sixth household gets the long form, which has 53 questions—some of them more personal. It's the bone of contention.

Some people are refusing to return census forms, even though that is required by law. Some politicians haven't helped matters. Republican presidential candidate George W. Bush said he wasn't sure he would answer all the questions.

Good reasons exist to cooperate. A big enough boycott could affect how federal money, programs and services are divvied up. Census workers are redoubling their efforts to make sure that everyone is counted—which wasn't the case in 1990—so that every city and region gets its fair share of federal help.

The Census is a statistical snapshot of the United States. It tells a lot about who we are as a people and is a manifestation of *e pluribus unum* (out of many, one), the motto that appears on U.S. currency.

It's irresponsible for any politician, especially one who aspires to be president, to suggest breaking the law by refusing to fill

out census forms. And while skepticism toward government is healthy, if citizens weigh all factors, they should be inclined to cooperate with the census takers.

The cure for any potential breaches of confidentiality isn't refusal to answer. It's strict enforcement of privacy laws that prohibit the Census Bureau from sharing confidential information with anyone else, including other government agencies.

The time to demand changes in the census isn't in the midst of one. It's in Congress, in the form of legislation that updates questions, strengthens safeguards and perhaps increases penalties for violating citizens' privacy.

Census officials need to do a better job of explaining the agency's existing protections against leaks and other privacy abuses. Why are Census officials so faceless? It's easier to trust people you've met, or at least seen on television.

Skeptics are fond of asking to see the evidence. In the case of the census, we all know there's a potential for misuse. What true skeptics should be asking is, "Just where and when have any abuses occurred?"

Failing a convincing answer, the reasonable course for all of us—skeptics or not—is to put away any residual fears and allow ourselves to be counted. For the good of one and all.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Apr. 5, 2000]

#### DON'T SHRED THE CENSUS

ONE IN six American households are facing a question this week: is it really necessary to fill out a lengthy census form that borders on nosy and antiquated? The answer is a resounding yes.

The head count is especially contentious this time around. Along with the time required and the odd questions, there is a political overlay. Republican leaders, including likely GOP presidential nominee George W. Bush, suggest that folks toss the form if they feel it is too intrusive. This suggestion is irresponsible neglect of an important duty.

The census has made its share of mistakes. Some were mailed incorrectly. Its laundry list of 53 questions takes more than half an hour to fill out. For city and suburban residents, who make up the overwhelming majority of Americans, there are quaint questions about farm income and indoor plumbing. Why should citizens be bothered with these far-fetched queries?

There are other arguments. High-tech boosters are upset there are no questions about computer use, a topic that could use some exploring. But census bureaucrats said they were under pressure from single-issue groups ranging from pet lovers to religious leaders for special questions. The census ended up largely as a repeat of the last one, which will limit its potential.

But for better or worse, the census remains an essential task. It asks citizens to complete a picture of their country, not give away personal secrets. Income, ancestry, job history and even driving habits are useful ingredients in depicting America, circa April 2000.

More specifically, the census plays a role in doling out federal aid and congressional districts. It can be used by schools, public health and transit agencies in planning. Change can be measured.

This evolution of the country is exactly why San Francisco officials, civil rights organizations and school boards are pushing hard to get every household to fill out the paperwork. Opponents are wrong to depict a basic government service as an invasion of privacy.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Apr. 5, 2000]

#### IT'S THE LAW. COUNT ON IT

Senator Majority Leader TRENT LOTT (R-Miss.) and a few of his congressional colleagues seem to have forgotten the oath they swore to uphold the Constitution and the laws of the United States. Responding to constituent complaints about parts of the long-form census questionnaire, they have suggested that questions that some might consider objectionable can simply be ignored. That is plainly and simply, advice to break the law, and considering the source it's especially reprehensible.

About one household in six—approximately 20 million in all—was mailed the long census form; all others got a mere eight questions about the people in the household. The long form aims to gather information that is essential for directing certain federal outlays. In the current decade, expenditures linked directly to census-provided information could total close to \$2 trillion.

So there are a purpose and a policy consideration behind every census question, no matter how dubious its relevance may seem. Questions that some find intrusive and none of the government's business—about indoor plumbing or household income, for example—contribute to a national economic and demographic profile that is of great value to both government and the private sector. This information helps determine where roads and schools will be built, where Medicare and Medicaid funds should be channeled, where shopping centers are best located, where the needs of the disabled may be most acute. The Census Bureau would have done well to emphasize this point much earlier.

The census has steadily evolved beyond its limited 18th century purpose of congressional reapportionment. Those in Congress who now counsel leaving some census questions unanswered suffer from a convenient memory lapse: Every one of the questions, many of which are mandated by statute or court rulings, was approved by Congress two years ago.

[From the USA Today, Apr. 6, 2000]

#### 200 YEARS PLUS: CENSUS NOSINESS ISN'T NEW

More than 200 years ago, Thomas Jefferson warned George Washington that taking the first U.S. Census, done in 1790, wouldn't be easy. A Census taker could wind up with a musket in the face. And those were the days of a well-regulated militia.

The Census today faces equal mistrust. This is due to the public's innate aversion to government prying, amplified by an unsubtle campaign to discredit the Census as too intrusive. Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott, R-Miss., has told Americans they need not answer questions they find too invasive. So has Republican presidential candidate George W. Bush. Sen. Charles Hagel, R-Neb., wants to change the law to make answering most questions voluntary.

Whether the campaign to malign the long form will affect results won't be known for weeks. But Kenneth Prewitt, director of the Census Bureau, testified in Congress on Wednesday that the return rate is lagging well behind 1990 figures. The Census was aiming for a 61% return over all. Below that, Congress will have to allocate extra money for door-to-door head counting.

That's just one reason the anti-Census crowd is giving bad advice.

Among the others: It's illegal not to answer all of the questions. And self-defeating. Over 10 years, up to \$2 trillion in spending will be directed by Census findings. Lott's beloved Mississippi, with one of the lowest response rates and highest illiteracy rates, could be shortchanged on education dollars.

It also could lose private-sector investment that is guided in part by Census data.

Lastly, the Census isn't uncommonly intrusive. The sort form is the shortest since 1820. The long form, received by 1 in 6 households, is the shortest ever. And some of the most criticized questions—about employment, disability status, etc.—have been asked since the 19th century. The question about income, since 1940. Indeed, Americans give more personal information, more publicly, when they buy a house, pay their taxes or fill out a medical form.

Still, the Census raises predictable questions about nosiness. The long form wants to know about your job and your mortgage, subjects you might not comfortably share with your brother, much less Big Brother.

Plainly, the government has done a poor job of preventive promotion. Worries about privacy are historic, yet the long form's cover letter barely addresses them.

Most people still answer the forms with speed and candor. But expecting them every 10 years to remember why they are providing personal information without immediate gratification is asking for trouble.

The irony is that many critics today also helped defeat the use of statistical sampling to make the head count more accurate.

Their understood motive was to prevent a reapportionment of congressional districts to represent undercounted populations, which tend to vote Democrat. Opponents demanded an actual head count, which is less accurate. Now the motive is simply to align Republican leaders with the public's general distrust of federal data-gathering.

Finally, let's not forget that Congress had a chance to review all of the questions two years ago. If they had problems, that was the time to stand up and be counted. Today's debate: Census forms, but politics, privacy concerns needlessly stoke anger.

#### IF YOU WANT TO COUNT, BE COUNTED

(By Lynn Sweet, Washington Bureau)

Chicagoans have made a lousy initial response to the 2000 census, and the entire state of Illinois is lagging as well. This is a sort of collective passive-aggressive behavior for which there is no excuse. And don't start saying that census questions are intrusive.

The early trend shows that the mail-in responses from suburban Cook County and the collar counties are running as much as 20 points higher than the 40 percent from the city. This will only ensure, if the pace keeps up, that the suburbs will have more political muscle than they deserve in the state redistricting that follows each census.

And if Illinoisans don't let themselves be counted, the potential of losing a seat in the House of Representatives because of reapportionment will easier become a reality. The return of Federal funds to Illinois also is dictated largely by census-driven formulas.

Filling out the census form is a "marvelous opportunity" for Americans "to prove they can reverse the trend of civic disengagement," said Census Bureau director Kenneth Prewitt, a Downstate Alton native who is a former director of the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago.

Across the nation, people are mailing in census forms—short and long—in disappointing numbers, and Prewitt earlier this week sounded an alarm because the nationwide response rate was at 55 percent, below the 61 percent the bureau had expected by now.

It's not too late to get a mail-in census form by calling (800) 471-9424. And the numbers still can be vastly improved as the census moves on to the next phase, where census employees, called enumerators, start making house calls.

"Someone will be knocking on their door," said Prewitt, though it will make the counting operation needlessly more expensive. It costs about \$3 to process a mail-in form compared with \$35 for a household visit.

The cheap-shot comments of some Republicans—including Texas Gov. George W. Bush, the GOP presidential candidate, and Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-Miss.)—could, knowingly or not, hijack the census.

On the average, about one in six households gets a long census form that asks a total of 53 questions, compared with seven on the short questionnaire.

Lott and Bush suggested that individuals don't answer any census question they consider impertinent.

"If they are worried about the government intruding into their personal lives, they ought to think about it," Bush said. Lott was forced to backtrack after he realized that his home state, Mississippi, is near the bottom when it comes to mail-in response rates, 47 percent on Wednesday, compared with 56 percent for Illinois and 58 percent for Indiana. Ohio is the champ so far, with 62 percent.

Lott and the other complaining congressional Republicans—no Democrats so far—are whiners and intellectual phonies. They are objecting to questions that (1) were presented for review to Congress in 1997 and 1998 and (2) were on census forms that went out under Presidents Ronald Reagan and George Bush.

The census has asked about plumbing facilities for decades. There are bigger privacy issues looming right now, especially with the Internet, than being asked about flush toilets in your home.

And for those who don't like the questions about income and mortgages and the like, well, the government already has a lot of information from tax returns. The Census Bureau does not swap data with other agencies. Tax cheaters or people who keep things from spouses or partners may not like answering the questions. But there is no right to absolute privacy in the United States. If there were, height, weight and date of birth would not be on a driver's license.

Cooperating with the census means getting more from the government you already are paying for. It is selfish—and self-defeating—not to be counted.

[From the Daily Bruin, Apr. 7, 2000]  
COMPLETING CENSUS FORM HAS FAR-  
REACHING BENEFITS

Though some people are skeptical of the United States Census, completing these forms can lead to real benefits—including better schools and libraries, quality health care and up-to-date national demographic profiles.

Though the official due date passed nearly a week ago, residents can still be counted. The Census Bureau reports that only 55 percent of U.S. residents have returned their forms so far.

The slow response is caused, in part, by the popular sentiment that the census, especially the long version of the form, invades individuals' privacy. While worries about privacy are understandable, those who fear filling out the census should remember a consequence of their inaction: Neglecting to participate can lead to a significantly inaccurate count.

The short form poses generic questions like name, age, gender and race, while the longer form asks for more specific social and economic characteristics, such as individuals' occupations and housing types. Responses to these questions help determine how critical resources are distributed and which areas need those resources the most.

Specifically, demographic information is used to plan for services like schools, hospitals and roads. It may alert the government to focus its resources in areas reporting high rates of unemployment, or pinpoint regions that require better child care. State and federal governments also allocate funding to individual counties, cities and congressional districts for health care, schools and libraries; all of this information is based on the census results. The government's support is critical to the maintenance of these institutions, and so the number of people who report living in a given community is directly related to how much financing will be allocated to that particular community.

The number of inhabitants reported in each region also determines congressional apportionment. District lines are drawn with respect to census reports, and the number of members in the House of Representatives accorded to each state is also based on census information. If more underrepresented citizens completed their census forms, they might begin to claim deserved representation in Congress.

According to the Los Angeles Times, low responses to the 1990 Census deprived California of an estimated \$2 billion and four congressional seats over the last decade. Unless an increasing percentage of forms are returned, this discrepancy may only get worse.

Not only can the new census correct the omissions made by the 1990 version, but the revised questions provide previously unexplored, yet important, statistical data. The 2000 Census is unique because it allows individuals to claim mixed ethnic and racial backgrounds. Compiling this information will give the government a more accurate perspective on racial dynamics in our society and can only help in overcoming one of America's biggest social problems—racial conflict.

Worries about the long form's intrusiveness, however, are legitimate considering the detailed nature of some questions. Still, the census count is a vital responsibility that helps facilitate the functioning of a democratic government.

If you haven't completed the census, you can still do so. Internet census forms are available until April 15. In addition, census workers will be following up with non-respondents by telephone. Go to [www.2000.census.gov](http://www.2000.census.gov) for more information.

Take a few minutes to finish the questionnaire, obey the law and practice some civic responsibility. Make sure your voice is heard.

[From the Atlanta Journal, Apr. 8, 2000]  
CONVERSATION STARTER: DON'T FALL PREY TO  
PARANOIA ABOUT QUESTIONS  
(By Harvey Lipman)

Fear is a natural human emotion. It keeps us safe in times of danger. Fear based on facts is caution, but baseless fear is just paranoia.

The fact is that the Census Bureau has never released any of the individual information that it gathers, not to the IRS, not to the FBI, not to the president, not to anybody. Never. That is a fact. The information gathered once every 10 years is compiled and the summary information, and only the summary information, is used to determine allocations essential to all of us, things like representation in Congress and federal funding of education.

The Census Bureau has proposed using statistical-sampling techniques as an alternate, less burdensome way, to obtain some of the data, but it has been rebuffed by Congress, the Supreme Court and even The Atlanta Journal. Until such time as these less invasive methods are permitted, there is

simply no other way to collect this necessary and constitutionally required information.

We have very few obligations as citizens of this country. If our participatory form of government is to work we must honor those obligations. Answering the census is such an obligation. As an American I am proud to do so, since I have no evidence whatsoever to fear that my government will divulge the personal information that I give them.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 9, 2000]  
ANSWER THIS QUESTION: HOW DID THE CENSUS  
BECOME OUR WHIPPING BOY?

(By William Casey)

Ten years ago this month, I was wearing a Boston Red Sox batting helmet to work.

No, I wasn't playing in the shadow of Fenway Park's hallowed Green Monster of a wall or tending a BoSox souvenir concession. The helmet was just a tool I used during my short-lived career as an enumerator for the 1990 Census. It was my job to track down miscreants who—for one reason or another—had not returned their census forms in a timely fashion. The buildings I covered in downtown Minneapolis were overflowing with young people, so setting myself up at a table in the lobby—official headgear in place—seemed a good way to pull in the curious and disarm the suspicious. As residents trickled in from shift work or nights out, they invariably wandered over to see what was up. With a little pleasant persuasion, presto, the short form—even the long form!—was complete.

It worked. Back then, anyway.

Today, given the grumbling in some quarters about the intrusiveness of the 2000 Census, I might need more than a batting helmet to do that job. We have such unhappy customers as Mr. M. Smith, a gentleman from Virginia Beach who was so annoyed by the long form that "I threw mine in the trash where it belongs" and then made his civil disobedience public in a letter to Norfolk's *Virginian-Pilot*. (Dear Mr. Smith: Those questions have been standard on the census for many decades.)

Then there is Mr. P. Graham of Saline, Mich., who wrote a letter to the *Detroit News* accusing the Census Bureau of promoting "alienation" from government and asserting that most of the long form's 53 questions are "none of its business." (Dear Mr. Graham: Contrary to popular belief, the Census Bureau is asking those specific questions at the direction of Congress, which likes to use the census to collect information it has decided it needs.)

Add the comments from such Republican heavyweights as Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott, Texas Gov. George W. Bush and Oklahoma Rep. Tom Coburn—all of whom have obligingly bashed the census for allegedly invading the nation's privacy—and you would think that the Census Bureau has suddenly transformed itself from an agency that once just counted noses into one that is just plain nosy.

This is—excuse my bluntness, please—a lot of nonsense. It's not the Census Bureau or its forms that have changed. It's us.

Or, more precisely, the fuss is one more dismaying result of the pervasive presence of consumerism and marketing in our lives. I find it puzzling, I admit, that people are bent out of shape by a form sent to them once a decade when—on a daily basis—they habitually reveal (willingly and unwillingly) the most private of data to advertisers, health insurers and Internet companies. Over the past 10 years, even the simplest sales transaction has become an opportunity to capture personal details that can be sold and resold (why do you think the cashier wants to know your phone number?). It's come to the point

where you can rarely sit down to dinner without receiving a "courtesy call" from someone who knows a lot more about you than just your area code. Those of us concerned about confidentiality might focus on the staggering amount of personal information maintained by largely invisible companies with names like Acxiom and Experian. Yet people think that they still have their "privacy" and that the government looms as the greatest threat to taking it away.

How did the census become the whipping boy, the embodiment of Big Brother, a waste of time, a symbol of oppression? The Census Bureau has an exemplary history of keeping the data it collects confidential, but that fact does not seem to have made a dent in the collective consciousness. It's easier to blame the census than to confront the world we've created.

Besides functioning as a worker bee on that 1990 census, I am a long-time user of census information. On both academic and journalistic projects, I've come to appreciate (and depend on) the richness and reliability of the material—which just about anyone can acquire, understand and put to work in a thousand ways. The notion of turning to particular census-driven data sets a few years from now and discovering that the 2000 information is unusable because of "citizen non-cooperation" is more than an annoyance. It makes my blood run cold.

A good deal of the complaining is directed toward the long form, a questionnaire sent to one of every six households in the past month. It's about the same length as the 1990 version and shorter than some previous censuses. There are changes—additions, deletions, rewordings—but it's basically the same old thing.

Continuity is a strong factor when it comes to census matters. It's not as if every 10 years, things start from ground zero. Just the opposite. The national statistical snapshots that census results help construct are most useful when they build on what went before.

It's true that census questionnaires are longer and more complex than they were in the first half of the 20th century—but that's hardly surprising. Those were times before the increased scope of governmental activity and responsibility that we take for granted today: an era when there was no Medicare, Medicaid or Social Security, no program of federal assistance to housing, minimal federal involvement with transportation spending and so forth.

There's a certain irony, however, in the fact that the census hasn't changed much last time around. Census 2000 mechanics could have been vastly different—more efficient, more accurate and much less expensive—but they're not. Carefully field-tested efforts to streamline the counting process via statistical sampling were opposed during the past few years for political reasons. It's common knowledge—although it's typically wrapped in layers of doublespeak—that Republicans see undercounting in urban areas as equating to a GOP advantage. (To be sure, if the sampling method threatened Democratic voting bases, then sides would no doubt be switched.) A count based on statistical sampling not only would have been less expensive, it would have helped prevent the higher levels of background noise we're experiencing at the moment.

There have always been ample numbers of people who balk at completing their questionnaires. In 1990, my fellow enumerators and I had to deal with people who—like our friends Mr. SMITH and Mr. GRAHAM above—were not inclined to cooperate. Mostly they were reluctant; occasionally they were almost hostile. But the majority of them completed their forms when asked to do so di-

rectly. Sometimes a chance to sound off about their objections was required. I was happy to oblige. "Whatever it takes" was my motto—at least during those six weeks.

This year's census has become a snapshot in a way that I didn't expect: It reflects not just how we live, but how we feel about ourselves and our society.

Take, for example, the subject of race. If, as a society, we are stalemated on issues of race, then how can we expect a census form to solve them, or even make them clearer? After reading through the seemingly endless and convoluted choices that the census short form offers ("If person 1 considers his/her race to include two or more races . . ."), is it any surprise that the precooked racial and ethnic categories seem unsatisfactory? I've heard more than a few people say they wrote in "human"—which seems, in fact, like a very human reaction to the country's current fascination and obsession with race and ethnicity.

Because the census at its core serves a political purpose—determining the number of representatives from each state—the count has always had a political dimension. But I don't recall the census forms being a hot item in the presidential election years of 1960 and 1980. This year, it appears, any issue properly framed and spun is fodder for "principled" stands by presidential candidates. One day it could be AL GORE'S sudden, self-serving switch on the Elian Gonzalez case; the next, it could be George W. Bush, aiding and abetting census resisters. "I can understand," the GOP nominee-to-be said, "why people don't want to give over that information to the government. If I had the long form, I'm not so sure I would do it, either."

Not to be outdone, Nebraska's rising star of a senator, Republican CHUCK HAGEL, offered to introduce legislation that would make question-answering optional. (Memo to the esteemed Mr. HAGEL: The Census 2000 questions were sent to Congress for review in 1998. No squawk was raised then.) With this kind of "leadership" out there—explicitly undermining a program that requires individual citizens to pull together in the interest of the larger whole—no wonder skepticism about the process is rising.

After litigation over the Census Bureau's proposed use of statistical sampling went to the Supreme Court—and sampling was ruled out for apportionment purposes, although its use for redistricting within states remains an open question—one might have hoped that by the time April 1, 2000, rolled around, we would have gotten our act together as a nation and proceeded with the job. I cannot help but wonder if the census is falling victim to our new millennium's variety of cultural solipsism. Societal building blocks such as family, neighborhood and community are subjected today to a wide range of pressures—largely destructive. These institutions were, to a substantial extent, the basis for successful past censuses. But the principle of doing something for the common good—for society's good—doesn't stand a chance if society's leaders won't speak up for it.

On Thursday, I read that hopes are "dimming for a timely and accurate count" in Census 2000. If response rates remain underwhelming, that will necessitate time-consuming and expensive enumerator work to track down, cajole, persuade and gather information from those who have not yet submitted it. Remember, "whatever it takes."

But later on, after things have settled down, perhaps a lesson regarding the fragility of our social and political fabric will have been learned. It's often said, but still true: It's easier to tear things down than it is to build them up.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about an issue of great importance in the year 2000.

I wish to express thanks to all Americans who are participating in the Census 2000. You are making an enormous difference to your community and setting our nation on the best path for the new century.

As of last night, 60% of Americans have completed and sent in their census forms. Nevertheless, we have much work to do, Mr. Speaker. We need to reach to the 40% of Americans who have yet to complete their census forms.

Regrettably in previous weeks, when everyone has been working to improve the initial response rate, we had Members of Congress, including prominent leaders of the Republican party, people who should better, tell the American public that the census was optional.

Unfortunately, the reality remains that the Census Bureau has missed millions of persons in conducting each decennial census, especially minorities, the poor, children, newly arrived immigrants, and the homeless. We cannot allow this to happen again.

For these reasons, of course, it should come as no surprise that I am disappointed by recent comments by highly respected individuals that advise Americans not to perform their civic duty. As reported in numerous news stories, some lawmakers on the other side urged citizens not to answer questions regarding the long form.

Yet over two years, every Member of Congress received a detailed list of the questions to be asked on the long form, including a description of the need for asking it and specific legal requirements supporting it. The time for input on the question was then. The time to achieve an accurate census count is now.

The low percentage of census forms being returned in certain cities with high minority populations is alarming. We must do all we can to change response rates. These remarks only discourage faster response rates.

Even the Governor of the State of Texas has said he supports his party's position against the use of modern statistical methods—methods that would get a more accurate count of America's African Americans, Hispanic, Asian American, and American Indian populations.

As a member of the Congressional Caucus Task Force on Census, I am obliged to convey my concern that no one is left out of the Census process. Unlike in the 1990 Census where so many minorities were disproportionately missed or "undercounted" as we say, everyone must be counted in the Census 2000.

Our goal for Census 2000 must be the most accurate census possible. We all know that accurate census data has proven vital to people of color, both economically and politically.

Texas lost almost \$1 billion due to the 1990 undercount. Over 486,000 Texans were missed in the 1990 Census, which prevented Texas from securing critically-needed federal funding for health care, transportation, housing, and community development.

In the city of Houston, 67,000 people were undercounted in 1990.

A comprehensive analysis of federal funding was prepared by PriceWaterhouseCoopers. The analysis was one at the request of the Presidential members of the U.S. Census Monitoring Board. According to

PriceWaterhouseCoopers, the population "undercount" similar to that which occurred in the 1990 Census would cost 26 states a minimum of \$9.1 billion. States with the largest numerical undercounts would be hit the hardest. California would lose more than \$5 billion, Texas nearly \$2 billion, and Florida \$5 million. I am particularly concerned that 120,267 are estimated to be undercounted from Census 2000 in Harris County, Texas.

Moreover, \$185 billion in federal funds are allocated each year based on each state's respective share of the population, as determined every 10 years by the Census. The PriceWaterhouseCoopers study examined the 15 programs analyzed by the General Accounting Office in its 1999 report on the funding impact of the 1990 census undercount.

The eight programs most affected by the census are Medicaid, Foster Care, Rehabilitation Services Block Grants, Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Block Grants Adoption Assistance, Child Care and Development Block Grants, and Vocational Education Block Grants.

Our communities cannot afford to squander the opportunity to secure desperately needed resources to make these programs available to everyone. An accurate Census is the only way to assure that local communities receive their 'fair share' of federal spending; an inaccurate count will shortchange the affected communities for an entire decade.

Keeping response rates high must remain a primary purpose in obtaining an accurate census. Recent news stories have only highlighted this need. Texas has a 33 percent return, but the fourth largest city in the nation only has 26 percent return. That is the city of Houston. This is precisely what we must change. Only a high response rate to the Census 2000 questionnaires will enable our community to secure desperately needed funds.

And while some have recently raised concerns about the legality or constitutionality of the long form, those only serve as a distraction. In fact, the Census Bureau has not prosecuted anyone for not sending in their Census form since the 1960s. They are interested in getting complete and reliable data; they do not want to jeopardize the public trust.

The long form is a sound investment—for a relatively small additional cost, information of very high quality about a number of subjects is collected for many geographic areas. The return on this investment is concrete information that serves the basis for sound public policy decisions and that supports the accurate allocation of over billions of dollars.

Community leaders use the long form for planning a wide range of activities, including neighborhood revitalization, economic development and improved facilities and services.

We need the long form to build highways, roads, bridges and tunnels in areas that need them. And planners need information about where people live and work and the times they leave for work.

Each long form question provides valuable, indeed essential, information for important public policy and business decisions.

For example, data from the question on the number of telephones in the home area is used to help plan local 911 emergency services. They also are used to help implement the Older Americans Act to provide emergency and health-care services to homebound seniors without phone service.

Data from the question on how long it takes to commute to work is used by federal, state, local and private transportation planners to help design new roads, bus routes, and mass transit transportation and to manage traffic congestion, as well as to distribute federal transportation dollars.

Indeed, data from the question on the veteran's status are used to plan the location of veteran's hospitals and to efficiently deliver veterans health-care and nursing services.

Your answers to Census 2000 are absolutely critical to ensure that every possible dollar is made available to the poor, the sick, and the neglected in our communities.

The U.S. Census only comes around once every ten years, but its information is used throughout the decade. Together, let's make sure that everyone is heard.

□

#### TAX LIMITATION CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity tonight to discuss a very important issue that is going to be on the floor of the House of Representatives this week. It is called the tax limitation amendment. The tax limitation amendment, known as H.J. Res. 37, is a very, very simple amendment that was first brought to life some 10 years ago by the gentleman from the 6th District of Texas (Mr. BARTON).

Last week we had a press conference where we talked about, in essence, the passing of the mantle from the gentleman from Texas to myself, being the lead for the tax limitation amendment where we will bring to the floor of the House of Representatives on Wednesday an opportunity for all Members not only to fully debate but also to vote on something which I believe is very, very important.

The essence of H.J. Res. 37 is that we are going to make it more difficult for Washington to raise taxes on America. That is what this debate is all about. It will be about doing those things that Washington talks about, making it more difficult by requiring a supermajority, a two-thirds vote on the floor of the House of Representatives and in the Senate to raise taxes. Part of what we are talking about today, we would assume, is just a conservative idea, and I think that that would be correct. But it is a bipartisan idea. It is an idea not only that has grassroots all across America, people who are pro-business but it also has people who consider themselves Democrats, Democrats even, who understand that raising taxes should not be easy, because taxes come from people who get up and go to work every day, work diligently, honest people, taxpayers, and then are giving too much money to Washington, D.C.

One of the persons who is the co-chairman of this effort, a coleader in

this effort, is the gentleman from the 4th District of Texas (Mr. HALL). This evening I am very honored to have the gentleman from Texas with me to help not only the discussion about the tax limitation amendment but also for an opportunity for us to discuss this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the 4th District of Texas, a life-long Democrat, a conservative, and a man who understands it is important to make it more difficult to raise taxes on taxpayers.

Mr. HALL of Texas. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am here today, of course, to express my support for the tax limitation amendment. I have been for this amendment from the word go. I really do not understand that it ought to be a Republican or a Democratic thrust or a liberal or conservative thrust because I think it is an American thrust. Requiring a two-thirds vote to raise taxes would force very serious consideration on this legislation at any time that they would attempt to raise taxes; and it would require, as the gentleman from Texas has said, a supermajority vote on any proposal that would impact the pocket-books of every hard-working American.

The major test of this legislation would be not what class supports it. We are in for at least 5 wonderful years in this country. We now have, rather than the deficits of the 1980s and the 1990s, a surplus; and we are going to have good times for the next 5, maybe for the next 10, years to have money to be that that we ought to be for people who have no lobby, pay a lot of it on our debt. That is tantamount to a tax break for everyone.

I think that if we would go into our district, and I say "our district" because the gentleman and I share districts in Texas. I have part of Dallas County in my district. He has a much larger part of it. I have most of Kaufman. He has a part of Kaufman in his district. He has a part of Smith County which is Tyler; Tyler, Texas. We represent the same type of people, people who want less government, people who want to keep the money that they work for, people who want to plan ahead, people who want to have money in September to buy school clothes without having the taxes that are put on them, that have been historically put on them by a 50 percent vote. A lot of those votes like the Tax Reform Act of 1986 would never have happened if it had taken a two-thirds vote.

□ 2030

So I think if they would go out into their district, into any part of our district, and talk to the first 10 people they see and ask them would you like to see it a little bit more difficult for the Congress of the United States to take money out of your left hip pocket, what do you think their answer would be?

Mr. SESSIONS. Let me say this: the gentleman from Texas, whose district

is literally overlaid on my district, the 4th District overlaid on the 5th District, very, very similar, the kind of people, the kind of people's thoughts and ideas, I believe that if you went in the 4th or 5th Districts of Texas, that people would say, I think Washington, D.C. has enough money. First of all, they have got enough money. They don't need to tax us more. They ought to be more efficient.

The second thing I think they would say, as the gentleman has pointed out, is let us make it more difficult. There is no need to go back to the American public to ask for a tax increase, especially when we are in a surplus condition. Right now, today, in America we are working off of a surplus, and yet we know that there are people in Washington, D.C., that want more and more and more money.

I would say to the gentleman from the 4th District of Texas that if we made it more difficult, it would immediately cause this Congress and the administration, whoever is President, to have to go and look within the administration, to go look in these agencies to find where there is waste, fraud and abuse, to find where there was opportunity to save money, rather than going back to the taxpayer.

Mr. HALL of Texas. I think as the gentleman well knows, we represent a conservative area. We both represent a part of the old Rayburn congressional district. We talk about balanced budgets and all that. Mr. Rayburn had a balanced budget the last 8 years of his service here; and as he went back home to Bonham, Texas, to die, he looked back over his shoulder at a balanced budget.

I think we could use some of that good common horse sense now. I think the people of this country want to be able to keep more of the money they are making. I just do not believe the argument that we have a lot more money now, so this amendment is not as important. I think this amendment is more important now than it was during the deficit times, because they have more to lose, and it is going to look like it is easy to put taxes on people.

I just think it is a golden opportunity to raise the bar and protect hard-working Americans from tax increases in the future that are not supported by a majority of two-thirds of the people. I think it is critical that we make a statement that we are committed to controlling government spending, rather than raising taxes, in order to maintain a balanced Federal budget.

I just think that the 10 people that I would talk to on Front Street in Tyler, Texas, or any part of Kaufman County, or any part of the district we share in Dallas County, we would talk to these people and ask this simple question; and I think we ought to invite the rest of the Congress to go home and do the same thing, ask them what do you think about the fact we are trying to

make it a little bit more difficult to put taxes on you. What do you think their answer would be?

Mr. SESSIONS. Absolutely. I believe the answer from people, if you talk to people who live in the districts that get up and go to work every day, they would say, We are very pleased. We love America. We support government and the essence of what it does. But today there is more than enough money in Washington, D.C. Make do with what you have. Do not come back to us. We are out producing, meaning the people back home, producing not only in efficiencies, but to the economy, to the local communities and to government, to make it work. This needs to be a bar that gets raised because it is that important of an issue.

You know that there are several parts of the Constitution that put a two-thirds vote that is a requirement to be able to pass something. I believe, and I think the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) agrees, that raising taxes should be one of those things that we make more difficult, that should require a consensus and a two-thirds vote.

I thank the gentleman. I know that the gentleman has got a dinner that he has got to go to, but I thank the gentleman for not only working on behalf of the people of the 4th District of Texas, but also doing it in a national leadership capacity here tonight. I thank him so very much for being a part of what we are doing.

Mr. HALL of Texas. I thank the gentleman for the time, and I certainly am pleased that he has accepted the leadership of this amendment. I pledge that I will work side by side with the gentleman and we will work this floor.

I do not know how we are going to come out, but I do know that we are going to still be swinging at it. I suggest that, no matter how the vote turns out, that we start anew the day we have either won or lost it, to working the other end of the situation and asking those 10 people what they think about it, and asking each Member of Congress here to go home and ask their first 10 people what they think about it. Maybe we are working at the wrong end of the deal here in Washington, D.C. Maybe we ought to be working at home.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the gentleman so very much.

This evening we are also joined by one of the stalwarts of freedom, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), who is not only a very good friend of the taxpayer, but a person who understands whose money this really is we are talking about. At this time I would yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my colleague from Texas, and I thank my colleague from across the aisle from Texas also for joining us here tonight.

Mr. Speaker, observers could not help but note the differing tone of those who preceded us in this Chamber this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I was astounded, but I guess not really surprised, at the level of bile, the venom, the mean-spiritedness and deliberate mischaracterizations that preceded us in this Chamber, and I could not help but notice the difference, Mr. Speaker, as we come here on a bipartisan basis.

Our good friend from Texas asked, what would the people at home say? And, Mr. Speaker, one of the things I hear repeatedly is how sick and tired they are of the endless partisan haranguing and insults and deliberate mischaracterizations of matters of public policy, because, Mr. Speaker, we are involved in dealing with the public trust. All 435 of us in this Chamber are entrusted with an awesome responsibility, to represent the peoples of our districts to the best of our ability, commensurate with full allegiance to the Constitution of the United States.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would just appeal to the American people to understand that we are talking about a bipartisan amendment, and, in the words of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), it really should not be liberal, conservative, Republican or Democrat. It is quintessentially American, because what will take place on this floor, through the leadership of my good friend from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) and many of others of us, we will come to this floor and ask for a supermajority vote, ask for 290 of us to line up to say that it should be harder for Congress to raise taxes on the American people.

We were talking about what folks say at home. The 6th Congressional District of Arizona, in square mileage almost the size of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. From the small hamlet of Franklin in southern Greenlee County, north to Four Corners, west to Flagstaff, south again to Florence, encompassing parts of Phoenix, Mesa, Scottsdale, a fast growing area, where people come from all over the country, a near universal lament has been well, you common sense folks can get some things done, but that is no guarantee that in 2 years if there is a change in the composition of the Congress, if something happens, that your hard work will not be reversed.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, that is precisely why we are bringing this amendment to the floor of the House again, this proposed amendment, because we believe, just as important, just as challenging as it is to amend the Constitution of the United States, to deal with questions such as impeaching a chief executive, or, in the other body, ratifying international treaties, we believe the same standard should apply to the Government reaching into the pockets of everyday, hard-working Americans. That is the key to this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out that, as is often the case, many of our States, often characterized as laboratories of democracy, the places where we apply with our dynamic system of Federalism the principles of our constitutional Republic, 14 of our 50 states

have already adopted State tax limitation provisions, including my home State of Arizona, when in 1992 the legislature and the people decided that a two-thirds vote would be required for any, any, increase in taxation.

Now, it is important, Mr. Speaker, to make this distinction: this does not prohibit tax increases, but it does say to the American people we understand a simple truth. The money does not belong to the Washington bureaucrats; it belongs to you. And we believe that if you work hard, play by the rules, want to provide for your family, want to provide for your children, have an obligation to your parents and other seniors in your community, are glad to shoulder that obligation, since it is your money, it should be tougher for Washington to get to it. It should be a question every bit as important as amending the Constitution of the United States.

So we will come here again seeking a supermajority to enact this notion of a higher standard for tax increases. We are reminded over the last 2 decades, 1980, 1982, 1983, 1990, and, of course, the largest tax increase in American history, which passed in this Chamber and the other body by one vote, which was characterized by some in this town, principally those at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, as an "investment on our future," when in fact it really was an assault on seniors, on children, on Americans who had even left the here-and-now to go to the here-after, so excessive was that tax increase it was retroactive to the first of the year in the grave, if the Congress or a future administration is tempted again to take the easy way out, to pickpocket hard-working American citizens, Mr. Speaker, this amendment would say, whoa, not so fast. Because we are a government of laws, because we are a government where the first three words of the Constitution talk about "We the people."

We are accountable to the people, and we want to make it more difficult, we want to raise the standard, so that the same Americans, whether they are in the 5th or 4th Congressional District of Texas, or the 6th Congressional District of Arizona, or any district across the country, will understand that we are going to think long and hard and have compelling reasons to make a change, should we decide to do so collectively in this body with the support of the American people. But that will take away a temptation that has been too often easily employed.

Let us raise the standard and return to the notion that the money belongs to the people, not to Washington. I know my friend from Texas has a few things to say.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman from Arizona has now clearly laid out is not only the essence of the reason why this is important to people back home, but I now want to add to those reasons and talk about why Washington needs to pay atten-

tion to the tax limitation amendment, H.J. Res. 94. I said H.J. Res. 39. That is wrong. That was last year. I have caught up now. H.J. Res. 94.

We must make it harder for Congress to raise taxes on the American people. Now, many people would say, Well, Washington has it down. We have already created a surplus. We are going to have a surplus now for as far as the eye can see.

I would say that, yes, that probably is true, provided we stay in power. But there is so much more that must be understood, and that is that just because the majority party believes that that is the right thing to do, it does not mean that that is what everybody agrees.

Back in 1995, when we were in the midst of the battle, the battle to determine that we would have a balanced budget, that we would be able to work within the confines to balance the budget based upon what the American people have given us before the Committee on Ways and Means, Alice Rivlin, the OMB, Office of Management and Budget, personnel director, said, "I do not think that adhering to a firm path," which means a balanced budget, that you are going to stick to it, "for a balance by 2002 is very sensible."

□ 2045

She did not believe it was sensible. It is not always a good policy to have a balanced budget.

Let me say that that was 1995. Here we are, the year 2000, and lo and behold, not only does Alice Rivlin represent her boss, and they said in 1995 the way things would be, but here we see it in print now, this President's budget that he presented, that he took 2 hours to describe to the American public in the State of the Union Address.

We find out that President Clinton and Vice President Gore have more tax increases. Even when we are in the middle of trying to not only take care of and shore up not only social security and Medicare and a lot of other things, but we have a surplus, and what do they want to do? They want to raise taxes, a \$96 billion tax increase, President Clinton and Vice President Gore, tax increases.

Yet we know that there was another person, another group of people, who were right there saying, we will not raise taxes. We are in a surplus circumstance.

Now what we have to do, because we recognize that we have people who even when we have a surplus they want more and more and more not only spending but tax increases, we have to go tell the story. We need to make it more difficult.

Mr. HAYWORTH. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, as my friend, the gentleman from Texas, was relating not only the recent history but also the facts and figures amidst the flowery rhetoric that is so often part of what transpires in Washington, I could not help but note the

successes that we have had as a commonsense conservative majority, and point out, Mr. Speaker, to the American people that it is very interesting the way Washington has worked heretofore.

We have had some success here, and indeed, we have rolled back taxes, as we were able to enact in the 105th Congress the \$500 per child tax credit; as we were able to work to make sure that there was a higher level of tax fairness; when in fact just this past week we were able to procure at long last the signature of the President of the United States on legislation to end the unfair penalty confronting senior citizens who chose to work beyond their assigned retirement age; seniors who, if they were making in excess of \$17,000 a year, were taxed to the tune of \$1 out of every \$3 of their social security benefit, lo and behold, Mr. Speaker, that was finally changed.

But I would note for the record that piece of legislation was first introduced well nigh in excess of two decades ago by the current chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER); that our current speaker, when he first arrived here in 1987, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), introduced the self-same legislation.

While we welcome epiphanies, whether they come in election years or at other times, we are so pleased that at long last those who resisted that fundamental act of fairness finally saw the wisdom in letting seniors hang onto more of their own hard-earned money. Because I think, Mr. Speaker, that truly defines compassion.

The reason I mention it is because it took so long. The anachronistic policies of the mid 1930s that accompanied what at that point was a labor shortage, it took all the way to the dawn of a new century, 70 years, to make that change, the modest but important tax relief we offered in 1997, which came a decade and a half after the tax relief offered in the Reagan years.

So it is extremely difficult here to get this institution, to get those denizens of Washington and those folks in the bureaucracy, focused on actually letting people hang onto more of their own money. We have made some progress, as I have just documented.

One of the reasons is institutionally it has been so easy to raise taxes: A simple majority vote; a chief executive who is of a mind to do that because of previous Congresses and free-spending ways.

Again, this is not a partisan argument. Our friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), was talking about the days of former Speaker Rayburn and the balanced budgets that were formulated with a Republican president, Dwight Eisenhower, and a previous majority in Congress of the other party. But following that time, whether the days of Speaker Martin or the days of Speaker Rayburn, that was then and what followed later was a complete role reversal.

Always, always, always, Mr. Speaker, the notion was, we just need to raise taxes a little bit more. Mr. Speaker, I ask Members to think of what that says to the family in Payson, Arizona, in my district where the husband and wife are doing all they can to establish a fledgling printing business. They are working hard to make that business work, they are creating jobs in their small communities, they are providing a service, and more importantly, they are providing for their children.

I think, Mr. Speaker, one of the key problems we have faced as a people is as follows. For years folks came to this Chamber and asked or told the American people, you have to sacrifice so Washington can supposedly do more. That premise, we understand, in the fullness of time is exactly turned around: Washington bureaucrats should sacrifice, Mr. Speaker, so that American families can have more.

This tax limitation amendment is the right thing to do because it changes constitutionally and institutionally the bias toward always picking the pockets of hard-working Americans. It raises the standard even as we, in a signal both to Wall Street and to Main Street, in a new commonsense conservative Congress have at long last instituted policies of fiscal sanity.

The risky scheme, Mr. Speaker, is to always dip into the pockets of hard-working citizens. The real test of trust and responsibility is to make government more responsive, to make governmental decisions more rational, to reduce the debt and empower everyday hard-working Americans to keep more of what they earn and send less here.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the gentleman from Arizona. Wonderful points. We believe, I believe, that the thing that Congress should focus on is to make sure that we are not putting more debt not only on people who work today, but also for our children and our grandchildren.

This chart so accurately describes this, really, and it goes back to 1941. But as we see, the numbers are small until we head to about 1976. The numbers are astronomical. They go up to \$350 billion in debts. This is what happened when Republicans and Independents and people who are from other parties, including Ross Perot, began talking about how America's greatest days are not behind her, America's greatest days are ahead; but that it would require responsibility, it would require, as the gentleman from Arizona said, sanity, the ability to balance and to comprehend what was happening to America.

So what happened is that a different vision was given. That was, we should not spend more than what we make. We should take the power that comes with the money to Washington, D.C. and put it back home. That is exactly what happened.

We now see where there has been a debt reduction directly as a result of what we have now accomplished. This

did not happen overnight. It was based on a set of principles which we believe, as Republicans, are critical to the country. They include that we are going to protect 100 percent of social security. We have now done that.

Lo and behold, 30 years after spending not just some of social security but all of the surplus from social security, Republicans said that not only will we not do that, but we are going to make sure that we lock it away into a lockbox.

Strengthen Medicare with prescription drug coverage, that is what this marvelous House will be debating in a few short weeks. Forty billion dollars has been set aside, that is the Republican plan, \$40 billion to make sure that citizens, not just like the people in the Fifth District of Texas, but like people that the gentleman has in Arizona, who live better lives today because of technology, because of investment that has been made by the private sector.

Yes, we have great doctors, but we have great drugs. Here is one thing we know. We understand and know that for every \$1 that is spent on drugs, prescription drugs, we save \$4 in hospital stay. It makes sense. It is the right thing to do.

We made sure that we are going to retire the debt by 2013; not add to it, not just let it stay out there, but we are going to pay it off a little at a time. It did not happen overnight, it took 40 years of Democrat-controlled Congresses to do that. We will get it done by 2013.

We are going to support and strengthen education, technology, research. We are going to make sure that education and science work together. That is why we are trying to double, and sticking to it, a commitment that was made by former Speaker Newt Gingrich that we would send double funding to NIH, the National Institutes of Health. Because we understood, and we still get it today, that if we invest in research and development, if we do the things by letting scientists and others who can make breakthroughs in not only prescription drugs and techniques, that what we can do is we can save lives and make life better.

We will promote fairness for families, farmers, and seniors. Half of the Fifth District of Texas is rural. Half of the Fifth District of Texas went through, in an agricultural setting, a terrible drought the last few years. We need to pay attention to rural America.

Restoring America's defenses. We have been able to accomplish so much because we were able to put on a sheet of paper the things that are important to America and Americans. People in the Fifth District of Texas, like the people in the Sixth District of Arizona, represent the topsoil of America. It is not the dirt, it is the people. They are the topsoil of our country. We are paying attention to people. We are going to get it right, and we are going to balance out the things that are important in America.

I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague the gentleman from Texas, for yielding to me.

In listening to the people of Arizona, as the gentleman so eloquently stated some of the goals there, we look at prescription coverage for seniors as we try to strengthen Medicare.

I think it is important to make this distinction. Almost two-thirds of the senior community currently enjoys some prescription drug benefit through current insurance plans. But I think of the lady in Apache Junction, Arizona, who works not by choice but out of necessity at a fast food restaurant because she and her husband are not in a financial circumstance that enables them to have a complete insurance plan.

So what we say is for the truly needy seniors, for those one-third of the senior community that have somehow eluded this opportunity at prescription drug benefits, we want to provide them. But we are being very careful, because as another one of my constituents reminded me, she came up one day, Mr. Speaker, and said, J.D., I don't want to end up seeing my Medicare premiums rise so that I have the honor and opportunity to pay the prescription bills of Ross Perot.

□ 2100

I think that is a valid point. We want reasonable, rational reforms that strengthen Medicare and help those truly needy seniors.

Mr. SESSIONS. It sounds like that part of this debate is now into the two plans, essentially the two plans that are floating in Washington; one which would tax all seniors, and as I described in the Fifth District of Texas where all the seniors in the room would please take \$20 out of their pocket, place them on the table, and then those people who placed the money, everybody placed the money, then if they did not need it, based upon their poverty level, if they did not qualify for prescription drug coverage, just please get up and walk outside the room. It is about 75 to 80 percent of senior citizens who would be paying \$20 more out of their own pocket.

I would say to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), here is a \$20; \$20 out of their own pocket every month for about 15 percent of the seniors who could not afford it. Why did we not come up with a plan, oh but there is one, the Republican plan, that will say, senior citizens, all senior citizens, put that money back in their pocket, put it back in their pocket; we have a budget surplus in Washington, D.C. We will take care of those people who need it most. We are not going to tax every senior citizen to help 15 percent of them. Sounds like a better idea to me.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), for again very eloquently

and practically pointing out the difference.

There is something else we should note. Even as we turn to the subjects of Medicare and Social Security, the institutional bias that always asks for tax increases, even as we celebrate in bipartisan fashion the fact that the President signed into law the end of the earnings penalty on seniors who chose to work past retirement age and we restored fairness that had been 70 years in the making, or should I say 70 years in the waiting, it is worth noting, the gentleman spoke about the largest tax increase in American history, it disproportionately affected seniors. It jacked up Social Security taxes. It hit Americans all across the board but it nailed seniors, and while we have taken this first step to restore tax fairness, it was born of another important step that was taken as the President of the United States was kind enough to come down a couple of years ago and stand at the podium behind my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), and he said something that was a wonderful rhetorical flourish, but once we took away the bells and the whistles and the theatrics it was a shot across the bow and a warning to all American seniors, and my colleague from Texas I think he has more on that topic right here as we look at this chart.

Mr. SESSIONS. We do, and I thank the gentleman for mentioning that. The President of the United States, just a few short years ago, said Social Security first, Social Security first.

It took the Republican Party and a plan to get that done. We ended the raid of Social Security because it was the right thing to do. 1998 was the last year that the Congress of the United States will allow the surplus in Social Security, the hard-earned money that people have put into it, to then be spent for general budgetary items.

There, as always, are at least two different views. Let us role back the tape. Let us remember just a year ago, when we talked about the year 2000, the Republican plan said 100 percent of Social Security, meaning that if people gave that money for Social Security, it should only be used for Social Security. It should not be used for something else. That is what savings plans are about. That is what the government took it for. The government took the money, it is required by law, and we believe that 100 percent of it, that is the way it should go.

There was another side. There is another story. The other story in Washington, D.C. is, the President has his own plan. We understand that. We are willing to debate it, even on the floor. Of all of the surplus, the President said 62 percent of the surplus goes to Social Security, but 38 percent of Social Security goes to new government spending. How much money are we talking about? We are talking about, in fact, a lot of money. The surplus in the year 2000, \$137 billion. That is \$137 billion that instead of going to general rev-

enue will be put directly into Social Security.

Now, one would say that is exactly what the gentleman from Arizona said, and I say, yes, that is close, except that the Democrats are still holding back our lockbox. They will not allow us to designate it. So the best we can say is, no money should be spent. The President still has \$85 billion of the \$137 billion.

In fact, the gentleman from Arizona and I are getting very good at this. If I can find my penny, every single penny that is given by an American for Social Security should only be used for Social Security, and that is what this is all about.

Mr. HAYWORTH. The gentleman has heard it in his district. One of the first things I heard, when I was honored and entrusted with this responsibility of service in the Congress of the United States, at innumerable townhall meetings across the width and breadth of my district, was a concern that funds were commingled. There was a fancy Washington term for it, of course there always is; the bureaucrats spoke of a unified budget. Well, that is a nice word, but what we really should have called it, Mr. Speaker, was a commingled budget, where Social Security money was not set aside and preserved for Social Security and to the point even now would we have those who lead the executive branch always talk about these plans for spending and trusting government more, it is very interesting that they forget about the basics.

Thank goodness, Mr. Speaker, that a common sense Congress reminds Washington's bureaucrats and big spenders, no, we need to restore that firewall. It has been our intent since day one and now we have done it in our budgetary plans, not a single dime, not a single cent of Social Security money spent on any other program; all of it, all of it, going to save and strengthen Social Security. That is the difference, is it not, Mr. Speaker? Because as I mentioned at the outset, we are entrusted with this constitutional responsibility. We take an oath of office and we are given a responsibility, a role, a mandate, an oath, not to deceive the American people, either by pandering to foreign governments to solicit campaign donations in what is a cynical, sad and macabre twist on the notion of having political opponents, and somehow confusing political opponents with enemies to the point where in a free society those in the highest offices in our land, who took, presumably the same oaths of office, entrusted with those responsibilities, would live up to them. In the same sort of rhetoric here on this House floor, in a speech two years ago, it was said, let us set aside 62 percent of the Social Security surplus for Social Security. What was left unsaid, when we do the math as my colleague pointed out, 38 percent of that money is set aside for Social Security to go to new government programs.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said of those who head up the other branch of gov-

ernment by columnists from their own State, do not listen so much to what they say; watch what they do.

We best secure America's future by restoring trust, by resurrecting that firewall, by putting Social Security funds in a lockbox to be used exclusively for Social Security, by making it more difficult to raise taxes. Rather than having Washington succumb always to the siren song of picking the pockets of hard working Americans, we reaffirm the truth that the money, when all is said and done, does not belong to the Federal Government or the Washington bureaucrats. It belongs to hard working Americans and they ought to hang on to more of it and send less of it here.

Mr. SESSIONS. The gentleman has led directly to the point that I believe is the essence of the tax limitation amendment, and that is in the era of surpluses, when the government has effectively, as a result of the Republican Congress, made sure that Social Security and Medicare will not be spent, it was given for a reason. It will be used for that reason. Then lo and behold, we have extra money called a surplus, that came about, the very essence of it came about because we cut taxes. We encouraged America not only to go work harder but to work smarter. We encouraged America to invest in America.

Just a few short years ago, we were worried about all the jobs in America going offshore. Ten years ago we were told America's greatest days are behind her. The best education is somewhere else; the best of technology is somewhere else; the best of future is somewhere else. We today and every Member of this body tries to take credit for it and that is okay, of the things that have happened in the last 5 years. It is the right thing to do for us to understand that we had to balance the budget; we had to take Social Security off budget; we had to make sure that we created a surplus.

Now tonight we are talking about making it more difficult to raise taxes, a simple thing. We want to make it more difficult for Washington to take your money. H.J. Res. 94, the tax limitation amendment, will be voted on on Wednesday, will be voted on because it is the right thing for America today. What is going to happen with more of the money, the money that is today a surplus? Here is what we are going to do: We are going to make sure that it goes back to the people who gave it to Washington. I am not sure they gave it because they wanted to necessarily, but they gave it and they expect us to do wise things with it.

Responsibility, here is what we are doing: We want to end the marriage penalty. Just a few short months ago in January, President Clinton stood right behind me and he stated he would be more doing away with the marriage penalty.

We are now talking about repealing the senior earnings limit. The President of the United States signed that

last Friday in the White House garden. It was beautiful. We are now going to have senior citizens who are no longer penalized with an unfair tax. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) worked on that for 30 years.

We want to reduce, eliminate the death taxes. We want to expand education savings accounts. Lo and behold, in my home I have a 6-year-old Down's Syndrome little boy who could use the money. We could also, by spending it efficiently on all sorts of not only educational tools for our baby, our son, our child, but also to help nurture him to where he will be able to be self sufficient.

We have a 10-year-old at home, a 10-year-old who every single day reads every book and takes everything that we can get our hands on, gobbles it in, understands that his future is the same as our country's future. We are going to spend more money on education. My son understands and so does my wife.

We are going to increase health care deductibility. We want every single working American, and especially those today who are not allowed to, by law, to be able to deduct their health care. We want every single person to have health care. Every single person deserves a right to have their own doctor, not just show up at some clinic, not just to have a doctor available but their doctor who they know and understand.

We want to provide tax breaks for communities that do not have as much money as others, and we want to strengthen private pension plans to where people have an opportunity to save for their future.

What we are talking about is the tax limitation amendment that will be the crowning jewel on responsibility, it is the crown jewel of responsibility, to make it more difficult for the Members of Congress to vote for tax increases. We have enough money. We should do the right thing and yet we recognize, I recognize, that in this town we have not flipped everybody.

□ 2115

The real spenders are still out there, people who will take money. This is why we have to have a tax limitation amendment, a two-thirds majority.

Oh, the debate will happen here on the floor, trust me, the debate where people will stand up and talk about we have got to spend more and more and more and more and raise taxes more and more.

I would say that discipline and responsibility is what will make the difference, and the responsibility comes down to what my party stands for. My party deeply believes that, if we want to have America's greatest days ahead of her, then we will empower people back home, men and women, children, small businesses, large businesses, people to invest in America because they know they can do so because the risk is not there to say, when one becomes successful, the government in Wash-

ington, D.C. wants their share, too. I think that they would understand fair share is okay. But in Washington, if one is successful, that means Washington wants more and more and more and more.

That is why we offer the tax limitation amendment. That is why this is bipartisan. It is bipartisan. It makes sense, because we want to create wealth and opportunity for generations to come. We want to get away from where Washington, D.C. all of a sudden sees where, oh, there is now an Internet out there, we ought to tax that. There is something else out there, we have got to raise taxes on that.

We still have been paying, for 70 years, a telephone tax that was done, ah, to raise money for the war. By the way, that was World War II.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is even more profound than that. In doing our research, we have crafted, again, bipartisan legislation to end this. But, Mr. Speaker, I am sure the American people will note with interest that a luxury tax was imposed on the telephone really before the advent of the 20th Century. It came in the Spanish American War.

So, Mr. Speaker, Teddy Roosevelt led the charge up San Juan Hill, and patrons of this new technology of the telephone, I guess at that time it was fairly called a luxury, we are paying a luxury tax. Telephone users since that time up until the present day at the advent of the Internet is still paying a luxury tax on telephones instituted in the Spanish American War.

We are taking steps to roll that back. Perhaps that is the most graphic example of the institutional bias in Washington, D.C. toward taxes.

Let us not forget that, in fact, what paved the way for the 16th Amendment to the Constitution that allowed for the direct taxation of personal income was a Supreme Court opinion that said direct taxation of personal income would be constitutional provided it was a temporary measure. That leads to what will transpire in our Committee on Ways and Means this week, hearings on changing our tax system, on offering real reform.

But, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) for shouldering the burden of responsibility and leadership and bringing to the floor the tax limitation amendment. Because real reform starts with this institutional change where we say, if raising taxes is so important to us as a people, let us at least raise the standard, make it difficult, make it more difficult, require a two-thirds majority, a supermajority, as we do on questions of constitutional amendments, as we do on questions of impeachment, of constitutional issues.

If we are willing to take these steps, there should be a standard of accountability and a lack of institutional bias that always favors the bureaucrat.

There should be a leveling of responsibility and a higher standard to protect the taxpayer. That is the key, the measure that will be offered by the gentleman from Texas on this floor in the days ahead. It is an important first step.

Mr. Speaker, as I think about Americans who may be within the sound of my voice electronically, who may be there pouring over that Form 1040, maybe succumbing to the EZ Form because the hour grows late or the deadline of April 15, I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that those Americans would take time to write, call, and fax their Members of Congress to let them know where they stand, to let them say to their advocates on Capitol Hill, you should advocate the notion that we should raise the standard and eliminate the institutional bias toward more and more and more taxation and higher and higher spending.

Just one final amendment to the amendment offered, in a friendly rhetorical fashion, to the gentleman from Texas. There is really a better word to use for surplus. Really what we have right now that is widely referred to as a surplus is, in fact, an overcharge of the American people who are now taxed at the highest level in our history parallel only by a period of grave crisis in World War II.

There is no excuse in a time of relative peace, to be assured there are challenges that confront us internationally, and we must provide for the common defense, and we are willing to take those steps to rebuild and restore our national defense, but having said that, there is no excuse for the American people to be taxed at the same level at which they found themselves taxed in World War II.

So with this tremendous overcharge, after setting aside a massive portion for what it was designated for to begin with, strengthening Social Security, strengthening Medicare, we owe it to the people who have placed their trust in us to give that overcharge back.

When one pays for something at a store, if one gives a greater amount of money in that retail exchange, one expects a return, one expects cash back. With this overcharge, we are saying it is time to give that money back to the people to whom it belongs.

That is why I applaud the gentleman from Texas, and that is why I hope Americans, Mr. Speaker, within the sound of my voice will call, write, fax, e-mail, phone their Congressional Representatives and ask them to support this tax limitation amendment.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona, from the 6th District. Tonight we have had my colleagues hear a wonderful debate about the tax limitation amendment from the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), a Democrat from the 4th District of Texas, and the gentleman from the 6th District of Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH). They had the opportunity to talk about, not only their districts,

but their vision of what America is all about, and it should be more difficult to raise taxes.

We heard the story about the senior earnings limit, the earnings limit put on seniors years ago. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, this was the very first bill that he presented upon being a Member of Congress 30 years ago. After years of working on this effort, he finally succeeded in giving the President of the United States, the House, and the Senate, the other body, the opportunity to agree to this bill, what turned out to be unanimous. What 5 years before was impossible, because the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) sat in the chair as the majority party representative to the Committee on Ways and Means, it got signed into law.

The tax limitation amendment, H.J. Res. 94, will be debated on Wednesday. I hope my colleagues will join us to support this.

□

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Reyes (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

□

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of North Carolina) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. EHLERS, for 5 minutes, April 11.

Mr. SWEENEY, for 5 minutes, April 12.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG, for 5 minutes, April 12.

Mr. NORWOOD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes, April 12.

Mr. PEASE, for 5 minutes, April 11.

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today, April 11, 12, and 13.

Mrs. MORELLA, for 5 minutes, April 11.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for 5 minutes, April 11, 12, and 13.

□

#### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 43. Joint resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President of the United States should encourage free and fair elections and respect for democracy in Peru; to the Committee on International Relations.

□

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 11, 2000, at 9:30 a.m., for morning hour debates.

□

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7001. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—National Poultry Improvement Plan and Auxiliary Provisions [APHIS Docket No. 98-096-2] received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7002. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Revision of the Salable Quantity and Allotment Percentage for Class 3 (Native) Spearmint Oil for the 1999-2000 Marketing Year [Docket No. FV00-985-3 IFR] received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7003. A letter from the Administrator, Risk Management Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—General Administrative Regulations; Reinsurance Agreement-Standards for Approval; Regulations for the 1997 and Subsequent Reinsurance Years—received February 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7004. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Tomatoes Grown in Florida; Partial Exemption From the Handling Regulation for Producer Field-Packed Tomatoes [Docket No. FV98-966-2 FIR] received February 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7005. A letter from the Administrator, Risk Management Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Common Crop Insurance Regulations; Forage Production Crop Provisions; and Forage Seeding Crop Provisions—received February 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7006. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Ports Designated for Exportation of Horses; Dayton, OH [APHIS Docket No. 99-102-1] received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7007. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Polyoxyethylated Sorbitol Fatty Acid Esters; Tolerance Exemption [OPP-300971; FRL-6490-8] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received February 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7008. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Ethoxylated Propoxylated C12-C15 Alcohols; Tolerance Exemption [OPP-300973; FRL-6491-3] (RIN:

2070-AB78) received February 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7009. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Dimethyl Silicone Polymer With Silica; Silane, Dichloromethyl-, Reaction Product With Silica; Hexamethyldisilazane, Reaction Product With Silica; Tolerance Exemptions [OPP-300972; FRL-6490-9] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received February 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7010. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, Department of Defense, transmitting notification of the Department's decision to study certain functions performed by military and civilian personnel in the Department of the Navy (DON) for possible performance by private contractors, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2461; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7011. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Selected Acquisition Reports (SARS) for the quarter ending December 31, 1999, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2432; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7012. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Final Flood Elevation Determinations—received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7013. A letter from the Director, Corporate Policy and Research Department, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing Benefits—received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7014. A letter from the General Counsel, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Safety Standard for Multi-Purpose Lighters—received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7015. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Hearings and Appeals, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Criteria and Procedures for DOE Contractor Employee Protection Program (RIN: 1901-AA78) received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7016. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy Management and Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Indirect Food Additives: Adhesives and Components of Coatings and Paper and Paperboard Components [Docket No. 92F-0111] received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7017. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Indirect Food Additives: Adhesives and Components of Coatings [Docket No. 92F-0443] received February 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7018. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Drinking Water

Tribal Set-Aside Grants Guidance to Applicants—received February 4, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7019. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendment to the Finding of Significant Contribution and Rulemaking for Certain States for Purposes of Reducing Regional Transport of Ozone [FRL-6542-9] (RIN: 2060-AH10) received February 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7020. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Missouri: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [FRL-6543-5] received February 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7021. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Louisiana: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions [FRL-6543-3] received February 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7022. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval of the Clean Air Act, Section 112(l), Delegation of Authority to Three Local Air Agencies in Washington; Amendment [FRL-6541-2] received February 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7023. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Killen and Cedar Park, Texas) [MM Docket No. 98-176 RM-9363] received February 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7024. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Stanfield, Oregon) [MM Docket No. 99-44 RM-9469] received February 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7025. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Silverton and Bayfield, Colorado) [MM Docket No. 99-76 RM-9400] received February 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7026. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Walton and Livingston Manor, New York) [MM Docket No. 99-10 RM-9435 RM-9688] received February 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7027. A letter from the Lieutenant General, USA, Director, Defense Security Corporation, transmitting a report containing an analysis and description of services performed by full-time USG employees during Fiscal Year 1999, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2765(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

7028. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee For Purchase From People Who Are Blind Or Severely Disabled, transmitting the Committee's final rule—Procurement List: Addition—received February 29, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7029. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee For Purchase From People Who Are Blind Or Severely Disabled, transmitting the Committee's final rule—Procurement List: Additions—received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7030. A letter from the Director, Office of General Counsel and Legal Policy, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting the Office's final rule—Executive Agency Ethics Training Programs Regulation Amendments (RIN: 3209-AA07) received February 14, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7031. A letter from the Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Threatened Status for Newcomb's Snail From the Hawaiian Islands (RIN: 1018-AE27) received January 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7032. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Catching Pacific Cod for Processing by the Offshore Component in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 991223348-9348-01; I.D. 020700A] received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7033. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29899; Amdt. 420] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7034. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29896; Amdt. No. 1969] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7035. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29895; Amdt. No. 1968] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7036. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29885; Amdt. No. 1967] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7037. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29884; Amdt. No. 1966] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7038. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29864; Amdt. No. 1965] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7039. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29863; Amdt. No. 1964] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7040. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29908; Amdt. No. 1972] received February 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7041. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29906; Amdt. No. 1970] received February 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7042. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney JT8D-200 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 99-NE-32-AD; Amendment 39-11465; AD 99-26-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7043. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A310 and A300-600 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 96-NM-194-AD; Amendment 39-11467; AD 99-26-08] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7044. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 B2 and B4 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-248-AD; Amendment 39-11475; AD 99-26-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7045. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Model A109A and A109A II Helicopters [Docket No. 99-SW-64-AD; Amendment 39-11472; AD 99-26-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7046. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Guidance for Project Eligibility and Design Under the Region IX Tribal Border Infrastructure Program—received February 4, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7047. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Service's final rule—Determination of Issue Price in the Case of Certain Debt Instruments Issued for Property [Rev. Rul.

2000-9] received February 14, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7048. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration and Assistant U.S. Trade Representative for WTO and Multilateral Affairs, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Subsidies Enforcement Annual Report to the Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7049. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Weighted Average Interest Rate Update [Notice 20000-2] received February 29, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7050. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Special Rules Relating to Debt Instruments [Rev. Rul. 2000-12] received February 29, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

□

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COMBEST: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 852. A bill to require the Department of Agriculture to establish an electronic filing and retrieval system to enable the public to file all required paperwork electronically with the Department and to have access to public information on farm programs, quarterly trade, economic, and production reports, and other similar information; with amendments (Rept. 106-565). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ARCHER. Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4163. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for increased fairness to taxpayers; with an amendment (Rept. 106-566). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. H.R. 3439. A bill to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from establishing rules authorizing the operation of new, low power FM radio stations; with amendments (Rept. 106-567). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

□

#### TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

*The following action occurred on April 7, 2000*

H.R. 1742. Referral to the Committee on Commerce extended for a period ending not later than April 11, 2000.

□

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. KUYKENDALL:

H.R. 4220. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to add certain firearms related crimes to the list of crimes giving rise to a presumption of dangerousness for purposes of hearings on the release of defendants before trial; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4221. A bill to amend the Service Contract Act of 1965 to require entities that

enter into certain services contracts with the Federal Government or the District of Columbia to offer the employees that carry out the services before the award of a contract the right to continue employment after the award of the contract; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H.R. 4222. A bill to provide for the establishment of a task force within the Bureau of Justice Statistics to gather information about, study, and report to the Congress regarding, incidents of abandonment of infant children; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JEFFERSON:

H.R. 4223. A bill to reduce temporarily the duty on Fipronil Technical; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETRI:

H.R. 4224. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reform the financing and conduct of campaigns for elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TANCREDO:

H.R. 4225. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Fructooligosaccharides (FOS); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THUNE:

H.R. 4226. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell or exchange all or part of certain administrative sites and other land in the Black Hills National Forest and to use funds derived from the sale or exchange to acquire replacement sites and to acquire or construct administrative improvements in connection with the Black Hills National Forest; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. JACKSON of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 95. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxing the people of the United States progressively; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 96. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding the right of citizens of the United States to health care of equal high quality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 97. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding the right of all citizens of the United States to an education of equal high quality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TERRY:

H. Res. 467. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the tax and user fee increases proposed by the Clinton/Gore administration in their fiscal year 2001 budget should be adopted; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

□

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 274: Mr. BEREUTER and Ms. SANCHEZ.

H.R. 357: Mr. WU.

H.R. 516: Mr. ROHRBACHER.

H.R. 518: Mr. ROHRBACHER.

H.R. 632: Mr. OXLEY.

H.R. 664: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 809: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 860: Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 920: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 960: Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 1020: Mr. BONIOR, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 1071: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 1115: Mrs. FOWLER and Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 1168: Mr. KINGSTON and Mr. MCINTOSH.

H.R. 1128: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. EHRlich, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1285: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1304: Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 1310: Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1322: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MCINTOSH, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. GILMAN, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 1398: Mr. HOSTETTLER.

H.R. 1413: Mr. EDWARDS.

H.R. 1495: Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 1515: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. WEYGAND, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 1560: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1645: Mr. BENTSEN.

H.R. 1806: Ms. RIVERS.

H.R. 1885: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DOGGETT, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 1899: Mr. REYNOLDS.

H.R. 1912: Ms. CARSON and Mr. FALCOMA.

H.R. 1926: Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 2002: Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 2175: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 2321: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 2485: Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 2498: Mr. MCKEON and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.R. 2543: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 2596: Mr. DREIER, Mr. CANNON, Mr. DELAY, Mrs. FOWLER, and Mr. SWEENEY.

H.R. 2640: Mr. OXLEY.

H.R. 2641: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 2722: Ms. CARSON.

H.R. 2736: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. TURNER, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 2790: Mr. HORN and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 2842: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 2883: Mr. GALLEGLEY and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2892: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 2909: Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 2955: Mrs. CLAYTON.

H.R. 2973: Mr. PORTMAN.

H.R. 3113: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 3125: Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. PETERSEN of Minnesota, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 3192: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. GREENWOOD, Ms. CARSON, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 3293: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. HYDE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. MINGE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. WYNN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. BERRY.

H.R. 3301: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HORN, and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 3319: Mr. DICKS and Mr. BERRY.

H.R. 3439: Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 3466: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 3485: Mr. HORN.

H.R. 3573: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. EVERETT, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 3575: Mr. FLETCHER.

H.R. 3580: Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky,

Mr. POMEROY, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. TURNER, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. COOK, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. HAYES, and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 3600: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 3609: Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 3634: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 3698: Mr. COOK, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. LEE, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. HAYES, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. COMBEST, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 3766: Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. WEYGAND, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. SANDLIN.

H.R. 3825: Mr. SAWYER, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 3861: Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. LEE, and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 3915: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. BUYER.

H.R. 3916: Mr. BAKER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 3981: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 3983: Mr. BOEHNER and Mr. GREENWOOD.

H.R. 4022: Mr. MCINTOSH and Mr. HOSTETTLER.

H.R. 4033: Mr. RUSH, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 4036: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 4040: Mr. PETRI and Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 4051: Mr. SKEEN, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. TERRY, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 4053: Mr. LEACH.

H.R. 4059: Mr. BARR of Georgia.

H.R. 4064: Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. COOK, Mr. LEACH, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, and Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 4069: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 4071: Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 4074: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 4091: Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SANDERS, and Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 4118: Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 4149: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 4152: Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 4163: Mr. TANNER, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. TERRY, and Mrs. BIGGERT.

H.R. 4199: Mr. REYNOLDS.

H.R. 4207: Mrs. BONO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WELDON of Florida, and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 4218: Mr. HERGER and Mr. DOOLEY of California.

H.J. Res. 77: Mr. NEY.

H. Con. Res. 108: Mr. BACHUS.

H. Con. Res. 228: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. BACA.

H. Con. Res. 262: Mr. HEFLEY, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. BLILEY, and Ms. PELOSI.

H. Con. Res. 282: Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. COX, Mr. SHOWS, Ms. DANNER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. GOODE, Mr. GOSS, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. KASICH, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. OLVER, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WICKER, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. SWEENEY, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mrs. ROUKEMA.

H. Con. Res. 295: Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, and Ms. SANCHEZ.

H. Res. 442: Mr. STUPAK.