

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I feel constrained to respond in light of the fact that our manager is not here. When you lose 17-1, not showing up is probably the best advice. But I want to say to my brother OXLEY, he and I are fraternity brothers and good friends. He is the manager of the Republican team. This was his first year as the manager. I hope it is not a preface of what is to come, because if it is, we on this side of the aisle are in a lot of trouble. But it was a good time. We played at one of the beautiful stadiums in America, in Bowie, Maryland, in my district.

On behalf of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), our manager and all the players on both sides, I want to congratulate all of those who were responsible for raising over \$100,000. That is the purpose of the game, to raise dollars for young people, for organizations in the city and in this community, to enhance the lives of children.

And some very old people feeling much older today than they felt the day before played last night so that much younger people, probably much better athletes, will have opportunities that they might not otherwise have.

I want to congratulate both Manager OXLEY and Manager SABO for their leadership.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would like to announce that one speech on either side concerning the Congressional baseball game will be accommodated outside the limit of five one-minute speeches per side.

TAX RELIEF

(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, in the preamble to the Constitution, the people of the United States declared that one of the purposes of having a Constitution was to promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to our posterity. Mr. Speaker, one of the best ways to promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to our children would be to pass meaningful tax relief, letting people keep more of what they earn means that their standard of living will go up.

It means that people can better save and provide for their families, better save for their children's education and maybe even better save for their own retirement. The Constitution speaks of providing the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity and reducing death taxes means that family farms can stay in the family, and the family business can remain in the hands of the people who built it.

I urge my colleagues to support the tax relief bill when it comes before the House. I think that is in the best interests of our Constitution and our people and their posterity.

ILLEGAL STEEL IMPORTS IS NOT FREE TRADE

(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, just knowing that the President would veto any steel quota bill, in 1 month steel imports from Japan rose 40 percent; from South Korea 50 percent; from Brazil 80 percent; from Indonesia 140 percent; and from Russia, our good buddies in Russia, 550 percent increase, in 1 month. Unbelievable. While the administration is getting tennis elbow over there for patting themselves on the back for killing the steel bill, foreign companies are getting hernias all over America unloading steel on American docks.

Beam me up. If this is free trade, I am a fashion leader.

TAX CUTS

(Mr. HEFLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, Republicans are in a quandary. We face some difficult choices. As the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) works on his tax cut package, Republicans in Congress are engaged in a fierce debate. What taxes should we cut? CBO, or the Congressional Budget Office, projects budget surpluses totaling \$824 billion over the next 10 years. That is real surplus, not counting Social Security surplus.

Some Republicans want to cut taxes on capital gains. That is the best way to keep the economy growing. Other Republicans want to cut or eliminate death taxes as a simple question of fairness. Some Republicans want to eliminate the senior tax. It is unfair to tax seniors who want to continue working at age 65. And some Republicans want to cut the marriage tax penalty, an obvious candidate for elimination because penalizing people because they are married is just plain stupid.

Democrats are arguing about which taxes to raise, but Republicans are considering tax cuts, tax cuts for all Americans.

PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I once again would like to call on the Republican leadership to bring up the Patients' Bill of Rights. I think many know that on Wednesday of this week, the Democrats initiated a discharge petition on the Patients' Bill of Rights, and as of yesterday afternoon, we had over 180 Democratic Members who had signed that petition to bring this HMO reform bill to the floor.

Yesterday also in the Senate, there was major action on the part of the Democrats to try to bring up the Patients' Bill of Rights, and also I should point out that the AMA, the American Medical Association, had a vote the other day which strongly indicated why we need HMO reform. I think it is abundantly clear that the American people, the Democrats and even some of the Republicans other than the Republican leadership are very supportive of HMO reform in a comprehensive way that essentially would be brought about most effectively by the Patients' Bill of Rights.

It is time to bring this up. It is time to stop talking and have some action on this issue which is so critical to the American people. More people contact my office about the problems that they have with managed care and the lack of patient protections than any other issue, and the horror stories continue. We must take action.

REPUBLICANS UNVEIL BEST AGENDA

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I was asked by someone the other day, "What is the Republican agenda?"

Now, of course my first reaction was to think clearly this is someone who has never watched the 1-minute speeches.

But instead I told them about the Republicans' BEST agenda:

B is for best defense, E is for excellence in education, S is for saving Social Security, and T is for tax relief.

Republicans clearly have the BEST agenda.

A stronger military, improved education, a reformed Social Security system that will protect present and future seniors into the 21st century and tax relief for the middle class, investors, job creators and families. That is our agenda.

B for best defense, E for excellence in education, S for saving Social Security, T for tax relief. It is a positive, winning agenda for the Republican Party and for securing our Nation's future.

BUSINESS AS USUAL IN WASHINGTON

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

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Speaker, in Washington, the usual pattern is for the liberals to completely avoid any talk about raising taxes and then lo and behold they end up raising taxes once they get in office. In fact, this is how taxes got to be as high as they are today.

But this year it appears that the liberals are changing their strategy. To

the shock of Washington insiders and even to some Members of the Democrat side, the leader of the Democrat Party in the House and the leader of the Democrat Party in the other body have announced in advance their enthusiasm for tax increases.

You heard that right, tax increases. Now, you have to admire their courage and you have to admire their daring. Middle-class families are not going to be so impressed, but lovers of expanded government, they are going to be ecstatic.

The House minority leader wants to expand Washington's control over our local schools and he wants to fund that with a tax increase on Americans. And the minority leader in the other body agrees. He said last weekend that tax increases are on the table.

I guess the Democrats really are serious when they say they are against business as usual in Washington.

FAIR CARE FOR THE UNINSURED ACT

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, this morning I am introducing the Fair Care for the Uninsured Act. This bill would create a new refundable tax credit for the purchase of private health insurance. The credit would be \$1,000 per adult, \$3,000 per family. No mandates, no bureaucracy. Your choice of plans, your choice of doctors.

Who is this bill for? Mr. Speaker, it is for the 44 million Americans who today lack health insurance. Their ranks are growing by 100,000 people a month. A decade from now, there could be 53 million, or 60 million if the economy softens.

Who are these people without insurance? They are the working poor, low-wage workers, people between jobs, the self-employed, cleaning ladies, African Americans, and Hispanics.

In California, Mr. Speaker, nearly 40 percent of the Hispanics are uninsured. Forty percent. And why is it they cannot afford insurance coverage? Because the tax code punishes you when you buy your own insurance outside the workplace. If your employer cannot afford a plan, you are out of luck. If your job is not full time, you are out of luck. That is not fair, and it is not necessary.

If the high-paid CEO is going to receive a big tax break for health care, then should the cleaning lady not that makes minimum wage?

Mr. Speaker, nowadays Democrats seem more eager to pile new mandates onto health care insurance than to help people who do not have any, but the truth is access to affordable health coverage is the first patient protection.

□ 0915

So let us protect patients by helping those 44 million get good health insurance.

ONCE AGAIN REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP TRYING TO TALK CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM TO DEATH

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, can there be any doubt now that the leadership wants to kill campaign finance reform? If my colleagues will listen closely, they can even hear the leadership trying to talk this issue to death one more time.

The leadership has ordered 2 months of hearings. Last Thursday was our first. What did we learn? Nothing, nothing that we did not learn in 15 hours of floor debate last year on the Shays-Meehan bill, a bill that passed this House by 252 to 179; nothing that we have not learned already in the 12 committee hearings on the issue since the 104th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the time for talk has long since passed. The Americans want and expect action. We can pass the bipartisan Shays-Meehan bill right now. These hearings are a sham designed to delay actions. As our colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP), observed, if we wait until September, the Senate will just run out the clock.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to sign the discharge petition to bring Shays-Meehan to the floor. Otherwise these hearings promise to be the death knell for meaningful campaign finance reform this year.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING SUBMISSION OF AMENDMENTS ON H.R. 10, FINANCIAL SERVICES ACT OF 1999

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, first I am proud to stand next to this trophy for the 17-to-1 victory last night.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform the House of the Committee on Rules' plans in regard to H.R. 10, the Financial Services Act of 1999. Today I inform the House of the Committee on Rules' plans regarding this bill in a "Dear Colleague" letter which I have just sent out.

The Committee on Rules will be meeting the week of June 28 to grant a rule which may restrict the offering of amendments to the Financial Services Act of 1999.

The bill was reported by the Committee on Banking and Financial Services on March 23 of 1999 and by the Committee on Commerce on June 15, 1999.

Any Member contemplating an amendment should submit 55 copies of the amendment and a brief explanation to the Committee on Rules up in H-312 of the Capitol no later than Tuesday, June 29, at 3 p.m.

Amendments should be drafted to the amendment in the nature of the substitute printed in the GPO Committee on Rules print which will be available to Members later today in the Com-

mittee on Rules' office. A version of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is now available on our Committee on Rules Web site. Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to assure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain that their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

FOSTER CARE INDEPENDENCE ACT OF 1999

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules. I call up House Resolution 221 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 221

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1802) to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to provide States with more funding and greater flexibility in carrying out programs designed to help children make the transition from foster care to self-sufficiency, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with section 401(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 80 minutes, with 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. Points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute for failure to comply with section 401(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against the amendments printed in the report are waived. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on