

And, furthermore, I was thinking about this. This bill, if we want to call it that, is asking basically for me to say to my children, I am going to go buy a new car, but, Mr. Banker, when I borrow the money from you for that car, I am only going to pay the interest on it. And when my children become 21, send them the bill for the car. Or I am going to buy a house, but, Mr. Banker, I am only going to pay the interest on it. Send the price of the house, the money that I borrowed to buy the house, send the bill for it to my children when they get to be 21.

We are not against tax cuts. We had in our budget a \$250 billion piece. That is a pretty sizable sum. But let me tell my colleagues how irresponsible I think this is and how far the American people are ahead of us on this. When they have got an \$800 billion tax package that has got something for almost every citizen in this country in it, and they cannot sell it and they cannot override it, they know it is irresponsible. The American people know that it is irresponsible, and that is why I am glad the President did what he did.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANCREDO). Time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) has expired.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS), a member of the committee.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, it is really humorous tonight to listen to this debate. For 40 years the liberal spending Democrats had majority in this House. When I got here, in 1994, we had a \$5 trillion debt. Now, they had control of spending for 40 years. How did we get a \$5 trillion debt?

For 40 years they did not mind spending out of the Social Security Trust Fund for every kind of program they could think of. They did not worry about balancing the budget then. They did not worry about paying down the debt. Now, all of a sudden, they are worried about it. That is very, very funny. Very strange.

Well, our plan, the Republican plan, sets aside \$1.9 trillion, 100 percent of the Social Security Trust Fund surplus money, to protect Social Security. One hundred percent. What are they setting aside? Twenty-seven trillion dollars is going to come into the Federal Government over the next 10 years. What is wrong with allowing the American people to have \$792 billion back of their money?

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, as I understand, all time has expired on the minority side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I say to my friend from New York (Mr. RANGEL), who has asked several times why we do not move to override the veto, that he knows as well as I do the very simple fact is that we do not have enough Democrats to go in with the

Republicans to raise the two-thirds majority necessary to give the American people the relief from the marriage tax penalty, relief from the death tax, and relief from so many of the other taxes that we have.

I think, too, that the Members on the other side are well aware of the fact that we have got locked away, as the gentleman from Kentucky just said, locked away sufficient dollars from the Social Security surplus in order to more than repair Social Security, more than take care of the problems that we are facing in Medicare. Indeed, it would be irresponsible to be spending that money, and that is why we passed the lockbox legislation, and that is why we have this in our budget, that was passed by the House, in order to prevent this type of spending.

But putting all this aside, and Members can say anything on this floor and it goes out like it is the truth, but the facts and the figures are there and they are there for all of us to see. But what I want to see is what is going to happen now next week as the spending bills, the appropriation bills, come to the floor. Are my friends on the other side of the aisle going to vote against them because we do not spend enough? I suggest that they will. Will the President veto them because we do not spend enough? I suggest that he will. And I wonder, when he does that, and as they vote and explain their votes on the other side of the aisle, how they will explain how they are saving this money for Social Security and saving Medicare.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE PHIL ENGLISH, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable Phil English, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 21, 1999.

Hon. J. DENNIS 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 that my office has received a subpoena for documents issued by the United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined to comply with the subpoena.

Sincerely,

PHIL ENGLISH,
Member of Congress.

PERIODIC REPORT ON THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO IRAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 106-131)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and section 505(c) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985, 22 U.S.C. 2349aa-9(c), I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12957 of March 15, 1995.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 23, 1999.

□ 1830

NATIONAL MONEY LAUNDERING STRATEGY FOR 1999—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANCREDO) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Banking and Financial Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by the provisions of section 2(a) of Public Law 105-310 (18 U.S.C. 5341(a)(2)), I transmit herewith the National Money Laundering Strategy for 1999.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 23, 1999.

PRESIDENT CLINTON VETOES TAX RELIEF PACKAGE

(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, today President Clinton vetoed the much-needed tax relief package passed by this Congress. President Clinton has permanently cemented his legacy as a tax raiser and sworn enemy of tax cuts.

By vetoing this legislation, the President is denying the average middle-class family relief from the marriage tax penalty. The President is robbing millions of workers the opportunity to obtain health insurance benefits who cannot afford to do so now. He is making it more difficult for parents to save for their children's education. He is making it more difficult for people to pass on the family farm or the family