

implement the budget resolution's call for \$778 billion in tax relief over the next 10 years. While I believe today's complicated and cumbersome Tax Code needs to be completely replaced, this will take time as the American people debate alternative tax systems. In the meantime, we can take a major step toward tax simplification by eliminating 10 of the worst taxes in the Tax Code today. We should pull these taxes out by their roots, not just reduce them, trim them or cut them back or decrease them. This will make it more difficult for them ever to grow back again.

That is why I am introducing the Top Ten Terrible Tax Act today—boy, that is quite alliterative—which would completely eliminate 10 of the most egregious taxes on the American people, including estate and gift taxes, the tax on telephone calls, capital gains taxes and the tax increase on Social Security beneficiaries. The American people deserve to keep more of their hard-earned money and the Top Ten Terrible Tax Act would provide much-needed tangible tax relief to every American.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

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

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 358, nays 56, answered "present" 1, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 262]

YEAS—358

Abercrombie	Bereuter	Brown (OH)
Ackerman	Berkley	Bryant
Allen	Berman	Bryan
Andrews	Berry	Burton
Army	Biggett	Buyer
Bachus	Bilirakis	Callahan
Baker	Bishop	Calvert
Baldacci	Blagojevich	Camp
Baldwin	Billey	Campbell
Ballenger	Blumenauer	Canady
Barcia	Boehert	Cannon
Barr	Boehner	Capps
Barrett (NE)	Bonilla	Capuano
Barrett (WI)	Bono	Cardin
Bartlett	Boswell	Castle
Barton	Boucher	Chabot
Bass	Boyd	Chambliss
Bateman	Brady (PA)	Chenoweth
Becerra	Brady (TX)	Clayton
Bentsen	Brown (FL)	Clement

Clyburn	Jackson (IL)	Pelosi	Weldon (FL)	Whitfield	Woolsey
Coble	Jackson-Lee	Peterson (PA)	Weldon (PA)	Wicker	Wu
Coburn	(TX)	Petri	Wexler	Wilson	Wynn
Collins	Jefferson	Phelps	Weygand	Wolf	Young (FL)
Combust	Jenkins	Pickering			
Condit	John	Pitts		NAYS—56	
Cook	Johnson (CT)	Pombo	Aderholt	Hinchee	Pomeroy
Cooksey	Johnson, E.B.	Porter	Baird	Kucinich	Ramstad
Coyne	Johnson, Sam	Portman	Bilbray	LaFalce	Riley
Cramer	Jones (NC)	Price (NC)	Bonior	Lee	Sabo
Crowley	Jones (OH)	Pryce (OH)	Borski	LoBiondo	Schaffer
Cunningham	Kanjorski	Quinn	Clay	Markey	Schakowsky
Danner	Kaptur	Radanovich	Costello	McDermott	Stupak
Davis (FL)	Kasich	Rahall	Crane	McGovern	Sweeney
Davis (IL)	Kelly	Regula	DeFazio	McNulty	Tauscher
Davis (VA)	Kennedy	Reyes	English	Meek (FL)	Taylor (MS)
Deal	Kildee	Reynolds	Filner	Meeks (NY)	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	Kilpatrick	Rivers	Ford	Miller, George	Thompson (MS)
Delahunt	Kind (WI)	Rodriguez	Frank (MA)	Moran (KS)	Udall (CO)
DeLauro	King (NY)	Roemer	Gephardt	Neal	Udall (NM)
DeLay	Kingston	Rogan	Gillmor	Oberstar	Velazquez
DeMint	Kleczka	Rogers	Hall (OH)	Pallone	Visclosky
Deutsch	Klink	Rohrabacher	Hastings (FL)	Pastor	Waters
Diaz-Balart	Knollenberg	Ros-Lehtinen	Hefley	Peterson (MN)	Weller
Dickey	Kolbe	Rothman	Hilliard	Pickett	
Dicks	Kuykendall	Roukema			
Dingell	LaHood	Roybal-Allard		ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1	
Dixon	Lampson	Royce		Carson	
Doggett	Lantos	Rush			
Dooley	Largent	Ryan (WI)		NOT VOTING—19	
Doolittle	Larson	Ryun (KS)	Archer	Ehrlich	Rangel
Doyle	Latham	Salmon	Blunt	Evans	Scott
Dreier	LaTourette	Sanchez	Brown (CA)	Fossella	Tierney
Duncan	Lazio	Sanders	Conyers	Green (TX)	Wise
Dunn	Leach	Sandlin	Cox	Hutchinson	Young (AK)
Edwards	Levin	Sanford	Cubin	Hyde	
Ehlers	Lewis (CA)	Sawyer	Cummings	Nadler	
Emerson	Lewis (GA)	Saxton			
Engel	Lewis (KY)	Scarborough		□ 1106	
Eshoo	Linder	Sensenbrenner			
Etheridge	Lipinski	Serrano		So the Journal was approved.	
Everett	Lofgren	Sessions		The result of the vote was announced	
Ewing	Lowe	Shadegg		as above recorded.	
Farr	Lucas (KY)	Shaw			
Fattah	Lucas (OK)	Shays			
Fletcher	Luther	Sherman			
Foley	Maloney (CT)	Sherwood		WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER	
Forbes	Maloney (NY)	Shimkus		AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT	
Fowler	Manzullo	Shows		ON H.R. 775, YEAR 2000 READI-	
Franks (NJ)	Martinez	Shuster		NESS AND RESPONSIBILITY ACT	
Frelinghuysen	Mascara	Simpson		Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direc-	
Frost	Matsui	Sisisky		tion of the Committee on Rules, I call	
Gallegly	McCarthy (MO)	Skeen		up House Resolution 234 and ask for its	
Ganske	McCarthy (NY)	Skelton		immediate consideration.	
Gejdenson	McCollum	Slaughter		The Clerk read the resolution, as fol-	
Gekas	McCreery	Smith (MI)		lows:	
Gibbons	McHugh	Smith (NJ)			
Gilchrest	McInnis	Smith (TX)			
Gilman	McIntosh	Smith (WA)			
Gonzalez	McIntyre	Snyder			
Goode	McKeon	Souder			
Goodlatte	McKinney	Spence			
Goodling	Meehan	Spratt			
Gordon	Menendez	Stabenow			
Goss	Metcalfe	Stark			
Graham	Mica	Stearns			
Granger	Millender-	Stenholm			
Green (WI)	McDonald	Strickland			
Greenwood	Miller (FL)	Stump			
Gutierrez	Miller, Gary	Sununu			
Gutknecht	Minge	Talent			
Hall (TX)	Mink	Tancredo			
Hansen	Moakley	Tanner			
Hastings (WA)	Mollohan	Tauzin			
Hayes	Moore	Taylor (NC)			
Hayworth	Moran (VA)	Terry			
Herger	Morella	Thomas			
Hill (IN)	Murtha	Thornberry			
Hill (MT)	Myrick	Thune			
Hilleary	Napolitano	Thurman			
Hinojosa	Nethercutt	Tiahrt			
Hobson	Ney	Toomey			
Hoeffel	Northup	Towns			
Hoekstra	Norwood	Trafficant			
Holden	Nussle	Turner			
Holt	Obey	Upton			
Hooley	Oliver	Vento			
Horn	Ortiz	Vitter			
Hostettler	Ose	Walden			
Houghton	Owens	Walsh			
Hoyer	Oxley	Wamp			
Hulshof	Packard	Watkins			
Hunter	Pascrell	Watt (NC)			
Inslie	Paul	Watts (OK)			
Isakson	Payne	Waxman			
Istook	Pease	Weiner			

Act. The rule waives points of order against the conference report and its consideration. The rule further provides that the conference report be considered as read. This rule is a fair rule which will enable the House to expeditiously consider this important and very timely matter.

Mr. Speaker, we all know the year 2000 is right around the corner, and most Americans have heard that some computers may, I underscore may, have a problem dealing with this historic date change. Now, I am not an alarmist, and I hope that we will not suffer major problems, but that does not mean that we can sit back and ignore this very important issue.

The fact is we live in the computer age. We have a digital economy. Therefore, we have a responsibility to do what we can to help people solve Y2K problems before anything goes wrong. That is what we are doing here today by passing this bipartisan conference report on H.R. 775, the Year 2000 Readiness and Responsibility Act.

Mr. Speaker, I come to this issue with the belief that the American private sector is clearly the most energetic, creative, and powerful force in the world. In particular, our high technology, computer and software companies are the best and the brightest. If anyone is up to tackling this technology challenge, they are. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that they are on our team.

But make no mistake about it, there are some hurdles standing in the way of the kind of teamwork and cooperation needed to solve Y2K problems. A broad coalition of private sector companies believe that uncertainty regarding unbridled Y2K litigation is the biggest hurdle for them of all. This view is not limited just to the high-tech and computer companies. It cuts across the business community large and small, including retail, manufacturing, and services alike.

Fixing the Y2K computer bug should not be a partisan issue. That is why over a year ago I began to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and with a broad private sector coalition, to enact a targeted Y2K litigation reform bill. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say that we are now nearing the finishing line.

In particular, I want to applaud the work of my colleagues, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY), the gentleman from California (Mr. COX), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CRAMER) for joining in this bipartisan introduction of H.R. 775.

The conference agreement is clearly a product of compromise, and that is not a criticism of it. It says a lot about the leadership and skill of our colleagues, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), and the gentleman

from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), and the gentleman from Detroit, Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

I will say that I greatly appreciated when the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) was able to sit upstairs in the Committee on Rules with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) in support of this conference agreement.

When I joined my friend from Fairfax, Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) in introducing H.R. 775 on February 23, we talked about the importance of enacting meaningful bipartisan Y2K litigation reform as quickly as possible this year so that we would lift the shadow of frivolous litigation in time to do some good. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what we are doing today.

So I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support this bipartisan conference report. It is a credit to this institution and to the bipartisan teamwork that is so often critical to enacting meaningful legislation. So I urge support of both the rule and the conference report.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), my dear friend, the chairman of the Committee on Rules for yielding me the customary half hour.

Mr. Speaker, when the House version of this bill came to the floor a few weeks ago, it was a massive tort reform package masquerading as a way to exterminate the millennium bug. The version of that bill was dangerous and probably would have made matters even worse. Fortunately, this bill has changed significantly from the original version. Although I still have some concerns over the measure, it is still a vast improvement over the last version.

Mr. Speaker, in exactly 6 months, all of us will find out whether the predictions of doom and gloom surrounding the event of the year 2000 are all they are cracked up to be. We will see whether or not medical care, food safety, and environmental safety are compromised in any way because, right now, high-tech companies from Boston to Silicon Valley are working very hard to correct their programs in order to ward off potential disasters. I certainly hope that they succeed.

But in case they do not, Mr. Speaker, they should be held responsible for problems that might arise within reason because even though we need to weed out frivolous claims and encourage alternatives to lawsuits, we still need to preserve the people's judicial recourse.

What I would prefer, Mr. Speaker, is for companies to work out these prob-

lems before anything horrible happens. I hope this bill will help get us there, and I hope Congress will keep working with the high-tech firms to help them fix the problem now so that we can minimize the amount of pain and suffering felt in the days following January 1, 2000.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I have no speakers at this time, and I would urge that we move ahead with the expeditious consideration of this rule. I hope that my friend on the minority could help us move along.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

□ 1115

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to support the rule on this conference report and look forward to voting for the conference report itself. I think that this is a good example of what we can accomplish when we extend our hands across the aisle and work in a bi-partisan way to come up with solutions that are practical and effective.

As I mentioned about a week ago today, there are probably a dozen different ways we could draft a bill that would address the Y2K issues. The conference report is one of them. There is no one way it is perfect, but certainly it is workable and one approach that I think will gain broad support in this House on both sides of the aisle.

I wanted to say something else today about bi-partisanship. I want to note that yesterday, once again, as has happened for years now, the research and development tax credit expired. This is a terrible situation that we have allowed to occur once again. High-tech companies in Silicon Valley become frustrated when the research and development tax credit expires each year. And, as we know, if the research and development tax credit is not lengthy or permanent, it is very difficult to get the maximum value out of that research and development tax credit.

That's why I and 157 other Members of this House, support H.R. 835, a bill to make the research and development tax credit permanent. We have not yet acted on this bill. I would therefore ask, in the spirit of bi-partisanship evidenced by this Y2K bill, that we bring the R&D permanent tax credit to this floor for a vote no later than the week of July 12. I know that once we get the R&D tax credit to the floor, we will have an overwhelming vote in support of that permanent extension. I look forward to doing that.

