

milk is regulated from 33 to 11. Fine, but it would also perpetuate the loopy Depression-era notion that the price of milk should in some respects be based in part on its distance from Eau Claire, Wisconsin. Under current policy, producers farther away from this supposed heart of the dairy region generally receive higher premiums or differentials.

The administration called for slightly lower differentials for beverage milk in many regions, but in Congress even this minuscule step towards rationality is being swept aside. The Committee on Agriculture has substituted a measure that essentially maintains a status quo. Similar moves are afoot in the Senate. Worse, some dairy supporters are working to reauthorize and expand the Northeast Interstate Dairy Compact, a regional milk cartel, and allow similar grouping for southern States. Missouri's legislature, by the way, has already voted to join the Southern Compact, even though it would result in higher prices for consumers. The Consumer Federation of America reports that the Northeast Dairy Compact raised retail milk prices by an average of 15 cents a gallon over 2 years.

Dairy producers concerned about the long view should be worried. Critics point out that the higher milk differentials endorsed by the House Committee on Agriculture may well lead to lower revenue for many producers. This is because the higher prices will encourage more production, driving down the base milk price and negating the higher differential.

The worst idea in this developing stew is the prospect for dairy-compact proliferation. A compact works like an internal tariff, because the cartel prohibits sales above an agreed-upon floor price. Producers within the region are protected from would-be outside competitors.

Opponents point out that more regional compacts, and the higher prices they support, will breed excessive production, creating dairy surpluses that will be dumped into markets of other regions. This will prompt other States to demand similar protection, promoting the spread of dairy compacts.

Ultimately, as in the 1980s, political pressure will build to liquidate the dairy surplus in a huge multibillion dollar buyout of cheese, milk powder, and even entire herds.

Congress should permit the Northeast Compact to sunset or expire, which will occur if the lawmakers simply do nothing. In fact, doing nothing to the administration's proposal seems to be the best choice in this case, or more properly the least bad. Perhaps some day Washington will debate real price simplification as in ditching dairy socialism and letting prices fluctuate according to the law of supply and demand, closed quote.

Mr. Speaker, the Kansas City Star is right. We should allow Secretary

Glickman's modest reforms to go forward. We should sunset the Dairy Compact. Mr. Speaker, markets are more powerful than armies. They allow the market to set the price of milk in Moscow. Maybe we should try it right here in Washington, D.C.

TWO OF THE MANY PROBLEMS WITH THE PROPOSED TAX CUT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, for this week the high profile, main business of the Republican leadership in Congress is to reach a final version of the \$800 billion tax cut that has been proposed.

Now, the Republican leadership says that their tax cut is for the middle class, but that is clearly not true.

The House-passed version of the bill passed here, passed this branch 2 weeks ago, and in that version the 6 million highest income taxpayers, which represent about 5 percent of all taxpayers in this country, with incomes of over \$125,000 a year, would get 61 percent, more than three-fifths of the total tax reduction, while the other 120 million taxpayers in this country, 95 percent of all the taxpayers, they would get only 39 percent of the total tax reduction that is involved.

Now, I do not think that many people would consider that a middle class tax cut. In fact, it is designed to make the already rich a very great deal richer, while the broad middle class of people in this country, the families that are living on an income of between \$20,000 to, say, \$80,000 a year, are only going to see a tax cut that is worth one or two cups of coffee a day for those families.

But that is only a small part of the story. The rest of the story is what cannot be done if the Republican leadership's tax cut bill were to become law. For that, I would like to just indicate a couple of areas of what cannot be done. Look at and consider the question of the national debt. On this chart, this chart shows what the publicly-held national debt of \$3.7 trillion is made up of.

These pie chart sections, 38 presidents from 1789 until 1977 produced this blue piece. This is President Carter's portion of the debt. This is President Reagan's. This is President Bush's. This is President Clinton's. The interest on that \$3.7 trillion of debt now is about as large, it is about \$230 billion a year, is about as large as the whole debt that was created during the Carter administration, that was built up during the Carter administration.

What happens? The tax cut makes certain that we will not be able to pay off that debt, and we will have to continue paying \$200 billion or more per

year for years into the future. That means higher interest rates for every American family that wants to buy a home, higher interest rates for every business person who wants to create a business that is going to provide more jobs.

So, the debt problem.

Let me take a different issue. If you take a look at the Social Security situation, the tax cut, if it were to become law in its present form, would make it very much more difficult to extend the Social Security system beyond the year 2030. We know the demographics. We know how many people are going to be retiring between now and then. We know how many are going to enter the workforce between now and then, and we know that the reserve funds in the Social Security system will run out in 2030. And we will only be able to operate on the basis of whatever is paid into the Social Security trust fund year by year, which means the benefits for the ever-growing number of senior citizens will have to be reduced or the retirement age for people will have to go up.

At the same time, at the same time, we know that for those people who are businesspeople who are wealthy Americans, the retirement age is going down. People are retiring, if they are wealthy enough, at 50, 55, some even younger than that. Some of them never have worked so they never have to retire.

So the Social Security system is in serious jeopardy of not having any additional revenue to put into the protection and preservation of the Social Security system.

Now, my mother, who is 92 years old, is living now on Social Security that is under \$500 per month. She also has a couple hundred dollars of income from other sources but she certainly could not live on a reduced benefit as would happen if this tax cut were to become law.

So those are two reasons. There are many others but those are two of what the problems are with the tax cut that is being proposed.

WE MUST TAKE ACTION TO ENSURE THE SAFETY AND SECURITY OF ALL AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, 3 weeks ago I first learned the story of a lieutenant colonel working for the Department of Energy whose job had been threatened. Colonel Ed McCallum was the director of the Office of Safeguards and Security for the Department of Energy. He and his staff were responsible for the policy that governs the protection of the Energy

Department's national security assets. This includes nuclear weapons, nuclear materials, highly classified information, and personnel clearances.

In his position within the Department, Colonel McCallum was responsible for evaluating and working to prevent security challenges with regard to our Nation's most sensitive technology. In his 9 years as director, Colonel McCallum worked under Clinton appointee Secretary Hazel O'Leary and then under current Energy Secretary Bill Richardson. Under both, he worked to highlight security lapses within the Department. Unfortunately, he faced a steep uphill battle getting anyone in the department to listen to his concerns.

Instead, his reports and memos were ultimately carelessly set aside. Even after gaining the attention of the Secretary, little or no action was taken. Time after time, his efforts were stonewalled.

Now Colonel McCallum is speaking out about the Department's efforts to ignore the great breaches of national security at our weapons laboratories. Since coming forward with the truth, Colonel McCallum was placed on administrative leave and his career was threatened. Now with the help of Bill O'Reilly and Fox News, I have been working to draw attention to the subject of China and other nations' efforts to steal American military secrets, as well as the administration's treatment of the men and women who are coming forward with the truth.

Colonel McCallum and members of his staff are working to protect the security of each and every American citizen. Rather than being rewarded for their patriotism, they are being punished by this administration.

After appearing on the O'Reilly Factor last month, my office has received numerous calls and letters from concerned citizens asking that we continue working to address this issue.

Mr. Speaker, the American people care that our national security has been compromised. The American people care about what other sensitive U.S. information China and rogue nations have been able to access. Our potential adversaries may have been able to steal information on our most advanced stealth technology. Our military space research or information on our most advanced communications equipment.

Each of these technologies by themselves pose real risks to the security of the American people. For that reason, I am concerned not only for the safety of our generation but also that of the future generations. My friend and colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), and I have asked the Committee on Armed Services chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE), to hold a hearing allowing members of Colonel

McCallum's staff to testify. The information they can provide will be critical in assessing Congress' effort to halt the leakage of sensitive military secrets.

Mr. Speaker, we must take action to protect those individuals who are willing to come forward with the information that will keep our sensitive national security information protected and secret. We must take actions to ensure the safety and security of all Americans.

EILEEN COLLINS, A TESTAMENT OF THE POSSIBILITIES THAT DREAMS PRESENT TO US

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, as a testament of the possibilities that dreams present to us, I rise this morning to speak on a resolution that I introduced which passed the House yesterday honoring a true American hero.

After two frustrating but necessary delays, STS-93 finally launched early in the morning on July 23, and last Tuesday the Space Shuttle Columbia landed safely at the Kennedy Space Center after the successful completion of its mission. On its 26th voyage to Earth's orbit, Columbia launched the Chandra X-Ray Observatory. This marvel of technology promises to unlock many secrets of the origins of the universe and the formation of galaxies, stars and planets. As promising and as exciting as this latest enterprise of exploration is to scientists and students everywhere, there is still a greater significance to this mission.

The commander of this mission, U.S. Air Force Lieutenant Colonel Eileen Marie Collins, was born in 1956, just one year before the space race began with the Soviet launch of Sputnik 1. She grew up in the tense climate of the Cold War, fully aware that as demonstrated by Sputnik the Soviet Union could launch a missile with enough force to threaten her home. No doubt, she shared the apprehension that would spark the space race and see the United States play catch-up to the apparent dominance of the world's other superpower.

She just turned 12 when Apollo 8 made its 10 historic orbits of the Moon on Christmas day 1968, and I have no doubt she was among the millions who watched Neil Armstrong, Michael Collins, and Buzz Aldrin make their voyage in Apollo 11 in July of 1969.

She dreamed of being a test pilot and an astronaut but it did not come easy for her. Though women were early pioneers of flight, since the 1930s fewer opportunities were open to women. It was not until the mid-1970s that women be-

came eligible for positions as military aviators, the traditional route to the astronaut program.

Collins was working her way through community college during this time and earned a scholarship to Syracuse. She studied mathematics and economics, going on to later earn a Master of Science degree in operations research from Stanford University and a Master of Arts in space systems management from Webster University.

In 1979, the same year Skylab fell out of Earth's orbit, she completed her pilot training for the Air Force. She became a flight instructor, and in 1983 when Sally Ride became the first American woman in space, she was a C-141 commander and instructor. As a test pilot, she eventually logged over 5,000 hours in 30 different aircraft.

She was selected as an astronaut in 1990, became the first woman pilot of the Space Shuttle aboard the Discovery on STS-63 in February of 1995. Going into this most recent mission, she had already logged over 419 hours of time in space.

With her latest mission, however, she embarked on an adventure that marks another moment in history. She became the first woman commander of a mission to space.

As chair of the Subcommittee on Technology, I introduced the legislation that created the Commission on the Advancement of Women and Minorities in Science, Engineering and Technology Development, working to reverse the underrepresentation of these groups in the sciences through better education and encouragement at all levels of learning. Through my work on the Committee on Science, I have had the pleasure of meeting Colonel Collins. I have been impressed by her down-to-earth personality and sense of self in such a historic context.

Commenting on the low number of women astronauts, she said, "If you do not have large numbers of women apply, it will be hard to select large numbers of women."

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 267 seeks to recognize the wider possibilities demonstrated by this flight. This latest mission is a signal to little girls who dream. Space is there for them, too. And the next time humankind endeavors to take another joint leap, it could well be a woman to make it.

NAIVETE OR CRASS PARTISAN, POLITICAL ADVANTAGE THROUGH SCANDALOUS FUND-RAISING?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Maryland spoke eloquently of the dreams of all Americans,