

(d) IMPLEMENTATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001.—The amendments made by the following sections of this Act shall apply beginning with fiscal year 2001:

(1) Section 105(b), relating to general requirements applicable to pilot programs.

(2) Section 304, relating to funding for reimbursement and research and development.

SEC. 403. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

The Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.) and section 196 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7333), as in effect on day before the date of the enactment of this Act, shall continue to apply with respect to the 1999 crop year and shall apply with respect to the 2000 crop year, to the extent the application of an amendment made by this Act is delayed under section 402 or by the terms of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

□ 1300

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCHUGH) having assumed the chair, Mr. LATOURETTE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2559) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to strengthen the safety net for agricultural producers by providing greater access to more affordable risk management tools and improved protection from production and income loss, to improve the efficiency and integrity of the Federal crop insurance program, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 308, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2559, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 2559, AGRICULTURAL RISK PROTECTION ACT OF 1999

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 2559, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, citations, and cross references and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House in amending the bill.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without prejudice to the resumption of regular legislative business, 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:

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed with my 5-minute special order at this time.

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

There was no objection.

WE SHOULD NOT SPEND SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUS MONEY ON OTHER GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we have significant challenges before this legislature, possibly more than any of the 7 years that I have served in Congress. That challenge is to hold the line on spending. The question before this body is should we spend the Social Security surplus money for other government programs.

And, Mr. Speaker, everybody should understand that when Congress spends more money, most often they are more likely to be reelected. They take home pork barrel projects, they do more things for more people with taxpayers' money, and they end up on the front page of the paper or end up on television cutting the ribbons; and so part of the problem is that there is a lot of Members of Congress supported by a lot of bureaucrats that work within Federal Government, all of whom

would very much like to spend more money and have a bigger government.

The challenge facing us this year is a budget resolution decision not to spend the Social Security surplus funds coming in. We are now approaching the new fiscal year. Day after tomorrow the new fiscal year starts for the United States Government. In that budget we now anticipate \$148 billion coming in surplus from the FICA tax, from the Social Security tax. We now estimate approximately \$14 billion coming in surplus from the on-budget surplus or, if you will, from the income tax.

In our budget resolution we said we were not going to spend the Social Security surplus. We passed what was called a lockbox bill on the floor that says that we are going to put all of the Social Security surplus into a lockbox and not use it for anything except Social Security.

Now we have got a lot of individuals, including the President, suggesting that we should have more spending; but everybody needs to understand that more spending means that we use the Social Security surplus money. The President suggested that we take 66 percent of the Social Security surplus and set that aside and do not spend it, but that we go ahead and we spend one-third of the Social Security surplus. This side of the aisle, the Republicans, said, no, let us try to do a little better than that, let us put a hundred percent of the Social Security surplus, trust fund surplus, aside and make sure that we do not spend it for other government programs.

I mean it is tough. We have not done this before. It would be history making if we are able to do this. Before the Republicans took the majority in 1995, for the 40 years before that the Democrats had the majority in this chamber for most every one of those years. Any time there was a surplus coming in from Social Security, it was spent for other government programs.

I chair a bipartisan task force of the Committee on the Budget on Social Security. In those hearings we learned that the Social Security Administration may be very well underestimating life span, especially how long an individual is expected to live after they reach the age of 65. Futurist medical experts were guessing that within 25 years anybody that wanted to live to be a hundred years old could make that decision to do so, and they guess that maybe within 35 years anybody that wanted to live to be 120 years old, it was within a realistic realm of possibility that they could live that long, Mr. Speaker.

See the huge consequences this will mean for any pension programs, for any government program, whether it is Social Security or Medicare or whether it is Medicaid with a huge cost, increasing cost, of nursing home care if