

with him as a citizen of our State of Nebraska.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great Nebraskan, a respected colleague, and a tremendous friend. Congressman BILL BARRETT is not only a consummate gentleman and a devoted public servant, but he is also able to balance his weighty duties in Congress with his even weightier duties as a father of four, a proud grandfather, and a husband to his remarkable wife, Elsie. Congressman BARRETT has my admiration and respect for a life of public service, and the admiration, respect, and thanks of the entire state of Nebraska. Upon his retirement, he will be missed by an entire state that has looked to him for leadership and guidance in his 30 years of public service.

Congressman BARRETT officially began a life in politics as a member of the Nebraska State Republican Party. He served as Chairman from 1973 to 1975. In 1979 he was elected to Nebraska's State Legislature where he ascended to become Speaker of the Unicameral for his last four years there, from 1987 to 1991. Congressman BARRETT was elected to this body of Congress in 1990. He has spent his entire life devoted to his districts, his state, and his country.

Congressman BARRETT's most notable accomplishment in Congress came in 1996, when his leadership on the Agriculture Committee greatly contributed to passage of the Freedom to Farm Act. The Act's sweeping reforms brought much-needed change to antiquated farm-subsidy programs by replacing them with market-based policies that allow our producers to better compete in a global agricultural economy. He also spearheaded efforts to maintain alcohol fuels tax credits, and in 1998, succeeded in extending a program vital to Nebraska's corn growers and a nation in need of renewable energy resources. Nebraska's farmers, and America's farmers, owe Congressman BARRETT a debt of gratitude.

Before I ran for Congress, I met with Congressman BARRETT on only a half-dozen occasions. He always strikes me as a person who epitomizes Congress. He is a distinguished gentleman who is always well-informed and insightful. It was only after I was elected to this body in 1998 and spent a great deal of time with Congressman BARRETT that my appreciation and respect for him as a person, a father, a grandfather, and a friend blossomed. Plenty of my colleagues are willing to offer advice, but few offer it as genuinely. Congressman BARRETT never pushed his advice on me; he was always available when I sought his sage advice on policy and procedure. Without exception it was sound and rooted in his love for our State. There is no doubt his counsel made me a better representative for Nebraska.

As wonderful a public servant he is, however, Congressman BARRETT is even more remarkable a man for his devout faith, spirituality, and his unbending love of family. When he told me he was days away from announcing his retirement, water welled in his eyes as he looked at my children, Nolan, age 5, and Ryan, age 2, and said, "My grandkids are about the same age and I want to go home and spend time with them." I wish only the best for Congressman BARRETT's family as they gain as a grandfather what we in Con-

gress lose as a colleague. I am fortunate to always have in him a true friend.

Bill, you have the Terry family's and the State of Nebraska's humble thanks and eternal gratitude. We wish that in your retirement, your only job as a grandfather, you find the same fulfillment and richness you found in your years of service to Nebraska and to our great country. God bless you.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

A GENERATION AT RISK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As no Member is present to take the time reserved to the minority leader, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) for 60 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, happy Halloween. This is probably as close as I am going to get to my grandchildren tonight, and they are sort of demonstrating their Halloween outfits. My daughter, Elizabeth, and her husband, Fred, are the mom and dad to Salena and James, and then everybody else comes from Brad and Diane, and Brad and Diane live with me on the farm. Brad is an attorney in Ann Arbor, but a farm guy at heart, and these guys are all 4-Hers. Just to prove to my wife that I can do this, this is Henry and George and Emily and Clair and Francis and Nick, and Alexander is missing from this picture.

I start with this picture because, Mr. Speaker, I am going to make some comments tonight about Social Security. If there is a generation at risk, if we continue to fail to make the changes necessary to keep Social Security and Medicare solvent, this is the generation at risk.

The next chart I am going to show is why they are at risk, because it represents what we have done on tax increases on Social Security in the past. In 1940, the rate was 2 percent, 1 percent for the employee and 1 percent for the employer. The base was \$3,000, so the total tax per year for employee and employer was \$60.

□ 2300

By 1960, it got up to 6 percent of the first \$4,800 for the total tax, employer and employee, \$144 each, \$288 combined. By 1980, we again increased taxes, and we were doing this as the number of workers per retiree kept going down.

In 1940, we had 38 workers paying in their Social Security tax, 38 of them, to cover the benefits of one retiree.

Today, as our tax rate has gone to 12.4 percent of the first \$76,000 for a total of \$9,448, we have three workers paying in that large tax to cover the benefits of every one retiree, and the guess is that within 20 years to 25 years, we will be down to two workers.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about my grandkids and everybody's grandkids, in terms of the kind of tax they are going to be asked to pay if this country continues to give them the burden of a greater debt, a greater mortgage.

I am a farmer from Michigan; and on the farm, we always had a goal of trying to pay down the mortgage so that our kids had a little better chance of having a good life, of having some income, as compared to their parents and their grandparents. This Chamber, this body, the Senate and the President has started borrowing money, because somehow we feel that we are so important in this generation that we can borrow more and more money.

The debt of this country is now \$5.6 trillion that we are justified in borrowing this additional money to satisfy what we consider very important needs of this existing generation, if you will; and we leave our kids with that larger mortgage, that larger debt. I think that is bad policy, what we have started doing of not using the Social Security surplus money coming in.

After the 1983 taxes that drove this up to 12.4 percent and indexed the base rate, which is now \$76,000 going with inflation, for a short period of time, there is more money coming in than is used for benefits; and what has been happening for the last 40 years is Congress has been spending that extra money on other government programs. So the money sort of disappears.

We started 3 years ago, it was a bill I originally introduced, that said we have to have a rescission. We cannot spend the Social Security surplus. With the bill of the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) last year, we passed what was called a lockbox. And the lockbox simply said we are not going to use any of the Social Security surplus for any government programs, and it is going to be used for Social Security or to pay down the debt held by the public. That is what we did last year.

It got popular support, so the President went along with it. This year we came up with another policy tool and said, look, the American people will support us if we say that we are going to take 90 percent of the surplus. Look, times are good now. There is extra money rolling in. And the danger is, of course, that this Chamber decides to spend it on government programs, rather than paying down the debt.

We decided in our Republican Caucus about 4 weeks ago that we were going to draw the line in the sand on spending and say at least 90 percent of that