

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall votes Nos. 12 and 13 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been here I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote No. 12 and "yea" on rollcall vote No. 13.

## JOINT SESSION OF THE CONGRESS—STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 28) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The Clerk will report the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

## H. CON. RES. 28

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, February 27, 2001, at 9 p.m., for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.*

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES AND COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 37) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

## H. RES. 37

*Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:*

Committee on Financial Services: Mr. Sanders of Vermont;

Committee on Government Reform: Mr. Sanders of Vermont.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## MAKING IN ORDER ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2001 A MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time on the legislative day of Wednesday, February 14, 2001, for the Speaker to entertain a motion that the House suspend the rules relating to H.R. 524.

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

There was no objection.

## MAKING IN ORDER ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2001 CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 559, JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time on the legislative day of Wednesday, February 14, 2001, without intervention of any point of order, to consider in the House H.R. 559; that the bill be considered as read for amendment; and that the previous question be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except for 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and one motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

## SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

## INTRODUCTION OF FEDERAL JUDICIAL FAIRNESS ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Federal Judicial Fairness Act of 2001.

This morning, the American Bar Association and the Federal Bar Association released a report detailing a fundamental problem that has been escalating over the past decade, the erosion of fair and adequate compensation for the Federal judiciary.

These two well-respected groups found that the current salaries of Federal judges have reached such a level of inadequacy and quality that the independence of the third branch of our Federal Government is threatened. I agree with these findings.

Since 1993, Congress has granted Federal judges only three of a possible nine cost-of-living adjustments, leaving our judges with a 13.4 percent decline in purchasing power. Not coincidentally, 54 Federal District Court and Circuit Court judges have left the bench in the 1990s, compared to only three during the entire 1960s.

Yes, the salaries of Federal judges are higher than the average salary in many occupations. But, yes, the salaries that our Federal judges could earn in the private sector could be exponen-

tially higher than what they earn as judges.

No individual agrees to serve in the Federal judiciary because of the pay. Individuals seek and accept nominations to the bench because they want to serve their country. But this does not mean that they should forego fair compensation for their critical work. It should be Congress' goal to ensure that the judges can afford to commit to public service and make certain that the judiciary is not open only to those with the financial means to do so.

Absent a change in the way we compensate these judges, I fear that the superior quality of our Federal judicial system may deteriorate over time.

This is why I am introducing the Federal Judiciary Fairness Act. The bill restores the six cost-of-living adjustments that Congress failed to grant the Federal judiciary in the 1990s, amounting to an immediate 9.6 percent salary increase.

My bill also fixes the annual pay adjustment problems for Federal judges. Unlike other Federal employees, Members of Congress and the President's Cabinet, Federal judges receive a COLA only if Congress specifically authorizes it. Under the Federal Judiciary Fairness Act, Federal judges will receive an annual COLA not subject to the approval of Congress. The size of the COLA would be determined by the Employment Cost Index, but it would not be larger than one received by other Federal employees under the General Schedule pay rate.

Together, these provisions will do much to remedy a problem, disparity in pay between the private and public sectors, that plagues one of the three branches of the Federal Government. But, Mr. Speaker, this legislation is about more than just fairly compensating the individuals who sit on the Federal bench. We must ensure that our Federal judiciary can attract and retain the best and the brightest. Passing the Federal Judicial Fairness Act is a small but important step in achieving this goal.

I want to thank my colleagues, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), for agreeing to be original cosponsors of this legislation; and I urge all my colleagues to support the Federal Judicial Fairness Act.

## THE ECONOMY

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, many government and Federal Reserve officials have repeatedly argued that we have no inflation to fear; yet those who claim this define inflation as rising consumer and producer prices. Although inflation frequently leads to

price increases, we must remember that the free market definition of inflation is the increase in supply of money and credit.

Monetary inflation is seductive in that it can cause great harm without significantly affecting government price indices.

□ 1845

The excess credit may well go into the stock market and real estate speculation, with consumer price increases limited to such things as energy, repairs, medical care and other services. One should not conclude, as so many have in the past decade, that we have no inflation to worry about. Imbalances did develop with the 1990s monetary inflation, but were ignored. They are now becoming readily apparent as sharp adjustments take place, such as we have seen in the past year with the NASDAQ.

When one is permitted to use rising prices as the definition for inflation, it is followed by a nonsensical assumption that a robust economy is the cause for rising prices. Foolish conclusions of this sort lead our economic planners and Federal Reserve officials to attempt to solve the problem of price and labor cost inflation by precipitating an economic slowdown.

Such a deliberate policy is anathema to a free market economy. It is always hoped that the planned economic slowdown will not do serious harm, but this is never the case. The recession, with rising prices, still comes. That is what we are seeing today.

Raising interest rates six times in 1999 to 2000 has had an effect, and the central planners are now worried. Falsely, they believe that if only the money spigot is once again turned on, all will be well. That will prove to be a pipe dream. It is now recognized that indeed the economy has sharply turned downward, which is what was intended. But can the downturn be controlled? Not likely. And inflation, by even the planners' own definition, is raising its ugly head.

For instance, in the fourth quarter of last year, labor costs rose at an annualized rate of 6.6 percent, the biggest increase in 9 years. What is happening to employment conditions? They are deteriorating rapidly. Economist Ed Hyman reported that 270,000 people lost their jobs in January, a 678 percent increase over a year ago.

A growing number of economists are now doubtful that private growth will save us from the correction that many free market economists predicted would come as an inevitable consequence of the interest rate distortion that Federal Reserve policy causes.

Instead of blind faith in the Federal Reserve to run the economy, we should become more aware of Congress' responsibility for maintaining a sound dollar and removing the monopoly

power of our central bank to create money and credit out of thin air, and to fix short-term interest rates, which is the real cause of our economic downturns.

Between 1995 and today, Greenspan increased the money supply, as measured by MZM, by \$1.9 trillion, or a 65 percent increase. There is no reason to look any further for the explanation of why the economy is slipping, with labor costs rising, energy costs soaring, and medical and education costs skyrocketing, while the stock market is disintegrating.

Until we look at the unconstitutional monopoly power the Federal Reserve has over money and credit, we can expect a continuation of our problems. Demanding lower interest rates is merely insisting the Federal Reserve deliberately create even more credit, which caused the problem in the first place. We cannot restore soundness to the dollar by debasing the dollar, which is what lowering interest rates is all about, printing more money.

When control is lost in a sharp downturn, dealing with it by massive monetary inflation may well cause something worse than the stagflation that we experienced in the 1970s; an inflationary recession or depression could result.

This need not happen, and will not if we demand that our dollar not be casually and deliberately debased by our unaccountable Federal Reserve.

#### THE BUDGET FOR DEFENSE

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, for the most part, Congress looks at national defense with a bipartisan eye. I am proud to say that I have served with five chairmen of the Committee on Armed Services of both parties and of various viewpoints. The number of substantive disagreements on matters of national security have been rewardingly few.

That is why so many of my colleagues and I were encouraged to see both candidates for President urging increases in funding for national defense. That is why President Bush and Vice President CHENEY's declaration that help is on the way sounded welcome to many congressional ears.

That is also why it does not sit too well with us to hear that the President has now decided that no increase is needed, either for next year's budget or to pay the bills already clogging the Pentagon's in-box. I have to say that it probably does not sit too well with a lot of the military officers who broke tradition to publicly endorse the President, either.

But the issue is not "I told you so." It is, instead, about how are we going

to get our parents, siblings, and children who are in uniform the resources they need to do their jobs.

The world is an unstable place, and the United States cannot afford to ignore any part of it. That is why our military is working so hard. That is why the cost of keeping our people trained, fed, and properly equipped is so high. We do not get good people by neglecting their needs.

An immediate supplemental appropriation to cover last year's activity and a responsive budget to meet the Nation's needs in the year ahead are both part of the price of American leadership. Delay paying that bill and training stops, ammunition runs out, and good people decide to say good-bye to the service.

Already, the Army reports that it is essentially out of 9-millimeter ammunition used in personal sidearms, and they have cut training because of it. Our commander in Europe, General Ralston, recently told me he has received word to curtail training because the money is running out.

Just this week, a new report indicates that the Navy's top fighters cannot meet their wartime schedules, again because of insufficient resources. In Washington, resources is spelled "m-o-n-e-y."

Troops that cannot train, planes that cannot fly, and an army out of bullets, if that does not justify supplemental funding, I am not sure what does. I do not believe we can afford any of those consequences. If the President wants to reconsider some of the high-cost programs that interfere with our ability to take care of America's soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines, that is his prerogative. He has announced a review to do so.

But it is not realistic for him to say, stop the world, America wants to get off. The world will not wait for our strategic review. Neither will the creditors, the men and women in uniform to whom the bills are owed. Without the support that it deserves and that was promised, our military cannot do its job. That, Mr. Speaker, makes nobody proud.

It is not partisan to say that we are disappointed. I know the Members on both sides of the aisle would applaud if the President were to reconsider his decision and make our service people whole. That is not only making good on a promise, it is just the right thing to do.

#### PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM 107TH CONGRESS

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting the attached Committee on Government Reform rules for the 107th Congress for