

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SOLOMON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 624. An act to amend the Armored Car Industry Reciprocity Act of 1993 to clarify certain requirements and to improve the flow of interstate commerce.

H.R. 1021. An act to provide for a land exchange involving certain National Forest System lands within the Routt National Forest in the State of Colorado.

H.R. 3069. An act to extend the Advisory Council on California Indian Policy to allow the Advisory Council to advise Congress on the implementation of the proposals and recommendations of the Advisory Council.

H.R. 3830. An act to provide for the exchange of certain lands within the State of Utah.

H.R. 4337. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide financial assistance to the State of Maryland for a pilot program to develop measures to eradicate or control nutria and restore marshland damaged by nutria.

H.R. 4679. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to clarify the circumstances in which a substance is considered to be a pesticide chemical for purposes of such act, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 131. Joint resolution waiving certain enrollment requirements for the remainder of the One Hundred Fifth Congress with respect to any bill or joint resolution making general or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1999.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3494. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to violent sex crimes against children, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and concurrent resolutions of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1752. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain administrative sites and use the proceeds for the acquisition of office sites and the acquisition, construction, or improvement of offices and sup-

port buildings for the Coconino National Forest, Kaibab National Forest, Prescott National Forest, and Tonto National Forest in the State of Arizona.

S. 2087. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain works, facilities, and titles of the Gila Project, and designated lands within or adjacent to the Gila Project, to the Wellton-Mohawk Irrigation and Drainage District, and for other purposes.

S. 2131. An act to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 2133. An act to preserve the cultural resources of the Route 66 corridor and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance.

S. 2401. An act to authorize the addition of the Paoli Battlefield site in Malvern, Pennsylvania, to Valley Forge National Historical Park.

S. 2402. An act to direct the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to convey certain lands in San Juan County, New Mexico, to San Juan College.

S. 2413. An act prohibiting the conveyance of Woodland Lake Park tract in Apache-Sitgreaves National Forest in the State of Arizona unless the conveyance is made to the town of Pinetop-Lakeside or is authorized by act of Congress.

S. 2458. An act to amend the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the creation of the Morristown National Historical Park in the State of New Jersey, and for other purposes" to authorize the acquisition of property known as the "Warren Property".

S. 2500. An act to protect the sanctity of contracts and leases entered into by surface patent holders with respect to coalbed methane gas.

S. 2513. An act to transfer administrative jurisdiction over certain Federal land located within or adjacent to Rogue River National Forest and to clarify the authority of the Bureau of Land Management to sell and exchange other Federal land in Oregon.

S. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution remembering the life of George Washington and his contributions to the Nation.

S. Con. Res. 119. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the American Red Cross Blood Services.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain 1-minute at the end of legislative business.

## ANNOUNCEMENT OF BILLS TO BE CONSIDERED UNDER SUSPENSION OF THE RULES ON TODAY

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 575, I announce the following suspensions to be considered today:

S. 1677, Reauthorization of North American Wetlands Conservation Act and Partnerships for Wildlife Act; H.R. 3046; and H.R. 3055, To Deem Activities of the Miccosukee Tribe on the Tamiami Indian Reservation Consistent with Purposes of Everglades National Park.

## WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 4(B) OF RULE XI WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 589, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## H. RES. 589

*Resolved*, That the requirement of clause 4(b) of rule XI for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported from that committee for the remainder of the second session of the One Hundred Fifth Congress providing for consideration or disposition of any of the following:

(1) A bill or joint resolution making general appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, any amendment thereto, any conference report thereon, or any amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon.

(2) A bill or joint resolution that includes provisions making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1999, any amendment thereto, any conference report thereon, or any amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order at any time for the remainder of the second session of the One Hundred Fifth Congress for the Speaker to entertain motions to suspend the rules, provided that the object of any such motion is announced from the floor at least two hours before the motion is offered. In scheduling the consideration of legislation under this authority, the Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or his designee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield half our time to my great friend, the gentleman from South Boston, Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY); pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is a standard management tool for the end of Congress, and similar tools have been employed under previous Republican control of the House as well as Democrat control of this institution. It will allow us to expedite our business and adjourn the second session of the 105th Congress so that Members can go home and at least have a couple of weeks to campaign.

This resolution waives clause 4(b) of Rule XI, which requires a two-thirds vote to consider a rule on the same day it is reported from the Committee on Rules, against certain resolutions reported from that Committee on Rules. I know that sounds confusing, but it is technical.

The resolution applies this waiver to special rules reported from the Committee on Rules for the remainder of the second session of the 105th Congress, which provide for consideration

or disposition of a bill or joint resolution, and, this is the key part of my statement here this morning, making general appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, any amendment thereto and conference report thereon, or any amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon.

What we are talking about, in layman's language, is perhaps the omnibus bill that will be coming before us as probably the last bill to pass this House and this Congress, or, for instance, a new agriculture appropriation bill that would replace the one recently vetoed by the President, or any conference report on any other appropriation bills that would come before the House.

This resolution would allow the House to expeditiously consider any appropriation bill or conference report from now until the end of the session on the same day that it is brought to the floor.

The resolution before us, Mr. Speaker, also applies the waiver to special rules reported from the remainder of the second session of the 105th Congress which provide for consideration or disposition of a bill or joint resolution making continuing appropriations—and to Members back in their offices that means a CR—for fiscal year 1999, any amendment thereto and conference report thereon. This will allow us to rapidly consider any measure making continuing appropriations which may be necessary for us to conclude our work.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the resolution before the House today allows, during the remainder of the second session of this Congress, for the Speaker to entertain motions to suspend the rules, provided that the object of any motion is announced from the floor at least 2 hours before the motion is offered, and that in the scheduling of legislation the Speaker or his designee shall consult with the minority leader or his designee, just as the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) did a few minutes ago when he announced the consideration of special suspension bills, of which the minority has been given 2 hours' notice.

Mr. Speaker, this will allow us to consider important and meaningful bills under the suspension of the rules procedure for the remainder of this session. Mr. Speaker, it is the intention, and if Members are listening again, it is the intention of the majority leadership to conclude the business of the 105th Congress as quickly as possible. The provisions of this rule are consistent with several precedents from recent Congresses under leadership of both Democrats and Republicans. And I would just say one more time that it is the intent of the majority leadership to conclude this business as quickly as possible and, hopefully, by no later than Sunday or Monday night.

So, I think with cooperation from all of the Members, we can accomplish that goal.

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 New York (Mr. SOLOMON), the retiring chairman of the Committee on Rules, who is retiring only because he is not going to be here any longer, not because he is retiring in effect, for yielding me the customary half-hour.

Mr. Speaker, this is the third martial law rule we have done in the last 10 days, and this one is totally open-ended. This will last until the end of the session, instead of a date certain, which is a very, very dangerous way to legislate.

Mr. Speaker, it is not as if my Republican colleagues have not had time to get things done. They have had months and months and months to pass any bills they wanted. But instead of working on legislation to help the American people, my Republican colleagues have spent time raiding the Social Security fund to pay for tax cuts.

This Republican Congress has worked fewer days and enacted fewer bills than any Congress in decades. And those are not my words, that is from the Congressional Quarterly. It says that as long as the records go back, this Congress has worked fewer days and accomplished less. That is not me talking, that is not our leader talking. That is the Congressional Quarterly.

So, as I said, the Congress has worked fewer days, enacted fewer bills than any Congress in decades, and the Congress has come up with no budget for the first time since the budget process was created. This Congress has passed no bills to improve public education. This Congress has passed no bills to reform managed care. This Congress has passed no bills to increase the minimum wage.

So here we are, Mr. Speaker, nearly at the end of the session with practically no substantive legislation to show for 2 years of Republican-controlled Congress.

Mr. Speaker, Americans want decent health care and they believe their insurance companies may put good profits before good health.

□ 1010

We have heard far too many stories of people who have suffered very serious health problems, in some cases even death, because their health insurance company would not authorize the procedures they needed.

The American people should be protected against not getting the care they need. They should be assured that their doctor is allowed to put every bit of medical training to use when they treat them. And they should be able to appeal decisions made by the health insurance company, and even sue their health plan, if the situation warrants. But my Republican colleagues just did not get around to it.

The American people also deserve to have their Social Security protected.

The most recent Republican tax plan will rob future Social Security recipients of their benefits. Mr. Speaker, these people have worked as hard as anybody else for their Social Security and they deserve to know that it will be there when they need it. But this is just another issue my Republican colleagues did not get around to.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the American schools need our attention. One out of every three schools in the United States needs extensive repair or replacement. If American children are going to compete in today's high-tech world, we need classrooms that are outfitted with the most modern technologies and conveniences, and we need class sizes that are not impossibly huge and hard to manage. But my Republican colleagues did not get around to it.

Mr. Speaker, if my Republican colleagues were so inclined, they could have passed some bills that would have made a great difference in the American people's lives. But, unfortunately, they did not. So we can give them that opportunity right now. I urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question and, if the previous question is defeated, we can bring up bills that the American people really care about; bills dealing with reforming managed care, reducing class size, and protecting Social Security.

Otherwise, we stand here, Mr. Speaker, on the day this Congress was scheduled to adjourn, passing another martial law resolution, passing number three martial law resolution, in order to allow other bills to come up to the floor without giving Democrats much of a chance to read what is in them. Since passing an endless martial law means that the Democrats will not have a real lot of time to look at these bills, and since we should be taking care of other issues, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill and defeat the previous question.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I was not going to seek time for myself and, instead, yield to others, but I am just inspired to get up here and respond to my good friend from Boston.

The gentleman talks about this Congress not having done anything. Well, let me tell my colleagues what it has not done. It has not increased spending. And, hopefully, when we get through negotiating with the President, we will not have increased spending at the end of this Congress. But from all that I am getting feedback on, this President is demanding that we increase spending, and that is why we have not adjourned yet.

Let me tell my colleagues what this Congress has done, though. We have passed and enacted into law the first major tax cut in 16 years. And that is what my constituents sent me here to do, to cut taxes and put money back into the pockets of American citizens

so that they could either spend it on what they want to spend it on, not what we want to spend it on, or they can save it. And either way that is what has stimulated this economy, and that is why things are as good around the country as they are.

Let me tell my colleagues what that tax cut did. To anybody listening, wherever they are, I want them to just think about what was done last year. The tax cut provided for \$250 billion in net tax relief over the next 10 years. Over 72 percent of the tax relief went to middle income families earning incomes between \$20,000 and \$70,000. And if my colleagues think my constituents were happy about that, they sure were.

Forty-one million parents were given a \$500 tax credit to help working families offset the cost of raising and caring for children. I just finished raising five children; now I have six grandchildren. And let me tell my colleagues, my kids appreciate that, because now they have a few dollars back in their pockets so they can spend it to educate their children, rather than big brother government telling them how to do it.

Families with educational expenses were helped by the provision of the HOPE scholarships. Remember that? And penalty free withdrawals from the IRAs for college and other educational expenses. If some of the younger Members have not been through it yet, let me tell them what it costs to educate five kids. We had five kids within 7 years, so they were all in college at the same time. I am just about broke, but we got them through. Let me tell my colleagues that that means something to those families.

Family farms and small businesses were provided with death tax relief. In other words, when a person dies, this Federal Government was taking 50, 60, 70 percent of the money, the money they had saved for their children. Farmers could not even sell their farms or let their kids inherit it, and now they can.

First-time home buyers were provided with the creation of America's Dream IRAs, from which they can now make tax-free withdrawals for buying a home and fulfilling every American's dream. We have new families now starting up where they can actually save a little money and not have to pay taxes on it if they are going to put it down on buying a house.

This Congress has provided, and this is so terribly important, this Congress has provided broad-based permanent capital gains tax relief to spur investment, create jobs, and increase the economic growth in this country. The top rate was reduced from 28 percent.

This really affects an individual who had saved a few dollars and invested it. I point to, let us say, a couple who had worked for Sears Roebuck and I have said this before on the floor, they do not pay the highest salaries in the world, but they give stock options to their employees to buy. And I know a couple that did that. They worked all

their life at not great salaries, but when they retired the Federal Government took 28 percent when they had to sell that stock. That was outrageous. That was their income for retirement and the Federal Government took a third of it, almost.

We reduced that to 20 percent for those with middle incomes. But with lower incomes, real senior citizens, who had not been able to save that much, we reduced it down to 10 percent. And that means if they had held on to some stock that they purchased 30 years ago, and now they were going to sell that stock, they only had to pay 10 percent back to this government. It is a shame they had to pay any. We are the only industrialized Nation in the world that has any capital gains tax. So, anyway, we got it down to something that was within reason.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I could go on here with a litany of things of what this Congress has done, but I am going to save some of this so my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), can tell of some of the other things we have done in this Congress.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to just comment that, as usual, my chairman has been great representing his party.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. Clay), the ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in opposition to this martial law rule.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the House Republican leadership at a press conference boasted about the Republicans' imaginary legislative accomplishments in the field of education. What folly, what gall, what audacity. Their refusal to tackle critical educational problems and priorities is the shame of this Congress. It is the shame of their party.

The Republican policy toward education is based on the contemptuous premise that education is not the province of the Federal Government. So, Mr. Speaker, the Republicans will do as little as possible to improve our educational system, and then only when forced to do it. Their sorry, sordid record on education issues is one of complete failure.

They fail to invest in the expansion of after-school programs, they fail to reduce classroom sizes, they fail to bring new technology to our schools, they fail to replace dilapidated school houses and replace them with new buildings.

□ 1020

They failed to hire 100,000 new public school teachers.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans have failed our school children, failed their parents, failed our public school teachers

and failed their responsibility to give leadership in the area of critical national concern. Their scheme to enact school vouchers would have diverted hundreds of millions of Federal dollars earmarked for public schools and school reform to private and parochial schools.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority tried to repeal affirmative action programs for disadvantaged youth and tried to destroy bilingual education. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Republicans' most sinister, most cynical, perversion was the attempt to kill the Head Start program by loading it down with non-germane killer amendments like Head Start vouchers.

In the past few days, we have seen a flurry of activity on measures that have languished for the past 2 years, but the record of this do-nothing Congress in the field of education is clear.

Thus far, only three education bills have become law during this Congress: job training, higher education renewal and the IDEA program.

Mr. Speaker, we demand, the American public demands, that the Republican leadership take immediate action to enact legislation to modernize our decrepit, run-down public schools and to reduce our classrooms to manageable and teachable sizes.

Mr. Speaker, we should vote this rule down. This proposal is bad for this country and we should stay here until we finish the business of government, the business of the American people. I say vote "no" on this resolution.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining between the two sides here, just to see where we balance out?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Bass). The gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) has 21½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) has 22 minutes remaining.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield whatever time he might consume to the brilliant gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), and I am not just referring to his tie, either.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the magnanimity of my very kind friend from Glens Falls.

Mr. Speaker, this is an incredibly ironic debate that we have embarked upon. I sat there listening to the comments of my very good friend from South Boston, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) rising in opposition to this rule, and he went through all of his complaints as to why he considers this to be a do-nothing Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the rule that we are considering is designed so that we can do something. We are trying very much to move legislation through and consider appropriations so that we can keep the government going, so that we can bring about the spending cuts to which the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) referred, and so that we can get out of here and go home.

Then they say that we have done nothing and all we want to do with this

rule is to make sure that we can do something.

Let us look at some of the things that we have, in fact, done. I will say that as I listened again to the litany of my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), I was struck with the fact that the United States Congress is not an automobile manufacturing plant. One is not graded based on the number of cars that they put out or the number of bills that they pass.

We are today at a point where I think based on, and I do not believe in all of these polls because, Lord knows, they are just a little picture at one point in time, but we all look at polls, and guess what? The 105th Congress has the highest approval rating of any Congress in recent history, and so it seems to me that we may be doing some things right.

What are some of the things that we have actually done? Well, we have passed the first balanced budget in 29 years, and I think that in itself is tremendous. The President of the United States on October 1, the first day of the fiscal year, was very proud to hold a ceremony in the Rose Garden and proclaim the fact that we had a \$60 billion budget surplus.

That all came about not because of what was done there, not because of the largest increase that was passed under the Democratic Congress and Democratic President back in 1993, but because a Republican Congress that took over following the 1994 election got us on the road towards fiscal responsibility. We dragged him, kicking and screaming, but we are very pleased that ultimately President Clinton embraced our themes of balancing the budget and cutting taxes.

We also, as the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) has mentioned, have had a tremendous tax cut for working families, and what has that brought us? It has brought us a lot of things. One of them has been an increase in the flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury.

As the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) mentioned, that working couple at Sears & Roebuck that has been able to realize some capital gain from their pension and other investments that they might have had, what has happened? Well, we have seen an increase in the flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury. That is what has helped us balance the Federal budget.

So it has been the first time in 16 years that we have been able to bring about a tax cut for working families.

I am also very proud of the fact that we have been able to reform Medicare to keep the seniors' health care structure solvent. Something else that was a major concern that came to the forefront, passed in a bipartisan way, but I am very pleased that it is a Republican Congress that did it, I do not have too many constituents who call me and say, Mr. DREIER, we are very, very happy with the work of the Internal

Revenue Service. What I do get is I get complaints from people who for years have talked about the fact that the Internal Revenue Service has more power than the CIA or the FBI. They have the ability to go in and close down a business and harass people.

What is it that this Congress has done? We are very proud that we have been able to reform the Internal Revenue Service so that we can make sure that rather than having to prove that you are not guilty, a taxpayer is innocent until proven guilty, which seems to me part of the American ideal.

I am very proud of the fact that we have been able to reform the Internal Revenue Service. We have much more to do, much further to go, but we have been able to do that.

My friend from St. Louis, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY), for whom I have the highest regard, has gone through a great many concerns that he has raised in the area of education, but we are very proud of our education record here in the Congress.

The chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) just reminded me that we, of course, want to empower local school districts and States to deal with these education issues rather than having so many of them centered right here in Washington, but as we move in that direction there are a number of very positive things that we have been able to do.

The A-Plus Education Savings Accounts Act, Merit Pay and Teacher Testing, Higher Education Act amendments, loan forgiveness for new teachers, Dollars to the Classroom Act, which we just recently passed, the Reading Excellence Act, the Charter Schools amendments, ban on new Federal school tests, low-income D.C. Scholarships, expanded prepaid college tuition plans, quality Head Start, creating safer schools, bilingual education reform, these are things that are designed to increase the level of competition so that we can have young people educated, so that they will be able to compete in this global economy.

Mr. Speaker, as we consider this rule that will allow us to continue to do more good things to help struggling American families, to help us keep some kind of restraint on the spiraling growth of the Federal Government, it seems to me that passage of this rule to allow us to consider those things helps us continue in our quest to do something.

Then when I hear this argument about doing nothing, I hate to stand here Saturday morning at 10:30 pointing the finger, but I am reminded that there have only been two Cabinet meetings that have been held this year, one in January and one just a few weeks ago, and that seems to be the record of the executive branch.

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

Mr. Speaker, my very dear friend from California (Mr. DREIER) mentioned that we were not a car manufac-

turing organization. He is exactly right, but if we were, we would probably be producing the Edsel.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. I listened very carefully to what the previous Republican speaker said, and basically what I understood him to say was that the reason we need this rule is because we have to get out of here as quickly as possible.

□ 1020

Let me say that I disagree with that completely. We should not be getting out of here as quickly as possible. We should be staying and getting things done that need to be done for the American people. Then I heard the previous Speaker say, "Well, it doesn't really matter if we haven't done much, maybe we haven't done much, but that's okay because the American people don't want us to do much."

Again if you want to take credit and say it is great that you have a do-nothing Congress, that is fine, but I do not think that is a good thing. I think a do-nothing Congress is a bad thing, and I want to say very emphatically that we have to accomplish a lot of things here before we leave, because the American people demand it.

Then I listened to the gentleman from New York on the other side. He started talking about all these great things that he claimed came out of the Balanced Budget Act. I would remind him that the Balanced Budget Act was passed and signed into law over a year ago. So basically for the last year and more, nothing has been accomplished here.

I would also point out that those middle-class tax credits or the things that helped the middle class that were in that Balanced Budget Act only came about because the Democrats kept insisting on it, kept insisting that the middle class be the priority in terms of what that Balanced Budget Act accomplished. For many months we had to deal here with Republican proposals that would help only the wealthy and the well-to-do in this country, but we kept insisting over and over again that the concentration had to be on the middle class and the average American.

Mr. Speaker, we need to stay here. Let us defeat this rule, let us stay here and let us get accomplished the things that need to be accomplished. Let us come up with some funding to modernize our schools, to hire the additional 100,000 teachers so we can reduce class size. Let us address HMOs and the need for HMO reform.

We went over to the other body yesterday to try to bring it up, Mr. DASCHLE, the Democratic leader, tried to bring it up and the Republicans basically banged the gavel and said, "No, we're not going to deal with it." We need to address these issues.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me this time, and I rise to oppose the martial-law rule.

Almost every week for almost 10 months this Congress has come to Washington, held a few committee hearings, done a little bit of work, cast a few votes and then recessed for a long weekend. Now, the Republican majority with its work still unfinished wants to leave town as quickly as possible to go campaign.

Mr. Speaker, we need to stay here and we need to do some work. This do-nothing Republican Congress has failed to strengthen Social Security. This do-nothing Republican Congress has failed to pass or even consider, hold hearings or even discuss the President's plan to modernize schools. This do-nothing Republican Congress has failed to reduce class size in America's schools. This do-nothing Republican Congress has failed to curb HMO or insurance company abuses.

Mr. Speaker, to be fair, this Republican Congress has done a few things. This Congress has renamed National Airport. Give them credit for that. This Congress has allowed tobacco companies to kill tobacco legislation. Give them credit for that. This Republican Congress has allowed the big insurance companies to kill serious HMO reform. Give them credit for that. But, Mr. Speaker, this Republican do-nothing Congress has failed in the issues that matter to America, to strengthen Social Security, to pass the patients' bill of rights, to work on education reforms by reducing class size and modernizing schools.

Mr. Speaker, we should stay here until we finish the people's business.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority is in a big hurry to go home and spend the piles of campaign cash that they have raked in from special interests as a reward for all the legislation they have killed in this Congress.

First they killed campaign finance reform, essential if they could rake in the money and spend it. They killed tobacco legislation. A lot of money coming there. And then they killed, outrageously, patients' rights, something that millions of Americans are demanding, are being oppressed by HMOs, they killed that. Guess what? A lot of money coming in from the insurance industry. Then a couple of environmental laws, the Clean Water Act, Endangered Species Act and others. Yes, they are in a big hurry to go home. It is a lot of work killing legislation that would benefit millions of Americans, at the behest of a few wealthy special interests, while pretending to serve the majority of people in this country.

They are in such a hurry after 107 days of work. As of today the average American has worked 200 days. Congress has worked 107. They have not got their job done.

Now they want to pass legislation funding the majority of Federal programs and not allow Members of Congress time to read it. They say it is so essential we get done and we get home. Why? Why can we not have one or two extra days to read the thousands of pages of legislation they are about to try and jam down our throats?

I think it is going to be because of what is in there, all sorts of special pork. We know they are going to stuff it full of pork, and what is not in there? There is not going to be funding, if they have their way, for education. They are not going to fulfill the President's program on school construction, new teachers, smaller class sizes. There is not going to be patient protection. There is not going to be a summer youth program. There is not even going to be low-income heating assistance for senior citizens.

No, that is right. They do not want us to read it. They do not want us to debate it. They want to jam it down, go home and then start running all their ads with the huge amount of money they have raked in from the few special interests they represent.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Let me just point out something to the membership. The last three speakers we heard from, as a matter of fact all of the Democrat speakers today, appear on the National Taxpayer Union's big spender list, the biggest spenders in the Congress. We have heard them stand up here and want to spend more, spend more, spend more, spend more. That is the difference between the Republican and the Democratic Party.

Now, they say do-nothing. What do you think we did just in the last couple of weeks? Let me tell you what we did in the taxpayer bill. We passed a provision providing marriage tax relief for 48 million Americans.

How many Americans are there in this country? I think it is 250, 260 million. Forty-eight million of them are being penalized right now for being married. We correct that. But President Clinton will not sign it. Six million married taxpayers who are currently itemizing deductions on their returns will no longer need to do so. What do you think? President Clinton will not even sign that. We provided 68 million more Americans tax relief by excluding from taxation a portion of interest and dividend income. Can you imagine the President will not sign that?

All of you are always pontificating and using a lot of rhetoric about senior citizens, of which I am one, and I may be drawing Social Security next month. We included my bill which increased the Social Security earnings limit, thereby raising the amount of money senior citizens can earn without

losing Social Security benefits, something that I have been trying to do in this body for years now.

There is a limitation of \$14,500 and for income above that level senior citizens have to start paying a penalty. We raise that limit to \$16,500 the first year, \$18,500 the second year, and then the third year every senior citizen in America on Social Security can earn up to \$26,000 without paying any penalty.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) one of the outstanding members of this body. He is going to tell you what we have done for education.

Mr. GOODLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, for anybody to come down to this House and indicate that we have a do-nothing Congress when it comes to education has to have been sleeping for the last 2 years. We just had a love-in down at the White House a couple of days ago, what a love-in about education and all the things we have done.

We have passed 21 pieces of legislation that deal with education and job training. Let me tell you about some of the most important ones, a lot of them done in a bipartisan fashion. We passed Head Start. We did not just pass the usual same old Head Start. We said we are going to have quality Head Start. We are going to make sure that every child in this country has an equal opportunity to become reading ready before they get to first grade and before they get stuck into special education.

□ 1040

We passed a special education bill, we passed a job training bill; not Washington knows all and Washington can do everything. We said the local level knows what is important and what has to be done to train people for the 21st century.

We passed a vocational education bill, not again one that talks about the 19th century, but what it is we do if we are going to be competitive in the 21st century.

We passed a child nutrition bill.

We passed a higher education bill that gives the lowest interest rates in 17 years. It gives the highest Pell grants. It gives quality teaching. It does not matter whether there are two people in a classroom or one person in a classroom or 32 people in a classroom, if there is not a quality teacher in that classroom, it really does not matter.

What the President is arguing about now is one simple thing: We want to, from Washington, D.C., control elementary-secondary education. There is not a poll that has ever been taken that says anybody in the United States wants this Federal Government to do that, and as long as I am in charge of that committee, I will guarantee we are not going to have any legislation that allows the Federal Government to

take over elementary-secondary education. But that is what it is all about.

That is what that tobacco tax was all about. They wanted not a tax to try to do something to keep children from smoking. I have been involved with children for 22 years. One does not tell a teenager, do not smoke; teenagers tell teenagers do not smoke. It is the power, the pressure, of teenagers that causes them to smoke, and it is only that same pressure that will stop them from smoking. So do not give that facade that, somehow or other, if we can do this, we somehow or other will stop them smoking. That whole deal was, I want \$20 billion so I can control elementary-secondary education in this country. That is not going to happen, Mr. President.

So he had better get used to that. It will not happen. The local government will determine what happens in elementary-secondary education, not the Federal Government.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY), the ranking member of the Committee on Education.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to once again talk about the imaginary educational program of the Republican Party, this phantom program that I keep hearing from the chairman of our committee, who just stated once again that they have passed 21 bills dealing with education. And I repeat what I said in my opening remarks. There are only three educational bills that came out of that committee that are the law of the land; one is the IDEA, another is the higher education reauthorization, and the third is the Workforce Investment Act.

Now, they did pass some bills; they are not the law. But the skill of legislators is to get legislation into law. One bill, the Help Scholarship Private School Voucher bill, that passed this House, it died here in the House, he takes credit for that. The Dollars to the Classroom Block Grant bill passed this House, but it died in the Senate. The bill terminating bilingual education died in the Senate. The Juvenile Justice bill died in conference. He is listing these bills as accomplishments in the field of education.

His own bill, he will not bring to this floor. He has got a bill in education that he is blocking right now that he will not bring to this floor, the Reading Excellence Act. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) will not allow his own bill to be brought to the floor because there is a little provision in there about national testing, and he is so concerned about testing that he refuses to bring his own bill to this floor. That is an imaginary list of accomplishments that the Republicans keep referring to.

Three education bills have passed this Congress in this session, not 21, and I wish the gentleman from Pennsylvania would correct the record.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article

titled "Significant Education Accomplishments? Not This Congress."

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

There was no objection.

SIGNIFICANT EDUCATION ACCOMPLISHMENTS?—NOT THIS CONGRESS

#### BILLS SIGNED INTO LAW

IDEA—signed into law in June 1997

Higher Education—signed into law in October 1998

Workforce Investment Act—signed into law in September 1998

#### PASSED BOTH CHAMBERS

Vocational Education—passed both chambers

Head Start Reauthorization—passed both chambers

Child Nutrition Reauthorization—passed both chambers

Charter School Bill—about to pass both chambers

Child Care Resolution—passed the House—a resolution not a solution

#### REPUBLICAN AGENDA BILLS WHICH DIED

HELP Scholarship Private School Voucher Bill—died in House

Dollars to the Classroom Block Grant bill—died in the Senate

Bill terminating Bilingual Education—died in the Senate

Juvenile Justice bill—died in conference

#### MYSTERY BILLS

Reading Excellence Act—Chairman Goodling won't allow his own bill to be brought up because he is blocking national testing.

*Bipartisan bills which included Democratic priorities*

3 major bills signed into law

4 bills being sent to the President

*Partisan bills which are a part of the Republican agenda against public schools*

3 bills died in the Senate

1 died in the House

*Partisan politics being played with bipartisan bills*

Chairman is refusing to bring his own reading bill to the floor, despite it being passed by the Senate with bipartisan support.

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

Mr. Speaker, in the two Congresses before we Republicans took control, I recall no education bill that became law. We have passed three.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, obviously the gentleman does not listen any more than he listens in committee. I did not say we passed 21 bills into law. I made it very clear that we passed 21 bills out of the committee.

I also mentioned that we passed Head Start, Higher Ed, Job Training, Special Ed, Voc Ed, Child Nutrition. If the President wants to sign them, they are there on his desk; let him sign them, they are there.

And let me also tell my colleagues about Reading Excellence. I re-wrote the Reading Excellence bill. The trash that came up from downtown was ridiculous. It had nothing to do with preparing teachers in order to be better teachers of reading. It had nothing to do with helping parents become reading

ready. I rewrote it, it is there, it is in the omnibus, it will be part of the law when the President decides to sign it.

Let me also mention that if my colleagues want to fix school buildings, if they want to reduce class size, they should put their money where their mouth is. For 30 years they have had a bill here, they had 100 percent mandate back to the district on special ed. They said, "We'll send you 40 percent of the excess costs," the most expensive piece of legislation ever passed, the most extensive, and what did they do? When I became chairman, they were sending 6 percent or at least up to 11 or 12 percent at the present time. If they send that back, every person in this building, every Member, will have millions of dollars to spend on class size, millions of dollars to fix buildings.

Just talk about York City, a small city alone would get an extra million dollars a year if they put their money where their mouth was.

I was told, "Hey, you're doing something about Pell grants now." But it did not keep up with inflation. I was not in charge. They had all those years to do something about inflation in relationship to Pell grants.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Massachusetts for yielding this time to me.

I wanted my friends on the other side of the aisle to know that before I came to this Congress I was a State Superintendent of Schools for 8 years, prior to that I spent 19 years in business, and I want them to also understand that I received the Chamber of Commerce award this year, and fourthly, I want them to understand that I voted for the balanced budget last year. That will set the tone for what I am about to say about this do-nothing Congress for education, because let me say to my colleagues the day I am here to speak for special interests, I make no bones about it; the children of America are not being spoken for.

I ran for this Congress because I was appalled when I was a superintendent at the sorry education legislation that I saw coming through, cuts in doing away with child nutrition programs, cuts in every education program that made a difference for poor children in this country.

And my colleagues can argue about all the issues they want to argue about, but I am here to tell them if a child does not have a decent classroom to go to, they understand that education is not important. And they really do not care whether the money comes from the Federal Government, whether it comes from the State government, if it comes from the local government or from private sources; they just know that someone does not care. And there is a big slip between the cup and the lip.

Congress must not abandon our schools. Over the next 5 years in this

country, we will have the fastest growing population at the high school age in the history of this country, and my State will be the fifth fastest growing State. We have just passed a \$1.8 billion bond issue.

I was on the telephone yesterday with a superintendent. He gets 3,500 students every year. We must help them, we can help them, and we should not go home until we do.

□ 1050

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the minority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, good morning. How are my colleagues this morning? I am glad everybody had their extra cup of coffee this morning.

Mr. Speaker, reality is that, over the last month and a half, my friends on this side of the aisle have tried to raid the Social Security Trust Fund, taking out billions of dollars. That cannot be denied.

We are on an education debate here this morning. The reality is that the leader of their party introduced legislation to eliminate the Department of Education. Just get rid of it. Just get rid of it. That kind of sets the tone for where they have been going on educational issues.

If you look at the budget this year on child literacy, the President requested \$260 million so our children could learn to read. Republicans have zero dollars for that program. They cut \$160 million out of a proven program that has worked year after year, decade after decade, the Head Start program.

Class size, trying to get those numbers down to a reasonable level so teachers can teach and children can learn and we can have more discipline in the classroom, we cannot get the bill up. We asked for one day to discuss education on this floor. They will not give it to us.

After-school program. Everyone knows that the juvenile crime problem in this country occurs between the hours of 3:00 and 6:00. That is when we have our teen pregnancies, we have our drinking, and we have our drug abuse and all those problems that plague our young people.

An after-school program, a safe haven for students and children, a mix of intergenerational people, older people, young people at our schools using our libraries and gyms and our labs and our crafts rooms, a \$40 million cut from the Republicans.

School modernization, they will not bring it up.

On program after program, the deals with the education of our young people in this country, we have been shut out. All we ask before we go home is that this Congress give us one day, just one day to deal with the modernization program so that kids do not have to go to schools in trailers, so that kids do not have to go to school where plaster is coming down, so that we do not send

them the wrong signal that they do not matter, one day so that we can pass legislation to reduce class size, so we can get a better product. But, no, they will not do it.

Somebody suggested the other day that we do it on Wednesday, and they said, no, it would ruin both weekends. I think that is a good note to end on.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

(Mrs. LOWEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, we are representatives in the Congress of the United States of America. I have traveled all across the metropolitan region. My district, as the Speaker knows, goes from Westchester through the Bronx to Queens County.

The schools are crumbling. They are crumbling all across America. Classrooms are literally overflowing. Students are learning in the hallways. But we are just sitting idly by. That is wrong.

Last year, 120 Members of Congress showed their commitment to America's children by cosponsoring a bill, the Partnership to Rebuild America Schools. This session, we have a similar proposal which I introduced with my good colleague the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

I say to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), we are not talking about taking over the schools. We are talking about a partnership. If we can be partners in rebuilding our highways, if we can be partners in rebuilding our roads and bridges and building prisons, then it seems to me we can be partners in modernizing our schools.

We have visited schools where computers cannot be installed because they do not have the wiring necessary. One school in lower New York, there were wires hanging out of the windows, and the vandals were clipping them because the school infrastructure could not hold those computer systems, the wires. That is wrong. We are not a Third World nation.

Our program will make interest-free loans available to school districts, they are going to be in control, across the country through the tax code. Under the bill, school districts will be able to issue special bonds at no interest to fund the construction or renovation of school building.

Mr. Speaker, we simply cannot ignore the poor physical conditions of our schools any longer. Nationally there is a \$112 billion problem. That is what is needed in school construction. Mr. Speaker, let us modernize our schools. We have that responsibility.

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

Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), comes from one of the nicest areas in the world, Westchester County and New York City. But do my col-

leagues know the State of New York, under the great leadership of Governor George Pataki, pumps millions of millions of dollars into the school system?

But do my colleagues know what? They do not tell them how to spend it. The state does not have any category programs. They give it to localities in block grants. They say, you know how to educate your children; your school board knows how to develop the curriculum for those children. We want to give them the autonomy to do that.

The New York State's School Board Association wants to abolish the Federal Department of Education because they want all that bureaucratic waste to be put into the school districts themselves, so they can spend it the way they want to.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the outstanding gentleman from Pensacola, Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH).

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to comment on a few statements that have been made on the floor today.

First of all, we hear again how Republicans wanted to raid the Social Security Trust Fund. I find this to be a bit humorous and ironic considering the President is now asking for \$18 billion more than what we have budgeted. I suppose it is acceptable to raid the Social Security trust fund of \$18 billion if we want to waste it on more Washington spending, but it is not acceptable if we want to give a little more money back to the American people, the money they earn.

We hear Democrats complain about education. And yet under the Democrats watch, from 1954 to 1994, the education system in America crumbled at an alarming, unprecedented rate. Now they come to us, and they tell us that we have a do-nothing Congress because we have failed to follow their failed approach to education.

I suspect each Democratic critic of our policies opposed the Dollars To The Classroom Act, where we guaranteed 95 percent of the money targeted for education would go into the classrooms and get out of Washington, D.C. bureaucracies. Of course this is a dangerous idea for statisticians because such an approach puts more trust in parents, in teachers, in principals that educate my children in public schools, than in bureaucrats and politicians in Washington, D.C.

Finally we hear calls of a do-nothing Congress. Such complaints come from a party that is led by a President who has held only two cabinet meetings this year. The purpose of the first cabinet meeting was to create a forum for the President to lie to his cabinet. The second cabinet meeting was for the President to apologize for lying at the first meeting. Now is this really a record that this democratic Congress is proud of? Do they really wish to cast the first stone?

On tobacco, we hear how Republicans want to get home and spend the tobacco money. Give me a break. In 1996,



we learned that the Democratic Party got tobacco money through the States. Then they funneled it back up to Federal candidates. All the while their candidates rallied against big tobacco.

Stop being self-righteous. This Democratic Party has done little more this session of Congress than obstruct and delay for the administration.

On the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, when we tried to uncover the Chinese fundraising scandal on campaign finance schemes that funded their campaigns in 1996, they obstructed and delayed our investigation. In fact, the ranking member of the Senate investigation said obstruction of the investigation was the Republicans' problem.

Mr. Speaker, such obstruction and delay is not the Republicans' problem. It is America's problem. We will continue to fight for education reform, for dollars in the classrooms, and to insure that American democracy is not subverted by foreign interests.

□ 1100

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) has 7 minutes remaining; the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the chief deputy whip, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the other side protest too much. The reason they want martial law, that they want to place martial law upon the House, is because they have not done their job. They have failed the country, and in doing so, they have failed our children.

Every time I hear about their education initiatives, everything is a block grant. But why do they want to do that? Because they want to take the entitlement, the legal right that our children have in this country to receive this assistance, move it and abolish that right, and then ultimately cut it, and that is their plan.

This Republican martial law allows the Congress to consider a bill naming a post office in an expedited manner, but it does not allow us to consider getting the classrooms in America in shape for the next century.

What kind of priorities do they have? We Democrats have had a plan to hold HMOs accountable for their actions and to preserve the doctor-patient relationships. My Republican colleagues sided with the HMO industry and rejected real patient protection.

We have a plan to keep our children from smoking. My Republican colleagues sided with big tobacco and rejected it.

We have a plan to clean up the campaign finance system, and in the other

House it was rejected, as well, by the majority. We have a plan to put 100,000 new teachers in our schools, and help reduce class size and let the local school district determine how they are going to use it, help them in getting that assistance, and for the taxpayers of those communities as well. Republicans side against our children and reject it.

So other than spending most of this Congress and millions of dollars on one investigation after another, what have they been doing all year that they have to declare martial law?

Frankly, it is hard to tell. My Republican colleagues cannot even pass a budget. With a balanced budget and a Federal surplus, they are 10 days into the budget year and they still cannot get a budget for America. American families cannot do that. They would not be able to get that way.

Vote against this martial law resolution, so we can have a martial law resolution that brings America's needs onto this floor, a real martial law for the right reasons.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. I think this is a Congress of missed opportunities. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN).

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I first thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, it is really quite simple. The Republicans want to go home. The Democrats want to go to work.

This has been a do-nothing Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is, Americans want a couple of simple things. They want more teachers; Americans understand that we need more teachers in our early-year classrooms in order to reduce class size. Take it wherever you want, north, south, east or west, people will tell us they need smaller classes, more teachers, better trained teachers. The Democrats want to do that; the Republicans want to go home.

Talk to Americans and they will also tell us we need school modernization. We have overcrowded classrooms, we have classrooms that are not wired to have Internet access. We need modernization. We need technological upgrades. We would like to do that. We would like to invest in education; the Republicans want to go home.

Mr. Speaker, in the final analysis, actions speak louder than words. They want to talk about then, there, what not and what how. The fact of the matter is, they have failed. They have not delivered on education. We need to go to work; we do not need to go home.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the chief deputy whip,

the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this martial law rule.

We have had an entire session to pass legislation which would have improved the lives of the people in this country, and the majority party has ignored, ignored that opportunity. Instead of doing the people's work, they frittered away your time and our time.

What have we spent our time doing here? What have they accomplished this year?

Let us take a look at the RECORD. We have no budget. We have not finished appropriations. We have not protected Social Security. We have not reformed HMOs to ensure that healthy patients are more important than healthy profits of the insurance companies in this country, and we have not stopped the tobacco companies from targeting and killing our children. We have not reduced class size to provide individual attention for our kids in classrooms. We have not modernized a single school. We have not raised education standards for a single child, we have not provided training for a single teacher, we have not hooked up a single classroom to the Internet.

Let me just say this to my colleagues, that what the Republican majority would do with regard to education is reduce the dollars to States. What they would do is take money out of our school system and put education once more in the hands of the rich and of the few.

Let me just say, we have a few days before this Congress adjourns. Let us do what the American people want.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues, defeat the previous question. Let us debate education. Let us do something for American families and for American kids in this country. Stop frittering away the American public's time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me say, I cannot think of anybody other than this Speaker of the House that I would less like to yield martial law to. The way this House has been managed, if we give him martial law authority, God knows what might could happen.

Mr. Speaker, 3 days ago, the Republican National Committee decided it would start running \$150,000 worth of ads in my congressional district to try to put me on the defensive for not raiding the Social Security Trust Fund to pay for \$90 billion worth of taxes for rich people. They can find \$90 billion in trust fund monies to give for tax cuts, but they cannot find any money to do a reduction in class sizes for our children in this country. They can find \$90 billion in money in the Social Security Trust Fund to give tax cuts to the wealthy people, but they cannot modernize our schools.



We need to stay here until we get our schools modernized, our class sizes reduced. Reject this martial law. Vote against this rule.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the outstanding chairman of our Committee on Education and the Workforce which has done so much for the children of this Nation.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I will not come here and say I was a superintendent in the State for a couple of years after being a businessperson, I was an educator all of my life.

Mr. Speaker, it is amazing that we have people on the floor today crying out for education. Where were you for 20 years when you were in the majority and I am standing in that well saying, please, please.

You mandated Special Ed. Very, very expensive mandate. You said you would send them 40 percent of the excess cost, and you sent them peanuts. And I asked you year after year after year, because to every school district it meant millions of dollars, millions of dollars to reduce class size, millions of dollars to maintain their buildings, millions of dollars to build new buildings. I could not get a penny. I could not get a penny.

And you know what the President did this year? The President sent a Special Ed budget up here that cuts Special Ed.

□ 1110

He does not allow for inflation. He does not allow for additional students in special ed., and there are hundreds and thousands of them every year. He cut special education, the one curriculum mandate that comes from the Federal level.

Now, what have we done in order to get more teachers? First of all, the GAO says there is no shortage of teachers now. There is none in the foreseeable future. But what did we do on the higher ed. bill? We said, okay, all of the teachers that are out there that are not teaching, we will let them reduce the amount that it costs them in their loan if they will go to the local school district that needs them, the center city, rural America. That is where they need them. They are out there doing other jobs.

Mr. Speaker, we increased impact aid, 31-plus billion dollars for education in the budget this year. We took care of some of the problems after school in the nutrition bill, because we said we are going to give schools food to feed and keep those youngsters there after school so they do not get into trouble.

We upgraded technology. All of these things that I have heard about, we have done. But most of all, we increased special ed. by \$500 million.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

(Mr. MOAKLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his re-

marks, and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, last night the host of "Crossfire" quoted Edward Crane, President of the Cato Institute; we know that the Cato Institute is not a liberal organization. Edward Crane was quoted as saying, "The record of the 105th Congress, Republican-controlled in both Houses, is an abomination. Spending is up, and the Tax Code is more complex than ever."

Even the Congressional Quarterly says that as long as the records go back, no Congress has worked fewer days or accomplished less.

Since the American people deserve more from their Congress, I urge my colleagues to defeat this previous question. If the previous question is defeated, Democrats will be able to bring initiatives to the floor before this Congress adjourns. An initiative to modernize schools that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) talked about; reduce class size by hiring 100,000 new teachers; an initiative to implement true HMO reform that protects patients and lets the doctors and nurses make the decisions, and not accountants and insurance companies; an initiative that saves 100 percent of the Social Security surplus and keeps it in the trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question to speed up consideration of school modernization, HMO reform, and legislation to save Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following for the RECORD:

The amendment to be offered if the previous question is defeated.

Amendment offered by Mr. MOAKLEY of Massachusetts:

In the resolution, on page 2, line 12, after "thereon," insert:

"(3) a bill or joint resolution pursuant to section 3 of this resolution, any amendment thereto, any conference report thereon, or any amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon."

At the end of the resolution add the following:

"Sec. 3. Before the consideration of any motions to suspend the rules pursuant to section 2 of this resolution, it shall be in order to consider:

"(a) A bill or joint resolution that will reduce class size in kindergarten through 3rd grade to a nationwide average of 18 students per class and will help local school districts hire an additional 100,000 well-prepared teachers, any amendment thereto, any conference report, or any amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon.

"(b) A bill or joint resolution that will provide local school districts with interest-free financing to modernize existing classrooms and build new school buildings, any amendment thereto, any conference report thereon, or any amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon.

"(c) A bill or joint resolution to remove 100% of the social security surplus from the spending control of Congress, any amendment thereto, any conference report thereon, or any amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon.

"(d) A bill or joint resolution to provide for a patients' bill of rights, any amendment thereto, any conference report thereon, or any amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon."

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives*, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual:

"Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues:

"Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

The vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker quoted Cato and their philosophy. The Cato Institute wants to slash the military budget of our country in half. They want to legalize marijuana. So much for the Cato Institute.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following to emphasize Republican accomplishments on education, dealing with illegal drugs in our schools:

Illegal drug use is behind most of the violence in this country. Over 50% of all men arrested for homicide test positive for illicit drugs at the time of arrest and illegal drugs are a factor in half of all family violence, most of it directed against women and children.

Illegal drugs are also the single most serious problem facing America's educational system. It has always bewildered me how President Clinton can claim to be the education President when drug use by school age children has doubled since he was elected President.

There is an obvious connection between the increase in illegal drug use which has occurred since President Clinton first took office and the educational problems facing our nation.

Illegal drug use has doubled since this President took office and according to the most recent reports drug use is still on the rise among eighth graders.

A person who uses illegal drugs is five times more likely to drop out of school than a non-drug user. Scientific studies show that illegal drugs—including marijuana—rob students of their motivation and self-esteem, leaving them unable to concentrate and indifferent to learning.

A recent study of 11th graders in our major cities showed that over half of the heavy drug users dropped out—twice the rate of those who are drug-free.

During the Reagan/Bush years drug use dropped, from 24 million users in 1979 to 11 million users in 1992. These hard fought gains were wasted by President Clinton.

There is not a parent in America who sends their children off to school without worrying that they will become exposed to illegal drugs. And it is not just teenagers anymore. Parents now need to be very concerned about 7th and 8th grade children getting involved with illegal drugs.

Toady in America one third of all high school kids smoke marijuana.

Today, more than half of all high school seniors have admitted to using illegal drugs. Since President Clinton was first elected. The trends of casual drug use for high school students have increased for virtually every illegal drug, including heroin, crack, cocaine, LSD and marijuana. This rise in teenage drug use also correlates closely with rising violence in our schools.

A recent study has also shown that students with the lowest grades were four times more likely to have used marijuana in the past month than those with the highest grade point average.

Since 1992, marijuana use has jumped 150% among 12 and 13 year old students and

200% among high school students. Nearly 1.5 million more middle school and high schools students use illegal drugs than when President Clinton was first elected.

I repeat, you cannot claim to be a President who cares about the education of our youth and not care about the illegal drug problem in this country. And President Clinton has demonstrated by his words—or lack of words—and by his deeds that he is not serious about winning the war on drugs. And our school systems have the casualties to prove it.

I urge support of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), vice chairman of the Committee on Rules.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the American people, at least the massive numbers who tuned into C-SPAN this morning, have been lucky enough to see the vision of the real Democratic Party. Fifteen out-of-touch liberal extremists and one pretending to be a conservative.

The Democratic vision is of a do-everything, big government, micromanaging, high taxes, big spending, deficit-creating, liberal, bureaucratic, getting-into-every-aspect-of-family-life Congress.

The Republicans propose a limited Federal Government that cuts taxes, balances the budget, strengthens national defense, empowers local and State governments to solve local problems, and make sure government works.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the American people have rejected the liberal do-everything-badly vision of government. They support a Congress that is focused on doing some things well and helping families and communities solve local problems.

We are trying to get things done here by passing this rule. I urge my colleagues to support this rule so that we can get things done and do the work that this Congress wants to do.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following statement from the Committee on Rules which explains the previous question vote:

THE PREVIOUS QUESTION VOTE: WHAT IT MEANS

House Rule XVII ("Previous Question") provides in part that: "There shall be a motion for the previous question, which, being ordered by a majority of the Members voting, if a quorum is present, shall have the effect to cut off all debate and bring the House to a direct vote upon the immediate question or questions on which it has been asked or ordered."

In the case of a special rule or order of business resolution reported from the House Rules Committee, providing for the consideration of a specified legislative measure, the previous question is moved following the one hour of debate allowed for under House Rules.

The vote on the previous question is simply a procedural vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution that sets the ground rules for debate

and amendment on the legislation it would make in order. Therefore, the vote on the previous question has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, further proceedings on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) will be postponed.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4761, URUGUAY ROUND AGREEMENTS COMPLIANCE ACT OF 1998

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 588 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 588

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4761) to require the United States Trade Representative to take certain actions in response to the failure of the European Union to comply with the rulings of the World Trade Organization. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 1 hour.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from South Boston, Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), as we continue our fun Saturday morning together, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. All time yielded will be for debate purposes only.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for consideration in the House of H.R. 4761, the Uruguay Round Agreements Compliance Act of 1998, without amendment or any intervention of any point of order.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate, divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, reducing trade barriers and expanding international commerce