

# PRIVATIZATION SCHEMES TRADE AWAY SOCIAL SECURITY'S GUARANTEE FOR A WALL STREET GAMBLE

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, investing Social Security in the stock market concedes to the hysteria manufactured by Wall Street. They exaggerate Social Security's actuarial imbalance and call it a crisis. There is no crisis. With current tax and benefit rates remaining constant, Social Security will pay 100 percent of the benefits of future recipients until 2032 without any change whatsoever. That is according to the most conservative estimates which assume extremely low economic growth rates and high unemployment.

What private sector initiative can promise the same? What other program backed by the full faith and credit of the United States? None. Only Social Security is guaranteed.

Privatization schemes trade away Social Security's guarantee for a Wall Street gamble. What goes up must go down. All forms of privatization constitute a cave-in and a back-track.

Members of Congress will soon be offering a resolution that says Congress must guarantee that all obligations to current and future Social Security beneficiaries will be paid in full. Americans need to hear Congress reaffirm its commitments to its citizens.

Stand up for Social Security.

## THE PROBLEM IN EDUCATION IS NOT A QUESTION OF MONEY

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, will we ever learn from history?

Last year the liberal Democrats said, "We need to spend more money on education because it will improve the education of our children." And so Congress voted to do so. The year before that, the message was exactly the same: Spend more money. And Congress did.

And the year before that, we heard the same arguments: Spend more money, and children will do better in school. And Congress did.

And the year before that, the liberals were in full cry demanding that more money be spent on education because that will surely improve student performance. And indeed Congress bowed to those demands.

But somehow we have still failed schools, and student performance is as dismal as ever.

My question is to the other side: At what point do they conclude that the problem in education is not a question of money? Is the other side utterly incapable of thinking seriously about the question, or will no amount of failure,

absolutely no amount of evidence, ever have the slightest impact on their thinking?

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of any thinking time they may have.

## BEAM ME UP—TEACHERS IN AMERICA CANNOT EVEN MENTION GOD?

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, Mildred Rosario, a sixth grade teacher in the Bronx, was fired. Mildred was fired for attempting to comfort her students over the drowning loss of a fellow classmate by simply saying he was in heaven.

Mildred was fired for saying, I quote, he was in heaven.

Unbelievable.

In America teachers can pass out condoms in school. Teachers can pass out needles. Teachers can even have forums and discussions on devil worship. But in America teachers cannot even mention God.

Beam me up.

A Nation that can discuss devil worship in our schools but cannot even mention God is a Nation that has lost both its sense of values and its sense of common sense.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back any problems we have in our schools.

## THE PRESIDENT IS OPPOSED TO EDUCATION SAVINGS ACCOUNTS

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, it is not very useful or helpful to debate another man's motives. After all, how can one possibly know the true motives in another man's heart? But how else can we explain the President's opposition to perhaps the best single thing this Congress has done for our Nation's children this year in the area of education?

Yesterday the President indicated that he plans to veto the Coverdell legislation that would allow parents, guardians, even corporations and unions to set aside up to \$2,000 per year in tax-free savings accounts.

Think about this: The President is opposed to education savings accounts. This is something that middle-class parents have been calling for for years. What could possibly explain the opposition of most of the Democrat Party to this pro-education bill? Could it be that this party is utterly, totally, inextricably beholden to the teachers' unions, special interests that fight every single reform that might threaten their power?

This is special-interest politics at its worst, and our children are the ones who are being short-changed by it.

## WHERE DO THE REPUBLICANS STAND?

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, Republicans continue to do everything they can to block the teen smoking and the campaign finance legislation. They want to preserve soft money and keep the obscenely large contributions from big tobacco and other special interests rolling in to fill their campaign coffers.

We know on Wednesday Senate Republicans killed the comprehensive bill to help stop teen smoking, and the GOP's efforts showed where the Republicans stand: in the pocket of the big tobacco companies who want to snuff out any real efforts to prevent kids from smoking.

And now we see the same thing happening with regard to managed care reform, patient protections. We have not been able to get a hearing on patient protections; we have not had any effort really to try to bring a bill to the floor that would reform managed care in the way that most Americans want to see something happen this year in Congress, to make it possible for us to have quality health care in this country.

What we are seeing here on a regular basis is Republican efforts to kill every major piece of progressive legislation, whether it is the tobacco settlement, it is campaign finance reform, or it is managed care reform.

## AMERICA NEEDS REAL EDUCATION REFORM

(Mr. ROGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, what would it take to convince education bureaucrats that reformers are pro-education? Would an effort to give parents more control over their children's education do it? Would a program that gives children trapped in terrible schools the opportunity to go to a better school do it? How about reforms in place around the country that offer disadvantaged children real hope for the first time?

No, none of these are satisfactory to the education bureaucrats, because they oppose everything we are attempting to do—from charter schools to parental choice to improve education. The only way to convince them is simply keep sending more money to spend from Washington, D.C.

We Republicans reject this failed philosophy. We are going to pass legislation to give control, as Governor John Engler says, to parents who love their children, and take it away from bureaucrats who love their paychecks.

BEST WISHES TO THE MEMBERS UNDERTAKING THE STUDY OF OUR CURRENT RELATIONSHIP WITH CHINA IN AN ELECTION YEAR

(Mr. SNYDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday this House voted to fund a \$2.5 million study of our current relationship with China. The newly-appointed chairman, a Republican, the gentleman from California (CHRIS COX) and the ranking member, a Democrat, the gentleman from Washington (NORM DICKS), two well-respected Members of this body, deserve our support and respect as they begin investigating whether our decades-long policy and current procedures allowing commercial American satellites to be launched by Chinese rockets have inadvertently allowed transfer to the Chinese of information useful to the Chinese missile program. These are issues deserving thoughtful analysis, but unfortunately for the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Washington they undertake this investigation at a time of intense rhetoric and prejudgment, and of course elections are 4½ months away.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage this body to let these Members do their work unobstructed by the hot rhetoric that sometimes overtakes this body. The gentleman from California (Mr. COX) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and the other members of this committee, we wish them well.

#### KILLER CONGRESSMEN

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's Washington Post headlines says it all: GOP Kills McCain Tobacco Bill. And in this body the Republicans leadership is trying to derail campaign finance reform.

Let me add what the Philadelphia Inquirer says today: Killer Congressmen. So unfair to call this a do-nothing Congress. Top Republicans on the Hill are putting in a lot of hard work right now. Think it is easy to kill off the tobacco bill and campaign financing reform at the same time? That is what they did yesterday, and that is what they continue to try to do.

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH) and his minions are killing off campaign finance reform. It is an astute gamble. Thwarting the Shays-Meehan bill may hurt their ability to pose as reformers, but it will keep open the soft money spigot they count on to hold their House majority.

What more proof do we need that our political system is hopelessly broken? Vote to fix our political system, vote to end big money in campaigns, and vote for real campaign finance reform. Vote for the Meehan-Shays bill.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4059, THE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 477 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 477

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4059) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Pending the adoption by the Congress of a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1999, the following allocations contemplated by section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall be considered as made to the Committee on Appropriations:

- (1) New discretionary budget authority: \$531,961,000,000.
- (2) Discretionary outlays: \$562,277,000,000.
- (3) New mandatory budget authority: \$298,105,000,000.
- (4) Mandatory outlays: \$290,858,000,000.

□ 0915

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I

may consume. During consideration of this resolution all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

House Resolution 477 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 4059, the Military Construction Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1999.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. Further, the rule waives points of order against the consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of Rule XXI, prohibiting unauthorized appropriations or legislative appropriations in general appropriations bills, and clause 6 of Rule XXI, prohibiting reappropriations in general appropriations bills.

Further, Members who have preprinted their amendments in the Congressional RECORD prior to their consideration will be given priority recognition to offer their amendments if otherwise consistent with House rules.

In addition, the rule grants the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole the authority to postpone votes and reduce voting time to 5 minutes, provided that the first vote in a series is not less than 15 minutes.

The rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Finally, because we are still without a budget resolution conference report, the rule provides that the allocations required by the Budget Act, section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 that sets out the process requiring those numbers, shall be considered as made to the Committee on Appropriations. In other words, Mr. Speaker, we are using last year's budget resolution numbers, as adjusted for economic assumptions.

The Committee on Rules hearing was cordial and bipartisan, which I am told is a reflection of how the Subcommittee on Military Construction of the Committee on Appropriations has acted during the stewardship of the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD), the chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HEFNER), the ranking member. The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HEFNER) has been a tremendous asset to this House, and his contributions to a better quality of life for our men and women in uniform are truly commendable.

I support this open rule as well as the underlying bill. The bill funds military construction, family housing and base closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999. The spending level represents a reduction in the underlying bill of \$1 billion from last year's bill, \$8.2 billion this year versus \$9.2 billion for 1998, a reduction from last year's bill, and I believe that the bill contains a reasonable amount of spending, with the majority of the money going to family housing.