

unpaid debt which has been unfairly withheld.

In the early 1980s, a subsidiary of Hill International, Gibbs & Hill, successfully completed a desalinization plant in Yanbu City, Saudi Arabia, yet were never paid the \$55 million due them for the work. Despite all the work put in by Members of Congress to encourage the settlement of this claim, and despite repeated promises that the claim would be paid, the kingdom of Saudi Arabia has yet to pay this overdue bill.

I also find it troubling that our own administration has been unable or unwilling to actively assist the U.S. company against a foreign government. Where is the State Department in this fight?

Fifty-five million dollars may seem like spare change to the Saudis, but it means something to Hill International, just as it would any hardworking company of the United States. I rise to say that I will not rest until the debt is paid.

SAUDI ARABIA NEEDS TO RESOLVE U.S. COMPANY'S CLAIM OF UNPAID DEBT

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

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I, too, join my two previous colleagues on the floor this morning, really out of absolute frustration. I came to the House 6 years ago and was involved in trying to help resolve this claim by Hill International with the Saudi Government. And here, for me personally, 6 years later, we are still at that point.

This is the only one of 19 claims filed against the Saudi Government by American companies in the 1980s that still remains unpaid. Over the last 5 years, literally dozens of Members of Congress have vocalized their support for resolution of this final claim but have received nothing but empty promises from Saudi Arabia's Ambassador to the United States, Prince Bandar.

A former member of this chamber, Bill Emerson, in 1995, met with Ambassador Bandar and was asked to broker a compromise agreement to the claim. Despite Representative Emerson's diligent efforts to implement this compromise before his passing, Ambassador Bandar has refused to honor this gentleman's agreement.

Over the last year, Prince Bandar has repeatedly committed to meet with the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. JO ANN EMERSON) in an effort to conclude this matter, but has been unwilling to set a date. How long must this American company continue to wait? We need to get this settlement resolved.

AMERICA NEEDS A NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM

(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, there are few issues which separate liberals and conservatives in dramatic fashion. Taxes, of course, is one; and crime is another. But defense and national security issues also illustrate two sharply different visions, different world views, which distinguished conservatives from liberals.

Liberals just love arms control agreements. They put almost boundless faith in a piece of paper between America and countries which are hostile to everything we hold dear, and they take great comfort in the ability that these agreements are going to keep America safe.

Conservatives, on the other hand, look at all of human history and are skeptical of such agreements, instead placing stronger and greater faith in a strong and secure defense.

Given these two world views it is time to reexamine our current vulnerability to ballistic missile attack. There is a piece of paper that exists to assure us that America is safe from a ballistic missile attack, but this is deliberate policy of vulnerability to ballistic missile attack and it is both foolish and dangerous.

It is time that conservatives act with prudence and demand that Americans be protected by building a strong national missile defense system.

NEW REPORT INDICATES WHAT U.S. STUDENTS DO NOT KNOW

(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, a new report says that American students just do not know: 70 percent do not know the name of the Vice President; 40 percent do not know the three branches of government; 25 percent do not know what the fifth amendment means; and only 2 percent know the name of the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

On the other hand, 99 percent know Michael Jordan, 99 percent know Mark McGwire, and 60 percent of American teenagers can cite all three names of the Three Stooges. Is it any wonder American students rank 14th around the world in achievement test scores?

Beam me up, Mr. Speaker. It is a sad day when more teenagers know Monica Lewinsky than Judge Rehnquist. And it is a sadder day when more teenagers know Larry, Moe, and Curly than reading, writing, and arithmetic.

Think about that one.

DOLLARS TO THE CLASSROOM

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we are all concerned about educating our Nation's children. For 30 years the Federal Government has been cre-

ating big Federal programs to try to improve education. It has resulted in lower scores and more bureaucracy.

Federal education dollars should go directly to the classroom and to teachers, not to State and Federal education bureaucracies. By passing H.R. 3248, Dollars To The Classroom, we can send these dollars to teachers who know the names of our kids.

The Dollars to the Classroom Act block grants 35 K-through-12 education programs and requires that 95 percent of these funds are made available to kids and teachers in the classroom. Under the Dollars to the Classroom Act, \$800 million more will be spent directly on classrooms in America. That is almost \$10,000 per school, \$425 for each classroom.

Just imagine what our teachers could do with an additional \$425 to spend directly on their students' learning each year. Pass Dollars to the Classroom.

AMERICAN PEOPLE SHOULD BE ASKING CONGRESS WHAT THEY ARE NOT DOING

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, there are 37 members of the Committee on the Judiciary, about 8 percent of this Congress. That leaves 398 Members of the House that could be working on some other matters. Yet today, September 16, 2 weeks before the end of the Federal fiscal year, incredibly, there is no budget. Months late.

Over 70 percent of the American public are in some kind of managed care plan, and yet this Congress has not passed a meaningful Patients' Bill of Rights to protect them.

Russia is falling apart, the Asian economy is in the tank, South America is teetering, and every American who has a stock thrift plan has seen their retirement drop 15 to 20 percent in the last few weeks, and yet no congressional action.

The Committee on the Judiciary's job may be to investigate whether something was done, but the American people should be looking at Congress and asking about what is not being done.

USING SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUS FOR TAX CUTS IS WRONG

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

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to talk about a very important issue. I just left a Republican conference, and they talked about a dynamite tax cut bill, and I think most Americans would support this tax cut proposal with the exception of one very important detail: Instead of finding spending reductions so we can reduce spending and reduce taxes, this time,

for the first time since I have been here, they are going to use Social Security surpluses for tax cuts.

There is no business in America that would go to their pension fund, take money out of the pension fund, and use it for pay raises. So why does Congress think that they can use Social Security surpluses for tax cuts? This is a totally unreasonable proposal.

I would like to make it very clear that this is different than the 1997 tax cut package. In 1997, we reduced spending and we reduced taxes. That is good. But in 1998, we are about to reduce taxes by utilizing Social Security surpluses that belong put away for the safety and security of Social Security for our senior citizens, and that is wrong.

I conclude this morning by asking the Republican leadership to reconsider asking for a vote that is going to put Members in this Chamber in a position where they have to choose between protecting Social Security for our seniors and cutting taxes for American people, both very good objectives.

SO-CALLED FEDERAL BUDGET SURPLUS IS FUTURE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, to follow on the comments of the person preceding me in the well, there will be much fanfare this September about the looming budget surplus, no end of ideas on how to spend these monies. That side of the aisle is going to promote tax cuts, with the exception of the gentleman who spoke before me.

Let us get some facts: 73 percent of the American people pay more in Social Security taxes than income taxes. We all pay this tax, knowing it goes to support our parents, our grandparents, the disabled, and, hopefully, ourselves, when we retire. This year Social Security will have a \$90 billion surplus.

Guess what? The so-called Federal budget surplus is the future Social Security trust fund. If we spend it today on tax cuts, it will not be there tomorrow for America's retirees.

We better step back and think about that before we jam this bill through in an attempt to get reelected and be popular in an election year at the cost of the future of Social Security.

THERE IS NO REAL SURPLUS TO GIVE TAX CUTS

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to follow up on what the previous speaker said, not only my Republican colleague from Wisconsin, but also my Democratic colleague from Oregon.

Seniors understand, when we talk to them and when we have town meetings,

that there is essentially no surplus; that the so-called surplus that we talk about is essentially what is owed to Social Security, and that we have to pay back a lot of money to the Social Security trust fund over the next 5 or 10 years if we are to have enough benefits to pay out to Social Security recipients.

That is why this Republican tax proposal is really the wrong way to go. What will happen, essentially, is that we will, in fact, increase the debt and, ultimately, may have to raise taxes in order to provide the benefits that Social Security recipients need.

So what I say is we spent a lot of time last year on a bipartisan basis to pass a Balanced Budget Act. We have a balanced budget, but we still have this problem that we have to pay back Social Security. We do not have a surplus. We do not have one to spend.

Let us not, in the few weeks we have here in this Congress, waste our time trying to kid the American people that somehow we are going to give them tax relief. It is not really there to spend.

□ 1015

FEDERAL ROLE IN EDUCATION

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the so-called Dollars to the Classroom Act which would turn critically important elementary and secondary education programs into one giant block grant.

Republicans want to eliminate 31 programs that work, including the Eisenhower professional development grants, women's educational equality, school-to-work, and gifted and talented education grants.

In the last Congress, Republicans tried to eliminate the Department of Education. Today they are trying to kill any chance of Federal leadership in education. Education is primarily a State and local responsibility. But the President and the Congress must provide national leadership on national issues and no issue is more important than improving education for our kids. Instead of focusing on what works, reducing class size, improving school facilities, raising standards and improving the training of our teachers, the Republicans want to destroy critically important programs. Do not let them succeed. Oppose H.R. 3248.

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Speaker, Social Security is a 60-year success story that all Americans should be proud of. Prior to Social Security enactment, over 50 percent of our retirees were in poverty.

Today it is less than 10 percent. We have an opportunity now to take the next step to protect Social Security for today, for tomorrow, for the future generations to come. But we are in jeopardy this week. We have heard from my colleagues this morning about efforts to take future Social Security trust fund dollars and place them into tax cuts. We last year all voted together, a majority of Republicans and Democrats, to provide a \$95 billion tax cut within the context of a balanced budget. I supported that. I want to move forward and continue to do that. But I will not vote for tax cuts that remove critical dollars from the future of Social Security. That is irresponsible. I call upon my colleagues to save Social Security first before any effort is made to proceed on tax cuts. The future of Social Security is just too important to all Americans.

90-10 TAX CUT PLAN

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) has just released a bold new tax cut package for this Congress. It is called the 90-10 tax cut plan. It will improve the health of Social Security and cut taxes.

First we will set aside 90 percent of the surplus, to save Social Security, a surplus that will total about \$1.4 trillion, and then we will use 10 percent of the surplus to cut taxes now. It is important to emphasize that we must cut taxes now. Already the liberals have ideas how they want to spend your money. Those who love big government do not think that the middle class ought to have tax relief. In fact they are against the whole idea of tax cuts, always and everywhere.

This tax package contains marriage tax penalty relief, it makes health care more affordable for many of those who cannot get it today, and it gives hard-hit farmers assistance at a difficult time. We were told that we could not balance the budget and cut taxes at the same time, but we did, just as we will save Social Security and cut taxes this time.

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to answer my friend from Kansas if I might for just a second.

Democrats believe America deserves tax relief but the money should not come from the Social Security trust fund.

Now they are going to fool around this week and try to create a separate piece of legislation to bank this