

the right thing to do. We think that it is the right thing for our senior citizens.

I wanted to thank every Member of this Congress who has joined with us in cosponsoring this legislation. We hope we can pass it for our senior citizens so folks like Ms. Frances Staley, my constituent in Orange, Texas, can be able to afford her prescription medication.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, September 29, 1998.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,  
*The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted to Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on Tuesday, September 29, 1998 at 12:45 p.m.

That the Senate Agreed to Conference Report H.R. 6.

That the Senate Agreed to Conference Report H.R. 4103.

With warm regards,  
ROBIN H. CARLE,  
*Clerk.*

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, September 30, 1998.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,  
*The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted to Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on Wednesday, September 30, 1998 at 10:45 a.m.

That the Senate Agreed to Conference Report H.R. 4060.

With warm regards,  
ROBIN H. CARLE,  
*Clerk.*

#### TRIBUTE TO DAN QUISENBERY

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

Mr. SNOWBARGER. Mr. Speaker, the Kansas City area, our national past time of baseball, and everyone who admires courage and grit suffered a tragic loss yesterday. Dan Quisenberry, former relief ace for the Kansas City Royals, lost his battle with brain cancer at the age of 45.

Quiz faced death with the same unblinking fearlessness with which he faced a Wade Boggs or a Don Mattingly or a Reggie Jackson. His courage in the

face of adversity was inspiration for all of us. Dan Quisenberry became the second Kansas City Royal to fall victim to this disease, joining manager Dick Howser, who died in 1987, just 2 years after leading the Royals to the world's championship.

Dan Quisenberry developed a reputation as a "flake", based on his friendly banter with reporters who always sought him out for a good quote. This is a man who, finding success after a rare downturn in his pitching fortunes, told a reporter that he had found a delivery in his flaw. But, Quisenberry also was an intelligent and articulate man, a witty man who turned to poetry after his retirement from baseball.

He also was the best relief pitcher the Kansas City Royals had ever known. He was the first pitcher to save 40 games in a season, and he still holds the American League record for most saves in two consecutive seasons with 89. At the peak of his career, he was a factor in every game; unique for a pitcher.

Baseball writer and fellow Kansan Bill James put it best in his baseball abstract, "The logic was this: let's say that the Royals were one ahead in the fifth inning, but the other team had a man on and Babe Ruth at the plate. You'd be thinking 'Well, if he gets the Babe out here he's got the bottom of the order up in the sixth. That means that Babe and Lou and company don't come up again until the seventh at worst, and if it really gets tough in the seventh inning, Quiz can come in and the Royals will still win. So if he just gets Babe out here in the fifth inning, then the Royals win.'"

□ 1545

Well, it was not just the Royals who threw this way, either. Managers would use their pinch hitters in the 5th and 6th innings, trying to keep Quisenberry out of the game. In a sense every Royals game revolved around trying to get to Quisenberry, and it was something that you started thinking about really as soon as you got to the park.

This is about a man who threw underhand to major league hitters and got them out. But Dan Quisenberry was more than a great baseball player. He was a great human being. He was active in Harvesters, an organization that collects food for the homeless, and Village Presbyterian Church. He gave something even more precious than his money, he gave of his time. His dedication to charity and to children was admirable.

I think it is appropriate to remember at this moment the immortal words of the fabled sportswriter Grantland Rice, words which very well might have been written for Dan Quisenberry:

When the one great scorer comes to write against your name, he marks not that you won or lost but how you played the game.

Mr. Speaker, I ask this body to join me in offering condolences to the Quisenberry family. Let them take comfort in the fact that life is not

measured by its length but by its quality.

#### FIRST SURPLUS SINCE 1969

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

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I thought I would take a few minutes to just talk about something that is pretty exciting, I find, for the folks back home in the south suburbs of Chicago and the South Side of Chicago and the rural areas and the bedroom communities I have the privilege of representing back home in Illinois.

October 1 is a big day. It is a big day that many of us, particularly in my generation, have been waiting a long time to see come. The reason October 1 is such a big day is, today is the first surplus that Washington has seen since 1969. Thanks to this new majority that has been in place here, the Republican majority that has been in place now for the last 3½ years, we have the first balanced budget in 29 years, a balanced budget that is projected to generate \$1.6 trillion in extra surplus tax dollars over the next 10 years.

Essentially the folks back home are sending more money to Washington than we need, producing a mammoth surplus, thanks to the fiscal responsibility that began with the Contract with America in 1995. I find that folks back home are pretty excited, because we talk about what we are going to be doing with this surplus. There are some, particularly down at the White House, that want to spend it. They would rather take that surplus and spend it on whatever they can call emergency spending, trying to avoid the budget rules and, of course, avoid the budget discipline that we have.

That is what a lot of folks back home say. They say, if we do not set aside that surplus now and give it to a specific purpose, those Washington politicians will spend that extra money. We made a commitment here 10 days ago to do something with that \$1.6 trillion surplus. We made a commitment to save Social Security. We made a commitment to eliminate the marriage tax penalty. We made a commitment, essentially, to give \$1.4 trillion, two times what President Clinton originally asked for back in January, to saving Social Security, \$1.4 trillion.

Now, the \$1.6 trillion in the budget surplus, of course, the 90-10 plan, as we now call it, sets aside 90 percent of the extra tax revenue and makes a commitment to put that money aside for Social Security. The remaining 10 percent we are going to give back to the American people, because we do not want it spent here in Washington. We want to use it to help families.

I have often raised the issue of the marriage tax penalty over the last year, asking a simple question: Is it fair, is it right that under our Tax Code

that 28 million married working couples pay higher taxes today just because they are married? Is it right that our Tax Code charges a married working couple with two incomes more in taxes than an identical couple with identical incomes living together outside of marriage?

I think we all agree that that is wrong. This House made a bipartisan commitment, by adopting the 90-10, plan not only to save Social Security, but also to work to eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

When I think of Social Security, I think of my mom and dad but. When I think of the marriage tax penalty. I think of my sister, Pat, and brother-in-law Rich, a school teacher and a farmer back home in Sheldon, Illinois who are just like 28 million other married working couples. They suffer the marriage tax penalty.

Under our legislation, by doubling the standard deduction for joint filers to twice that of a single filer, raising it from \$6900 to \$8300, we save 28 million married working couples \$243 under the 90-10 plan. That saves Social Security and helps eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

Back home in the south suburbs, towns like Joliet, Illinois, \$243, that is a car payment, that is a couple months' worth of day care for a family with kids that need to be in day care while mom and dad are forced to go to work just to pay the taxes. That is a big victory.

I am also proud that not only does doubling the standard deduction for joint filers to twice that of a single filer save \$243 but it also simplifies the Tax Code, one of the other goals of our Republican Congress. By simplifying our Tax Code, in fact, our marriage tax relief not only saves \$243 each for 28 million couples, but we allow 6 million married working couples to no longer have to file a schedule A. They will only need to file a schedule 1040 EZ, meaning they will no longer need to itemize. We are simplifying their tax filing process.

Mr. Speaker, that is a big victory. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle keep raising this ogre. They always say somehow by working to eliminate the marriage tax penalty that somehow because you are doing that you are somehow hurting the Social Security trust fund.

As a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, two weeks ago we asked a representative of the Social Security Administration, the deputy commissioner, and her name, Judy Chesser, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) asked Judith Chesser, he asked her, now, as a result of the tax bill, the tax cuts contained in the 90-10 plan, that the committee was planning to vote out, will there be any impact on the Social Security trust fund. Judith Chesser said, absolutely, no.

The 90-10 plan is good for families back home. It helps farmers in Illinois.

It helps small business people in Illinois. Helps those who want to send their kids off to college. We eliminate the marriage tax penalty for a majority of those who suffer it. The bottom line is, we also save Social Security by setting aside \$1.4 trillion.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 4:30 p.m.

□ 1633

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. EWING) at 4 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 3874, CHILD NUTRITION AND WIC REAUTHORIZATION AMENDMENTS OF 1998

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3874) to amend the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to provide children with increased access to food and nutrition assistance, to simplify program operations and improve program management, to extend certain authorities contained in those Acts through fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none and, without objection, appoints the following conferees:

From the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for consideration of the House bill, and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. GOODLING, RIGGS, CASTLE, CLAY and MARTINEZ.

From the Committee on Agriculture, for consideration of sections 2, 101, 104(b), 106, 202(c) and 202(o) of the House bill, and sections 101, 111, 114, 203(c), 203(r), and titles III and IV of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. SMITH of Oregon, GOODLATTE, and STENHOLM.

There was no objection.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 2073, JUVENILE CRIME CONTROL AND DELINQUENCY ACT OF 1998

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with rule XX and by direction of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, with the concurrence of the

Committee on the Judiciary, I move to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 2073) to authorize appropriations for the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) is recognized for one hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my motion. The bill addresses the problem of juvenile crime in this country. We all know that juvenile crime is not going to go away on its own.

For two Congresses we have attempted to address the problem of juvenile crime through legislation supporting accountability and prevention programs. Yet we have not produced a final bill. While the states have their own initiatives to combat juvenile crime, they rely on the resources we have provided them through laws such as the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, which expired in 1996. Today's action is merely an effort to get to conference with the Senate. H.R. 3 passed the House by a vote of 286 to 123. H.R. 1818 passed the House by a vote of 413 to 14.

We need to address juvenile crime through a two-pronged approach. First, we must send a message to our youth that we will not tolerate their involvement in criminal activity. We can do this through the imposition of appropriate punishment for each crime they commit.

Second, we need to work with the youth at risk of committing juvenile acts and those who have already been in touch with the juvenile justice system to prevent their involvement in criminal activities.

I realize that some of the body have problems with certain of the provisions of the bill, that it is not perfect legislation. However this motion to go to conference is the way to address these concerns. I believe the conferees will have a much better chance to produce an approach to address the problems of juvenile crime with which we can all agree. I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. RIGGS).

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time. I will be brief, since I know we promised the minority we would not have any extended debate on this particular issue.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to rise to say that I am particularly pleased in the waning days of this Congress, the 105th Congress, in our country's history, we are going to be able to go to conference with the Senate on hopefully a comprehensive approach to combating juvenile crime.

As the chairman mentioned, there are two measures that have passed the House, both with strong bipartisan support; H.R. 3, the Committee on the Judiciary bill, and H.R. 1818, the bill that