

the number that normally come in any given year. From the comments of what those folks said at that breakfast, they are hurting and hurting badly.

□ 1345

These loans will determine whether or not some of those farmers and their families and their neighbors can stay on the farm. I am glad we are taking action to help farmers make it through the dire straits that they now face and that we will act today.

Our small farmers are a vital part of our economic fiber in this country. They are important to the character of rural North Carolina and America, and we cannot afford for those small farmers to cease to exist.

I am proud of what we are doing this afternoon, and I want to make sure that this important program is available to farmers as they approach the critical spring planning season.

This is the first, as you have already heard, in many steps, including crop insurance reform and supplemental funding for this year as we look at the 1999 year that this Congress must take to strengthen the safety net for our farmers.

I urge unanimous passage of H.R. 882, and I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Committee on Agriculture and others in this Congress to make sure that we provide a safe and secure future for American farmers so the rest of us might enjoy a safe and secure future and good food.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) for pointing out the fact that, while so many people in this country think the economy is doing so well, it is obvious those who say that have not been in the farm communities recently. There are some very, very difficult times ongoing there.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 882. Natural disasters and low commodity prices have forced many farmers and ranchers to seek government loans to cover operating and ownership expenses. In fact, in many states, funds available for these USDA programs have already been exhausted, creating a credit crunch at a time when these loans are absolutely necessary to cover producers expenses.

H.R. 882 will immediately make available to the Secretary of Agriculture \$450 to \$500 million in unused funds in order to guarantee loans to farmers and ranchers. These unused funds are currently set aside for the Beginning Farmers and Ranchers program but were not to be available until April 1. Because it is not anticipated that these funds will ever be used by this program it makes sense to have them available for those most in need.

This bill requires no new net government outlays and will have no effect on the federal budget. It is a common-sense reaction to the problems facing rural America today and it deserves our full support.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 882.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 882, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

SOCIAL SECURITY GUARANTEE INITIATIVE

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 32) expressing the sense of the Congress that the President and the Congress should join in undertaking the Social Security Guarantee Initiative to strengthen and protect the retirement income security of all Americans through the creation of a fair and modern Social Security Program for the 21st Century, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 32

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This joint resolution may be cited as the "Social Security Guarantee Initiative".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) the Social Security program provides benefits to 44,000,000 Americans, including more than 27,000,000 retirees, 5,000,000 people with disabilities, and 2,000,000 surviving children, and is essential to the dignity and security of the Nation's elderly, disabled, and their families;

(2) the Social Security program's progressive benefit structure is of particular importance to women, due to their (A) longer life expectancies than men, making the Social Security program's lifetime, inflation-adjusted benefits a critical income support especially for widows; (B) lower average earnings; and (C) lower pension and other retirement savings, stemming in part from their lower incomes and their spending an average of 11 years out of the paid workforce caring for families;

(3) the approaching retirement of the Baby Boom Generation will result in the Social Security program's benefit costs exceeding its tax revenues beginning in 2013;

(4) the Social Security program faces looming insolvency and instability in the next century so that by 2032 the Social Security Trust Funds will be fully depleted and the program will be able to honor less than 75 percent of benefit commitments; and

(5) prompt action is necessary to restore Americans' confidence that their retirement benefits will be protected.

SEC. 3. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.

The President and the Congress should join in strengthening the Social Security program and

protecting the retirement income security of all Americans for the 21st century in a manner that—

(1) ensures equal treatment across generations to all Americans, especially minorities and other low-income workers;

(2) recognizes the unique obstacles that women face in ensuring retirement, disability, and survivor security and the essential role that the Social Security program plays in protecting financial stability for women;

(3) provides a continuous benefit safety net for workers, their survivors, their dependents, and individuals with disabilities;

(4) protects guaranteed lifetime benefits, including cost-of-living adjustments that fully index for inflation, for current and future retirees; and

(5) does not increase taxes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.J. Res. 32.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, our work on Social Security is well under way. We have held numerous Social Security hearing already this year, and the President has provided us with a framework for the Congress to consider as we work towards a bipartisan solution to Social Security's problems.

In fact, we are in agreement with President Clinton on many of the major issues relating to preserving and strengthening our Social Security system; namely, one, action is necessary now to shore up Social Security's financial underpinnings; two, 62 percent of the Federal budget surplus should be set aside until Social Security is indeed saved; three, investment in markets can be a part of the long-term solution for Social Security; and, four, personal savings accounts are both technically feasible and a necessary part of the solution.

Passage of H.J. Res. 32 will add to this strong start and will further strengthen our bipartisanship as we face the challenges ahead. The joint resolution says that Congress and the President should protect benefits for current and future retirees while avoiding any tax increases.

On a program as vital to our country as Social Security, I am sure all of my colleagues will agree that we must work together, and H.J. Res. 32 is a measure that deserves all of our support. I hope they will join with me in showing the American people that Congress is committed to strengthening and preserving Social Security for the future and for future generations.

Let me also add that I view this resolution as a test of whether the two parties can work together. We certainly

did in the passage of this in the full committee. If we divide into partisanship over a simple, noncontroversial resolution affirming our support for Social Security, why should the American people expect us to be able to work together to actually save Social Security.

Whatever our differences may be, and I am sure we will have plenty of differences, surely we can agree on this resolution as it is vitally necessary to the future of Social Security that we do work together and we work together in this Congress.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in the old partisan days, I would say this resolution is good because Santa Clause is coming through. But recognize that we have not had too many legislative accomplishments. Being very anxious to display some degree of bipartisanship, let me congratulate the majority for this resolution for whatever it means.

In the olden days, when people saw a problem, they started legislating. But if this is a new thing, where you send a message that I recognize the problem and I do intend to legislate, well, who can be against that?

So let me join with my Republican colleagues and say we have a very, very serious problem with Social Security in its present form. The majority party is acknowledging that it is going to do something about it. They have met the President halfway in terms of identifying the set-aside of the 62 percent. But they have a great deal of difficulty in stating that they will not entertain a tax cut from using the surplus until such time as we take care of the Social Security system and the Medicare trust system as we know it.

Now, I do not know why these things are omitted. I have no idea as to why they are difficult to talk about. But let me join with my friend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and say that half a loaf is better than nothing. I sincerely hope that we get beyond these resolutions and see what we can do in a bipartisan way to find a solution to this serious problem.

The reason I say this, Mr. Speaker, is that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and I know that this problem does not lend itself to a Republican answer or to a Democratic answer. If it is going to be done, and we both hope that it will be done, it has to be done in a bipartisan way.

What has been done to move us closer to a bipartisan effort besides this resolution, I do not know. But if, with a great deal of imagination, I can say that let this be that one first step toward a journey which has to be concluded this year if we are going to do anything at all, then I want to be on the floor to join with the gentleman from Florida in this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Cali-

fornia (Mr. MATSUI), and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), the architect of this joint resolution.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Social Security for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the comments that were made. We do have to get beyond resolutions and get to real solutions. But as we debate what we are going to do on Social Security, we need to send a message to our Nation's Social Security retirees, our current beneficiaries, that they will be held harmless in this debate as we move forward on Social Security.

I authored this resolution because I believe it is vital that Congress send a very clear message to the millions of Americans who rely on Social Security today.

As we debate how best to fix and preserve Social Security, we must also commit ourselves to guaranteeing this generation of retirees that their benefits will be there when they need them.

I recently completed 21 town hall meetings over the Congressional recess on Social Security throughout southern Wisconsin. At every single one of these meetings, I had constituents who are concerned about the talk they hear on Social Security. Whether it is 62 percent, 38 percent, whatever percent, they are concerned that their current level of benefits will be diminished.

I think it is very important that we, as a conference, on a bipartisan basis, send a signal that their benefits will not be cut; that we have to preserve guaranteed benefits for current retirees and people who are about to retire. Then we have to look at how we are going to keep Social Security solvent for future generations.

This is the most important task that is facing this Congress this year. I think that this resolution gets us off to a good start, gets us off to a bipartisan agreement.

From the western edge of my district in Brodhead, Wisconsin, to the shores of Lake Michigan in Racine, at every stop, I heard these types of comments. There was one thing that I learned, that I heard from an older gentleman in Evansville, Wisconsin; and this is a remarkable recommendation. I want to quote him. He said, "If Congress allows Social Security to go broke, and seniors can no longer receive their benefits, then Members of Congress should not be allowed to receive their pensions."

The people will hold this Congress and this administration accountable, and they should. Thousands of other

seniors throughout my district have echoed these concerns. They have great concerns about whether Social Security will be there as we negotiate and as we put together a bipartisan agreement to fix this program for the seniors in the future.

But I want to be very clear about what this resolution does. One, for current and soon-to-be retirees, there will be no loss of benefits, no additional costs to beneficiaries, and no increased payroll taxes. Two, for the next generation of retirees who are now paying into the Social Security program, we must guarantee that the program will be saved and that their benefits will be there in their retirement years.

Mr. Speaker, we have a historic opportunity to preserve what has been one of our Nation's most successful programs. I look forward to working with both seniors in my district and my colleagues in Congress on this important issue.

I urge Members on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of the resolution.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, Social Security is the most successful domestic program in the history of our Nation, keeping 40 percent of our elderly out of poverty and 800,000 children out of poverty.

I support this resolution. But the real issue is whether Congress will finish the work begun by the President when he introduced the framework for Social Security, strengthening our system. The President's plan lays out a good foundation of reducing public debt and shoring up the program's assets.

Social Security is too important of a program to play partisan politics. We must focus on improving the Trust Fund rate of return, restoring long-term solvency, and protecting benefits for current and future retirees. We should also focus on helping Americans save for their retirement to supplement the guaranteed benefit they receive from Social Security.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we should make strengthening Social Security and Medicare our top fight and enact those reforms before any other aspect of our budget. Let us make it our top priority. Let us get it done. Let us get it done in a bipartisan way, and let us move on, really, to the bill itself rather than just this resolution.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY MILLER).

(Mr. GARY MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of House Joint Resolution 32. I want to thank my fellow freshman, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) for his leadership on this issue.

This bill is our opportunity to stand up and say our government will pay what it owes the people. We are committed to keeping the promise of Social Security.

When our constituents look at their pay stubs, they see a large portion of their hard-earned money going to Social Security. Ninety-six percent of all workers pay 12.4 percent of payroll taxes. That is 148 million workers and their employers.

□ 1400

Every one of those workers sees the exact dollar amount on the Social Security portion of their paychecks. In exchange for that money, they expect a certain amount of help in their retirement years. They expect that money to come back to them in later years. I repeat, they expect that money to come back to them in later years. They do not care about charts and graphs here in Washington, they just know that money is going out of their pockets and expect to have some of it come back. They have paid for Social Security, they have been promised the money will come back to them when they retire, and we are committed to making sure that promise is kept.

I know that some changes, some of them possibly difficult changes, will have to be made to make Social Security solvent, but we need to keep our promise.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

(Mr. NADLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution recognizes the historic importance of Social Security and commits the Congress to protect guaranteed lifetime benefits, including cost-of-living adjustments that fully index for inflation, for current and future retirees. For this reason, I will vote for it, but I must note several flaws in the resolution.

We should have included a provision that states that Social Security should be strengthened in a way that does not cut benefits, does not raise the retirement age, and does not place individuals at financial risk in their senior years by diverting Social Security tax revenues to individual private accounts. These ought to be the guiding principles of the Social Security debate.

This resolution also states as fact the prediction of the trustees that by 2032 the trust funds will be fully depleted and the program will be able to honor less than 75 percent of benefit commitments. But this prediction will be correct only if the trustees' other prediction, that our economic growth rate will decline from 3.8 percent to 1.5 percent, and stay at that absurdly low level for 70 years, is also correct.

All of the budget calculations of the administration, the House Committee on the Budget, the Senate Committee on the Budget, and CBO assume much higher growth rates. Nobody really believes that the 1.5 percent prediction of the trustees is anywhere near correct. So we should not make a congressional

finding of fact we do not really believe to be true.

But even granting the trustees' projection for the sake of argument, the shortfall predicted by the trustees is still small and manageable, can be completely funded in a way that does not cut benefits, raise the retirement age, raise tax rates or shift economic risk to individuals by shifting to a system of individual accounts.

I plan on introducing legislation later this week that will do just that.

Raising the retirement age, which is a key component of many so-called "reform" proposals, is cruel and unnecessary, especially for those whose careers demand hard physical labor, and this resolution ought to say so.

Cutting benefits, either directly or by replacing the defined benefit nature of Social Security with a defined contribution program, would devastate millions of Americans who are just barely getting by right now. Benefits should not be reduced and the basic guarantee of Social Security must not be undermined in any way. This is crucial, and it ought to be included in this resolution.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), who has early on been working very hard on a reform package.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his good words.

This resolution is good. All resolutions are good that move us ahead with a commitment to fix this significant problem. I think maybe we will start believing these resolutions and we will do it.

But, look, everybody needs to understand it is not easy. A Committee on the Budget staffer just figured out if we put every cent of the surplus into Social Security at a nominal return of 10.5 percent, every cent of the surplus over the next 5 years, it would only keep Social Security solvent until the year 2040.

I mean this is a tough question. It is so easy to demagogue. I hope there will be a commitment by both sides of the aisle and the President of the United States to not criticize parts of the program as we try to move ahead with a very serious effort to make a solution. I would ask the Democrats to give us their ideas and their proposals that can be scored to keep Social Security solvent and, likewise, Republicans do the same, to try to seriously move ahead with saving a very important program.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me this time, and I wish to use this opportunity for a little prekindergarten 101 budget talk.

Through all the rhetoric we hear today and we are soon to hear as we anxiously await the budget for 2000, let us remind ourselves today there is no surplus to be divided for any purpose for the next 2 years, other than by

using Social Security Trust Fund. And for the next 5 years there is \$82 billion that are non-Security Trust Fund.

Let us remind ourselves of that and use this opportunity in a bipartisan way, as we unanimously vote for this resolution today, that what we are saying is, unequivocally, that a lot of the rhetoric we hear about who and how much we are going to spend, and how much we are going to cut taxes, will not fit within the spirit of the resolution that is voted on today.

Let us remind ourselves of that today as we vote for this and use this in a positive way to do what all of us want to do, both sides of the aisle. And I agree with the gentleman from Michigan, there are some of us on this side, as on that side, that are willing to make some of the tough choices. That will come through committee work.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. This resolution doesn't do anything to actually strengthen Social Security, but I hope that it is the beginning of a bipartisan process to honestly address the financial problems facing Social Security.

Social Security reform should start by walling off the Social Security surplus and saving it for Social Security. We shouldn't even talk about budget surpluses until we have truly taken Social Security off-budget by balancing the budget without counting the Social Security surplus. All of the Social Security surplus should be saved for Social Security by using them to reduce the debt held by the public.

There is no surplus today unless you count the Social Security surplus. A tax cut that is not paid for will require us to increase borrowing from Social Security trust fund for purposes other than saving it for Social Security.

I want to remind all of my colleagues that there is no free lunch. The promised benefits under Social Security will cost \$9 trillion more than we can afford over the next 75 years—that money will have to come from somewhere. The Directors of the Congressional Budget Office and the General Accounting Office and Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan have all testified that Congress and the President must make tough choices to bring Social Security costs in line with revenues. Many proposals that appear on the surface to offer painless resolutions have significant hidden costs and shortcomings which must be taken into consideration.

I have been critical of the President's plan for avoiding the heavy lifting of proposing reforms to deal with the unfunded liabilities of the system. I am equally troubled by the proposals being floated by some of my friends on the other side of the aisle that suggest that individual accounts are a magic bullet that offers a painless solution to save Social Security without making any structural reforms.

Rhetorically acknowledging that tough choices are inevitable is not enough. Reaching agreement on fiscally responsible legislation that truly makes Social Security financially sound without simply shifting costs to future taxpayers will require leadership by the President and Congressional leadership. I encourage both the President and the Leadership hear in Congress to provide the leadership necessary to move the debate beyond the misleading suggestion that projected surpluses

alone will save Social Security and begin a serious discussion about the tough choices that remain.

There is a bipartisan bill that meets all of the principles in this resolution which makes Social Security financially sound and gives future generations the flexibility to address other priorities. JIM KOLBE and I have proposed legislation, the 21st Century Retirement Security Plan, which would preserve the best features of the current system while modernizing it for the 21st century. Our plan would strengthen the safety net, restore the long-term solvency of the Social Security Trust Fund, reduce future liabilities and increase individual control over retirement income, all without increasing taxes.

The plan would create individual security accounts, funded through a portion of the current payroll tax, to explicitly replace unfunded liabilities by prefunding a portion of future retirement income. The plan also establishes a minimum benefit provision which, for the first time, guarantees that workers who work all their life and play by the rules will be protected from poverty, regardless of what happens to their individual accounts. We make benefit changes in a progressive manner through bend point changes that affect middle and upper income workers, who will benefit from individual accounts. Perhaps most importantly, our legislation ensures that future governments will have resources to deal with other problems in addition to providing Social Security by honestly confronting the future unfunded liabilities of the system that will threaten other budgetary priorities if we do not take action.

I encourage all my colleagues to follow through on the bipartisan rhetoric embodied in this resolution and roll up our sleeves to tackle the tough choices necessary to strengthen and preserve Social Security for the 21st Century.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), a member of the Subcommittee on Social Security of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. Speaker, there is a daunting challenge at hand, and part of that challenge of saving Social Security is to approach this problem not as Republicans or as Democrats, but as Americans; understanding the dependence of many in their old age on this program, understanding the concerns of those of generations just entering the work force, understanding the concerns of baby boomers who have paid into the system and hope to see it continue.

As we begin this debate, as we work to solve this problem, this resolution is a good starting point. In committee we accepted many amendments from our friends in the minority. Now, there is not unanimity, to be sure, but with this resolution we reaffirm the primacy, necessity and commitment of this Congress to the Social Security program. And, more importantly, we say, let us save it without increasing taxes and protecting against inflation. So that is where we start.

I would echo the comments of my colleague from Michigan; that we

should avoid the temptation to point fingers, to engage in fear rather than facts. And the reality must be borne out by our rhetoric and, more importantly, our resolve. The American people look to us and count on us, and in this spirit today it begins now with the passage of this resolution.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I basically support this resolution. Americans have been misled by some to doubt that Social Security will provide retirement security. In fact, Social Security does not face a financial crisis. A projected shortfall occurring 34 years in the future is not a crisis, it is a projection. No other organization, public or private, has a plan for operation nearly two generations into the future.

Social Security does face a political crisis if Congress abandons its commitments to guarantee benefits. This resolution is a good first move and should put to rest whether Social Security will pay full benefits. With this resolution Congress pledges to guarantee paying full benefits to current and future retirees.

A pledge is good. Making it the law would be better. Congress will have to add this concept in any reform legislation we adopt to make the words of this resolution meaningful. We must work to ensure that any reform legislation Congress passes also upholds the Social Security guarantee that promised benefits are as good as money and are backed by the full faith and credit of the United States, just like our currency and bonds.

I hope everyone will join me in adding meaning to this resolution by writing the Social Security guarantee into law.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES).

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the efforts of my colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) for his introduction of a resolution that undertakes the Social Security Guarantee Initiative. Through this resolution we establish a framework for debate and reaffirm our commitment to the long-term solvency of Social Security.

It is clear to me that the moment is prime for a national debate on Social Security. The citizens of our Nation understand the importance of Social Security's fiscal health, not only for the time being but for generations yet to come. They expect their elected officials to come together in a bipartisan fashion to provide solutions.

I recently had the opportunity to lead a forum on the future of Social Security reform. What struck me the most about this particular event was that its main participants were not a panel of experts or a group of politicians. Instead, those most interested were concerned North Carolinians who have a stake in the system and expect a fair return on their investment. They

do not need policy experts from Washington to explain to them that in a few years the government will not have enough money to keep the promises it made when the program began.

Mr. Speaker, ensuring the viability of Social Security is a tall challenge, and I realize there is no silver bullet, but we must take one step at a time. I support the resolution before us now and the spirit of cooperation that it represents. Citizens from my district, the Eighth District of North Carolina, expect their elected officials, Republicans and Democrats alike, to work together for a better future.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY).

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California.

The resolution calls for equal treatment in Social Security across generations, especially for workers of minorities. It says Congress must recognize the unique obstacles facing women and the disabled. The resolution says we must guarantee a lifetime benefit for America's elderly and those future retirees and avoid, in the process, increasing taxes.

Now, I support these principles, and I believe the President's framework also advances these principles in the administration's proposal for dealing with Social Security. I am, therefore, going to vote for this resolution. But I want to note the resolution, in and of itself, does nothing.

A point of concern I would have about it is that sometimes I have seen resolutions offered by majorities that have no intention on actually advancing legislation to get something done. I have also seen resolutions extolling principles advanced when the plan is to advance legislation that actually achieves something quite different.

Now, the ultimate question, and the point of uncertainty, can only be addressed by a plan. So I say to the majority, give us a plan. Let us move the debate past meaningless resolutions to actual debate.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution because it involves the most important of all issues, preserving Social Security and Medicare. But while I appreciate the sentiments, I think it is most important we really get down to legislation.

In a sense, this is a baby step when we need a great leap forward. It is entitled Social Security Guarantee Initiative, but it really guarantees nothing. We have to get busy on legislation. The President has proposed his position, now we need to hear from the majority and then begin to compare notes and to act.

This resolution would be more meaningful if it had said that the first priority should be to save Social Security

and Medicare as we proposed in the full committee. But in any event, let us pass this resolution and then get down to a bipartisan effort to secure Social Security and Medicare for the long run.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER).

(Mr. WELLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today in support of this resolution, and I want to commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) for the statements they have made publicly to work together in a bipartisan way.

One statement we will make very clear today is every Member of the House, I expect, will vote for this. Because even though we may disagree a little bit on how to do it, we all stand here because we want to save Social Security. In fact, we are committed to saving Social Security not just for today's seniors but for future generations, the next three generations, who depend on Social Security.

When I think of Social Security, I think of my own mom and dad, now in their 70s. I think of my nieces and nephews that are college age and entering the work force out of high school. They all look for Social Security. They have paid their dues into Social Security, and they want Social Security to be there when it is their turn.

Social Security today, as some have pointed out, is sound for today's seniors. But the question is how are we going to make Social Security sound for future generations. That is the challenge that is before us.

I hope we remember as we go through this process the importance of looking at how Social Security impacts women as we look at the numbers; as we look at ways to ensure that we treat women equally and fairly when it comes to Social Security. Because it is clear that statistics show that elderly women have been almost twice as likely as elderly men to live in poverty. That is a challenge we need to meet, and I hope we can do it in a bipartisan way.

Once again, I also plan to offer an additional solution to help supplement Social Security. I believe that we should reward retirement savings. I believe that we should eliminate discrimination against retirement savings and allow people to contribute more to their 401(k)s and their IRAs.

□ 1415

We should also allow working moms to make up missed contributions through catch-up IRAs, allow them to make up the contributions for their retirement accounts that they could have made had they stayed working and instead chose to stay home with their children.

We should allow working moms to have that opportunity. Catch-up IRAs will be a big help for women. Let us work in a bipartisan way.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Social Security Subcommittee, I strongly support H.R. Res. 32. This resolution expresses the willingness of Congress to work with the President to strengthen and protect the Social Security system for current and future generations. Just last week, this resolution passed the Ways and Means Committee with a unanimous, bipartisan vote of 32-0.

Social Security affects the majority of Americans, whether it be a 70 year old retiree, a 40 year old parent, or a 19 year old college student. We all pay our Social Security taxes with the promise that when we retire, we will collect the benefits that are due to us. Unfortunately, our Social Security system is in dire straits and it is our responsibility as Members of Congress to make sure that the program remains healthy and stable far into the 21st century.

As we discuss ways to change the system, we must also remember that women, even more than men, rely on the Social Security system for financial security in their golden years. Over their lifetime, because of family commitments, many women cannot accumulate adequate pension savings. By the mid-1990s, only 18 percent of women over the age of 64 received their own pension benefits and their pension benefits were less than half of those received by men.

Additionally, we must keep certain important statistics in mind. In 1997, elderly women were almost twice as likely as elderly men to live in poverty. Additionally, the poverty rate for unmarried elderly women was 19 percent in 1997. This is a crucial statistic because 60 percent of elderly women are unmarried. Also significant, nearly 30 percent of elderly black and Hispanic women lived in poverty in 1997, making Social Security especially important to minority, elderly women.

To help women save for their later years, I plan to again offer legislation to help improve retirement savings opportunities for women and other individuals who opted out of the workforce to raise families. These Catch-up IRAs will also allow individuals approaching retirement the ability to save more for their golden years, and for all savers the ability to make additional "after tax" contributions to their savings plans.

I am encouraged by H.J. Res. 32 and I hope that President Clinton will join us in finding bipartisan solutions to the problems that plague our Social Security System. Additionally, I hope that we can continue to work together to find Social Security reform solutions which protect the special needs of women in their retirement years.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to speak on this important resolution.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON).

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the debate on H.J. Res. 32 in the Committee on Ways and Means was not a debate about whether we should save Social Security or give the American people a tax cut. Both the Democrats and Republicans favor tax cuts so long as they are paid for. The debate was about whether we would memorialize our commitment and then keep our promise to the American people not to touch a dime of the surplus until we have saved Social

Security for future generations. This resolution does not make that commitment.

Mr. Speaker, the Social Security system is the most respected and successful system in U.S. history. While my remarks will not change the resolution, I want to let the American people know that I, along with my Democratic colleagues, are serious about addressing the long-term solvency problems facing the Social Security system and stand by our commitment to save Social Security first.

We owe it to the over two-thirds of older Americans who rely on Social Security for 50 percent or more of their total income. We owe it to the hard-working American families who rely on Social Security for continued prosperity as they enter into retirement. And, most of all, we owe it to our children who deserve to know that Social Security is going to be there for them.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. FLETCHER).

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution of my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN). Today, this Chamber takes an important step towards strengthening our Nation's Social Security system. However, this goal can only be achieved if we work together to find a permanent solution to the problems facing this important program.

The American people deserve more than Washington simply placing a Band-Aid on the problem by offering a temporary solution. This would not be leadership. It would be politics as usual. In order to assure retirement income security for all Americans, both sides of the aisle will have to work together, not against one another.

Ronald Reagan once said, there is no limit to what a man can do or where he can go if he does not mind who gets the credit.

As we debate Social Security reform, it must not be about who gets the credit but how can we shore up the system, provide equal treatment, protect benefits and avoid tax increases for our fellow Americans.

Citizens of the Sixth District of Kentucky and across America want genuine leadership. Let us give them just that and let us support this resolution.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding; and I want to thank the committee for bringing this resolution to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this resolution, but let us understand that this resolution is only the beginning. It pledges all of us to save Social Security. That pledge will also have to include a decision not to invade those Social Security trust funds.

This week, on the cover of Barron's Magazine, they have the headline which screams to people in Washington, D.C. This week, the Dow Jones financial magazine says there is no budget surplus. And they are quite correct; there is no budget surplus. There is only money that is in excess in the Social Security trust fund, and whether or not we save Social Security will depend upon the decisions we make in this Congress about whether we are going to break the budget caps that restrain spending in this Congress; whether or not we are going to invade these trust funds for a whole range of spending proposals that are currently before the Congress.

If we do that this year and if we do that before 2001, every dollar we spend will come out of the Social Security trust funds. Because Barron's has it right. There is no other surplus. There is only the Social Security trust funds.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as we have heard today and just heard from the previous speaker, both in terms of politics and substance, reforming Social Security and making the needed changes to preserve the system over time is going to be very, very difficult. It is going to require bipartisanship; it is going to require trust; and it is going to require small steps, many small steps, to get us there.

That is what I see this resolution being all about, it is a small step in the right direction. It is not a solution. It is not the plan to save Social Security. But it does lay out for the first time in this Congress principles, basic principles, that I hope we can agree on, on a bipartisan basis. That seems to me to be a very good starting point.

I would say also that there is a need to supplement Social Security with more private retirement savings, and I hope that we can work on a bipartisan basis on that as well. This is our 401(k) plans, our IRA plans and so on. Because, ultimately, that is an important part of retirement security for all Americans.

There is no reason, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot get this done and get it done this year, so long as we reach out across the aisle and work on a bipartisan basis. And I see us beginning to do that with this resolution today; and, therefore, I strongly support it.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that here in Washington a promise is never really a guarantee. And so the resolution that we have before us today has been self-styled by the Republican leadership as the "Social Security Guarantee Initiative." But it is important for every American to understand that there is no guaran-

tee in the Guarantee Initiative. It guarantees absolutely nothing in the way of any substantive improvement in the Social Security system.

I believe it was not a Democrat but a Republican member of the committee that studied this measure, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), who conceded that this resolution, H.J. Res. 32, is solely, in his words, and I quote, "a political document. It has no teeth." No teeth, indeed. I would suggest that this resolution offers less promise than an ill-fitting set of dentures.

On day one of this Congress, we Democrats proposed a rule to save Social Security first, to see that the surplus was not dissipated, that we utilized it to preserve the future of the Social Security system. That was rejected on day one of this Congress; and, since that time, now entering month three of this Congress, not much progress, a few hearings but not much progress, has been made towards strengthening and preserving Social Security.

Instead of meaningful action, as Americans will remember in 1995 our Republican colleagues said they wanted a revolution. We have now come another 4 years, and they present us a resolution. I believe what we really need is a bipartisan solution to preserve and protect and strengthen the Social Security system.

What might that bipartisan solution, not a meaningless resolution like we are considering today, what might it include and what might it exclude? We have an excellent idea of that today in a new report.

One of the groups that has been working toward a solution of this problem is the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare. They turned to a Republican economist, who did a simulation, looking at various proposals to reject the Social Security system as we have known it for the last many decades and substitute for it some type of private system. This study is entitled "Winners and Losers from 'Privatizing' Social Security."

What this study concluded was that there are many losers and not very many winners. In fact, the conclusion of the study is that, with these various schemes to reject our current Social Security system, instead of to strengthen and preserve it, that every person alive today, in these United States or anywhere else, who is drawing Social Security or could draw Social Security in the future, every person will lose under the various schemes to privatize fully or partially the Social Security system instead of to strengthen and preserve it.

The only people who might stand to gain, we were told in this simulation, which fortunately is just that, a simulation instead of an experiment on the American people as some have advanced, but the only people who would gain are a few high-income males to be

born somewhere 20 or 30 years from now after the full transition costs to a private system are effected.

So with that kind of information now available, it is time to reject ideology and focus on real, meaningful changes in this system that will strengthen and preserve it.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is an important study with important findings. There has been so much held out about how if we had a revolution in Social Security and we rejected the system as we have known it for the last many decades, that everybody would be the winner. But when one looks at the facts, the winners just are not there.

Everyone loses if we reject this system and substitute the kind of revolutionary system that some of these Washington think-tank ideologues have been advancing. So I hope we will come together behind some of the proposals the President has advanced to strengthen and preserve Social Security in a truly bipartisan manner.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just comment on the comments of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) with respect to what the Subcommittee on Social Security has been doing and what the full Committee on Ways and Means has been doing since the beginning of this Congress.

We have already had more hearings on Social Security than we did on welfare reform, and that is just from the beginning of this year, than we had in drafting the welfare reform bill.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a valuable member of the Subcommittee on Social Security, knows this well. He has attended these hearings, and he has been very attentive in these hearings, so I would not want anyone listening to this proceeding to in any way think that Congress has been sitting on its hands. It has not. There will be proposals out there, and these proposals will be in the form of draft legislation.

I would hope and I intend to, as the subcommittee chairman, to be part of a majority bill that will be put in place and hopefully will become the framework for moving forward on a bipartisan solution.

I would also invite the minority to put forth their bill. I would also invite the President to put forth his bill. They will be received with great courtesy and cooperation, and I would pledge hearings on any such bills that would come before my subcommittee that have the backing of the minority party or the White House.

I believe this is very important. That is how strongly I feel about a bipartisan solution and a bipartisan effort. The Committee on Ways and Means is working very, very hard. The system is in crisis and we do need to find a solution, because we can avoid this crisis very early and be sure that the Social Security system is in place and continues to be a very safe system for all

Americans, both of this generation and generations to come.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to comment on the comments of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW).

First of all, the gentleman is correct. We have had four full committee hearings and we have had three, I believe, subcommittee hearings. But I have to say, and I think most people would confirm my comments, and I have sat through almost all of the hearings except maybe 3 hours of the 20 hours of hearings, and most of the purposes of these hearings and most of the people talking at these hearings have been basically just trashing the President's proposal.

The Republicans asked that the President come up with his proposal last year. The President has come up with an outline that everyone understands. There is no complexity to it. We have just been spending all our time just trashing the President. We have spent very little time on real substance.

And I think what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) was referring to is a comprehensive study that actually was done by John Mueller. John Mueller, for those who were here in the 1980s, was the economist for the Republican Conference under the leadership of then Jack Kemp; and Mr. Mueller came in with the idea of doing this study with a bias actually toward private accounts.

What basically happened is that he completed the study and now he believes that private accounts would really do bad damage. This was commissioned, by the way, by Martha McSteen, who happened to be the administrator for the Social Security Administration in 1983 to 1986, under the leadership of Ronald Reagan.

So we had two Reagan people, one Reagan and one Jack Kemp, and they basically have said private accounts are the wrong way to go. It is easy to figure out why. There is \$8 trillion of unfunded liability, \$8 trillion of unfunded liability. If we go with private accounts, we have those people living today in the workforce and paying for the retirement of their parents or grandparents.

□ 1430

That means they are going to be paying twice the amount for half the benefit. That is the real problem with private accounts. You can talk about private accounts all you want, but the real person that is going to benefit from private accounts will be born 25 years from now in the year 2025, and he will be a single male. Every other economic group will lose. The biggest losers, believe it or not, are going to be women. Because women live longer than men, they are going to have to set up an annuity, they will get less even

though they may have made the same amount in the workforce.

In addition, we all know that women make about 70 percent of what men make normally in the workforce. So they are going to start off way behind, anyway. This is going to do damage to Democratic women, Republican women, conservative women and liberal women.

This is not an issue of ideology. It is a question of getting the facts and making sure we know the facts before we move. I am afraid all those hearings and everything we have been doing over the last 2 months have been basically to create a partisan division against the President's plan rather than to do anything really substantive and trying to understand this issue. But I do appreciate what the gentleman has done. He has come up with this resolution. I think, as the previous speaker said, resolutions really do not mean much. On the other hand, I guess we might as well do something since we are not doing much else. We are going to be out at 3 o'clock today so we might as well use some of that time at least pretending like we are doing something significant, but we all know that this resolution will not advance the cause of reforming the Social Security system one second.

As a result of that, we will pass it with a unanimous vote, but let us not kid ourselves. We have got to come up with a proposal. The President has. I like the President's proposal. Let us hear from the Republicans and let us see how they deal with an \$8 trillion transition cost if they want to go to private accounts and protect women and minorities and middle-income people and suburban people at the same time. You will not be able to do it. I hope you try but you will not be able to do it. Instead what we should be doing is picking up the President's plan, moving forward with it and at least solving this problem for the next 55 years.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I would like to respond to the gentleman from California with regard to the remarks that he has made. We have heard the minority trash a proposal which has been characterized as a Republican proposal which has not been made as yet. There is no Republican proposal out there. We have had hearings, we have had statements with regard to the direction we should go, but there has not been a concrete proposal laid upon the table.

By contrast, I think it is interesting to note that on this side not one single speaker has gotten up and trashed the President's proposal. The President's proposal is out there. I am treating it with great courtesy. I want to encourage the President and his staff and the Treasury Department and all those connected with the Social Security

system to come forward with a concrete proposal in writing that we can receive. So I am hopeful yet that we do receive a formal proposal from the President.

The purpose of this resolution is to bring us together, to show that there is some unity in this House between Democrats and Republicans. I am not going to spoil the day by going out and trying to retaliate and bring about argument or try to accent what separates us, because this resolution is what brings us together.

Both sides have said that we are going to preserve the Social Security system. Both sides have said that we are not going to raise payroll taxes. Both sides have said that we are not going to cut benefits. When you have that as a perimeter, there is not too many other places you can go except to look at the investment of the system itself. That is where we are going to concentrate. That is where we are going to have to move forward.

This resolution is a good step forward, albeit a single step forward, but it is a good step forward in trying to show that there is unity in this House, that we do have unity of purpose and that we are going to draw together.

I will be actually out there soliciting help from the minority side in trying to craft this legislation to see that we can come up with something that is quite meaningful. This task is far too important than to bicker in a partisan manner. This is the most important item to come before this Congress either this year or next year. It would be a terrible tragedy if we were to back away from this point of history. We have a surplus. We have divided government. Both of those are very important. Because we need the divided government to be sure it is bipartisan, and we need the surplus to be sure that we save Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of the resolution.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.J. Res. 32, which expresses Congress' desire to strengthen and protect Social Security. Saving Social Security must be our top priority as we prepare America for the next century.

Without fundamental changes in the Social Security program, either massive tax increases or a reduction in benefits will be required or the program will reach financial crisis by 2013. This is of special concern for most women, who have a vital interest in Social Security. The fact is, on average, women live longer than men, earn less, and are more likely to be dependent on Social Security for most or all of their retirement income.

Mr. Speaker, having paid into Social Security myself for over forty years, I will never support hasty reforms that threaten the financial futures of those who have committed a lifetime of earnings to the system. As a father and a grandfather, I will insist that our reforms provide more choices for those now entering the workforce. It is time we take action to ensure this program will be available to our children and grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 32 to ensure a stable future for Social Security.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 32, the "Social Security Guarantee Initiative." As we all know, one of the most important questions facing Congress today is how best to preserve Social Security and Medicare for this and future generations. We need to ensure that benefits are not cut for today's Social Security recipients, while at the same time guaranteeing that our children and grandchildren will have the piece of mind that Social Security brings.

Before Social Security was enacted in 1935, retirement meant financial insecurity and poverty for many seniors. This program, however, has dramatically changed that and has allowed millions of Americans to enjoy their later years with greater tranquility and less worry. President Franklin Delano Roosevelt said it best when, upon signing the Social Security Act, he stated that "[t]he Social Security Act was primarily designed to provide the average worker with some assurance that when cycles of unemployment come or when his work days are over, he will have enough money to live decently."

It is imperative that Congress and the President work together in a bipartisan manner to achieve this goal. Arguably the most successful domestic government program in world history, it is our duty to do everything in our power to ensure its existence for years to come. I urge my colleagues to vote for this resolution. And even more importantly, I urge my colleagues to put partisan differences aside, and to take concrete actions beyond this resolution, to strengthen the Social Security system.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation that focuses on the need to restore our Social Security program in a fair manner for all Americans.

With the looming prospect that its funds will be depleted by 2032, the issue of ensuring the solvency of Social Security needs to be addressed. But there are a number of priorities we must keep in mind as the debate on reforming Social Security begins to take form.

First, it is important that any reform to Social Security guarantees equal benefits to all Americans, including women and minorities.

We also need to ensure that cost-of-living adjustments and a continuous benefit safety net are provided for all Social Security recipients.

Most importantly, we want to do all we can to save Social Security without raising taxes. Americans are already over-burdened by high taxes, and it is our duty to ensure that more of their money stays in their pockets. We owe it to the American people to provide them with a fair plan that saves Social Security for generations to come without increasing their tax burden.

I am proud to support this initiative and want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) for introducing this important piece of legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 32, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 8(c) of rule XX, this 15-minute vote will be followed by a 5-minute vote on H.R. 609.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 1, not voting, 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 29]
YEAS—416

Abercrombie	Cramer	Hastings (FL)
Ackerman	Crane	Hastings (WA)
Aderholt	Crowley	Hayes
Allen	Cubin	Hayworth
Andrews	Cummings	Hefley
Archer	Cunningham	Heger
Armey	Danner	Hill (IN)
Bachus	Davis (FL)	Hill (MT)
Baird	Davis (IL)	Hilleary
Baker	Davis (VA)	Hinchev
Baldacci	Deal	Hinojosa
Baldwin	DeFazio	Hobson
Ballenger	DeGette	Hoefel
Barcia	Delahunt	Hoekstra
Barr	DeLauro	Holden
Barrett (NE)	DeLay	Holt
Barrett (WI)	DeMint	Hooley
Bartlett	Deutsch	Horn
Barton	Diaz-Balart	Hostettler
Bass	Dickey	Houghton
Bateman	Dicks	Hoyer
Becerra	Dingell	Hulshof
Bentsen	Dixon	Hutchinson
Bereuter	Doggett	Hyde
Berkley	Dooley	Inslee
Berry	Doolittle	Isakson
Biggert	Doyle	Istook
Bilirakis	Dreier	Jackson (IL)
Bishop	Duncan	Jackson-Lee
Blagojevich	Edwards	(TX)
Bliley	Ehlers	Jefferson
Blumenauer	Ehrlich	Jenkins
Blunt	Emerson	John
Boehlert	Engel	Johnson (CT)
Boehner	English	Johnson, E. B.
Bonilla	Eshoo	Johnson, Sam
Bonior	Etheridge	Jones (NC)
Bono	Ewing	Jones (OH)
Borski	Farr	Kanjorski
Boswell	Fattah	Kaptur
Boucher	Filner	Kasich
Boyd	Fletcher	Kelly
Brady (PA)	Foley	Kennedy
Brady (TX)	Forbes	Kildee
Brown (CA)	Ford	Kilpatrick
Brown (FL)	Fossella	Kind (WI)
Brown (OH)	Fowler	King (NY)
Bryant	Frank (MA)	Kingston
Burr	Franks (NJ)	Kleczka
Burton	Frelinghuysen	Klink
Calvert	Frost	Knollenberg
Camp	Gallely	Kolbe
Campbell	Ganske	Kucinich
Canady	Gejdenson	Kuykendall
Capuano	Gekas	LaFalce
Cardin	Gephardt	LaHood
Carson	Gibbons	Lampson
Castle	Gilchrest	Lantos
Chabot	Gillmor	Largent
Chambless	Gilman	Larson
Chenoweth	Gonzalez	Latham
Clay	Goode	LaTourette
Clayton	Goodlatte	Lazio
Clement	Goodling	Leach
Clyburn	Gordon	Lee
Coble	Goss	Levin
Coburn	Graham	Lewis (CA)
Collins	Green (TX)	Lewis (GA)
Combest	Green (WI)	Lewis (KY)
Condit	Greenwood	Linder
Conyers	Gutierrez	Lipinski
Cook	Gutknecht	LoBiondo
Costello	Hall (OH)	Lofgren
Cox	Hall (TX)	Lowey
Coyne	Hastert	Lucas (KY)

Lucas (OK)	Peterson (PA)	Smith (WA)
Luther	Petri	Snyder
Maloney (CT)	Phelps	Souder
Maloney (NY)	Pickering	Spence
Manzullo	Pickett	Spratt
Markey	Pitts	Stabenow
Martinez	Pombo	Stark
Mascara	Pomeroy	Stearns
Matsui	Porter	Stenholm
McCarthy (MO)	Portman	Strickland
McCarthy (NY)	Price (NC)	Stump
McCrery	Pryce (OH)	Stupak
McDermott	Quinn	Sununu
McGovern	Radanovich	Sweeney
McHugh	Rahall	Talent
McInnis	Ramstad	Tancredo
McIntosh	Rangel	Tanner
McIntyre	Regula	Tauscher
McKeon	Reyes	Tauzin
McKinney	Reynolds	Taylor (MS)
McNulty	Riley	Taylor (NC)
Meehan	Rivers	Terry
Meek (FL)	Rodriguez	Thomas
Meeks (NY)	Roemer	Thompson (MS)
Menendez	Rogan	Thornberry
Metcalf	Rohrabacher	Thune
Mica	Ros-Lehtinen	Thurman
Millender-McDonald	Rothman	Tiahrt
Miller (FL)	Roukema	Tierney
Miller, Gary	Roybal-Allard	Toomey
Miller, George	Royce	Towns
Minge	Rush	Traficant
Mink	Ryan (WI)	Turner
Moakley	Ryun (KS)	Udall (CO)
Mollohan	Sabo	Udall (NM)
Moore	Salmon	Upton
Moran (KS)	Sanchez	Velazquez
Moran (VA)	Sanders	Vento
Morella	Sandlin	Visclosky
Murtha	Sanford	Walden
Myrick	Sawyer	Walsh
Nadler	Saxton	Wamp
Napolitano	Scarborough	Waters
Neal	Schaffer	Watkins
Nethercutt	Schakowsky	Watt (NC)
Ney	Scott	Watts (OK)
Northup	Sensenbrenner	Waxman
Norwood	Serrano	Weiner
Nussle	Sessions	Weldon (FL)
Oberstar	Shadegg	Weldon (PA)
Obey	Shaw	Weller
Olver	Shays	Wexler
Ortiz	Sherman	Weygand
Ose	Sherwood	Whitfield
Owens	Shimkus	Wicker
Oxley	Shows	Wilson
Packard	Shuster	Wise
Pallone	Simpson	Wolf
Pascrell	Sisisky	Woolsey
Pastor	Skeen	Wu
Payne	Skelton	Wynn
Pease	Slaughter	Young (AK)
Pelosi	Smith (MI)	Young (FL)
Peterson (MN)	Smith (NJ)	
	Smith (TX)	

NAYS—1

Paul
NOT VOTING—17

Berman	Cooksey	Hilliard
Bilbray	Dunn	Hunter
Buyer	Evans	McCollum
Callahan	Everett	Rogers
Cannon	Granger	Thompson (CA)
Capps	Hansen	

□ 1455

So the joint resolution, as amended, was passed.

The title of the joint resolution was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President and the Congress should join in undertaking the Social Security Guarantee Initiative to strengthen the Social Security program and protect the retirement income security of all Americans for the 21st century."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. COOKSEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 29, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 29, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 29, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

EXPORT APPLE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 609.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONDIT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 609, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 0, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 30]

YEAS—416

Abercrombie	Chenoweth	Fossella
Ackerman	Clay	Fowler
Aderholt	Clayton	Frank (MA)
Allen	Clement	Franks (NJ)
Andrews	Clyburn	Frelinghuysen
Archer	Coble	Frost
Armey	Coburn	Gallegly
Bachus	Collins	Ganske
Baird	Combust	Gedjenson
Baker	Condit	Gekas
Baldacci	Conyers	Gephardt
Baldwin	Cook	Gibbons
Ballenger	Cooksey	Gilchrest
Barcia	Costello	Gillmor
Barr	Cox	Gilman
Barrett (NE)	Coyne	Gonzalez
Barrett (WI)	Cramer	Goode
Bartlett	Crane	Goodlatte
Barton	Crowley	Goodling
Bass	Cubin	Gordon
Bateman	Cummings	Goss
Becerra	Cunningham	Graham
Bentsen	Danner	Green (TX)
Bereuter	Davis (FL)	Green (WI)
Berkley	Davis (IL)	Greenwood
Berry	Davis (VA)	Gutierrez
Biggert	Deal	Gutknecht
Bilbray	DeFazio	Hall (OH)
Bilirakis	DeGette	Hall (TX)
Bishop	Delahunt	Hansen
Blagojevich	DeLauro	Hastings (FL)
Bliley	DeLay	Hastings (WA)
Blumenauer	DeMint	Hayes
Blunt	Deutsch	Hayworth
Boehrlert	Diaz-Balart	Hefley
Boehner	Dickey	Herger
Bonilla	Dicks	Hill (IN)
Bonior	Dingell	Hill (MT)
Bono	Dixon	Hilleary
Borski	Doggett	Hinchey
Boswell	Doolley	Hinojosa
Boucher	Doolittle	Hobson
Boyd	Doyle	Hoefl
Brady (PA)	Dreier	Hoekstra
Brady (TX)	Duncan	Holden
Brown (CA)	Edwards	Holt
Brown (FL)	Ehlers	Hooley
Brown (OH)	Ehrlich	Horn
Bryant	Emerson	Hostettler
Burr	Engel	Houghton
Burton	English	Hoyer
Calvert	Eshoo	Hulshof
Camp	Etheridge	Hutchinson
Campbell	Ewing	Hyde
Canady	Farr	Inslee
Capuano	Fattah	Isakson
Cardin	Filner	Isakson
Carson	Fletcher	Jackson (IL)
Castle	Foley	Jackson-Lee
Chabot	Forbes	(TX)
Chambliss	Ford	Jefferson

Jenkins	Moore	Shaw
John	Moran (KS)	Shays
Johnson (CT)	Moran (VA)	Sherman
Johnson, E. B.	Morella	Sherwood
Johnson, Sam	Murtha	Shimkus
Jones (NC)	Myrick	Shows
Jones (OH)	Nadler	Shuster
Kanjorski	Napolitano	Simpson
Kaptur	Neal	Sisisky
Kasich	Nethercutt	Skeen
Kelly	Ney	Skelton
Kennedy	Northup	Slaughter
Kildee	Norwood	Smith (MI)
Kilpatrick	Nussle	Smith (NJ)
Kind (WI)	Oberstar	Smith (TX)
King (NY)	Obey	Smith (WA)
Kingston	Olver	Snyder
Klecza	Ortiz	Souder
Klink	Ose	Spratt
Knollenberg	Owens	Stabenow
Kolbe	Oxley	Stark
Kucinich	Packard	Stearns
Kuykendall	Pallone	Stenholm
LaFalce	Pascrell	Strickland
LaHood	Pastor	Stump
Lampson	Paul	Stupak
Lantos	Payne	Sununu
Largent	Pease	Sweeney
Larson	Pelosi	Talent
Latham	Peterson (MN)	Tancredo
LaTourette	Peterson (PA)	Tanner
Lazio	Petri	Tauscher
Leach	Phelps	Tauzin
Lee	Pickering	Taylor (MS)
Levin	Pickett	Taylor (NC)
Lewis (CA)	Pitts	Terry
Lewis (GA)	Pombo	Thomas
Lewis (KY)	Pomeroy	Thompson (CA)
Linder	Porter	Thompson (MS)
Lipinski	Portman	Thornberry
LoBiondo	Price (NC)	Thune
Loftgren	Pryce (OH)	Thurman
Lowe	Quinn	Tiahrt
Lucas (KY)	Radanovich	Tierney
Lucas (OK)	Rahall	Toomey
Luther	Ramstad	Towns
Maloney (CT)	Rangel	Trafficant
Maloney (NY)	Regula	Turner
Manzullo	Reyes	Udall (CO)
Markey	Reynolds	Udall (NM)
Martinez	Riley	Upton
Mascara	Rivers	Velazquez
Matsui	Rodriguez	Vento
McCarthy (MO)	Roemer	Visclosky
McCarthy (NY)	Rogan	Walden
McCrery	Rohrabacher	Walsh
McDermott	Ros-Lehtinen	Wamp
McGovern	Rothman	Waters
McHugh	Roukema	Watt (NC)
McInnis	Roybal-Allard	Watts (OK)
McIntosh	Royce	Waxman
McIntyre	Ryan (WI)	Weiner
McKeon	Ryun (KS)	Weldon (FL)
Sabo	Salmom	Weldon (PA)
Salmon	Sanchez	Weller
Sanchez	Sanders	Wexler
Sandlin	Sandlin	Weygand
Sanford	Sanford	Whitfield
Sawyer	Sawyer	Wicker
Saxton	Saxton	Wilson
Scarborough	Scarborough	Wise
Schaffer	Schaffer	Wolf
Schakowsky	Schakowsky	Woolsey
Scott	Scott	Wu
Sensenbrenner	Serrano	Wynn
Serrano	Sessions	Young (AK)
Sessions	Shadegg	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—17

Berman	Evans	McKinney
Buyer	Everett	Rogers
Callahan	Granger	Rush
Cannon	Hilliard	Spence
Capps	Hunter	Watkins
Dunn	McCollum	

□ 1505

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 603, CLARIFYING THE APPLICATION OF THE ACT POPULARLY KNOWN AS THE "DEATH ON THE HIGH SEAS ACT" TO AVIATION INCIDENTS

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-37) on the resolution (H. Res. 85) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 603) to amend title 49, United States Code, to clarify the application of the Act popularly known as the "Death on the High Seas Act" to aviation incidents, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 661, CONDITIONALLY PROHIBITING THE OPERATION OF SUPERSONIC AIRCRAFT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-38) on the resolution (H. Res. 86) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 661) to direct the Secretary of Transportation to prohibit the commercial operation of supersonic transport category aircraft that do not comply with stage 3 noise levels if the European Union adopts certain aircraft noise regulations, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 87) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. HOYER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I will not object, but I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) for the purpose of explaining the resolution.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It is my pleasure to announce that the Committee on House Administration now has its full complement of members on both sides of the aisle, and this resolution constitutes the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library, consisting of the chairman and ranking member, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS); and the Joint Committee on Printing, the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio