

Buyer	Herger	Ramstad	Lampson	Moakley	Schakowsky
Callahan	Hilleary	Regula	Lantos	Mollohan	Scott
Calvert	Hobson	Reynolds	Larson	Moore	Serrano
Camp	Hoekstra	Riley	Lazio	Murtha	Sherman
Canady	Hostettler	Rogan	Lee	Nadler	Shows
Cannon	Houghton	Rogers	Levin	Napolitano	Skelton
Castle	Hulshof	Rohrabacher	Lewis (GA)	Neal	Smith (NJ)
Chabot	Hunter	Ros-Lehtinen	Lipinski	Oberstar	Smith (WA)
Chambliss	Hutchinson	Roukema	LoBiondo	Obey	Snyder
Chenoweth-Hage	Hyde	Royce	LoFgren	Olver	Stabenow
Clement	Isakson	Ryan (WI)	Lowe	Ortiz	Stark
Coburn	Istook	Ryun (KS)	Luther	Owens	Strickland
Collins	Jenkins	Salmon	Maloney (CT)	Pallone	Stupak
Combest	John	Sanford	Maloney (NY)	Pascrell	Terry
Condit	Johnson (CT)	Scarborough	Markey	Pastor	Thompson (CA)
Cook	Johnson, Sam	Schaffer	Martinez	Paul	Thompson (MS)
Cooksey	Jones (NC)	Sensenbrenner	Mascara	Payne	Thurman
Cox	Kaptur	Sessions	Matsui	Pelosi	Tierney
Cramer	Kasich	Shadegg	McCarthy (MO)	Phelps	Traficant
Crane	Kelly	Shaw	McCarthy (NY)	Pomeroy	Udall (CO)
Cubin	Kingston	Shays	McDermott	Price (NC)	Udall (NM)
Cunningham	Knollenberg	Sherwood	McGovern	Quinn	Velazquez
Davis (VA)	Kolbe	Shimkus	McIntyre	Rahall	Visclosky
Deal	Kuykendall	Shuster	McKinney	Rangel	Waters
DeLay	Largent	Simpson	McNulty	Reyes	Watt (NC)
DeMint	Latham	Sisisky	Meek (FL)	Rodriguez	Waxman
Dickey	LaTourette	Skeen	Meeks (NY)	Roemer	Weiner
Dingell	Lewis (CA)	Slaughter	Menendez	Rothman	Wexler
Dooley	Lewis (KY)	Smith (MI)	Metcalfe	Roybal-Allard	Weygand
Doolittle	Linder	Smith (TX)	Millender	Rush	Wise
Dreier	Lucas (KY)	Souder	McDonald	Sabo	Woolsey
Duncan	Lucas (OK)	Spence	Miller, George	Sanders	Wynn
Dunn	Manzullo	Spratt	Minge	Sandlin	
Ehlers	McCollum	Stearns	Mink	Sawyer	
Emerson	McCrery	Stenholm			
English	McHugh	Stump			
Everett	McInnis	Sununu	Brown (OH)	Hinojosa	Saxton
Fletcher	McIntosh	Sweeney	Campbell	Leach	Tauzin
Foley	McKeon	Talent	Carson	Meehan	Towns
Fossella	Mica	Tancredo	Davis (FL)	Myrick	Turner
Fowler	Miller (FL)	Tanner	Doyle	Rivers	Vento
Frank (MA)	Miller, Gary	Tauscher	Hall (OH)	Sanchez	Wamp
Franks (NJ)	Moran (KS)	Taylor (MS)			
Frelinghuysen	Moran (VA)	Taylor (NC)			
Gallely	Morella	Thomas			
Ganske	Nethercutt	Thornberry			
Gekas	Ney	Thune			
Gilchrest	Northup	Tiahrt			
Gillmor	Norwood	Toomey			
Goode	Nussle	Upton			
Goodlatte	Ose	Vitter			
Goodling	Oxley	Walden			
Gordon	Packard	Walsh			
Goss	Pease	Watkins			
Graham	Peterson (MN)	Watts (OK)			
Granger	Peterson (PA)	Weldon (FL)			
Green (WI)	Petri	Weldon (PA)			
Greenwood	Pickering	Weller			
Gutknecht	Pickett	Whitfield			
Hall (TX)	Pitts	Wicker			
Hansen	Pombo	Wilson			
Hastings (WA)	Porter	Wolf			
Hayes	Portman	Wu			
Hayworth	Pryce (OH)	Young (AK)			
Hefley	Radanovich	Young (FL)			

NOT VOTING—18

	Brown (OH)	Hinojosa	Saxton
	Campbell	Leach	Tauzin
	Carson	Meehan	Towns
	Davis (FL)	Myrick	Turner
	Doyle	Rivers	Vento
	Hall (OH)	Sanchez	Wamp

1235

Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Ms. BERPKEY, Mr. ROTHMAN and Ms. KILPATRICK changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. CUNNINGHAM and Mr. RILEY changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 7, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

NAYS—194

Abercrombie	Costello	Gonzalez
Ackerman	Coyne	Green (TX)
Allen	Crowley	Gutierrez
Andrews	Cummings	Hastings (FL)
Baca	Danner	Hill (IN)
Baird	Davis (IL)	Hill (MT)
Baldacci	DeFazio	Hilliard
Baldwin	DeGette	Hinchev
Barrett (WI)	Delahunt	Hoefel
Becerra	DeLauro	Holden
Bentsen	Deutsch	Holt
Berkley	Diaz-Balart	Hooley
Berman	Dicks	Horn
Berry	Dixon	Hoyer
Bishop	Doggett	Inslee
Blagojevich	Edwards	Jackson (IL)
Blumenauer	Ehrlich	Jackson-Lee
Bonior	Engel	(TX)
Borski	Eshoo	Jefferson
Boswell	Etheridge	Johnson, E. B.
Boucher	Evans	Jones (OH)
Boyd	Ewing	Kanjorski
Brady (PA)	Farr	Kennedy
Brown (FL)	Fattah	Kildee
Capps	Filner	Kilpatrick
Capuano	Forbes	Kind (WI)
Cardin	Ford	King (NY)
Clay	Frost	Kleczka
Clayton	Gejdenson	Klink
Clyburn	Gephardt	Kucinich
Coble	Gibbons	LaFalce
Conyers	Gilman	LaHood

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 2005, WORK-PLACE GOODS JOB GROWTH AND COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 1999

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be directed to make technical and conforming changes in the bill, H.R. 2005, to accurately reflect the actions of the House.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the majority leader for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule for the remainder of the week and next week.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that we have completed our first week of legislative business in the new year. There will be no recorded votes in the House Thursday or Friday.

The House will meet next for legislative business on Tuesday, February 8, at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and at 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider a number of bills under suspension of the rules, a list of which will be distributed to Members' offices later this week. On Tuesday, we do not expect recorded votes until 6 p.m.

On Wednesday, February 9, and Thursday, February 10, the House will meet and consider H.R. 2086, the Networking and Information Technology Research and Development Act, subject to a rule; and, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that as a special Valentine's Day preview, the House will be taking up H.R. 6, the Marriage Penalty Relief Act.

Mr. Speaker, on Friday, February 11, no votes are expected.

Mr. BONIOR. Can the gentleman tell us what day the vote and debate on the marriage penalty legislation will be?

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for asking. If the gentleman will yield further, we expect that that vote will be taken on Thursday of next week.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 3 TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2000

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Thursday, February 3, 2000, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday, February 7.

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

There was no objection.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2000

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday February 7, 2000, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, February 8 for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

HIP HIP HOORAY TO SUPER BOWL
CHAMPION ST. LOUIS RAMS

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself, the minority leader, Mr. GEPHARDT, and the entire Missouri delegation, I ask unanimous consent that this body give a hip hip hooray to the Super Bowl champion St. Louis Rams.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1598

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1598.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

A REPUBLIC, IF YOU CAN KEEP IT,
PART 2

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, I took a special order to discuss the importance of the American Republic and why it should be preserved. Today, I will continue with that special order.

When it comes to executive orders, it has gotten completely out of hand. Executive orders may legitimately be used by a President to carry out his constitutionally authorized duties, but that would require far fewer orders than modern day Presidents have issued as the 20th century comes to a close, we find the executive branch willfully and arrogantly using the executive order to deliberately circumvent the legislative body, and bragging about it.

Although nearly 100,000 American battle deaths have occurred since

World War II and both big and small wars have been fought almost continuously, there has not been a congressional declaration of war since 1941. Our Presidents now fight wars not only without explicit congressional approval but also in the name of the United Nations, with our troops now serving under foreign commanders.

Our Presidents have assured us that U.N. authorization is all that is needed to send our troops into battle. The 1973 War Powers Resolution meant to restrict presidential war powers has either been ignored by our Presidents or used to justify war up to 90 days. The Congress and the people too often have chosen to ignore this problem, saying little about the recent bombing in Serbia. The continual bombing of Iraq which has now been going on for over 9 years is virtually ignored.

If a President can decide on the issue of war without a vote of the Congress, a representative republic does not exist. Our President should not have the authority to declare national emergencies and they certainly should not have authority to declare martial law, a power the Congress has already granted to any future emergency.

Economic and political crises can develop quickly and overly aggressive Presidents are only too willing to enhance their own power in dealing with them. Congress sadly throughout this century has been only too willing to grant authority to our Presidents at the sacrifice of its own.

The idea of separate but equal branches of government has been forgotten and the Congress bears much of the responsibility for this trend. Executive powers in the past 100 years have grown steadily with the creation of agencies that write and enforce their own regulations and with Congress allowing the President to use executive orders without restraint.

But in addition, there have been various other special vehicles that our Presidents use without congressional oversight. For example, the exchange stabilization fund set up during the depression has over \$34 billion available to be used at the President's discretion without congressional approval. This slush fund grows each year as it is paid interest on the securities it holds. It was instrumental in the \$50 billion Mexican bailout in 1995.

The CIA is so secretive that even those Congressmen privy to its operation have little knowledge of what this secret government actually does around the world.

1245

We know, of course, it has been involved in the past 50 years in assassinations and government overthrows on frequent occasions. The Federal Reserve operation, which works hand in hand with the administration, is not subject to congressional oversight. The Fed manipulates currency exchange rates, controls short-term interest rates, and fixes the gold price, all behind closed doors.

Bailing out foreign governments, financial corporations and huge banks can all be achieved without congressional approval. One hundred years ago when we had a gold standard, credit could not be created out of thin air, and, because a much more limited government philosophy prevailed, this could not have been possible. Today it is hard to even document what goes on, let alone expect Congress to control it.

The people should be able to closely monitor the Government, but as our government grows in size and scope, it, the Government, seeks to monitor our every move. Attacks on our privacy are an incessant and always justified by citing so-called legitimate needs of the State, efficiency and law enforcement.

Plans are laid for numerous data banks to record everyone's activities. A national ID card using our Social Security number is the goal of many, and even though we achieved a significant delivery in delaying its final approval last year, the promoters will surely persist in their efforts.

Plans are made for a medical data bank to be kept and used against our wishes. Job banks and details of all our lending activities continue to be of interest to all our national policy agencies, to make sure they know exactly where the drug dealers, the illegal aliens, and tax dodgers are and what they are doing, it is argued.

For national security purposes, the Echelon system of monitoring all overseas phone calls has been introduced, yet the details of this program are not available to any inquiring Member of Congress.

The Government knew very little about each individual American citizen in 1900. But, starting with World War I, there has been a systematic growth of Government surveillance of everyone's activities, with multiple records being kept. Today, true privacy is essentially a thing of the past. The FBI and the IRS have been used by various administrations to snoop and harass political opponents, and there has been little effort by Congress to end this abuse. A free society, that is, a constitutional republic, cannot be maintained if privacy is not highly cherished and protected by the Government, rather than abused by it. We can expect it to get worse.

Secretary of Defense Bill Cohen was recently quoted as saying, "Terrorism is escalating to the point that U.S. citizens may have to choose between civil liberties and more intrusive forms of protection." This is all in the name of taking care of us.

As far as I am concerned, we could all do with a lot less Government protection and security. The offer of Government benevolence is the worst reason to sacrifice liberty, but we have seen a lot of that during the 20th century.

Probably the most significant change in attitude that occurred in the 20th century was that with respect to life