The second thing that he was extremely excited about is the variety of health care cases that his doctors will now be able to see and be compensated for because, as he said, and I will never say it as well as he did, cardiologists do not stay very busy when all they are taking care of is 18- and 19- and 20-year-olds; but in order to have them well trained for mobilization, it is important that some of the older retirees are included in this mix so that those people can hone their skills that they are going to need in the event of a national emergency.

So for so many reasons, I think this is a good idea for our Nation. Number one, it is the right thing to do. We are going to keep our promise to those people who kept their promise to us.

Number two, we are going to do it in a fiscally responsible manner.

I think, Mr. Speaker, quite frankly, I am most pleased that in the history of this committee we have tried to do things in a bipartisan manner. I am most pleased that we are going to keep that promise in a bipartisan manner. I very much welcome the remarks of the chairman of the committee. I very much welcome the remarks of gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that this national missile defense system, which is part of this report, will cost $60 billion to build and deploy. Congress intends to spend $12 billion in the next 6 years. The SDI Star Wars system has cost the taxpayer more than $60 billion, and it is estimated that this system though less far-reaching than Star Wars will cost more. We have spent more than $122 billion on various missile defense systems. We need to reorganize our priorities and look at how we could better use these funds for programs that benefit the poor, seniors, and our Nation's children.

Before the decision is made, three exo-atmospheric intercept tests have been scheduled to determine the system's success rate and reliability to deploy the system, but one of two tests failed. The third test failed miserably as well. Three tests cannot define the technical readiness of the system and serve the basis for deploying a national missile defense.

According to the Union for Concerned Scientists, countermeasures could be deployed more rapidly and would be available to potential attackers before the United States could deploy even the much less capable first phase of the system.

A report by the Union of Concerned Scientists details how easily countermeasures could be used against this system and would not have to use new technology or new materials.

We are the only superpower in the world. The deterrent that we currently have is sufficient. We have thousands of missiles on hand that act as a deterrent. Any attack by another state would not be massive and would not be able to completely destroy our country or our nuclear arsenals. So any attack would leave the United States and its Armed Forces intact.

Our deterrent is impaired only if another state had enough missiles to knock off ours before they launched.

The national missile defense system will simply line the pockets of weapons contractors, spending billions of dollars for a system that does not work and does not protect against real threats. We will undermine our legitimate military expenditures and erode the readiness of our forces.

So who is benefiting from having a national missile defense system? According to The Washington Post, Boeing in 1998 already obtained a 3-year contract for $1.6 billion to assemble a basic system before the President even decided to deploy the system. The Post states that TRW has contracts for virtually every type of missile defense program. The military industry has the most to gain from a national defense system. According to The Washington Post, Lockheed Martin is the major contractor on theater missile defense with its upgraded version of the Patriot missile and the Army's $14 billion Theater High Altitude Area Defense system.

Deploying a national missile defense system could politically succeed in setting the stage for a worldwide arms race and dismantle past arms treaties.

The NMD violates the central principle of the ABM treaty, which is a ban on deployment of strategic missile defenses. It will undermine the nuclear nonproliferation treaty. It will frustrate SALT II and SALT III. It will lead directly to proliferation by the nuclear nations. It will lead to transitions toward nuclear arms by the nonnuclear nations. It will make the world less safe. It will lead to the impoverishment of the people of many nations as budgets are refashioned for nuclear arms expenditures.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, one of the lessons I had to teach myself was that almost every Member of Congress represents about 600,000 people. Even those people I disagree with, everybody in this floor was elected by a majority of the voters and I am going to respect their ability to say what they want to say.

I would like to remind the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) that the matter at hand is health care for our Nation's military retirees. This is a motion to instruct the conferees to stick to the House-passed provisions of the bill, provisions that I think greatly improve health care for our Nation's military retirees; a much better package than the other body.

At this moment we are instructing our conferees to stick to what I think is the better language of the two. It really has nothing to do with missile defense.

Mr. Speaker, again, it is always to be a position to be envied when one has their chairman and ranking member with them and most of their subcommittee chairmen with them.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

TWENTY-FIRST ANNUAL REPORT OF FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Government Reform.

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 701 of the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 (Public Law 95–454; 5 U.S.C. 7104(e)), I have the pleasure of transmitting to you the Twenty-first Annual Report of the Federal Labor Relations Authority for Fiscal Year 1999.

The report includes information on the cases heard and decisions rendered by the Federal Labor Relations Authority, the General Counsel of the Authority, and the Federal Service Impasses Panel.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 26, 2000.*

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT'S MISMANAGEMENT OF TAXPAYERS' MONEY

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

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I am here on a personal crusade. I came to Congress because I have got five children and I care about their school. They are getting ready to go back to school in August.

A couple of things disturb me, Mr. Speaker. The Department of Education contract employees, some of them,

pleaded guilty to participating in a scheme to defraud the Department of more than $1 million in equipment and false overtime. They illegally procured equipment, including a 61-inch television set, digital cameras, and Gateway computers for the personal use of Department employees and their families.

That is not all. Another fraudulent overtime claim includes a trip to Baltimore to pick up crab cakes for another Department employee. Two more Department employees were recently charged by the Department of Justice with involvement in this scandal, and as many as four other Department employees remain under investigation.

In 1998, the Department could not even audit its books, they were so badly managed. In 1999 when they did audit their books, they got a D minus.

Republicans have a different idea. We want to get dollars to the classroom and out of that bureaucracy over there.

Mr. Speaker, unbeknownst to all but Beltway bureaucrats and a handful of reform minded Members of Congress, the U.S. Department of Education has failed its last two financial audits.

The nationally known and respected accounting firm Ernst and Young has attempted, for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, to determine if the Department of Education has spent the money sent to it by Congress appropriately and lawfully.

The sad truth is, we just don't know. The Department's books were unauditable for FY 1998. This means the auditors couldn't even form an opinion on the state of the Department's books, let alone say whether those books were balanced and accurate.

In FY 1999, the Department received a grade equivalent of a D−. This means the auditors could put the books together into some sort of coherence, but not well enough to give the Department a passing grade in Accounting 101.

According to the auditors, if a private company received the same results the Department did on its FY 1999 audit, its stock would plummet. A real life example of this is MicroStrategy, whose stock, on the day a critical and unfavorable audit was announced, fell 62% and unleashed a slew of investor lawsuits.

Sadly, no one really knows when the Department will be able to receive a clean audit.

So, Mr. Speaker, what does this really mean to taxpayers—parents—and children? A few recent incidents illustrate the effects of this financial mis-management.

A Department of Education contract employee pleaded guilty to participating in a scheme to defraud the Department of more than one million dollars in equipment and false overtime. Illegally procured equipment included a 61 inch TV, digital cameras, and Gateway computers for the personal use of Department employees and their families.

However, that's not all. Among the fraudulent overtime claims was a trip to Baltimore to pick-up crab-cakes for another Department employee.

Two more Department employees were recently charged by the Department of Justice with involvement with this scandal, and as many as four other Department employees remain under investigation.

Earlier this year, 39 students were incorrectly notified by the Department that they had won the prestigious Jacob Javits scholarships. The cost of the mistake? Nearly $4 million dollars.

The theft ring and mis-identified students may only be the tip of the iceberg. Who knows what other kinds of waste, fraud, abuse and mismanagement might be taking place right now because of the inaction of the AL GORE and Education Secretary Riley?

For example, in one academic year alone, $177 million dollars in Pell Grants were improperly awarded, and the Department forgave almost $77 million in student loans for borrowers who falsely claimed to be either permanently disabled or dead.

The Department of Education also maintains a ''grantback'' account which at one time contained $750 million. Not surprisingly for an agency that cannot pass a basic audit, most of this money didn't really belong there. So far, the Department has been unable to explain exactly where the money came from, where it went, or why it came and went.

Is a clean audit an unreasonable goal for a federal agency? Bureaucrats would have you believe it is, but we all know it isn't. In fact, businesses large and small comply with this simple measure of fiscal responsibility every day. Any business owner will tell you the importance of a clean audit to maintain the confidence of investors and customers and to prevent waste, fraud and abuse.

The Department has failed to address its financial management for eight years running. Inaction has consequences and our children are paying the price. Fortunately, Republicans have responded to this inexcusable waste of hard-earned taxpayer money devoted to support the education of American children. We have held numerous oversight hearings, continue a rigorous investigation and passed a bill requiring a comprehensive fraud audit of the Department by the General Accounting Office.

We know what needs to be done. Until it is, the taxpayers' investment in the education of American school children will not reap anything close to maximum return.

f

OMISSION FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF TUESDAY, JULY 25, 2000 AT PAGE H–6853

(The following addition to the statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) was omitted from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Tuesday, July 25, 2000 at page H6853.)

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4924, the ''Truth in Regulating Act of 2000,'' is a bi-partisan, good government bill. It establishes a regulatory analysis function within the General Accounting Office (GAO). This function is intended to enhance Congressional responsibility for regulatory decisions developed under the laws Congress enacts. It is the product of the leadership over the last few years by Small Business Subcommittee Chairwoman on Regulatory Reform and Paperwork Reduction, Sue Kelly.

The most basic reason for supporting this bill is Constitutional: Just as Congress needs a Congressional Budget Office (CBO) to check and balance the executive Branch in the budget process, so it needs an analytic capability to check and balance the Executive Branch in the regulatory process. GAO is a logical location since it already has some regulatory review responsibilities under the Congressional Review Act (CRA).

Article I, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution vests all legislative powers in the U.S. Congress. While Congress may not delegate its legislative functions, it routinely authorizes Executive Branch agencies to issue rules that implement laws passed by Congress. Congress has become increasingly concerned about its responsibility to oversee agency rulemaking, especially due to the extensive costs and impacts of Federal rules.

During the 105th congress, the House Government Reform Subcommittee on National Economic Growth, Natural Resources, and Regulatory Affairs, chaired by David McIntosh, held a hearing on Mrs. Kelly's earlier regulatory analysis bill (H.R. 1704), which sought to establish a new, freestanding Congressional agency. The Subcommittee then marked up and reported her bill (H. Rept. 105–441, Part 2). H.R. 1704 called for the establishment of a new Legislative Branch Congressional Office of Regulatory Analysis (CORA) to analyze all major rules and report to Congress on potential costs, benefits, and alternative approaches that could achieve the same regulatory goals at lower costs. This agency was intended to aid Congress in analyzing Federal regulations. The Committee Report stated, ''Congress needs the expertise that CORA would provide to carry out its duty under the CRA. Currently, Congress does not have the information it needs to carefully evaluate regulations. The only analysis it has to rely on are those provided by the agencies which promulgate the rules. There is no official, third-party analysis of new regulations'' (p. 5).

Unfortunately, CORA supporters in the 105th Congress could not overcome the resistance of the defenders of the regulatory status quo. Opponents argued against creating a new Congressional agency on the basis of fiscal conservatism. By this logic, Congress ought to abolish CBO, as an even more heroic demonstration of fiscal conservatism in action. Of course, most of us recognize that dismantling CBO, however penny wise, would be pound foolish.

In the 106th Congress, Government Reform Subcommittee Chairman David McIntosh and Small Business Subcommittee Chairwoman Sue Kelly, seeking to accommodate the prejudice against a freestanding agency, introduced bills (H.R. 3521 and H.R. 3669, respectively) to establish a CORA function within GAO, which is an existing Legislative Branch agency. McIntosh and Kelly introduced their bills in January and February 2000. On May 10th, the Senate passed its own regulatory analysis legislation, S. 1198, the ''Truth