

consume to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT), the sponsor of this legislation.

□ 1900

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER); the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota Mr. OBERSTAR; and the gentleman from Tennessee (Chairman DUNCAN) for working with me to bring this bill for making a technical correction to the boundaries of the Lawrence County Airport to the floor this evening.

Back in 1999, as it has been stated before, the FAA approved a revised layout plan for the Lawrence County Airport in Courtland, Alabama, which states that the ownership and the management of the airport consists of approximately 414 acres. This plan has been approved by the FAA and the local industrial development board in Lawrence County, Alabama.

The FAA subsequently uncovered a map submitted in 1989 with a grant application for runway improvements showing the airport as consisting of approximately 600 acres. The additional acreage was incorporated into the grant application to accommodate an extension of the existing 5,000 foot runway to 7,000 feet each over a period of 20 years. There is no need for aircraft which require a 7,000 foot in the area, and this plan has not proceeded.

Due to the discrepancy between the old grant application and the FAA's revised layout plan, Lawrence County is not able to use the property. H.R. 5111 makes technical and conforming changes that clarify that the 414 acre layout plan is in effect.

Again, I would like to thank the chairman and the other members of the committee for their support, and ask my colleagues to support H.R. 5111.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to object to the bill sponsored by the Gentleman from Alabama, Mr. ADERHOLT, which directs the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to use a revised March 8, 1999 airport layout plan to determine the boundaries of the Lawrence County Airport, located in Courtland, Alabama. However, I want to make it clear that this bill should not be viewed as a precedent for diverting revenues from the sale of airport property.

Since 1982, and in subsequent reauthorization legislation, Congress has placed very strict conditions on the use of airport revenues to ensure that the revenues would be used primarily for airport purposes. In 1999, FAA issued its final revenue use policy, which states that any revenue from the sale of airport real property not acquired with Federal assistance will be considered airport revenue. Accordingly, the policy requires that the airport operator deposit the fair market value from the sale of the property into the airport account.

In the situation at hand, a master plan for Lawrence County Airport prepared by the Industrial Development Board of Lawrence County in the late 1980's showed more airport property that was needed for the current and foreseeable requirements of the airport. The

excess property was included in exhibits to Federal grant agreements as airport property, but was not material to any FAA decision to award Airport Improvement Program funds for the development of the airport. However, the FAA recently approved an airport layout plan allowing for limited commercial development on approximately 200 acres of land surrounding the Lawrence County Airport.

This bill would confirm the boundaries of the airport shown on the airport layout plan approved by the FAA on March 12, 1999, and release the sponsor from the obligation to put the proceeds of sale for property not within the agreed boundaries of the airport into the airport account.

This narrow legislation is based on a unique set of circumstances and should not be considered a precedent for a change in the clear policy on use of airport revenues. I am strongly supportive of requiring that proceeds from the sale or rental of airport property must be used for the capital and operating costs of the airport.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5111.

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. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous remarks on H.R. 5111.

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

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.

ECONOMIC PROBLEMS AHEAD

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, the financial markets are now nervously watching the impasse now reached in the Presidential election. Many commentators have already claimed the most recent drop in the market is a consequence of the uncertainty about the outcome of the election. Although it would be a mistake to totally dismiss the influence of the election uncertainty as a

factor in the economy, it must be made clear that the markets and the economy are driven by something much more basic. We know that the markets have been off significantly for the past several months, and this drop was not related in any way to the Presidential election.

Confidence is an important factor in the way markets work, and certainly the confusion in the Presidential election does not convey confidence to investors and to the rest of the world.

Mises, the great 20th century economist, predicted decades before the fall of the Soviet system that socialism was unworkable and would collapse upon itself. Although he did not live to see it, he would not have been surprised to witness the events of 1989 with the collapse of the entire Communist-Soviet system. Likewise, the interventionist-welfare system endorsed by the West, including the United States, is unworkable. Even without the current problems in the Presidential election, signs of an impasse within our system were evident.

Inevitably, a system that decides almost everything through pure democracy will sharply alienate two groups, the producers and the recipients of the goods distributed by the popularly elected congresses. Our system is not only unfairly designed to take care of those who do not work, it also rewards the powerful and influential who can gain control of the government apparatus. Control over government contracts, the military industrial complex and the use of our military to protect financial interests overseas is worth great sums of money to the special interests in power.

Even though it is argued that there are huge budget surpluses in Washington, instead of budget compromise, a stalemate results. Each side wants even a greater share of the loot being distributed by the politicians. Even with the windfall revenues, no serious suggestion is made in Washington for cuts in spending.

Instead of moving toward a market economy and less dependency on the Federal Government in the midst of this so-called "prosperity," we continue to go in the other direction by internationalizing the interventionist-welfare system. Planning-by-government has gone international as the political power is delivered to organizations like the United Nations, the World Trade Organization, the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. Although in the early stages of interventionism and government planning, especially when a great deal of wealth is available for redistribution, it seems to enhance prosperity while prolonging the financial bubble on which the economy is dependent. The monetary system, both our domestic system as well as the international fiat system, plays a key role in the artificial prosperity based on inflated currencies as well as debt and speculation.

The pretended goal of the economic planners has been economic fairness

through redistribution of wealth, politically correct social consciousness, and an all-intrusive government which becomes a responsibility for personal safety, health and education while personal responsibility is diminished.

The goal of liberty has long been forgotten. The concentrated effort has been to gain power through the control of wealth with a scheme that pretends to treat everybody fairly. An impasse was destined to come, and already signs are present in our system of welfare. This election in many ways politically demonstrates this economic reality. The political stalemate reflects the stalemate that is developing in the economy. Both will eventually cause deep division and hardship. The real problem, the preserving of the free market and private property rights, if ignored, will only make things worse, because the only solution that will be offered in Washington will be more government intervention, increased spending, increase in monetary inflation, more debt, greater military activity throughout the world, and priming the economic pump with more expenditures for weapons we do not need.

We have already seen signs of economic troubles ahead. Although the Fed plans for only a slight slow down and a so-called "soft landing," the correction from the monetary mischief of the last 10 years has already been determined. Although the dollar currently remains strong, because other currencies are so weak, there is a limitation on how long we can create new dollars without them being devalued. A weaker dollar will surely come in our not too distant future. Our huge current account deficit and trade imbalances warn us of that day.

Government statistics continue to tell us that price inflation is not a problem, and when an inflation statistic comes out it does not like, it drops out food and energy and claims the number is totally benign. Ask any housewife, and they will tell you that the cost of living is going up steadily and much more rapidly than the government will admit.

We in the Congress should be prepared for lower revenues in the future since the revenues received in the last couple of years were artificially created by a stock market that had skyrocketed due to the credit expansion by the Federal Reserve. These capital gains tax revenues will soon disappear.

The savings rates of the American people are now negative. Without savings, true capital investment cannot be maintained. Creation of credit out of thin air by the Fed was the original problem so it surely can't be the solution.

Even in the midst of our great imaginary budgetary surpluses, there has been no effort to cut. Once the economy tends to slow and more problems are apparent, expenditures are going to soar not only because of future problems but because of the new programs recently initiated.

A huge financial bubble has been created by the GSEs, such as Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. The \$33 billion of shareholder equities in these two organizations has been

leveraged into \$1.07 trillion worth of assets—a bubble waiting to be pricked.

The Congress has reacted to all these events irresponsibly by increasing spending, increasing spending, increasing tax revenues, doing nothing to reduce regulations and being totally apathetic toward the dollar and monetary policy. We in the Congress have a moral and constitutional obligation to protect the value of the dollar and to understand why it is so important to the economy that a central bank not be given the unbelievable power of inflating a currency at will and pretending that it knows how to find tune an economy through this counterfeit system of money.

Rising interest rates in the high yield bond market is giving us an indication that a serious problem is just around the bend. Commercial debt was but \$50 billion in 1994 and is now ten times higher now at \$551 billion. The money supply is now growing at greater than a 10% rate and the derivatives market, although difficult to calculate, probably exceeds \$75 trillion. We also have consumer debt, which is at record highs and has not yet shown signs of slowing. The Dow Jones Industrial Average stocks are now 5 times book value, the highest in over a hundred years. There will come a day when most people come to realize the fraud associated with Social Security and the inability for it to continue as currently managed. Rising oil and natural gas prices, it is argued, are not inflationary, yet they are playing havoc with the pocket-books of most Americans. The economies of Asia, and in particular Japan, will not offer any assistance in dealing with the approaching storm in this country. Our foreign policy, which continues to obligate our support around the world, shows no signs of changing and will contribute to the crisis and possibly our bankruptcy.

What must we do? We should develop more sensible priorities. We must restore confidence in freedom and recognize how free markets can solve our problems. We must have more respect for the Rule of Law and demand that Congress, the Courts, and the President live within the Rule of Law and stop arbitrarily flaunting the Constitution. If the Constitution is to be changed, it should be changed slowly and deliberately as is permitted, but never by fiat. We must eventually reconsider the notion of the original constitutional Republic as designed by our Founders. The monolithic centralized state was not the design nor is it supported by the Constitution. We were meant to have loose knit individual states with the states themselves managing their own affairs.

The political impasse we now see with the election process along with the divisions in the House and Senate is surely related to the economic and budgetary impasse that plagues Washington. Since interventionism (the planned welfare state) is unworkable and will fail, the surprising developments in this presidential election will accelerate its demise. The two are obviously related.

ENSURING FAIRNESS AND JUSTICE IN ELECTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on November 7, 2000, some of

the people were able to exercise their will. I believe that all of the people of this great Republic and great Nation should have that opportunity. Now we find ourselves, our eyes, the Nation's eyes, the world's eyes, on the great State of Florida.

First, let me thank my colleagues, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER), and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) for their leadership, along with the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER) in trying to explain to the American people what is happening in their great State.

I think the real key has to be that we must listen to the people of that State, the people of Florida, and, although so many of us would want to cast our opinions and our viewpoints, it is time now to let their will be heard. I think it is a very strong will; and, if we watch what is going on in Florida, we will see that the first order of recount was driven by the law of the State of Florida.

I was in Nashville, Tennessee, as the numbers began to crumble, and it was about 3 a.m. in the morning when the votes that were originally called for Governor Bush now deteriorated to just a difference of 569 votes between Vice President Gore and Governor Bush. So a recount was triggered, not by the Vice President or by the Governor, but by the laws of the State of Florida.

The recount was then further activated, if you will, by the laws of that State and the will of the people. They are asking that their recount be allowed to proceed. I believe it is extremely difficult to address the concerns of an accurate count without allowing an accurate count to take place. There were ballot deficiencies and irregularities. There was the butterfly ballot that confused many of the voters.

I have listened to the political pundits and media pundits. I am offended by insulting and making fun of those individuals who say that they had difficulty. In fact, I have heard and understand that many did ask, "could I get another ballot," or try to determine whether that could happen, and, unfortunately, in the rush of activities, they were told not.

I believe in "we, the people," and I think the focus should be on the people of Florida. I come from a county of about 1 million. 995,000 people voted in Harris County. We only discarded 6,000 votes in Harris County, Texas. But yet, in this county in Florida, 19,000 ballots were discarded. That is, of course, an exception, an aberration, that should be addressed.

I think it is unfair for the Secretary of State to demand that all be in by 5 o'clock on tomorrow. That is not responding to the will of the people. Let their voices be heard. It is evident by