



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 143

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 5, 1997

No. 76

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. NEY].

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

June 5, 1997.

I hereby designate the Honorable ROBERT W. NEY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Reverend Steve Kummernuss, Zion Lutheran Church, Doylestown, OH, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, You have given us this good land as our heritage. Make us always remember Your generosity and constantly do Your will. Bless our land with honest industry, truthful education, and an honorable way of life. Save us from violence, discord, and confusion; from pride and arrogance, and from every evil course of action. Make us who came from many nations with many different languages a united people. Defend our liberties and give those whom we have entrusted with the authority of government the spirit of wisdom, that there might be justice and peace in our land.

Bless those who hold office in our Government that they may do their work in a spirit of wisdom, kindness, and justice. Help them use their authority to serve faithfully and to promote the general welfare, through Your Son, Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the

last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. GIBBONS] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GIBBONS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain fifteen 1-minutes on each side.

WELCOME TO REVEREND KUMMERNUSS

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, we are pleased to welcome today Reverend Kummernuss from the Zion Lutheran Church in the 16th District of Ohio, who gave the invocation, a very thoughtful one, I thought. And this is a little bit special because Reverend Kummernuss' son, Matthew, is one of our outstanding pages this session.

We are pleased that we could have Reverend Kummernuss here today to join in our opening and also to give him an opportunity to see where his son has spent his past several months. If we have any errands that we need run, just summon him. Since Reverend Kummernuss has the privileges of the floor today, he also has the privilege of asking Matt to do his errands.

We are happy that Reverend Kummernuss joined us for today's invocation.

BOY SCOUTS AND GIRL SCOUTS

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, a California court ruled that the Boy Scouts do not have to accept girls. Scouts honor. Check this out, 13-year-old Katrina Yah sued, her attorney said the Boy Scouts of America is a business, therefore under California law, she should be allowed in. Beam me up, Mr. Speaker. What is next?

Boys suing the Girl Scouts. Sons suing the Daughters of the American Revolution. Grandpas suing the Brownies. Teenagers suing the AARP? Think about it. I believe that there is really nothing wrong in America with boys being boys and girls being girls. Think about it. Yield back the Cub Scouts.

SHORTFALLS IN DEFENSE FUNDING

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on National Security will meet soon to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1998 for military activities of the Department of Defense. When voting on the defense authorization bill in the coming weeks, we must consider our Reserve component forces and the shortfalls in their funding. What will happen to our Reserve component readiness, compatibility and equipment interoperability with the Active Force if we continue to shortchange these forces?

We must remember that as the American defense budget continues to dwindle, we will be relying more on these

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H3479

dedicated men and women who choose to serve in the Guard and Reserve.

If we continue to ask these troops to do more with less, more operations and contingencies with less equipment, less training and fewer troops, we will see significant problems with recruiting, retaining the same caliber people that we choose to serve in this All Volunteer Force. Our Armed Forces, Mr. Speaker, are more than just Active Forces. They are a total force component comprised of Active, Reserve and Guard members.

EDUCATIONAL STANDARDS OF EXCELLENCE

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

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to call on my colleagues to join me in support of educational standards of excellence for our Nation's students and parents and communities. As a former State superintendent of schools in North Carolina, I have seen firsthand how much progress can be achieved when we aim high in education and give our children and teachers the tools they need to get the job done. I call on this House to go on record in favor of this commonsense approach to improving education in America.

Last week I participated in an educational town hall meeting with the Vice President in my home area. The voice I heard from North Carolina students and citizens came through loud and clear. An America needs educational standards of excellence.

Mr. Speaker, I have drafted legislation in support of voluntary standards of educational excellence. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this important legislation.

BE FAIR TO OUR NATION'S POLICE AND FIREFIGHTERS

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I will be introducing a bill that is aimed at benefiting our Nation's police officers and firefighters. My bill will rescind the dollar limitation on police and firefighter benefit laws allowing these employees to collect the money that they have rightfully earned by contributing to their benefit fund, to their pension fund.

Currently, under section 415 of the Tax Code, police officers and firefighters are not eligible to collect the funds that they have earned and instead are required to retire with benefits generally based on the percentage of their highest 3-year salary average. Regrettably the average in most instances does not exceed 65 or 75 percent. Thus many officers living along the east coast or in large metropolitan

and surrounding suburban areas throughout our Nation are forced to work past their general retirement age in order to afford the high cost of living in these areas.

This bill will not initiate a tax revenue loss. In fact, under my bill, we would gain Federal revenues due to the disbursement of previously uncollected funds to retirees.

I invite my colleagues to support this measure. Let us be fair to those who day in and day out place their lives on the line for our protection.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, it is time to stop the political games. The Republican leadership's failure to pass a clean supplemental appropriations bill is denying our troops in the field the resources they need to carry out their mission. The supplemental appropriations bill provides \$2 billion to pay for our operation in Bosnia. If we do not enact this bill swiftly, their readiness will suffer.

I am holding letters from Secretary of Defense Cohen, and the Chiefs of Staff of the Army and Air Force, which describe the effects on the military of the Republicans' failure to pass a clean bill. Training is curtailed. Maintenance is delayed. Rotations are canceled. Inventories are drained. Our soldiers, sailors, marines and airmen need a clean supplemental appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, there is a time for partisan politics and there is a time to put it aside. But when Americans are hit by a natural disaster, we must act together and act quickly. When American troops need our help, we must do our job and do it today.

Let us support our troops in Bosnia and our people at home. Pass a clean supplemental.

VOTE "NO" ON CAMPBELL-GREENWOOD

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today two diametrically opposed resolutions will be on the floor, in the next order of business dealing with population control. The Campbell-Greenwood substitute, which is a substitute to a bill or amendment that I am offering along with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BARCIA], promotes abortion on demand overseas and not family planning.

The Campbell-Greenwood amendment does not add any pro-life conditions to current law. Rather, it blurs the distinction between abortion and

family planning in U.S.-supported programs overseas. It allows U.S. dollars to go to the U.N. Population Fund, the UNFPA, even though that organization continues to support China's brutally enforced one-child-per-couple policy, and to nongovernmental organizations that are engaged in a crusade for abortion on demand around the world.

My amendment does not reduce family planning by even one penny. It conditions those funds to those organizations that are all about family planning and not about abortion promotion. I urge a "no" vote on the Campbell-Greenwood, a "yes" vote on Smith-Barcia-Hyde-Oberstar.

IN OPPOSITION TO REPUBLICAN AMENDMENTS TO DISASTER RELIEF BILL

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, there are people in the Midwest who are suffering. Their homes have been destroyed by floods and they need our help. The Democrats in Congress have an emergency spending bill that will help them put their shattered lives back together.

We want to help these victims but the Republicans will not let us.

Instead, the Republicans are attaching language to a flood relief bill that would stop an accurate count of minorities in the census. The Republicans are so afraid of an accurate count of minorities that they are willing to let flood victims suffer.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans do not mind playing politics with the American people. They already shut down the Federal Government twice. Now they are fiddling while the Midwest drowns.

THE NEED TO FUND FEDERAL JUDGESHIPS IN MIDDLE FLORIDA

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I want to make my colleagues aware of a crisis existing in the middle district of Florida. The current Federal case load is one of the worst in the country. The population continues to increase. If no additional judgeships are approved, by 2005 there will be only one-third of the State's Federal judges assigned to two-thirds of the State's population.

As case loads increase, current judges cannot simply shoulder the additional burden. By failing to create additional positions, we are producing a backlog of cases, increasing legal costs for citizens and undermining the Federal courts.

Lately much attention has been focused on getting tough on crime. We must remember the only path from indictment to incarceration is through the judiciary. It must receive adequate

resources, otherwise the process is brought to an absolute standstill.

Only judges can exercise judicial power. There is no substitute. I urge my colleagues to fill and fund these vacancies and provide much needed help to judges, not only in Florida but across this Nation.

FLOOD RELIEF

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the Government shutdown artists are at it again. Americans watched with disgust as this House Republican leadership shut down the Government and frittered away one and a half billion dollars of taxpayers' hard-earned money. Well now, this same crowd is in control, and they propose to shut down flood relief moneys to families desperate for assistance throughout the American Midwest.

□ 1015

Even though the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense say that our troops in Bosnia cannot rotate out in order and cannot come home after placing their lives at risk for our security, they would shut down those funds.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the American people can see that this same shutdown fervor for partisan political advantage is wrong and they can recognize when they look at North Dakota that it is not the only disaster area in this country. One of those disasters is occurring right here, when the needs of the American people are forgotten in the race for partisan political advantage.

DOUBLE STANDARD EXISTS IN THE AIR FORCE

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, it was only 1 week ago that a junior officer in the Air Force was discharged without honor for engaging in an extramarital affair. This junior officer was a woman. Today, 1 week later, a general in the same Air Force is up for promotion to the pinnacle of military responsibility after engaging in an extramarital affair. The general was a man.

Whether this double standard is because of military rank or of gender, it is still a double standard and it is simply wrong. Secretary Cohen said today he wanted to stop the feeding frenzy surrounding allegations in the Armed Forces. I understand his goal and believe he is trying to do what he feels is the right thing; however, if he wants to promote General Gaston to the Chair of Joint Chiefs of Staff, he should invite Lt. Kelly Flinn to rejoin the Air Force as a B-52 pilot.

This morning women all over America are scratching their heads wonder-

ing what kind of double standard exists in the Air Force. The Secretary should rectify that immediately and reinstate Lieutenant Flinn.

FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1998 AND 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). Pursuant to House Resolution 159 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1757.

□ 1017

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1757) to consolidate international affairs agencies, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and for other purposes, with Mr. NEY (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, June 4, 1997, pending was the amendment by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] adding a new title to the bill.

Pursuant to the order of the Committee of that day, debate on that amendment and all amendments thereto will be limited to 1 hour and 20 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the following Members or their designees:

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] for 20 minutes;

The gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] for 20 minutes;

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] for 20 minutes; and

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BARCIA] for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and let me just begin this debate by saying that today one of the most important pro-life amendments will be up before this Congress.

It is the amendment that separates abortion from family planning in our overseas population control programs. It is a policy that was in effect during the Reagan-Bush years and effectively erected a fire wall between family planning and the promotion of abortion on demand around the world, where approximately 100 countries protected their unborn. And regrettably they are under siege by organizations like Planned Parenthood and others in trying to bring down these laws.

So that is what the amendment is all about. I understand there will be a substitute that, frankly, is a fake, and we will talk about that during the debate.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] the designee for the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON]?

Mr. BERMAN. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

We have 25 speakers, many of whom thought this would be starting at 10:30, so many are probably on their way over at this time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. BERMAN. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman. Presently before us is the Smith amendment?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. BERMAN. And we are operating under a unanimous-consent request with respect to the Smith amendment, a substitute amendment to be offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL], and time limits for debate on both of those measures; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. On the Smith amendment and all amendments thereto.

Mr. BERMAN. But at this point, though, Mr. Chairman, the only amendment in front of us is the Smith amendment?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. BERMAN. I thank the Chair, and I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, first of all, a parliamentary inquiry. Is my understanding correct that there will be a unanimous-consent request to divide time?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The unanimous-consent agreement has already been ordered. The time has been divided.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Further inquiry, Mr. Chairman, before proceeding, and that is whether the Campbell-Greenwood-Lowey amendment is to be the only amendment included during this time period?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. On the clarification, the time restriction is on the Smith amendment and any amendments thereto.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Further inquiry, Mr. Chairman, if I may proceed, it is my understanding that that is the only amendment; otherwise we might want to divide the time differently.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, it is my understanding that presently before us is the Smith amendment, the Campbell-plus amendment will be offered as a substitute to that amendment, and the time limit is for the two amendments together, three 20-minute segments.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's clarification.

One last inquiry of a parliamentary nature, Mr. Chairman. Is it now appropriate or necessary for me to actually move the Campbell-Greenwood-Lowey amendment as a substitute for the Smith amendment?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It would be in order for the gentleman to offer an amendment at this time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CAMPBELL to the amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Page 1, strike all following the title designation and insert the following:

SEC. . POPULATION PLANNING ACTIVITIES OR OTHER POPULATION ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or any other provision of law, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act for population planning activities or other population assistance may be made available to pay for the performance of abortions in any foreign country, except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term or in cases of rape or incest.

(2) The limitation contained in paragraph (1) shall not apply to the treatment of injuries or illness caused by unsafe abortions.

(b) LIMITATIONS ON LOBBYING ACTIVITIES.—

(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or any other provision of law, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act for population planning activities or other population assistance may be made available to lobby for or against abortion.

(2) The limitation contained in paragraph (1) shall not apply to activities in opposition to coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization.

SEC. . UNITED NATIONS POPULATION FUND.

(a) LIMITATION.—Subject to subsections (b), (c), and (d)(2), of the amounts made available for each of the fiscal years 1998 and 1999 to carry out part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, not more than \$25,000,000 shall be available for each such fiscal year for the United Nations Population Fund.

(b) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS IN CHINA.—None of the funds made available under this section shall be made available for a country program in the People's Republic of China.

(c) CONDITIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—(1) Not more than one-half of the amount made available to the United Nations Population Fund under this section may be provided to the Fund before March 1 of the fiscal year for which funds are made available.

(2) Amounts made available for each of the fiscal years 1998 and 1999 under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for the United Nations Populations Fund may not be made available to the Fund unless—

(A) the Fund maintains accounts made available to the Fund under this section in an account separate from accounts of the Fund for other funds; and

(B) the Fund does not commingle amounts made available to the Fund under this section with other funds.

(d) REPORTS.—(1) Not later than February 15, 1998, and February 15, 1999, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees indicating the amount of funds that the United Nations Population Fund is budgeting for the year in which the report is submitted for a country program in the People's Republic of China.

(2) If a report under paragraph (1) indicates that the United Nations Population Fund plans to spend China country program funds in the People's Republic of China in the year covered by the report, then the amount of such funds that the Fund plans to spend in the People's Republic of China shall be deducted from the funds made available to the Fund after March 1 for obligation for the remainder of the fiscal year in which the report is submitted.

Mr. CAMPBELL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I offer to the Smith amendment restores the agreement that was reached last year on U.N. family planning assistance, and its purpose is that we would have exactly the same compromise which allowed us to go ahead with necessary family planning assistance through the U.N. population fund that we had last year and that was made law last year.

Let me be explicit in noting that it does not permit the United States contributions to go for any abortion purposes; and, also, it states that there is to be no contribution at all to China. So those two issues really should be taken off the table. In the Campbell-Greenwood-Lowey amendment funds may not be used in China, even if it is for family planning in China.

So the substance of the amendment is, I repeat, what we had last year. Money is to be cut into two parts, that which is available for disbursement before March 1 and that which comes after March 1. That which comes after March 1 goes to the U.N. population fund, as the first half does as well; but, dollar for dollar, if the United Nations family planning fund gives money to China, then dollar for dollar we restrict, we take that dollar out of what the United States is contributing to the UNFPA.

So, as a result, it is simply not true that any of our taxpayers' money will go to fund abortion. It is also untrue any of our taxpayers' money will go to assist even family planning in China. What the amendment permits, however, is the continuation of successful participation in family planning, which, I suggest, is a very great benefit to the U.S. interests and to those in need throughout the world.

I draw attention to the fact that family planning is a substitute for abortion. It is just essential to recognize that if a country is attempting to bring down its birthrate, and if there is a temptation to have abortion as a means of doing that, family planning is far preferable.

The Smith amendment, by contrast, runs a tremendous risk. What it does is to say unless the President can certify

that the entire United Nations fund does not go to assist in China, or unless the President can assert that there are no coerced abortions in China, then all United Nations family planning assistance contributions by the United States must end.

Let me be very clear about that. Even if the assistance is to Bangladesh, even if the assistance is to sub-Saharan Africa—because of China, the United Nations family population assistance, the part that comes from the United States, may not go ahead. Whatever one's views happen to be about China, it is simply wrong to punish the good essential functions of international family planning in destitute areas of the world because of China, which is what the Smith amendment does.

Last, Mr. Chairman, I want to draw attention to the fact that contraception diminishes abortion. The facts are indisputable. I cite the AID studies in this area involving Russia, Kazakhstan, Hungary, where there was an increase in the use of contraception, a dramatic drop in abortions followed.

Russia, 1990 to 1997, contraceptive use went up 30 percent, abortion dropped 22 percent; Kazakhstan, 1993 to 1994, contraception went up 59 percent, abortions dropped 41 percent; Hungary, from 1968 to 1988, contraceptive use more than tripled and abortion dropped more than half.

Examples of this nature are obvious because the need for family planning removes the occasion for abortion.

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

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to clarify some of the information relative to the Smith-Barcia-Oberstar-Hyde amendment and mention a few of the points that the amendment attempts to address and focus the issue and the discussion back on the issue of the amendment itself as opposed to debate between of course the concept of contraception, which many of us support and certainly should support, and the actual language of the amendment.

The Mexico City policy would ensure, of course, it would certainly address the point in the policy and it would ensure that U.S. tax dollars will not be allocated to foreign nongovernmental organizations unless they agree not to violate the laws or lobby to change the laws of other countries with respect to abortion and agree not to perform abortions in those countries, except in the cases of rape, incest, or where the life of the mother is in danger.

□ 1030

Second, it closes the loophole that allows U.S. tax dollars to subsidize organizations which perform abortions. Currently, law under the 1973 Helms amendment prohibits the direct use of U.S. foreign aid funds to pay for most abortion procedures. U.S. funds and tax dollars are being used indirectly by organizations claiming that they are

using their funds and not U.S. tax dollars to perform abortions.

Third, the amendment will prohibit any U.S. funds to the United Nations Population Fund, the UNFPA, until they cease their support for China's coercive abortion and involuntary sterilization policy. The actions of the Chinese toward their citizens are beyond description. The forced abortion of their unborn and mandatory sterilization of their people, regardless of the economic hardship in their country, is inexcusable. U.S. funds should not be used to support those actions.

This amendment does not decrease funding for population assistance. In fact, spending for population control programs increased over the time the Mexico City policy was in effect from \$318 million for fiscal year 1985 to \$448 million for fiscal year 1993. This amendment continues to fund international population assistance but limits the availability only to those organizations who do not perform abortions.

Finally, this amendment will not prevent funding for most family planning organizations. Virtually all family planning organizations agreed to the terms of the Mexico City policy.

Mr. Chairman, those are the points that I wanted to make. I know we will be hearing additional debate on these very important amendments, and I hope that those of us who are concerned about this issue will get to the floor on our side to be recognized for statements they might wish to make, recognizing of course that it is a very busy and hectic time this morning as we try to complete the session business this week. But I am delighted to join my cochair, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who has done a fine job in leading the discussion and offering these amendments which I was very pleased to offer bipartisan support to.

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

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague from California, the author of the substitute which we are now considering, made the essential point. It is counterproductive, it is wrong to seek language which would restrict the disbursement of contraceptive services in the name of opposition to abortion when the consequence of that very conduct will be to increase abortion. That point needs to be made over and over again.

I want to just take what little time I have yielded myself to point out the other language in the amendment of the gentleman from California. There is a clear prohibition on the use of U.S. funds to pay for abortions or for abortion counseling in any foreign country except in cases of rape, incest, or where the life of the mother is in danger. No U.S. funds will be used for these purposes.

The goal of the Campbell amendment is to free up family planning funds and

contraceptive services so that people can make their decisions about how to avoid the problem of having to have abortions. It also prohibits lobbying on the issue.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Smith language and in very strong opposition to the Campbell-Greenwood amendment. I would like to clarify the debate at hand here. This is a funding issue, what are we going to do with our U.S. taxpayer dollars. While there are prohibitions against U.S. taxpayer dollars being used for purposes like providing abortions, for lobbying to overturn pro-life laws in foreign capitals, or to go to an organization that promotes the forced abortion issue that is going on in China, United Nations funds right now are going to China and they are using it to force women who do not want to have abortions to have abortions.

Our colleagues will claim that that is OK and that they can play this numbers game, and they can use our U.S. taxpayer dollars to provide condoms or other contraceptive services and then use dollars from somewhere else for forced abortions, for providing abortions or lobbying to overturn abortion laws in foreign capitals.

The Smith amendment very clearly just says we are not going to give it to those organizations, we do not want to give U.S. taxpayer dollars that come out of the pockets of hard-working Americans, millions of whom are pro-life, millions of whom are pro-life Catholics and Protestants who have a strong religious prohibition against this.

We do not want to give our U.S. taxpayer dollars to those organizations. Why would we want to give U.S. taxpayer dollars to an organization that is going to do forced abortions in China, and then we are going to get up here on the floor of the House and smile and say, well, our dollars did not go for that purpose.

I mean, what a joke. They have got \$1 million in the account, and they get \$500,000 from the United States and \$500,000 from their private sources, and they say the \$500,000 going for abortions comes from the private sources. I say support the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and support his amendment, vote against the Campbell-Greenwood amendment.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD], the co-author of the amendment.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, what is this all about? The base bill does the right thing. The base bill holds true to America's commitment to population control.

This is the history of population growth on planet Earth. We can say that in the second half of this century we headed off on an explosive growth of population worldwide, and most of that growth is in underdeveloped nations, in places like India and China and Africa.

The purpose of these funds is to simply enable families, particularly poor families, to have the number of children that they want to, as many children as they want to or as few as they want to.

My colleague and friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], has an amendment. His amendment would say that none of the funds to help control population development may go to an organization if that organization, with its own money, not with American taxpayers' dollars but with the money of the woman who seeks an abortion, provides that service as well.

My colleague stands on a moral point. I respect him for that. But there is a time in public policy where morality becomes hypocrisy and morality becomes hypocrisy, when what we are trying to achieve does far more harm and in fact goes counterproductive to what we are trying to accomplish.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will say that I am not suggesting that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is hypocritical, if that is his point.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I appreciate that.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I am suggesting that public policy can make us all hypocrites. The point is that without these funds, the consequences are real. The consequences are 1,600 women dying every day because their pregnancies are too closely spaced together, because their bodies are too young, their bodies are too old to sustain that pregnancy, they die of postpartum hemorrhage.

Five hundred eighty thousand women die a year because they do not have access to good reproductive health services, and it is hypocritical for any of us to suggest that we want to, in the name of reducing the number of abortions, allow that to occur. It is wrong to allow 7 million infants a year around the world to die because they are born to women who cannot nourish them, they are born into families that cannot sustain them. That is an awful consequence to pay for a moral principle.

It is wrong and most ironic that the consequence of the Smith amendment is millions and millions of more abortions around the world, because we will not stop abortions by simply prohibiting agencies from participating in family planning funds. That defies common sense on its face. In fact, what we do have is an explosive growth of abortions in those places around the world where women do not have access to family planning.

My colleagues, please support the Campbell-Greenwood amendment. It accomplishes what we all want to accomplish. It reduces human suffering. It empowers poor families to develop their families, to grow their families as they are able, to prevent this awful toll of human suffering, and it ensures that not a penny, not a dime of taxpayer moneys goes to pay for abortion.

Let us talk about the realities of this process. We know that if the Smith amendment prevails unamended by Campbell-Greenwood, that this will not be accepted by the Senate and it will be vetoed by the President, so this will not stand. This is the time for compromise. We have found ourselves compromising on this issue year after year, session after session. Let us be realistic. Let us understand the political realities as well as the realities in human suffering and support the Campbell-Greenwood amendment.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I would just also like to comment on the Campbell-Greenwood amendment and say that it simply does nothing to end United States support for the UNFPA's continued activities in China that have already been referenced, and I think are certainly viewed in a very negative fashion by the taxpayers across this country. It also does nothing to end United States tax dollars being used to promote and perform abortion around the world.

Pro-life Americans believe that it is improper use that any tax dollars go to organizations that perform or promote abortions, even though these organizations may claim that U.S. dollars are not used for abortion-related activities. We should not support any organization that fails to adhere to our unyielding belief in the right to life.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ADERHOLT].

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], an amendment that would save literally countless children throughout the world, and in opposition to the alternative amendment which would only continue the status quo, dodging the real issue at hand.

I would like to commend my colleague from New Jersey for taking action to try and prevent the use of hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars for promoting abortion and funding the international abortion industry. How can we justify using our hard-earned money for the purpose of helping foreign nations take the lives of innocent children? This is not what I would call foreign aid.

I also commend my colleague for taking steps to save children from a death sentence. Just yesterday in Poland, Pope John Paul II stated that the right of life is not a question of ideology, not only a religious right, it is a human right. He also restated his belief that a nation which kills its own children is a nation without a future.

The question we will vote on today is quite simply whether you oppose taxpayer funds being used to promote abortion in foreign countries or whether you support it, pure and simple.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes on behalf of the Campbell-Greenwood-Lowey amendment to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, our world's population is growing at an alarming rate. Resources are being consumed faster than they can be renewed. This exploding population is leaving poverty, malnutrition, widespread transmission of disease, and environmental degradation in its wake. That is why, Mr. Chairman, support for reproductive health services is becoming more important every day.

□ 1045

Voluntary family planning services give mothers and families new choices and hope. They increase child survival and promote safe childhood and safe motherhood. Without our support for international family planning, women in developing nations will face more unwanted pregnancies, more poverty, more despair.

Mr. Chairman, it continues to be extremely ironic that the same people who would deny women in the developing world the choice of an abortion would also seek to eliminate support for family planning programs, programs that reduce the need for abortion in the first place. Without access to safe and affordable family planning services, there will be more abortions, not fewer, the abortions will be less safe and put more women's lives in danger.

To this end, Mr. Chairman, the very least we can do is pass the Campbell-Greenwood-Lowey amendment. We should not be playing political football with international family planning funds. Let us allow international family planning programs to do what they were designed to do, maintain sustainable levels of population, giving people in the developing world better health, greater prosperity and more hope for the future.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Smith amendment which would reinstate the so-called Mexico City policy.

Once again we have this unnecessary debate. Once again those of us who are strong supporters of international family planning have to remind Congress that we already prohibit U.S. funds for

abortion in international family planning through a 1973 Helms amendment that is part of the permanent foreign aid statute. Once again we have to remind Congress that family planning is not abortion, that family planning prevents abortion. Once again we stand here today debating an issue of women and infant mortality.

This amendment uses scare tactics to prevent nongovernmental organizations from discussing issues pertaining to reproductive rights. The Smith amendment gags foreign nongovernmental organizations from talking to their own governments with their own funds about abortion law or policy, even when it might involve discussions about making abortions safer.

The effects of the Mexico City policy are far-reaching and negative. According to UNICEF, each year 600,000 women die of pregnancy-related causes; 75,000 of these deaths are associated with self-induced unsafe abortion. Is this the result we want? Do we want the blood of 75,000 women on our hands year after year after year?

In addition, this amendment would terminate the entire U.S. contribution to the U.N. Population Fund unless the President certifies that the U.N. Population Fund has terminated all activities in China. This is simply not fair.

The U.N. Population Fund's country program in China ended in 1995. Currently they maintain a liaison office only in Beijing for programs in Mongolia and North Korea. This amendment seeks to use the U.N. Population Fund's past program in China and its small presence in China as a basis for withdrawing all support of the U.N. Population Fund altogether.

Lastly, I would like to emphasize that to call family planning abortion is to trivialize a critical and complex issue. Family planning is prenatal care. Family planning is child nutrition. Family planning is followup and preventive care. It is the education provided by international family planning that is often what enables children to survive the first year and what enables women to survive their pregnancies.

Do not impose this gag order. Provide the world with family planning education that works to eliminate the need for abortion. Defeat the Smith amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOSTETTLER].

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

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, today, I rise in strong support of the Smith amendment and in opposition to the Campbell amendment. The Smith amendment is about abortion and it is about prohibiting the use of Federal dollars for the promotion of abortion. Do not be misled. Promoting abortion is never about family planning.

This administration would have us believe that once we give away millions of dollars to contractors or grantees in faraway countries, how these dollars are used is irrelevant as long as their money is not being used to directly perform abortions. Since when is it irrelevant that U.S. tax dollars are being used to harm innocent human life? Since when are Americans obligated to finance efforts to dismantle the laws of foreign countries who have so appropriately chosen to protect human life? And since when has this Government simply turned over tax dollars to any individual, organization or entity and simply said, "What you do with this is irrelevant," especially when lives are at stake?

Mr. Chairman, human life is relevant. Nothing is more relevant. It matters to that innocent baby that may be killed because laws that protect it are being dismantled with U.S. tax dollars. It matters to the families of these children. Quite frankly, it should matter to us. It is our obligation as elected officials to actively protect innocent human life. Abortion is a disgrace to society and to civilization. Let us not degrade ourselves and our reputation abroad any longer. Please support the Smith amendment and defeat the Campbell amendment.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise respectfully in disagreement with the Smith amendment and support of the Greenwood-Campbell-Lowey amendment and thank them for their leadership in bringing this amendment to the floor.

It seems repetitive to say what some of my colleagues have already said on the floor on this issue, but obviously the issue needs repetition because it does not seem to be clear that this provision, the Smith amendment, is unnecessary. No United States funds can be used by UNFPA in China. Current appropriations law, and I speak as ranking member of the subcommittee on appropriations for foreign operations, so I know intimately the details of our legislation. Current appropriations law already denies foreign aid funding to any organization or program that, quotes, supports or participates in the management of a program of coerced abortion or involuntary sterilization in any country, and this is under the so-called Kemp-Kasten amendment. Further, current appropriations law also ensures that none of the United States contribution to UNFPA may be used in China, and United States funds are maintained in a segregated account and may not be commingled with other UNFPA funds.

I understand and appreciate the concern that my colleague has spoken out on in terms of China and their forced abortion program. But the United States Government should not as a matter of principle hold family plan-

ning and UNFPA hostage to a legitimate concern that my colleagues and I share about the conduct of the Chinese Government. There is a well-founded concern about China's family planning program but not UNFPA's. UNFPA is already subject to more restrictions that are more punitive than those imposed on other multilateral organizations working in countries considered to be rogue nations or guilty of human rights abuses.

We must not hold our policy hostage to the politics of the House of Representatives. We must not hold the poor families and the poor women of the world hostage to the politics of the House of Representatives.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 seconds to respond.

This is not about politics. This is about life and death. We are talking about not reducing family planning by a dime. That is a priority issue and that is a money issue. We are talking about erecting a wall of separation between promotion and performance of abortion overseas by groups like Planned Parenthood Federation of America and their international branch and the IPPF and all these other groups who have it as their mission to promote abortion on demand globally. That is what we are talking about. This is not about politics.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH].

Mrs. CHENOWETH. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I come forward today to express my strong support for the Smith amendment that would essentially restore two policies that were in effect during the Bush and Reagan Administrations. I totally support and identify with the comments of the gentleman from New Jersey. One concerns future U.S. funding of the United Nations Population Fund. The second is intended to prevent U.S. funding of nongovernmental organizations which perform or promote abortion as a method of family planning.

Mr. Chairman, current law, known as the 1973 Helms amendment, already bans direct funding of abortions. But I have learned that Planned Parenthood Federation of America—now, this is a fact—Planned Parenthood Federation of America provides direct assistance to family planning projects through its Family Planning International Assistance Program. That is not fiction. That is fact.

In Kenya, for instance, the Family Planning International Assistance Program began supporting a project designed to remedy the serious problem of unsafe abortions. The project offers feminine cyclical regulation and post-cyclical family planning services. The other projects, in Bangladesh and Nicaragua, also provide abortion and cyclical regulation services. Altogether these projects perform nearly 10,000 abortions a year.

Mr. Chairman, this news makes me very angry, because we have to deal with the facts. We cannot be fooled by the false claims of many international population groups who state that this is not an abortion issue. It is an abortion issue.

We must be firm and stipulate that no population funds will go to foreign nongovernmental organizations that, No. 1, perform abortions, except in the case of criminal rape, incest, or when the mother's life is in imminent danger; or, two, violate the laws of any foreign country. We must respect their laws with respect to abortion. Or, three, engage in any activity or effort to alter the laws or governmental policies of any foreign country with respect to abortion.

My position on abortion is very clear and consistent. I oppose it except in the case of the imminent life of the mother being threatened, or criminal rape or criminal incest, where that has occurred.

Our system of laws, our American heritage, is based on the idea that people have certain God-given rights, and those rights are life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Those rights existed before laws were established. In fact, it is because of those rights that existed that laws were established in order to protect those rights.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I have the highest respect for the gentleman from New Jersey. He has been and is one of the great leaders in this Congress in supporting human rights and the rule of law across the world. Yesterday, he stood up and ensured that Voice of America and Radio Free Asia got additional funds so that we can broadcast the message of freedom to the people of China hourly.

We have had this debate so many times. Sometime I hope that I can convince the gentleman from New Jersey that voluntary family planning, the right to plan the number and spacing of one's children by the spouses of a family, is a basic human right for all people across this planet and that the United States of America ought to be the strongest supporter of that basic human right.

□ 1100

Mr. Chairman, yes, I agree there is absolutely no question that abortion is not a legitimate family planning method. The United States has never provided \$1 for abortion as a family planning method, and we do not do so today. Unfortunately, some have seen an opportunity to address a tangential issue in the context of voluntary family planning, and in the meantime, 75,000 women a year all across this world are dying from botched abortions.

In the year 2025, the world's population is projected to be 8.2 billion people; 85 percent of this population will

live in less developed countries. Thirty-five percent of the developing world is under the age of 15, compared to 20 percent in an industrialized country. In nearly all sub-Saharan African countries close to half the population is under the age of 15. What opportunity do those people have to a life of any hope?

In 1994, the average gross national product per capita in the United States was \$25,860; in Africa, \$660. With the population rate increasing faster than an economic growth rate, people are simply assigned to the dustbin of a life of no hope, no future, and no chance.

We are talking about international family planning. The abortion issue has been brought into this debate sideways, as a tangential issue. Some day we have to realize that access to family planning is a basic human right. I would say to the gentleman from New Jersey, that, since we are both strong supporters of human rights worldwide, I hope we can find common ground to support family planning and to ensure that abortion is never considered as a legitimate option.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Smith amendment and in strong support of the Campbell-Greenwood-Lowe substitute. My good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and other proponents of the Smith amendment, claim that the amendment simply cuts abortion funding. What they do not tell us is that abortion funding overseas has been prohibited since 1973.

This amendment would cut abortion funding from its current level of zero to zero. Therefore, the Smith amendment must be after something more. That something is family planning.

One of the most important forms of aid that we provide to other countries is family planning assistance. No one can deny that the need for family planning services in developing countries is urgent.

Let us not forget what family planning assistance means to women around the world. Complications of pregnancy, child birth, unsafe abortion are the leading killers of women of reproductive age throughout the third world. One million women die each year as a result of reproductive health problems; each year 250,000 women die from unsafe abortions. Only 20 to 35 percent of women in Africa and Asia receive prenatal care. Five hundred million married women want contraceptives but cannot obtain them. Most of these deaths can be prevented.

The Smith amendment would impose a gag rule on U.S.-based organizations, nongovernmental organizations, multilateral organizations that provide U.S. supported family planning aid overseas. The gag rule is written, in fact, so broadly that it would prohibit the publishing of factual information about maternal morbidity and mortality related to unsafe abortion.

Finally, the Smith amendment cuts funds to UNFPA, an organization that provides family planning and population assistance in over 140 countries.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose the Smith amendment and to support the Campbell-Greenwood-Lowe amendment.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I would just like to respond to the gentlewoman from New York's comments, a Member who I have a great deal of respect for, but again we emphasize this amendment does not decrease funding for population control assistance. In fact, spending for population control programs, as I mentioned in my earlier remarks, increased over the time the Mexico City policy was in effect from some \$318 million for fiscal year 1985 to over \$448 million for fiscal year 1993. The intent of the Smith amendment is to restrict those dollars from being used through subterfuge for the performing of abortions.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARCIA. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind my good friend and colleague that I recently came back from a trip to Egypt. This amendment would have a chilling effect on programs such as exist in Egypt which are lifesaving to women and children, helping them space their children, giving them the information. If an organization such as we find in Egypt that provides these valuable services to these women uses their own money or even provides some factual information in response to a question, they could be defunded.

So we are saying here, and I believe with all due respect to my friend and colleague, that this is not about family planning; it is because, in speaking to the health professionals, they make it very clear that this would have a tremendous impact on family planning.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT], my good friend and colleague.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support a strong wall between abortion and other health-related services. This Congress should do nothing to spend U.S. tax dollars overseas to promote abortion. We as Members of Congress should not help abortionists push abortion.

If my colleagues want to hear the type of philosophy this administration wants to fund, listen to a quote from the director of the U.N. Population Fund. China has every reason to feel proud of and pleased with its remarkable achievements made in its family planning policy and control of its population growth. Now the country could offer its experiences and its special experts to help other countries.

This is a shameful statement. The forced abortion policy in China is

wrong and immoral. This Nation should not use our hard earned tax dollars to push China's policy or this administration's abortion philosophy on other nations in the world.

Mr. Chairman, we should build a strong wall between the abortion industry and other health-related services. We should promote health-related services, but let us stand up to the most pro-abortion administration in our history. Please support the Smith amendment.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. NEY). Is the gentleman the designee for the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON]?

Mr. GEJDENSON. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I think there is one fact that cannot be argued here. If the Smith amendment wins, as well-intentioned as it is, there will be more abortions because every time we shut down a family planning project we end up with unwanted pregnancies, and the only alternative we are going to leave for these women are abortions. In many instances not only will the fetus die, the mother will die because they do not have the kind of conditions that a safe abortion can be performed in. So my colleagues can be on lots of sides on the issue of abortion, but they cannot argue with one central fact here:

If the Smith amendment wins, women will die, and more abortions will occur because when we take away the choice of family planning, when we reduce the leverage of the dollars we have that provide for education and family planning, contraceptives and other methods of reducing the need for abortion and reducing unwanted pregnancies, we end up with one unarguable fact, that the number of abortions worldwide will increase.

Now my colleague's intent may be another category. People's intent may be completely honest here. I am sure the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who I know to be a genuine individual and cares deeply about this issue, has the best intent possible. But the results of his amendment, if it succeeds, will be to increase abortions around the world in communities that cannot afford it. They cannot afford the economic consequences, they cannot afford the loss of life of mothers who are mothering children already born, and so the policy that we will send from this Chamber will have the exact opposite result than the one the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is seeking.

We need to defeat the Smith amendment to make sure that people have an alternative to abortion around the world, that family planning, that contraception is the way that we can do that, and so I say to my colleagues,

"Don't just walk into this Chamber and think about where you normally line up on this issue, because if you really want to cut the number of abortions worldwide, vote against the Smith amendment. If you're really against abortion, if you want to see fewer abortions than we had yesterday, then oppose the Smith amendment because it is the only way to reduce the number of abortions. You can't hope it is going to do it, you can't do anything else to reduce it except to increase family planning and education."

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds just briefly to respond.

First of all, we are saying in my amendment, "Divest yourself of abortion and you get family planning funds." The gentleman from Connecticut in 1984-85, when I first offered this amendment, said none of the non-governmental organizations would accept those conditions. Well, over the course of the years in the 1980's, early 1990's, virtually every family planning provider except for the International Planned Parenthood Federation in London and Planned Parenthood Federation of America accepted those conditions. They separated themselves from the killing of babies through abortion and took the money and did family planning. We want to erect that wall again in my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Smith-Oberstar-Hyde-Barcia amendment.

I find it ironic that today the U.S. Congress is honoring Mother Teresa for her devotion to protecting the lives of the world's children, born and unborn, and yet the American government is contradicting itself by sending money to pay for abortions in other countries. This is an outrage. Each year Congress authorizes hundreds of millions of dollars for family planning organizations which in turn use the money for population control activities. These groups perform and promote abortion worldwide so in essence this American money ends up paying for abortions.

The majority of the American public is opposed to spending their tax dollars on federally funded abortions. Let us not forget that we are elected to serve the people of America. Surveys have shown time after time that the people, no matter how they feel on the abortion issue, are adamantly opposed to their tax dollars paying for abortions. It is not fair and it is wrong that the U.S. Government continues to go against the will of the taxpayer.

The fact that American tax money is spent overseas on abortion not only goes against the wishes of the taxpayer, it is anti-family. We are talking about the lives of innocent children. The allocation of this foreign aid money contradicts the ideals that this

Congress claims to support. It is wrong for the U.S. Government to set the social agenda for other countries.

I urge my colleagues to protect life. Support the Smith amendment.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. EMERSON].

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Smith amendment to prevent taxpayer dollars from promoting abortion overseas, and I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], for offering this important amendment and for his unwavering support for the unborn.

As many of us know, the House has already endorsed several of the provisions of the Smith amendment in a vote earlier this year, and in passing H.R. 581 we affirm the wisdom of the Reagan-Bush Mexico City policy, which does prevent taxpayer dollars from going to international organizations which promote or perform abortions as a method of family planning. Today the House has an opportunity to again make it clear that the U.S. Government must not be in a position of encouraging abortion.

The second part of the Smith amendment, which would prohibit funding of the United Nations population fund until that body ceases activities in China or until China abandons its policy of forced abortion, is equally as important as the first. It is a terrible injustice that the UNFPA would allow China's abuses to go unchecked, but worse still that the United States taxpayer may be a partner to this crime.

□ 1115

The safeguards contained in the Smith amendment are the only way to be sure that we are not fostering the policies of the Chinese Government, or making it possible for the UNFPA to do so.

I urge the House to say no to a policy of exporting abortion and yes to support the Smith amendment.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Smith amendment. I strongly support international family planning because we know it will improve women's health, it reduces poverty, and it protects our global environment.

Some people claim that our family planning efforts increase the number of abortions. This is not true. This amendment is not only harmful, it is unnecessary as well. By law and by practice, U.S. funds cannot be used today to provide abortion services, either in the United States or abroad. AID has implemented procedures that carefully monitor the spending of these funds, and independent audits confirm that not one dollar of U.S. funds is used today to perform abortions.

While I personally support a woman's right to choose strongly and I disagree with this policy, it is, nonetheless, the current policy and the current law with or without this amendment.

The real problem with this amendment is that it forces family planning clinics that receive U.S. funding abroad not to use their own resources to provide abortion counseling or to perform abortions. Clinics that accept these restrictions will be limited in the services they are able to provide, and many health clinics will not accept such restrictions on the use of their own resources and may be forced to close for lack of funding.

These closed clinics will no longer help women receive prenatal care, will no longer prevent more women from dying during childbirth, will no longer prevent unintended pregnancies, and therefore will no longer help reduce the number of abortions. The number of abortions will increase, not decrease, if this amendment were to pass.

This amendment is unnecessary, pernicious and harmful. It will simply result in more unwanted pregnancies, more fatalities among women in childbirth, and more abortions. It makes no sense on any grounds, and I strongly urge a yes vote for the Lowey-Greenwood substitute and a no vote on the Smith amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I heard the comments on that side of the aisle, and I would say to my good friend from Connecticut and the gentlewoman from New York, if we knocked on the door of the people who live in Danbury, CT, in Torrington, CT and in Hartford and we said to them, we want to tax you and take the dollars that you are paying for your automobiles and dollars you are paying for your food and we want to send them over, as the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] would like to do, to Egypt, we are sending them over to Egypt to a group that is involved with family planning. What do you think the people of Westchester and Armonk, New York and Torrington and Danbury and Hartford would say. Get a life. They would not say, here are my dollars, run over to Egypt and give them to a family planning organization. How ridiculous. They would say no, I want to keep my dollars here.

Then we would say, well, we are going to put in a very strict accounting mechanism that is going to say, wait a second, these dollars will not be used for abortion, they will only be used for the health and welfare of the child and the mother. They would say, well, maybe, just maybe, but by and large every one of the people in Torrington and Hartford and Armonk and Westchester County would say, you know what? I would like to keep my tax dollars here.

We are talking about taxpayers money. We are talking about people

who pay taxes. My colleagues on the other side want to send this money way over to these countries and let these people use it for anything they want. And the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] here, all he is saying is, I want to put a mechanism in place to protect the taxpayer. Good Lord. Let us support the taxpayers and support the Smith amendment.

Mr. Chairman, since his first days in office, President Clinton has pushed for abortion on demand, both domestically and abroad. His policies undermine the laws of several foreign countries where abortion is illegal, particularly in Africa and parts of Latin America.

With his repeal of the Mexico City policy in 1993, President Clinton has granted United States funds to organizations heavily involved in promoting both the legalization and provisions of abortion in foreign nations.

Supporters of worldwide family planning legislation say that this vote has nothing to do with abortion, but everything to do with family planning.

We must understand that abortion is a central element to what many countries consider family planning. Whether or not U.S. funds pay for the actual abortions themselves, nothing is preventing pro-abortion organizations from spending more of their own money on abortion when U.S. funds are there to fill the caps.

Congress must assure that international population assistance dollars will not support organizations which perform or actively promote abortion as a method of family planning. Representative SMITH'S amendment assures the American taxpayers that their money will not fund any program which not only performs abortions but attempts to change abortion laws in other countries.

This amendment reinstates the Mexico City restrictions on international family planning by prohibiting United States funding to any organization that directly or indirectly performs abortions in a foreign country.

Furthermore, this amendment will prevent the United States Government from funding any aspect of China's horrific population control programs. United States policy must stand against China's brutal policies toward its women and baby girls. But we don't have a chance of succeeding until we stop pouring money into programs that force abortions and sterilizations without consent.

Thomas Jefferson once said, "The care of human life and happiness, and not their destruction, is the first and only legitimate object of good government." I share this commitment to actively support legislation that sustains the Federal Government's traditional goals in family planning.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support Representative SMITH'S amendment which will restore the program's original purpose—promoting family planning, not abortion.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], my friend and colleague.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Smith-Oberstar-Hyde-Barcia amendment. I also want to make it clear, as Members who are

listening, I favor family planning, so I think one can strongly favor family planning and be for the Smith amendment.

Also, this just merely returns us back to the policies of previous Congresses. This is not something dramatic or new, it just previously goes back to where we were, and more importantly, this is the House of Representatives. This returns us to the position of the American people. The American people, if they were voting today in the Congress, would clearly support the Smith amendment.

Third, this is about China. This is about China. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and I were in China together where we talked to people where we had cases of women who were literally tracked down in villages and forced to have an abortion. So this is about China, and it is about forced abortion with regard to China.

Lastly, under the Smith amendment, I believe as someone who strongly favors family planning, there will be more money for family planning, and I strongly urge Members on both sides to support the Smith amendment.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER].

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

We have this debate almost every year here and it always makes me sad. I think those of us who are fortunate enough to live in America where we have good access to health care and information probably do not understand what it is like in a Third World country where one does not have it.

Frankly, I think the harshest kind of birth control on Earth is to live in a place where women kill themselves trying to abort. They have not been able to get the information they need to help space their families or even to plan them, and we rise to the floor year after year after year and say that we don't care.

Is there anything worse than the children who are left motherless because their mother could not face one more child, and we could have helped her, had we been able to give the family planning information that she needed?

I want to give two quotes this morning which I think are very succinct. One of them has to do with the Helms amendment, and I know everybody in the majority strongly believes that the Helms amendment is quite good. The first is no U.S. foreign aid funds are used to perform abortions. It is explicitly prohibited in the annual appropriations law and the underlying statute, which is the Helms amendment. USAID has been scrupulous in complying with the law, and even the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who is my good friend, agrees that the Helms amendment stopped the direct funding of abortions.

The second is what President GORE has said, and I quote,

Our administration believes that the United States Constitution guarantees every woman within our borders the right to choose. We are unalterably committed to that principle, but let us take a false issue off the table. The United States has not sought, does not seek, and will not seek to establish any international right to abortion.

He said that at a national press conference in 1994, and that has not changed.

The Smith amendment is absolutely unnecessary and it is simply again another way to punish women in other countries and to provide some sense in the House that we are helping children, which is absolutely untrue.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, this has to be emphasized. The vote today is not about whether we are pro-choice or pro-life on abortion, it is about whether life for thousands, hundreds of thousands of families who choose to plan their families will include a real chance to do so, not whether or not abortion is available to that family.

I say to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS], yes, I think most Americans support U.S. assistance for voluntary family planning.

Since 1973 the Helms amendment has prohibited the use of U.S. dollars to perform, support, or encourage abortion overseas. That mandate has been followed in good faith by the U.S. Government. And in order to ensure its implementation and sensitive to the argument about fungibility of moneys, when I was assistant administrator of AID, we instituted in the late 1970's a rigorous system to separate out U.S. moneys from other funds spent by organizations receiving American funds, and that practice has been followed assiduously by every administration. Audits show not one dollar of American funds is being used for abortion-related activities overseas.

So this is the basic question. When the United States is fully abiding by the Helms amendment, when the Government has taken every possible step to separate American funds so no American money is being used for abortion-related activities, and when there is no real fungibility as to U.S. dollars, do we want to stop the availability of critical funds for voluntary family planning for millions of families in fast-growing developing countries?

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the answer for each of these is no. I urge a vote against the Smith amendment and for Campbell-Greenwood.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PITTS].

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge Members to support the

Smith amendment. The Campbell amendment merely creates a scheme which frees up more of the organization's own resources for the promotion of abortion overseas. In contrast, the Mexico City policy places a wall of separation between abortion and family planning.

The Smith amendment prevents U.S. funding for such things as China's deplorable population control program, which includes coercion, forced abortion, forced sterilization for Chinese men and women alike. Women all over China are victimized daily due to their ability and desire to bear children. China's so-called family planning policy includes the following methods, and it is documented in this book by the anthropologist Steven Mosher and others, entitled "The Broken Earth". This is the international family planning program the UNFPA has publicly praised.

First, arresting pregnant women and taking them to abortion clinics tied up or in handcuffs. Second, incarcerating pregnant women in barracks until they acquiesce to abortions and/or sterilization. Third, forcing pregnant women to attend study sessions away from their families until they agree to have abortions. Carrying out sterilization or abortion without the consent or knowledge of the women while rendering other medical services. Imprisoning husbands until wives submit to abortion procedures. Cutting off food, electricity, water and wages for couples who refuse to comply with the Chinese Government's barbaric policies. Confiscating furniture, livestock and even homes of families who refuse to comply. And fourth, demolishing the homes of people who refuse to comply as reported in the two Catholic villages at Hepel Province.

Mr. Chairman, this is not family planning. These are outright human rights abuses. I do not believe this is a pro-life or pro-choice issue; this is a human issue, this is a woman's issue, this is a family issue. This is an issue of blatant governmental abuse, and the United States should not be in any way a part of it through the United Nations or any other agency.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Ms. DEGETTE].

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, let us be clear what this amendment is about. This amendment is not about abortion. This amendment is about family planning. If we went to the door of every household in this country and said, do you think our Government should be involved in family planning efforts throughout the world so that women are not forced against their will to have countless unwanted children, children who will be subject to starvation, children who will be subject to disease, so that the women can avoid the pregnancy to begin with, so that the woman can avoid abortion, these families across America would say yes, we think that that is a high use of our taxpayer dollars. We think that America

should be working across the world to prevent unwanted pregnancies and to help increase the quality of life for citizens around the world.

□ 1130

That is a noble purpose. Let us be clear. The current U.S. policy prevents Federal funds from being used for abortions anywhere in the world. This is not going to be changed.

What this amendment will do is prevent women across the world from planning their pregnancies and avoiding unwanted pregnancies. That is not the policy the United States should pursue. That is why just last month or the month before, this Congress affirmed the right of the United States to increase its family planning efforts nationwide.

I urge Members to defeat this amendment, to keep our appropriate policy throughout the world, and prevent unwanted pregnancies to begin with.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAPPAS].

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in strong support of the Smith amendment. My time is short, so let me get to the point: the U.N. funds. My parents had more than one child. Because they had the freedom to do so, I have a wonderful sister named Olga. However, parents in China do not have a similar basic right. Brothers and sisters are illegal. Until the UNFPA strongly condemns and disassociates itself from this brutal coerced abortion policy in China or any other country, no United States tax dollars should go to this misguided program.

Second, Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise this Congress' and in fact our Nation's attention to this irony of our entire overseas abortion debate. Many of our colleagues who will stand here on this floor and oppose this amendment to restore the successful Mexico City policy are many of the same Members who regularly lambasted this body for not moving campaign finance reform.

If they truly believe in campaign finance reform, this is their vehicle. This is the first campaign finance reform vote of this session of Congress. Vote for the Smith amendment and Members will walk the walk of campaign finance reform. Otherwise, they are saying it is OK for U.S. foreign aid money, America's hard-earned tax dollars, to be used as soft money to lobby and change abortion laws throughout the world.

Make no mistake about it, failure to enact the Smith amendment will be interpreted by the world community that this Congress wants our tax dollars going to foreign lobbyists to change other countries' laws. I am against welfare for lobbyists for the abortion industry, and so is the vast majority of the American people. The Smith amendment will prevent this. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to my colleague, the

gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD].

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, if it seems we just had this debate, it is because we just had this debate. On February 13, this House by a vote of 220 to 209 decided to release these international family planning funds. We did so, 44 Republicans, 175 Democrats, and one Independent to 20 in all, so we knew at the end of the day if we are going to achieve the goals that we share, that we all share, including the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] that international family planning funds be available to help empower families to control the number of children that they have, that the only way to get that done is to do it without the entanglements of the Smith language, to pass language that is straightforward, that prevents these funds from being used for abortion, can be adopted by the Senate and signed by the President.

When all is said and done, if we adopt the Smith amendment, we know that one of two things will happen: Either we will come back on another day and undo it, as we have in the past, or we will kill the program. Neither of those, certainly killing the program makes no sense. It makes no sense to do this simply for rhetorical reasons today, and come back and compromise as we have done each and every year.

Let us do what is reasonable. Let us do what is sensible. Let us adopt the compromise which is embodied in the Campbell-Greenwood-Lowey amendment now, get it over with, and move on to the next issue.

I want to particularly address those colleagues who equivocate on this issue to be consistent and vote today as they did in February.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank first of all the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] for his dedication to this issue. While we disagree on the major issue, I think his dedication is certainly something we all commend. I value his participation in our committee.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Campbell amendment. As Members know, I am a strong supporter of voluntary family planning programs. It is important to note that after almost 30 years of U.S. assistance to the voluntary family planning programs, the health of millions of women and children has been improved throughout the world.

I also note that the voluntary family planning programs have led to the reduction of abortions in key countries and in newly independent States of the former Soviet Union, where abortion used to be the only method of family planning.

Mr. Chairman, family planning is good for mothers, for children, for the environment, and for economic growth. The Smith amendment would impact upon voluntary family planning programs by blocking assistance to key providers of family planning programs in the U.N. Fund for Population Activities.

Permit me to review a couple of basic facts about the family planning program. First, the Hyde amendment is part of the current U.S. law which prevents any U.S. funds from being used for abortion. Second, the U.N. Fund for Population Activities no longer has a family planning program operating in China. Accordingly, the Smith amendment is language in search of a problem that essentially does not exist. Please permit me to repeat: United States funds are not now used for abortion and the UNFPA does not have any program in China.

I would also like to bring Members up to date as to how this issue affects the rest of this important issue. The Committee on International Relations, when it met to consider this bill, rejected language offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and included language offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] on this very point. I remind our colleagues that the Committee on International Relations strongly favored the Campbell language and supports the voluntary family planning program.

Accordingly, I urge Members to support the Campbell amendment and oppose the Smith amendment.

I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

MR. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I would remind Members that the U.N. Population Fund was there on the ground in 1979 when the one-child-per-couple policy was crafted. They were one of the cocrafters. Over the years they have praised this coercive population control program, given it highest praise.

Dr. Sadik, the executive director of the U.N. Population Fund, has said it is a "totally voluntary program," a total lie. It is not a voluntary program. It is a coercive program.

Let me also add that they are now in negotiations with the Beijing dictatorship to decide what kind and the scope of any new programs that they will be involved in. We send a clear, non-ambiguous message: Get out of China; do your family planning elsewhere, but do not comanage and support that program.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I just want to congratulate the gentleman from

New Jersey, Mr. CHRIS SMITH, and his associates for bringing this very important issue to the floor. We ought to stop funding the international abortion industry. Family planning and abortion are two separate things. Family planning asks the question, do you want a baby or not? Once you are pregnant, you have a baby. Abortion helps you dispose of that baby by killing it. It has been our policy and it ought to continue to be our policy not to subsidize that function on an international basis.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD] ignores the concept of fungibility. If you give money and say do not spend it for this, only spend it for this, who are you kidding, because it frees up other money to be spent for the forbidden function. It does not matter whether they are using our money or their money. If we give money, we empower all of their activities, so it is a distinction without a difference.

The Mexico City policy simply says that we will continue to generously fund family planning, but we will not subsidize abortion, we will not subsidize organizations that lobby to change laws in countries that forbid abortion, and it is in keeping with, I believe, the best ideals and policy certainly under the Reagan and under the Bush administration. I regret keenly that it was changed.

I ask Members to vote "no" on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD], which is more obfuscation than clarification, which ignores the fact that money is fungible, and if you forbid it for one purpose you free up other money for the other purpose.

I hope that Members will support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. CHRIS SMITH, who has been a real hero in this very difficult fight. When my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] says the United Nations is out of China, that is rather superficial. They are not out of China.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. That is a U.N. program.

Mr. HYDE. They have an office here, and they said they are negotiating for more programs.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute and 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR].

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, let us make it very clear. The Smith-Barcia-Oberstar-Hyde amendment does not reduce by one penny the amount spent on international family planning.

It merely ensures that the money we do spend and commit to population control goes to family planning, not to abortion. American taxpayers who believe that abortion is morally wrong should have their voice expressed on this floor in support of this amendment; and likewise, those who believe abortion is acceptable, and that abortion ought to be made safe and rare, ought to have assurance that their tax dollars do not go to groups who do not share that viewpoint, who see abortion as a means of family planning.

Both sides have an interest in the outcome. I believe that our side is on the side of justice, that it is morally wrong for the United States to support with its taxpayer dollars abortion as a means of family planning control, and this amendment will assure that none of those dollars go to that purpose.

□ 1145

That is what we are trying to accomplish; that just as we have pursued the policy at home of not funding abortion with taxpayer dollars, that we should not fund it abroad with taxpayer dollars. Family planning is a legitimate objective, but it should not include abortion as a means of family planning. That is what we are asking. That is what this amendment does. I ask Members to support the Smith-Barcia amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute and 15 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, let me rise briefly to support the Smith amendment and to say that the Mexico City policy that we propagated under the Reagan administration sent a moral message to the world. As I understand it, most of the organizations that heretofore had performed abortions stopped them as an effect and impact of that policy. If we still have that moral policy, and that is my feeling that we do have that and that that is exactly what we are voting on, then we should not support abortions through middlemen. We should not support organizations that support abortion. We ought to keep that message as clear as we did under the Reagan administration, under the Mexico City policy. I would urge a strong yes for the Smith amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, let me remind Members that we do not cut family planning by a dime in this amendment. We condition it. We put on human rights, pro-family, pro-baby conditions. Abortion takes the life of a baby. We do not think that we should be giving to organizations that are promoting abortion overseas. That is the simple reality of what we are trying to do today. Any other characterization misses by a mile.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is right on point. The

facts are that the taxpayers of the United States have a right to put conditions on money that they earn with their hard work that we send to international organizations. This has been one of the important conditions that we historically have put on, and we should put it on whether the organization indirectly supports abortion or does it directly.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore [Mr. NEY]. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Smith amendment and in favor of the Campbell-Greenwood amendment because I, like my colleagues, love children and love families. I have five children of my own, my parents had seven children. Their parents had 14 children. But all those children were born into a world that is vastly different than the world that we are talking about and that would be affected by this amendment.

We in this Nation are so blessed with such prosperity and high living standards that it is often very difficult to relate to people that are born into a world of such abject poverty and desperation that parents would be willing to sell their children into a life of virtual slave labor or prostitution. How can life be so cheap? How can suffering and human degradation be so tolerated?

It is largely because people in that other world have so little control over their lives because they have so little ability to control the size and the timing of their families. Ironically, this amendment further limits that control over their lives. This amendment in effect diminishes the value of those children's lives, when we have a moral responsibility to be increasing, enhancing the value of children's lives, and that is what family planning information is all about. With proper education, those in developing countries can plan their families just as we in the United States do.

It is unconscionable as leaders of the most prosperous, blessed Nation on Earth that we would deny these vital resources to the least fortunate people on Earth. Yet that is precisely what this amendment does. This, the Mexico City policy that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] wants, restricts funding to groups who offer reproductive educational services to families in need of those services.

We decided in February that denying those funds had a negative impact on population control efforts internationally and that decreasing family planning funding increases the number of abortions. This has not changed since our vote in February.

Mr. Chairman, we need to understand that family planning in this other world can prevent about 10,000 deaths that are due to pregnancy complications, low birth weight babies born to

women who are neither ready nor desirous of having children. Defeat the Smith amendment.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I would ask my pro-life colleagues in the House to oppose the Campbell substitute, which is not a compromise but in fact would continue the current policy of abortion on demand around the world. Organizations can use simple bookkeeping to create the impression that U.S. taxpayer funds are not being used for abortion while in fact they are substituting other moneys for that purpose in their respective facilities around the world. I just hope that our pro-life Members of the House today will cast a strong vote against the Campbell substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has 7½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] has 1½ minutes. The time of gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BARCIA] has expired. There was a half minute yielded to the gentleman from New Jersey by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my support for the Smith amendment. I believe it is appropriate and right, and I want to express my strong support on behalf of the people of my district.

Mr. Chairman, 50 years ago, the Nuremberg Tribunal condemned population control policies enacted by the Nazis as "crimes against humanity," and yet today, not only does China engage in the same barbaric practices but our tax dollars support them.

Every year since 1985, we have denied funds to the U.N. Population Fund because it provides financial support for China's brutally coercive one-child policy. But, Mr. Chairman, in 1993, the administration changed the rules. They reinterpreted U.S. law in order to claim opposition to coercive population control programs, but then actually provide for their financial support.

The administration's policy prohibits our tax dollars from providing direct support for forced abortion and sterilization, but that doesn't stop our money from freeing up funds in other accounts to be used for these barbaric acts. This is an unconscionable deception which must be brought to an immediate end.

Mr. Chairman, the Smith amendment simply interprets United States law as it was originally intended—it stops all payments to the U.N. Population Fund until it withdraws its financial support for China's draconian population control programs. Mr. Chairman, as a nation deeply concerned about China's human rights record, we have no business sending such mixed signals. For these reasons I urge a yes vote on the Smith amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Many of our colleagues were shocked and angered to learn that the big name pro-abortion population control organizations like Planned Parenthood Federation of America, the Alan Guttmacher Institute, Zero Population Growth and others had grossly misled Congress, the President, and the American people about partial-birth abortion. In one letter sent to every Member of Congress signed by those organizations and many others, we were solemnly assured that, and I quote: This surgical procedure is used only in rare cases, fewer than 500 per year. It is most often performed in cases, it goes on to say, of severe fetal anomalies.

Mr. Chairman, we now know that the abortion lobby's campaign to defeat the partial-birth abortion ban was and is riddled with lies and distortions. It is one thing to have an honest difference about policy. Congress after all is a marketplace of disparate opinions and ideas, but do not lie to us.

Mr. Chairman, interestingly, it was one of their own, Ron Fitzsimmons, executive director of the National Coalition of Abortion Providers, who blew the whistle on their fraudulent tactics. Members will recall Mr. Fitzsimmons came forward and said that he was lying through his teeth about the circumstances and the incidences surrounding partial-birth abortion. Having raised serious questions concerning the credibility and the reliability of Planned Parenthood and others, Mr. Fitzsimmons admitted, and I quote, that thousands of partial-birth abortions in the vast majority of cases are performed on healthy mothers with a healthy fetus.

Why is this relevant to the amendment the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BARCIA] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] and I are offering this morning? Because each year Congress authorizes hundreds of millions of dollars; this is not an entitlement, these are discretionary funds, hundreds of millions of dollars for population control organizations. And much of that cash will wind up in the hands of the very same abortion industry that so skillfully lied to my colleagues and me.

After lying through their teeth on the partial-birth abortion ban here in the United States, is it so unreasonable to doubt the abortion lobby's commitment to truth-telling elsewhere? Who then will expose their deceptive tactics in Warsaw or Lima or Cairo or Pretoria or San Salvador? I believe that we need to steer family planning funds to those who will pledge neutrality on abortion rather than promote abortion in foreign capitals.

Today the pro-life laws and policies of almost 100 countries that restrict abortion are under siege, and the engine driving this global pro-abortion

push are the nongovernmental organizations like Planned Parenthood funded by the U.S. Government. Let me remind Members, we provide almost 50 percent of all the money that goes into their coffers. That is why we need to make a difference with the amendment that I and my friends are offering today.

Our amendment permits the flow of funds to those organizations that pledge to provide family planning and only family planning and not abortion. This is all about abortion, Mr. Chairman. The innocent children are held harmless. Who we subsidize, not just what, but who we subsidize and who we give millions of dollars to does matter.

Some Members have argued today that U.S. funds will not be used for abortion. That is already the underlying law. An amendment simply restates current law. But money is fungible. The millions of dollars we give to a group immediately frees up other non-U.S. funds that can be used, and in this case are used, for performing and aggressively promoting abortion around the world. If we give millions of dollars to those for whom abortion on demand is a way to plan family size, we put unborn babies at grave risk of death.

It should matter greatly to each of us not just what an organization does with our specific donation but the rest of its agenda as well. It is a package deal. Many groups use family planning as the Trojan horse to conceal their real agenda, which is abortion.

Let me remind Members of Vision 2000, that abortion manifesto in 1992 that was agreed to by International Planned Parenthood Federation based in London and its 140 affiliates. It said these are their marching orders that they will, quote, "bring pressure on governments and campaign for policy and legislative change to remove restrictions against abortion."

Fred Sai, who used to be chairman of IPPF, a Planned Parenthood group, said, now for the first time the IPPF plan Vision 2000 outlines activities at both the secretary and the family planning association level to further their explicit goal of increasing the right of access to abortion. Again let me remind Members, 100 countries protect their babies. These people to whom we are giving millions of dollars want to bring down those right-to-life laws. Let me give some examples.

In Poland, the chairman of the Parliamentary Group on the Family, Stanislaw Kowolik, recently lashed out at external factions in Poland for meddling in that country and pushing for liberalized abortion. As a result of strong lobbying by family planning groups, Poland recently reversed the pro-life policies of Lech Walesa and Solidarity and put in its place the pro-abortion policy of the Communists.

Another example of backlash over United States and Planned Parenthood pressure to legalize abortion on demand is the Philippines. A headline in

the Philippine Daily Inquirer last July said Senator "Flavier Hits U.S. Pressure on Abortion." And he writes: We had just celebrated our 50th anniversary of independence from America, but we can still see insidious methods of imperialism trying to subvert our self-determination by using funds as subtle leverage," and then he goes on to say he strongly opposes abortion, that his constitution prohibits it. And then he said, finally, "we should be prepared to lose foreign funding rather than be pressured into causing the death of unborn children."

The abortion promotion by Planned Parenthood is so extreme in the Philippines that the head of their IPPF affiliate, the Planned Parenthood president, quit. He said it was because a "hidden agenda of" and that his affiliate was being used as a Trojan horse to legalize abortion. They talk family planning, the real agenda is abortion on demand.

The pro-life safeguards say: We will provide money for family planning. There is not one penny lost as a result of this amendment. But we will give it only to those groups that are committed to family planning and not abortion on demand.

Let me also say on the China provision, since 1979, the U.N. Population Fund has been there on the ground promoting the one-child-per-couple policy. We have heard testimony, Members should be fully aware by now that forced abortion is commonplace in the People's Republic of China. Yet Dr. Sadik, who is the executive director of the UNFPA, has said, and I quote: "UNFPA firmly believes, and so does the government of the People's Republic of China, that their program is a totally voluntary program. It is not. It is a totally coercive program, and the UNFPA has been whitewashing these crimes since 1979."

Let me also point out to my colleagues that the amendment, the substitute amendment, is a fake. With all due respect to my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL], it is cover. It does not stop abortions. It does not do anything meaningful relative to China, and it actually trivializes this crime against humanity, against women, of forced abortion because again in China there is the UNFPA doing its work day in and day out. And we understand now that they are in negotiations for new programs in the PRC. We are saying you can have your \$25 million. Just get out of China. Stop being complicit. Stop the hand and glove relationship with the dictatorship of the PRC.

Mr. Chairman, many of our colleagues were shocked and angered to learn that the big name pro-abortion/population control organizations like Planned Parenthood Federation of America and the Alan Guttmacher Institute, had grossly misled Congress, the President, and the American people about partial-birth abortion.

In one letter sent to every Member of Congress, signed by Planned Parenthood and others, we were solemnly assured that:

This surgical procedure is used only in rare cases, fewer than 500 per year. It is most often performed in the case of wanted pregnancies gone tragically wrong, when a family learns late in pregnancy of severe fetal anomalies or a medical condition that threatens the pregnant woman's life or health.

We now know the abortion lobby's campaign to defeat the partial-birth abortion ban was and is riddled with distortion and lies.

It's one thing to have honest differences about policy—Congress is, after all, a marketplace of disparate opinions and ideas.

But don't lie to us.

Interestingly, it took one of their own, Ron Fitzsimmons, Executive Director of the National Coalition of Abortion Providers, to blow the whistle on their fraudulent tactics. You will recall that Mr. Fitzsimmons admitted "lying through (his) teeth" in spouting the pack of lies dished out by the abortion lobby. Having raised serious questions concerning the credibility and reliability of Planned Parenthood and others, Mr. Fitzsimmons admitted that of the thousands of partial-birth abortions "in the vast majority of cases, the procedure is performed on a healthy mother with a healthy fetus * * *"

Why is this relevant to the amendment Messrs. BARCIA, OBERSTAR, HYDE, and I are offering today?

Because each year Congress authorizes hundreds of millions of dollars for population control organizations—and much of that cash will wind up in the hands of the very same abortion industry that so skillfully lied to you and me. After "lying through (their) teeth" on the partial-birth abortion ban here in the United States, is it so unreasonable to doubt the abortion lobby's commitment to truth-telling? Who then will expose their deceptive tactics in Warsaw of Lima or Cairo or Pretoria of San Salvador? We need to steer family planning funds to those who will pledge neutrality on abortion rather than the promotion of abortion in foreign capitals.

Today, the pro-life laws and policies of almost 100 countries that restrict abortion are under siege and the engine driving this global pro-abortion push are the nongovernmental organizations funded by the U.S. Government.

My amendment permits the flow of funds to those organizations that pledge to provide only family planning, not abortion. The innocent children are held harmless.

Who we subsidize—not just what—but who we give millions of dollars to, does matter. Some Members will argue today that no U.S. funds will be used for abortion. But money is fungible. The millions of dollars we give to a group immediately frees up other non-U.S. funds that can be used—and, in this case, are used—for performing and aggressively promoting abortion. If we give millions of dollars to those for whom abortion on demand is a way to plan family size, we put unborn babies at grave risk of death. It should matter greatly to each of us not just what an organization does with out specific donation, but the rest of its agenda as well. It is a package deal. Many groups use family planning as the Trojan horse to conceal their real agenda—abortion on demand.

I urge Members to carefully consider the 1992 International Planned Parenthood Federation abortion manifesto called Vision 2000, a global strategic plan that Planned Parenthood and its 140 country affiliates adopted

and have been implementing ever since to promote abortion in every corner of the world.

The Vision 2000 strategic plan says, and I quote, that family planning organizations should "bring pressure on governments and campaign for policy and legislative change to remove restrictions against abortion." Can anything be more clear? Pressure governments to nullify their pro-life policies. Campaign for abortion on demand. And we are providing many, many millions of dollars to this group.

Fred Sai, who is the former chairman of International Planned Parenthood, put it very succinctly:

Now, for the first time, the IPPF strategic plan, Vision 2000, which was unanimously adopted at the Members' Assembly in Delhi, outlines activities at both the Secretariat and FPA level to further IPPF's explicit goal of increasing the right of access to abortion.

IPPF has plans of action, as they call them, to promote abortion in Central and South America where unborn children are now legally safeguarded. They have plans to repeal the pro-life laws in Africa, the Muslim countries in the Middle East, and several Asian countries.

In Poland, the chairman of the Parliamentary Group on the Family, Stanislaw Kowalikveouk recently lashed out at external factions in Poland for meddling in that country and pushing for liberalized abortion. As a result of strong lobbying by family planning groups, Poland recently reversed the pro-life policies of Lech Walesa and Solidarity and put in its place, the pro-abortion policy of the Communists.

Only last week's action by Poland's high court stopped the new abortion law from going into effect.

Another example of backlash over United States and Planned Parenthood pressure to legalize abortion on demand is the Philippines.

A headline in the Philippine Daily Inquirer last July: "Flavier Hits U.S. Pressure on Abortion." The article quotes Senator Juan Flavio:

We had just celebrated our 50th anniversary of independence from America, but we can still see insidious methods of imperialism trying to subvert our self-determination by using [population control] funds as subtle leverage * * *. I strongly oppose abortion. It is prohibited by our laws and the Philippine Constitution. Hence, we should be prepared to lose foreign funding rather than be pressured into causing the death of unborn children.

The abortion promotion by Planned Parenthood is so extreme in the Philippines that the president of IPPF's affiliate—the Family Planning Organization of the Philippines [FPOP]—resigned over what he called International Planned Parenthood Federation's "hidden agenda" and use of his affiliate as a Trojan horse to legalize abortion.

The use of family planning as cover—the use of family planning as a Trojan horse for abortion law liberalization is now commonplace and must be stopped.

Let me remind Members that the pro-life safeguards included in my amendment are nothing new; they were in effect for almost a decade. And they worked.

The pro-life safeguards often referred to as the Mexico City Policy were in effect during the Reagan and Bush years as a principled way to fully fund family planning without promoting abortion.

Specifically, the safeguards say this: We will donate funds only to those organizations that will not perform abortions except in the cases of rape, incest, and life of the mother. Funds may go to those organizations that will not lobby for or against abortion.

We should have no part in empowering the abortion industry to succeed in its war on the unborn.

If Members want to promote abortions, be up-front and legislate that. But don't hide behind counterfeit amendments like the Campbell substitute. The Mexico City Policy makes it very clear that there ought to be a wall of separation between abortion and family planning. The Campbell amendment—with all due respect to its author, a friend of mine—is a fake and a counterfeit.

The second part of our amendment relates to forced abortion.

Every day, forced abortion and forced sterilization devastate the lives of women and families in China while the U.N. Population Fund provides political cover and sustenance to those who practice these abuses. The Government of China compels women to abort their so-called unauthorized, illegal unborn children. It starts with intense persuasion using all of the economic, social, and psychological tools a totalitarian State has at its disposal. If these methods fail, women are taken physically to abortion mills. Forced abortions are often performed very late in pregnancy, even in the ninth month. Sometimes the baby's skull is crushed with forceps as the baby emerges from the birth canal. Other times the baby gets an injection of formaldehyde or some other poison into the baby's cranium. The mass murderers, euphemistically called family planning cadres, are at it every day—killing babies, devastating women's lives.

Forced abortion was properly construed to be a crime against humanity at the Nuremberg war crimes tribunal. Today, it is employed aggressively and with chilling effectiveness and unbearable pain upon women in the People's Republic of China. Women in China are required to obtain a birth coupon before conceiving a child. Chinese women are hounded by the population control cadres and even their menstrual cycles are publicly monitored as one means of ensuring compliance.

The New York Times has pointed out in an exposé that the authorities, when they discover an unauthorized pregnancy, an illegal child, normally apply a daily dose of threats and browbeating. They wear the women down. Eventually, if the woman does not succumb to the abortion, she is physically forced to submit.

In the mid-1990's, the PRC issued a decree on eugenics which nationalizes discrimination against the handicapped. In a move that is eerily reminiscent of Nazi Germany, the Communist Chinese Government is implementing forced abortion against handicapped children simply because they suffer an anomaly like Downs Syndrome, and forced sterilization against parents who simply do not measure up in the eyes of the State. Since 1979, the U.N. Population Fund has provided funds, materiel, people on the ground and what no money could buy, the sort of shield of respectability that the PRC Program so desperately wants.

Mr. Chairman, in July 1995, victims of the Chinese forced abortion program testified to the truth. Our Subcommittee on International

Operations and Human Rights heard the testimony of three women who testified that they had been forced to have abortions.

One of those witnesses, Li Bao Yu [Lee Bough You], told us how her troubles started in earnest after she removed an IUD that the population cadres had forced her accept, but which had been making her sick. She became pregnant. The family planning program officials, who came to inspect every woman in the village several times a year—the involuntary inspections a serious violation of each woman's privacy—discovered her pregnancy and threatened that if she did not have the abortion, her first child would be denied education and health care. In her own words,

They threatened me that I do not agree to have this abortion, then my first child will forever have no chance of being a registered, normal citizen.

Mr. Chairman, this is the human cost of the shameful program that for years has been assisted, praised, coddled, and protected by the U.N. Population Fund, the UNFPA. The supporters of this amendment argue that if it were not for UNFPA, the Chinese program would be even worse. But this is an assertion without evidence. UNFPA officials including Nafis Sadiq have repeatedly praised the Chinese program. UNFPA has provided demographic capabilities—a tracking system that hunts down women bearing babies—a system that enables the Beijing population commissars to tell where they need to enforce their program more vigorously. They have trained thousands of cadres—the implementors of this egregious policy. They have provided major elements of the infrastructure that systematically oppresses the women of China and murders their babies. They are part of the problem, not part of the solution.

The Campbell amendment would delete the pro-human rights language in my amendment and insert a substitute that looks good and does next to nothing. UNFPA could spend all the money it wanted in China so long as it kept a separate set of books that showed our money going only for projects outside China. There would also be a reduction in the U.S. contribution—but past experience has shown that a reduction is not enough. The language of the amendment is almost identical to language that has been adopted in the past by the Appropriations Committee, and when this language has been adopted, UNFPA has stayed in China. Only when there was a real threat of serious action—an absolute condition that UNFPA get out of China or lose our money—did UNFPA even go through the motions of getting out. So the substitute language is simply not enough. It absolutely trivializes these crimes—it should not be enough for those of us who are pro-life, and it should not be enough for those who think of themselves as pro-choice. If there is anything UNFPA's involvement in China is not about, it is not about free choice.

This House has voted countless times to condition United States funding for UNFPA on its disengagement from the PRC forced abortion program. Last year, we gave UNFPA some flexibility. They insisted they were no longer giving grants in China. They still had an office there, which they said they were using to administer old grants. Now it turns out that they are actively negotiating with the Chinese Government for future grants and contracts. So we were misled last year: UNFPA was not

getting out of China and, unless we take decisive action, has no intention of getting out of China. Congress gave UNFPA the flexibility their supporters said they needed. This is as far as we can go. Loyalty to these women—these victims of unspeakable torture—will allow us to go no further.

□ 1200

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I address to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], one simple question. I have 1 minute, so if he could please confine his answer, if he can.

Under the gentleman's amendment, if the U.N. spends one dime to advise one person in China about contraception, would not all United States assistance to U.N. family planning throughout Africa and Latin America be terminated?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman that the language in our amendment says if the President can certify that there is no more forced abortion, and if they get out of China, which is what we are advocating, because they have had this duplicitous, egregious policy, working hand in glove with the dictatorship, we are saying get out and they get their full \$25 million. And there will also probably be about \$400 million of other family planning money that is also in the bill that is conditioned by the first part of the amendment.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, is the answer to my question yes?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. If the gentleman will continue to yield, unless the forced abortion is ended, sure. They have had a hand-in-glove relationship.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

My colleagues, we have heard the fundamental problem with the Smith amendment. It is not simply Mexico City. It terminates all United States contribution to all family planning around the world, in Africa, in Latin America, in Indonesia, in desperately poor parts of this world, all of it, if the U.N. spends a dime for family planning in China. It was crafted with that intention and it is cruel and wrong.

For whatever motive we have regarding China, to punish the destitute, the poor, the needy in Africa and Latin America, compassion suggests a "no" vote on the Smith amendment and a "yes" vote on the Campbell-Greenwood-Lowey amendment.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment and in opposition to the amendment by the gentleman from New Jersey.

I have some concerns about the fact that we are even debating this issue today; especially since most of the foreign aid sections were stripped from this legislation.

I am also disappointed that the gentleman from New Jersey has insisted on offering his

amendment. The legislation that was reported out of the International Relations Committee would have provided women and families worldwide with the maximum access to essential family planning services. At the same time, it called for a dollar-for-dollar reduction in United States funding to the UNFPA for any amount spent in China. I think we can all agree that U.S. funds should not be used to pay for "forced abortions" in that country.

The gentleman from New Jersey will attempt to equate support for family planning with support for abortion. That is simply not the case. U.S. law already prohibits the use of Government international family planning funds for promoting or providing abortion services. These programs are carefully monitored to ensure that U.S. policy is strictly followed. At the same time, studies have shown that the availability of family planning services actually reduces the incidence of abortion.

The support for international family planning is instead equivalent to the support of women and families and of sustainable economic growth worldwide.

I have long been interested in the cause and effect relationship between rapid population growth and movement and worldwide environmental degradation, dwindling natural resources, urban poverty, malnutrition, and social unrest.

This is especially disconcerting given that more than 90 percent of the annual population increase of 100 million people is in the developing world.

International family planning funds allow women and families to make responsible and informed choices about when and whether to have children. These are choices that many Americans take for granted; they are also choices that many parents in the developing world do not realize they have.

Giving people in the developing world the resources to make informed reproductive choices can help to control the population growth in those countries and decrease the strains that such growth would place on society and on natural resources.

It is in our national interest, and in the global interest, to support voluntary international family planning. Efforts to slow population growth, elevate the status of women, reduce poverty, and promote sustainable development will lead to a more stable global system.

In short, it bears repeating: in so many important ways, family planning saves lives.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment by the gentleman from New Jersey to restrict international family planning.

We should not, we cannot return to the days when the so-called Mexico City policy dictated the flow of America's family planning dollars. That policy had a chilling effect on family planning in developing countries.

There is no evidence that Mexico City restrictions reduced abortions in developing countries. On the contrary, there is strong evidence that gag rule increased abortions and decreased the quality of life for many women.

The Mexico City policy denied many women access to family planning. Without these services, women lack the help they need to protect themselves from disease and to regulate childbearing.

The Mexico City policy restricted women from learning how to reduce unintended pregnancies. And, in the developing world, 40 per-

cent of unintended pregnancies end in abortion.

Clearly, the Mexico City policy is at odds with itself. We would be wrong to restore it.

Nor should we ban aid to the U.N. population fund.

The U.N. population fund does not support abortion as a family planning method. It does not fund abortions. And it does not condone coerced abortions in any country.

But, the U.N. population fund does provide women in 140 countries with family planning services.

These services help women choose the number and spacing of their children. In doing so, the U.N. fund has saved women's and children's lives, and reduced population growth.

Population growth affects all of us through its impact on the economy, environment and national security.

Population pressures on ecologically fragile areas lead to increased environmental degradation. Unchecked population growth where job opportunity is lacking threatens the political stability of the entire planet.

The Smith amendment would undermine years of progress in battling unchecked population growth and the problems it causes.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the Smith amendment. Oppose a return to the past. And vote in favor of the future.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Campbell-Greenwood-Lowey substitute to the Smith amendment. This is a commonsense measure which restates current law and will protect the lives of women and children around the world.

This vote is not about supporting abortion. Under current law, not \$1 of U.S. family planning funds can be used to perform—or even counsel women to obtain—abortions anywhere in the world. The substitute would retain that prohibition. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the substitute. Vote to prevent abortion. Vote to improve the health of women and children. Vote to save lives.

U.S. family planning aid saves the lives of women. Around the world, 600,000 women die in childbirth every year. Access to family planning in the developing world would reduce unintended pregnancies by one-fifth, and could save the lives of as many as 120,000 of those women.

U.S. family planning aid saves the lives of children. Family planning allows women—and men—to choose how many children they want and when to have them. Spacing children further apart and breast feeding them can improve a child's chance of survival by up to 20 percent in most developing countries. Evidence from across the developing world shows that increased contraceptive use reduces abortion, raises families out of poverty, and increases the life expectancy of all of the children in the family. The Smith amendment, which would halt U.S. family planning aid, condemns hundreds of thousands of women to poor health and possibly death.

If we fail to pass this substitute today, family planning and health clinics across the developing world will close. For many women, these health clinics are the only source of preventative health care that can detect diseases such as cervical cancer in the early stages and save lives.

By voting "yes" to this substitute, you vote to save the lives of women. You vote to reduce unwanted pregnancies. You vote to reduce abortions across the world. You vote to

improve children's health and life expectancy. Support women's health. Support children's health. Vote "yes" on the Campbell-Greenwood-Lowe substitute, and vote "no" on the Smith amendment.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak out against the Smith amendment which seeks to reinstate the so-called Mexico City restrictions on international family planning and to cut funding for the U.N. Fund for Population Activities [UNFPA]. This is really nothing more than a global gag rule.

First of all, no U.S. foreign aid funds are used to either promote, or perform abortions. So this amendment is really unnecessary and antifamily planning. The amendment also seeks to ban aid to UNFPA based on its past involvement in China. But UNFPA is in no way linked to reported family planning abuses in China.

UNFPA does not support abortion and has never funded an abortion. The UNFPA does work in 140 countries where people are desperately seeking assistance in preventing unintended pregnancies. Holding these funds hostage hurts women, children, and families around the world.

UNFPA programs have achieved better nutrition, better health, longer life expectancy and a reduced toll of infectious disease for people all around the world. Their programs have increased the use of family planning from about 15 to 60 percent of couples. And they ensure that young women, whether in Bangladesh or Botswana, have access to reproductive and other basic health care services.

A basic principle that has governed UNFPA's work for many years is that abortion should never be promoted as a method of family planning. Families which lack access to adequate public health services deserve our understanding and our help. Vote "no" on the Smith amendment. Vote "yes" on Campbell-Greenwood.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Smith amendment and I congratulate the gentleman from New Jersey for offering this important amendment to reinstate what we refer to as "The Mexico City Policy."

The wording in that policy is direct, simple, and straightforward, and from 1985 to 1993 this "Mexico City" language protected the American taxpayers from having their tax dollars spent on abortion. For 8 years, this language assured that our great Nation would not, directly or indirectly, support or promote abortion throughout the world. With all the world's great crying needs, we should not spend our scarce foreign aid dollars to subsidize and promote abortion.

The world looks to America for moral leadership. The world looks to America for justice for the weak and the disenfranchised. We should respond to this call for leadership not by promoting abortion for the children of the poorest peoples of the world, but rather by helping them develop the economic and political infrastructure that encourages development, peace, and progress.

I urge my colleagues to support the Smith amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] to the amendment offered

by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 158, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NETHERCUTT

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NETHERCUTT:

At the end of the bill add the following section:

SEC. . SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO THE ABDUCTION AND DETAINMENT OF DONALD HUTCHINGS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Al-Faran, a militant organization that seeks to merge Kashmir with Pakistan, has waged a war against the Government of India.

(2) During the week of July 2, 1995, Al-Faran abducted Donald Hutchings of the State of Washington, another American John Childs, and 4 Western Europeans in the State of Jammu and Kashmir. John Childs has since escaped.

(3) Al-Faran has executed one hostage and threatened to kill Donald Hutchings and the remaining Western European hostages unless the Government of India agrees to release suspected guerrillas from its jails.

(4) Several militants have been captured by the Indian Government and have given conflicting and unconfirmed reports about the hostages.

(5) Donald Hutchings and the 3 remaining Western European hostages have been held against their will by Al-Faran for nearly 2 years.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the militant organization Al-Faran should release, immediately, Donald Hutchings and 3 Western Europeans from captivity;

(2) Al-Faran and their supporters should cease and desist from all acts of hostage-taking and other violent acts within the State of Jammu and Kashmir.

(3) the State Department Rewards Program should be used to the greatest extent possible to solicit new information pertaining to hostages; and

(4) the governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany, Norway, India, and Pakistan should share and investigate all information relating to these hostages as quickly as possible.

Mr. NETHERCUTT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I am introducing this amendment today for myself and for the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE, who has worked with me, with the two Senators from the State of Washington, Senator GORTON and Senator MURRAY, as well as the gen-

tleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MCHALE, the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico, the former Congressman, Bill Richardson, who is now Ambassador Richardson, the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HAMILTON, and certainly the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. GINGRICH, the distinguished Speaker of the House, over the last 2 years to raise the awareness about a constituent of mine, Donald Hutchings from Spokane, WA, who was taken hostage nearly 2 years ago on foreign soil.

On July 2, 1995, Donald Hutchings was on a mountain climbing expedition in Kashmir with his wife and other climbers when they were abducted by a shadowy group of militants known as Al-Faran. Don's wife, Jane Schelly, was released immediately, and another American, John Childs, escaped his captors.

This group has repeatedly threatened Donald Hutchings, to kill him, and the other three remaining Western European hostages, unless the Government of India agreed to release suspected guerilla fighters from its jails. One hostage was found brutally murdered in August 1995, but the location of the other hostages is unknown. A number of militants have been captured by the Government of India, but they have given conflicting and unconfirmed reports about the hostages.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, expresses the sense of Congress that Al-Faran should immediately release all the hostages from captivity and cease all violent acts in India. It urges the use of the State Department Rewards Program, which this bill, H.R. 1757, improves by raising the cap on available funds in order that those funds can be used to solicit new information pertaining to the hostages.

The Nethercutt-Pallone amendment also urges that the Government of the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany, Norway, India, and Pakistan continue to work together to share all investigative information relating to these hostages.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment also sends a strong message to Al-Faran that the United States believes such terrorism is reprehensible, we condemn it; and, at the same time, it encourages the flow of new information which will allow Don's courageous wife, Jane Schelly, to know where her husband is being held.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NETHERCUTT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the gentleman from Washington that it is an excellent amendment, the committee agrees to accept the amendment, and I think the minority has also expressed a willingness to accept the amendment.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I am delighted the chairman would do that. I would just conclude by saying that Jane Schelly

has been halfway around the world in order to raise the level of the interest of this amendment and in the finding of her husband.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NETHERCUTT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Washington as well as the chairman of the committee. I totally support this amendment.

I am not going to repeat the background of what occurred there and the brutal killing of the second hostage that was mentioned by the gentleman, but I do feel that we need to send a message to the Al-Faran and I believe that this will accomplish that.

I just wanted to say that while I was in India, I talked to former Prime Minister Devde on the hostage situation, and he informed me he could not confirm nor deny the status of Donald Hutchings, but he did assure me he would continue to investigate the situation and the Indian Government would do all it can to find and release the hostages.

Before my trip to India this year, I had the opportunity to meet with Donald Hutchings' wife, Jane Schelly. Obviously, she was upset and would like the safe return of her husband, and although the safe return of her husband does not look promising, she continues to hope. In her heart she believes her husband is alive and will return back to home in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot lose hope. We need to support this amendment and we must urge the State Department to work with India, Pakistan, the United Kingdom, Germany, and Norway in securing the release of these hostages. I think the gentleman's amendment will help in that regard and thank him for sponsoring it.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey, and I would hope we can have a recorded vote on this to make certain the whole Congress weighs in very heavily on the importance of this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. NETHERCUTT].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 159, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. NETHERCUTT] will be postponed.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to advise the House that late last night, when the Committee of the Whole was meeting, there were three Members, I believe,

three Members at most, in the Chamber. One of our colleagues introduced an amendment to the legislation that is being debated at this point which is replete more than with irony, with cynicism.

It was an amendment introduced by a gentleman from New York that says more or less the following: If the terrorist state, the Cuban terrorist state, complains about any United States citizen, makes a complaint, then the State Department, paid for by United States taxpayer funds, will have an obligation to report to Congress on the complaints of the Cuban terrorist state.

I have rarely seen examples of such advocacy directly, directly in favor of a state on the terrorist list of the State Department. That is the amendment that was introduced last night by one of our colleagues.

So I want to advise the House that I will demand a separate vote in the House at the time that the Committee of the Whole rises on this unfortunate amendment.

I think that it is important for our colleagues to know, for this House to know what was introduced into this legislation last night. It was truly unfortunate, and it was truly something that I think should be and, hopefully, will be stricken at the time that the Committee of the Whole rises and we have a separate vote in the House.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we will soon be voting on final passage and I alert my colleagues that, as my colleague from Florida has stated, we will be calling for a recorded vote on the amendment introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO] last night. For various reasons, the Committee felt it was best to allow a voice vote and wait until final passage to raise the question of recorded votes.

This amendment does not even belong within the scope of a debate concerning U.S. foreign policy and the protection of U.S. national security interests. The amendment places a greater emphasis on the false and distorted allegations of a terrorist regime, a pariah state, than on safeguarding persons of the United States. It places the activities of the U.S. Government in jeopardy and potentially endangers the lives of some U.S. Government personnel who risk their lives every day in Castro's Cuba in an attempt to assist human rights dissidents and the pro democracy movement inside the island.

The Serrano amendment would essentially turn our U.S. State Department into an instrument of Castro's propaganda machine. It will waste thousands of U.S. taxpayers' dollars, forcing the U.S. Government to act based on the rumblings and idiotic attacks of officials from a regime which is desperately trying to cling to the reins of power.

Time and time again Castro officials have accused falsely the United States

Government and falsely accused United States nationals of the most ridiculous actions, such as the United States launching of biological warfare against the Cuban people. That was an actual Castro accusation. They have also said that we have launched insect warfare to destroy Cuba's agricultural sector.

This is what Fidel Castro has actually accused the U.S. Government of doing. This is absolutely ridiculous, and the Serrano amendment, introduced last night, would want us to pay attention to and would tell the State Department to monitor such attacks. So if Castro says the United States is waging a chemical war against the Cuban people, which is exactly what Castro has said, we, the taxpayers of this country, would have to foot the bill to make sure that will we monitor these criticisms.

□ 1215

I think it is the wrong action for the U.S. Congress to take and that is why we will be calling for a vote on this Serrano amendment at the proper time.

So to force the State Department, our own Government, to turn against our own people, U.S. citizens, falls dangerously close to doing the same things that Castro's apparatus intimidation does on a daily basis. For anyone to suggest that this body should violate the privacy of the American people for the purposes of granting credence to the rantings of oppressors and terrorists is ludicrous. It is shameful, it is ridiculous. It is so far beyond the stretch of the imagination that it does not even merit further discussion in any serious debate of U.S. foreign policy objectives and national security interests.

In fact, if this amendment were to pass on a recorded vote, that would mean that our own State Department would have to then report on the activities of this very body. Why do I say that? Just last week, on Friday, the president of Cuba's national assembly, a nondemocratically elected group, denounced this very bill as, quote, anti-Cuban actions and rendered an official complaint, which is the only criteria required by the Serrano amendment. So according to this amendment introduced last night, our very own State Department would have to investigate us and put us on the State Department list.

I know, Mr. Chairman, that my colleagues will vote against the Serrano amendment and I reiterate our call for a recorded vote against it. I wish that the Member of Congress who proposed this amendment would instead be trying to pass legislation calling for free elections in Cuba. I wish that our colleague on the other side of the aisle would instead be denouncing the human rights violations that occur daily in Cuba. But instead he is doing Castro's work for him in this body. I think that he should rethink that decision and I know that this body will

rethink our vote on that amendment, and that is why we will be proud to call for a recorded vote at the proper time.

I ask Mr. SERRANO, shouldn't U.S. taxpayer money be put to better use? Wouldn't U.S. foreign policy objectives be better served by requesting reports on human rights abuses; on Castro's narcotics trafficking; on Castro's support for terrorism worldwide?

I know this would be a better use of funds, time, and effort for the U.S. Government and specifically the State Department.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. BROWN OF FLORIDA

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. BROWN of Florida:

At the end of title XVII insert the following new section:

SEC. 1717. SENSE OF CONGRESS CONCERNING THE RIGHTS OF PRISONERS IN ANDEAN COUNTRIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Several American prisoners have spent years in Ecuadorian prisons on drug-related offenses without having received a trial.

(2) The prisoners include James Williams, a United States citizen who has been held for 9 months without any findings, and Sandra Chase, who has been held for more than 18 months and has never seen a judge.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that the Governments of the Andean countries of Peru, Ecuador, Bolivia, Columbia, and Venezuela, should respect the rights of prisoners, including United States citizens, to timely legal procedures and abide by international standards of due process.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, my amendment addresses one of the most basic issues that ties together every country in this globe. This issue is respect for human rights—including the rights of people accused of crimes. My amendment expresses the sense of Congress that the Governments of the Andean countries, including Peru, Ecuador, Bolivia, Columbia, and Venezuela, should respect the rights of prisoners, including United States Citizens, for timely legal procedures and international standards of due process. This is a simple amendment—one that would be difficult to vote against because it simply asks for due process, nothing more.

On my recent trip to Ecuador, I witnessed extreme human rights violations in this nation's prisons, and in their justice system. I traveled to Ecuador to visit American prisoner James (Jim) Williams in the Guayaquil Penitentiary. Jim Williams is a businessman from Jacksonville, FL, and he has been held in this prison for the past 9 months. On my trip one factor became very apparent. Like several other South American countries, Ecuador's judicial system—including the courts and prisons—is in shambles. It is a country where poverty is the norm and typewriters are a luxury. Thousands of people linger in prisons for years without a trial.

Officials related to me that because of U.S. pressure for drug suspects to be apprehended, there is a focus by an overwhelmed local police force to bring in anyone suspected of drug use, drug trafficking, or money laundering. Local police lock up persons who associate with even suspected drug dealers. Hence, prisons are overcrowded with sus-

pected drug users, drug dealers, or money launderers. But because of the rampant, corruption and bribery, the most dangerous narcotics offenders—the traffickers—are able to buy their freedom.

Because of the rampant corruption and bribery, most people sit in jail for years without every going to trial. And some of the most dangerous drug dealers buy their way out of the system.

Within this corrupt system are Jim Williams, Sandra Chase, and 40 other Americans. They are in jails where most people have no toilets. There are only six public defenders for 10 million people. Most prisoners become hopelessly lost in a broken judicial system. Children grow up in prisons with imprisoned mothers.

The prison I visited in Guayaquil has 2,500 prisoners; only 400 have ever received a trial. Because of the extensive bribery, simply getting a trial can cost the prisoner up to \$30,000. Wealthy people simply buy their way out. But Jim Williams has insisted on proving his innocence. Unfortunately, those who plead innocent spend more time in the system battling the charges than if they had first plead guilty to the crime and served their time.

The good news is that we can make a difference. When I was in Ecuador, I met one prisoner who had been in jail for 4 years on charges that he had a single marijuana cigarette. He was 16 when he entered this prison. Last week, he and 11 other prisoners who spent years in jail without a trial, were released.

I believe this is a direct result of the publicity we brought to these prisoners, and I am even more committed that we can work with our neighbors in Latin America to ensure that all people have access to due process.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment, and send a message to our neighbors that the U.S. Congress will not stand by while prisoners lie suffering, waiting indefinitely for justice.

Ecuador's judicial system is in shambles. There are few typewriters, cases lie in paper heaps on office floors where there is no air conditioning and the humidity is usually at very high levels.

Poverty in Ecuador is the norm.

U.S. officials in Ecuador have an overriding role to combat drug trafficking.

Local police lock up persons who associate with even suspected drug dealers.

Because of bribery, wealthy drug offenders go free.

Forty Americans are imprisoned within this system.

Ecuador has 6 public defenders for 10 million people.

One prisoner was in jail for 4 years without a trial for having one marijuana cigarette.

The jails have no phones and no toilets.

Children grow up in prison with imprisoned mothers.

Each lingering case represents a person out of work and a family that suffers.

I visited a prison with 2,500 prisoners—only 400 had ever received a trial. A trial can cost \$30,000.

COMITE DE INTERNOS,
DEL C.R.S.V.-G.,
Guayaquil, 31 de Mayo de 1.997.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN,
Congresswoman of the U.S.A.,
Washington.

MY DEAR LADY: Thanks to your visit to this Penitentiary some changes have occurred

and we, the inmates, wish to thank you for your kind intervention and interest in our plight

First of all, we wish to inform you that the inmate Jose Ayala Gomez, after 4 years and 6 months of prison, for possessing one marijuana cigarette, was finally released. He went to the press and T.V. to publicly thank you for your help.

On the other hand, we have seen that judges have started to take depositions from the inmates and some progress seems to be underway. This all has happened after your visit to this center.

Two thousand prisoners that have been relegated and remain without sentence for years are still waiting for justice.

We wish to ask you to keep your kind interest in our suffering so that the international organization of Human Rights pressures the Ecuadorian authorities to comply with the law and cease the abuse of the civil and human rights of Ecuadorian citizens.

We are pleased to remain yours very truly.

FRANCISCO BAQUERIZO

VILLAO,

President.

ROBERT VERA,

Secretario.

Guayaquil, 31 de Mayo de 1.997.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN,
Congresswoman U.S.A., Washington.

DEAR LADY: I wish to send you by this letter, my deep feeling of gratitude for my release from prison.

After four years and six months I have managed to get out of hell, thanks to your kind help. I will always remember the beautiful lady that came here as an apparition from heaven.

Now I must seek my wife and three children that I have lost. I will also try to recover my health. Hundreds of companions that are left behind wait also for justice.

I pray so hard that you are well and that your efforts be successful.

FRANKLIN AYALA GOMEZ.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentlewoman from Florida yield?

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support our colleague from Florida, Ms. BROWN, in offering this amendment. I have been monitoring closely the case of James Wilson who is being held in prison in Ecuador. Without prejudging the merits of any particular case, I am proud to join the gentlewoman in expressing the sense of Congress that all such persons should be afforded timely legal procedures. And by passing this amendment, we would be making a strong unequivocal statement in favor of justice and due process. I commend the gentlewoman for her amendment and I would like to note to the gentlewoman that the majority accepts the amendment.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. BROWN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was in my office listening to the comments by the two

Members from Florida on an amendment that was passed last night concerning the ever-present and sad Cuban issue. Let me first set the record straight.

I presented the amendment because I felt it was right. I printed it under the rules of the House. I presented it under the procedures set up by the Republican majority, the amendment was voted on by voice vote and it was passed. If they desire now to quiet me and quiet the issue by bringing up the vote, that is fine; they have a right to do that. But I think we have to understand what is going on here. This bill includes provisions that ask the administration and other agencies to report to the Congress every 3 months on how the administration is enforcing the Cuban embargo. I am an opponent of the Cuban embargo. I feel it is improper and I feel it is foolish and it has not gained any success for our country.

Therefore, in a desire to strike some balance, I have said on many occasions that there are complaints that come from the Cuban Government that deal with the behavior of some American citizens and American residents, complaints such as, on more than 10 occasions before the tragic downing of 2 airplanes flown by Florida residents, on more than 10 occasions prior to that time, the Cuban Government had officially complained to our Government that these planes and planes from the same organization were violating Cuban air space.

On that July, prior to that tragic incident, the Cuban Government had complained officially to the United States and to the rest of the world, if anybody wanted to listen, that planes from that organization had flown over Havana, dropped leaflets, dropped paint, and incited or attempted to incite a riot. Now please understand what I am talking about. If Cuban airplanes flew over the capital, each one of us would expect our Government to shoot them down immediately. And I would be the first one to say that that would be the proper action to take, but because it is Cuba and it is the desire of this country and of some people to continue to press them until they come begging forgiveness for their different form of government, nothing gets done.

So all my amendment does, the amendment that was passed properly last night, is to say every 3 months tell us what official complaints have been brought forth by the Cuban Government, complaints that deal with violation of air space, complaints that deal with American citizens or residents who enter Cuban territory, complaints that deal, official complaints with ships getting beyond international waters into Cuban territory, and recently complaints that deal with American residents or citizens that have been accused by the Cuban Government of being involved in what we would call terrorist actions.

What is it that some people want to hide that they do not want simply the

truth to come out? I am not suggesting in my amendment that we do anything about those actions. Interestingly enough, I am not suggesting in my amendment that we arrest anyone, I am not suggesting in my amendment that we stop anyone from doing these things. All I am suggesting is that we know as Members of Congress so that we can balance the Cuban issue and the Cuban approach.

Now, there are people who stand on this floor and accuse my amendment of being the worst amendment they ever saw and accuse my actions of being the worst actions any Member can take, but let me say something. I strongly believe that we are wrong in our policy toward Cuba and I will not rest until my country, this country, realizes that the best way to deal with this issue is the way we dealt with the Soviet Union, the way we are dealing with China, the way we are dealing with Vietnam, the way we are dealing with Korea.

If there are Members that do not like that, I apologize for bringing grief upon their lives. But I will not move back, nor any approach on their part will make me move back from this that I believe so strongly. What is right is to let the amendment go through. What are we afraid of? To learn the truth?

The vote will be taken today. I would hope that all Members on both sides take into consideration the fact that an amendment properly presented before this House was approved. If they want to kill it, there are other ways to do that, in conference, in the Senate, but they should let this amendment go through because I presented it properly and it was approved properly.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield to the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN].

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to engage our colleague from New York, Mr. SERRANO in a series of questions about some of the statements that he has made. For example, he said that the amendment that we passed yesterday had to deal with how the United States is monitoring Cuban embargo. That is not the case.

The amendment that we will pass deals with how the State Department is or is not administering the laws that the U.S. Congress has passed with almost 400 votes in favor in a strong bipartisan way. We would like the State Department to administer the law. The U.S. Congress approved it. We would like the State Department to approve it, to implement it.

Furthermore, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO] is saying that Castro was so upset about the U.S. planes flying so close to his territory. Too bad that the facts of the case are that every international body, including the United Nations, that has looked at this incident has said that it

was an unarmed, humanitarian flight that took place in international waters and Castro killed American citizens, shot them from the sky.

But my colleague is not concerned with that. He is concerned with Castro's accusations. He is not concerned about our constituents that died, and he is not concerned about the thousands of Cubans that die every year trying to get to liberty. He wants to do Castro's work in the U.S. Congress.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention, in coordination with our committee's ranking minority member, Mr. HAMILTON, to move at a subsequent time to seek an agreement to limit consideration of any further amendments to this bill, the bill that is now before us.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON].

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I was just trying to understand what the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] was saying. Would he repeat, please. I apologize, I was distracted.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I intend to move at a subsequent time to seek an agreement to limit consideration of any further amendments to this bill.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HAMILTON. I commend the chairman for his statement. I think it is important that we give Members notice that we are going to cut off amendments to this bill. I think the chairman is taking the right approach on it, and I will work with him on it.

REQUEST FOR MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCARBOROUGH TO TITLE XVII, FOREIGN POLICY PROVISIONS

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to make a technical amendment on my amendment regarding Sudan to add the sentence: "This restriction shall not be interpreted to restrict humanitarian assistance or transactions relating to normal diplomatic activities."

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment offered by Mr. SCARBOROUGH:

At the end of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] insert: "This restriction shall not be interpreted to restrict humanitarian assistance or transactions relating to normal diplomatic activities."

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

□ 1230

Mr. HAMILTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I understand the amendment has been adopted. The gentleman is seeking a unanimous-consent change in the text of the amendment. I just had it handed to me. I do

not want to object to the gentleman's request, but I would request that we be given a little time to examine it. It is new to me. I would like to check it out. May I request that the gentleman withdraw his unanimous consent and let me have a couple of hours here to check it and renew it at a later point?

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. If the gentleman will yield, I thank the gentleman for asking. This vote is going to be coming up early this afternoon, after 1:30. The objection last night was that this would somehow affect NGO's. We actually have talked to NGO's that are going into Sudan. They have said this would not have any impact on them whatsoever. But we wanted to just bend over backwards to make sure that everybody knew that humanitarian assistance was cleared.

Let me just say that after this passes, we will certainly be glad as we go to conference to do whatever it takes to make sure that the minority has no concerns regarding it.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, I do not have any doubt about the gentleman's intent here, but since I have only had a very few minutes to look at it, I still feel like I need some additional time to review it, so I would be constrained to object to the unanimous consent at this point. However, I would anticipate we could work this out.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. If the gentleman will yield further, would the gentleman agree to possibly, if I come back to amend it before the vote, when we come back in later today, would that be all right with the gentleman?

Mr. HAMILTON. Yes. I understand there is a vote pending on the gentleman's amendment. I do not want to delay that. Let us proceed quickly here to find out about it. Then the gentleman can renew his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request.

Mr. HAMILTON. I will be back in touch with the gentleman.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER) having assumed the chair, Mr. NEY, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1757) to consolidate international affairs agencies, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1469, 1997 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR RECOVERY FROM NATURAL DISASTERS, AND FOR OVERSEAS PEACEKEEPING EFFORTS, INCLUDING THOSE IN BOSNIA

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-120) on the resolution (H. Res. 162) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1469) making emergency supplemental appropriations for recovery from natural disasters, and for overseas peacekeeping efforts, including those in Bosnia, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 84, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1998

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 160 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 160

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 84) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1998 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read. The conference report shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 160 is the customary rule for considering a conference report on a budget resolution.

The rule waives all points of order against the conference report to accompany House Concurrent Resolution 84, the budget resolution for fiscal years 1998 through 2002, and against its consideration.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate on the conference report, divided equally between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the Budget. This 1 hour is instead of

the 5 hours called for under section 305(a) of the Budget Act. However, a review of the budget conference report rules over the last decade or so reveals that most of them provided for only 1 hour of debate, so this is customary, what we are doing here today.

Finally, the rule does not address the issue of a motion to recommit, since section 305(a)(6) of the Budget Act states that a motion to recommit the conference report is not in order under the rules of the House. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, this is a customary rule for the consideration of a budget resolution conference report.

Turning to the conference report itself, it is extremely important to recognize that this is a dramatic and a very positive shift in the direction of this country. This improvement is in large part due to the steadfast leadership and the committed drive of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and the bipartisan members of the Committee on the Budget. They and the other Members who worked with them deserve our commendation.

Our former colleague and leader, Bob Michel, used to say on this floor that "in political decision-making, we must never let the perfect become the enemy of the good." This sage advice I think applies here today.

Mr. Speaker, this balanced budget agreement is not perfect and it does not reflect the complete priorities of any one Member of this House. In fact, I think that I can say with certainty that every Member of the House would probably have written this differently if he or she were the only one making that decision.

I know that if I were writing this budget, I would have had deeper spending cuts, much deeper. I would have had more tax cuts, more entitlement reform to get these entitlements under control, and certainly more spending for defense, which is really why this Congress exists, is to provide for a common defense for the 50 States against those that would take away our freedoms.

However, it is important to recognize once again that the nature of a democracy rests on the art of compromise, a compromise not in principle but in approach and in process. This principled compromise is epitomized in the leadership of the Committee on the Budget in crafting a bipartisan agreement that reflects the principles of balanced budgets, lower taxes, lower spending, and a smaller Federal Government. That is what this budget is all about.

Second, on balance it is a good budget. It is built upon permanent spending savings and permanent tax cuts. These are specific changes that are being written into the law by the adoption of this budget, something radically different than the procedural spending caps and deficit targets included in previous budget agreements such as Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, and my colleagues all know that that did not work at all.

This one is going to work. These principles deliver real benefits for the American people. Listen to these facts.

First, this agreement balances the budget for the first time in 30 years, and for the second time in 40 years. Government spending will be less than 20 percent of the gross domestic product for the first time since 1974. Think about that. American taxpayers will save \$600 billion over the next 5 years in entitlement spending reform, the fastest growing portion of the budget. Finally, this Congress has got the guts to stand up here and do something about it.

Most importantly of all, Mr. Speaker, nondefense discretionary spending will grow at one-half of 1 percent a year over the next 5 years, one-half of 1 percent per year over the next 5 years compared with 6 percent per year over the last 5 years. What a difference that is going to make.

Contrary to what some have asserted, this budget is also built on conservative economic assumptions that the economy will grow at 2.1 percent over the next 5 years, that unemployment will rise to 6 percent, and that the Consumer Price Index will continue to go up.

However, the economy has actually been growing stronger, reaching 5.6 percent in the last quarter alone. The unemployment rate has remained below 5 percent, I think it is 4.9 percent right now, and the CPI may actually be going down. This budget is built on sound economic assumptions as well as a strong and vibrant national economy.

Furthermore, the chairman of the Federal Reserve, Alan Greenspan, has stated, and again this is very important, that balancing the budget will further improve the performance of the economy.

Why is that so? One-third of all the interest that the American people pay on their home mortgages, one-third of it, let us say that their total mortgage interest rate per year is \$6,000, \$2,000 of that is caused by the Federal deficits. If we get these deficits under control, we are putting \$2,000 back into the pockets of families with mortgages. That is nontaxable money. That is money they have already paid taxes on, so that they can go out and spend it or save it, and either way it certainly stimulates the economy.

While this conference report is good, the reconciliation and appropriation bills that follow it are perhaps the most important bills that we will pass in this Congress this year, important in the sense that they will also directly benefit every single American family.

I think we owe it to those families to pass this budget and then once that is done, Mr. Speaker, to summon the courage to vote "yes" on these enabling authorization and appropriation measures that will cut spending, that will cut taxes, and end the deficits that are bankrupting the future generations of Americans. I, for one, pledge here today, right now, that I will vote for

every one of those spending cuts that are going to bring some fiscal sanity back to this Federal Government.

This budget is a victory for America's children, and I believe something this Congress and even this President should be proud to support.

Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson in a letter to a friend back in 1816 gave the following charge: "To preserve people's independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our election between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude."

I urge my colleagues to follow Thomas Jefferson's instructions to preserve independence and to maximize liberty by supporting this rule and supporting this balanced budget here today.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, on May 20 when the House considered the rule providing for the consideration of the budget resolution, I said that the vote on the resolution was but the beginning of what promises to be a difficult process. I also said that even if individual Members supported the framework of the agreement to balance the Federal budget, such a vote would not obligate any Member to support the separate pieces implementing that agreement that he or she might consider unfair or ill-conceived.

Mr. Speaker, even before this conference report has been adopted, we are seeing pieces of the implementing package which might indeed be considered unfair. Many Members supported the budget agreement because it promised to right a wrong that had been part of the welfare reform legislation enacted in the last Congress. I am referring, of course, to the removal of thousands of elderly disabled legal immigrants from the SSI program.

This House agreed during the consideration of the supplemental appropriation to provide funding to keep disabled elderly legal immigrants on the rolls until the Congress had an opportunity to revisit the issue and correct what is an unjustifiable inequity. Yet, Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority is now offering the House what can only be called a bait-and-switch deal.

This budget agreement came about as a result of long and difficult negotiations between the administration and the Republican leadership. Democrats in the House were subsequently assured that the agreement ensured that disabled elderly legal immigrants would be protected as part of those negotiations. Mr. Speaker, how is it, then, that the Republican majority is now proposing to fulfill perhaps only a part of that agreement?

□ 1245

The Committee on Ways and Means now has pending before it a proposal which will fulfill at least that part of the agreement that might save the Re-

publican majority a major public and political embarrassment. To avoid what would surely create a public furor the Republicans have agreed that they will not kick those elderly disabled illegal immigrants who currently receive SSI off the rolls. Thus the Republicans will ensure that they will not be blamed for kicking sick old people out of their nursing home beds and onto the streets.

But, Mr. Speaker, this is only half of the deal. What about the future? Mr. Speaker, I ask this question in the context that this is the same Republican majority who left Washington for a 10-day break without addressing the urgent necessity of providing money to the flood ravaged regions of the Dakotas and the Midwest. This is the same Republican majority that is now going to send a supplemental appropriation to the President knowing full well that he will veto it because of the extraneous political issues which are designed to save them future political embarrassment are attached to a bill that was supposed to help families begin to put their lives back to order. What next Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, I will not oppose this rule providing for the consideration of this conference report, but I caution my colleagues to examine closely every bill that comes to the floor which will implement this budget agreement. Some parts may indeed be fair and equitable and deserve the support of all Members, but others, Mr. Speaker, deserve to be exposed for what they are, Republican proposals which will fill only part of an agreement and are not part of the agreement at all.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, we have debated this at length, and we have with us speakers that could speak, but I would just as soon expedite this, and if the gentleman is willing to yield back his time, I would do so right after he does.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Member from Texas is always agreeable, and because of that I also yield back the balance of our time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. FROST. 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. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, further proceedings on this measure will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the House stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1330

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. LAHOOD] at 1:30 p.m.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 84, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1998

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question de novo of agreeing to the resolution (H. Res. 160) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 84) establishing the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal year 1998 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. SERRANO. 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 373, nays 47, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 165]

YEAS—373

Abercrombie	Bliley	Carson
Ackerman	Blumenauer	Castle
Aderholt	Blunt	Chabot
Allen	Boehlert	Chambliss
Archer	Boehner	Chenoweth
Armey	Bonilla	Christensen
Bachus	Bono	Clayton
Baesler	Boswell	Clement
Baker	Boucher	Clyburn
Baldacci	Boyd	Coble
Ballenger	Brady	Coburn
Barcia	Brown (CA)	Collins
Barr	Brown (OH)	Combest
Barrett (NE)	Bryant	Condit
Barrett (WI)	Bunning	Cook
Bartlett	Burr	Cooksey
Bass	Burton	Costello
Bateman	Buyer	Cox
Bentsen	Callahan	Coyne
Bereuter	Calvert	Cramer
Berman	Camp	Crane
Berry	Campbell	Crapo
Bilbray	Canady	Cubin
Bilirakis	Cannon	Cummings
Bishop	Capps	Cunningham
Blagojevich	Cardin	Danner

Davis (FL)	John	Pryce (OH)
Davis (IL)	Johnson (WI)	Quinn
Davis (VA)	Johnson, E. B.	Radanovich
Deal	Johnson, Sam	Ramstad
DeGette	Jones	Redmond
DeLaunt	Kaptur	Regula
DeLauro	Kasich	Reyes
DeLay	Kelly	Riggs
Deutsch	Kennelly	Riley
Diaz-Balart	Kildee	Rivers
Dickey	Kim	Rodriguez
Dingell	Kind (WI)	Roemer
Dixon	King (NY)	Rogan
Doggett	Kingston	Rogers
Dooley	Klecza	Rohrabacher
Doolittle	Klink	Ros-Lehtinen
Doyle	Klug	Rothman
Dreier	Knollenberg	Roukema
Duncan	Kolbe	Roybal-Allard
Dunn	LaFalce	Royce
Edwards	LaHood	Ryun
Ehlers	Largent	Sabo
Ehrlich	Latham	Salmon
Emerson	LaTourette	Sanchez
Engel	Lazio	Sandlin
English	Leach	Sanford
Ensign	Levin	Sawyer
Eshoo	Lewis (CA)	Saxton
Etheridge	Lewis (KY)	Scarborough
Evans	Linder	Schaefer, Dan
Everett	Livingston	Schaffer, Bob
Ewing	LoBiondo	Schumer
Fattah	Lofgren	Scott
Fawell	Lowey	Sensenbrenner
Fazio	Lucas	Serrano
Flake	Luther	Sessions
Foglietta	Maloney (CT)	Shadegg
Foley	Maloney (NY)	Shaw
Forbes	Manton	Shays
Ford	Manzullo	Sherman
Fowler	Mascara	Shimkus
Fox	Matsui	Shuster
Frank (MA)	McCarthy (MO)	Sisisky
Franks (NJ)	McCollum	Skaggs
Frelinghuysen	McCrery	Skeen
Frost	McDade	Skelton
Furse	McGovern	Slaughter
Gallegly	McHale	Smith (MI)
Ganske	McHugh	Smith (NJ)
Gejdenson	McInnis	Smith (OR)
Gekas	McIntosh	Smith (TX)
Gephardt	McIntyre	Smith, Adam
Gibbons	McKeon	Smith, Linda
Gilchrest	McKinney	Snowbarger
Gillmor	Meehan	Snyder
Gilman	Menendez	Solomon
Gonzalez	Metcalfe	Spence
Goodlatte	Mica	Spratt
Goodling	Millender-McDonald	Stabenow
Gordon	Miller (FL)	Stearns
Goss	Minge	Stenholm
Graham	Moakley	Strickland
Granger	Molinari	Stump
Green	Mollohan	Stupak
Gutierrez	Moran (KS)	Sununu
Gutknecht	Moran (VA)	Talent
Hall (OH)	Morella	Tanner
Hall (TX)	Murtha	Tauscher
Hamilton	Myrick	Tauzin
Hansen	Neal	Taylor (MS)
Harman	Nethercutt	Taylor (NC)
Hastert	Neumann	Thomas
Hastings (WA)	Ney	Thornberry
Hayworth	Northup	Thune
Hefley	Norwood	Thurman
Hefner	Nussle	Tiahrt
Herger	Ortiz	Towns
Hill	Oxley	Traficant
Hilleary	Packard	Upton
Hinchey	Pallone	Vento
Hinojosa	Pappas	Walsh
Hobson	Parker	Wamp
Hoekstra	Pascrell	Watkins
Holden	Pastor	Watts (OK)
Hooley	Paul	Waxman
Horn	Paxon	Weldon (FL)
Hostettler	Pease	Weldon (PA)
Houghton	Peterson (MN)	Weller
Hoyer	Peterson (PA)	Wexler
Hulshof	Petri	Weygand
Hunter	Pickett	White
Hutchinson	Pitts	Whitfield
Hyde	Pombo	Wicker
Inglis	Pomeroy	Wise
Jackson (IL)	Porter	Woolsey
Jackson-Lee	Portman	Wynn
(TX)	Poshard	Young (AK)
Jenkins	Price (NC)	Young (FL)

NAYS—47

Becerra	Lampson	Pelosi
Bonior	Lewis (GA)	Rahall
Borski	Lipinski	Rangel
Brown (FL)	Markey	Rush
Clay	Martinez	Sanders
Conyers	McCarthy (NY)	Stark
DeFazio	McDermott	Stokes
Dellums	McNulty	Thompson
Filner	Miller (CA)	Tierney
Hastings (FL)	Mink	Torres
Hilliard	Nadler	Velazquez
Kanjorski	Oberstar	Visclosky
Kennedy (MA)	Obey	Waters
Kennedy (RI)	Olver	Watt (NC)
Kilpatrick	Owens	Yates
Kucinich	Payne	

NOT VOTING—14

Andrews	Istook	Pickering
Barton	Jefferson	Schiff
Farr	Johnson (CT)	Souder
Goode	Lantos	Turner
Greenwood	Meek	

□ 1351

Messrs. OLVER, RUSH, and WATT of North Carolina changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1525

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1525.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 84, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1998

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 160, I call up the conference report on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 84) establishing the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal year 1998 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 160, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 4, 1997, at page H3358.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KASICH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of engaging the chairman in a colloquy.

This budget resolution contains an intercity passenger rail reserve fund, which originated in the other body, whereby if there is a reduction in direct spending or an increase in revenues additional funding could be provided for intercity passenger rail on a deficit neutral basis.

Is this the chairman's understanding of the intercity passenger rail reserve fund?

Mr. KASICH. Yes, it is.

Mr. SHUSTER. The chairman is probably also aware the reserve fund in the budget resolution links additional funding for intercity passenger rail service to the enactment of authorizing legislation for Amtrak. The enactment of reforms for Amtrak is absolutely critical to the future of intercity rail in this country. Amtrak, as it is currently structured, cannot survive into the future.

My committee produced reform legislation in the last Congress that passed this House by a vote of 406 to 4. This legislation relieved Amtrak of burdensome statutory mandates, imposed caps on liability exposure, and restructured the Amtrak board of directors to make Amtrak more streamlined and able to make customer-based business decisions. Unfortunately, the other body never considered the legislation, so 2 years later Amtrak is still subject to onerous statutory requirements that prevent it from providing quality service at a reasonable cost.

In my view, it would be a grave disservice to the American taxpayers to provide additional funding for Amtrak if no legislation is enacted. That is why I want to be sure that if additional funding is provided to Amtrak through the reserve fund it will happen only if the reform legislation has been enacted.

Mr. KASICH. I agree entirely. Additional funding for Amtrak through the intercity passenger rail reserve fund established in the resolution should only be permitted if reform legislation is enacted. In my role as chairman of the House Committee on the Budget I will categorically refuse to release funds from the reserve fund for Amtrak if authorizing legislation reforming Amtrak has not been enacted into law or if the additional funds are not made contingent upon the enactment of such reforms.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for his support.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KASICH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to enter into a colloquy with the chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

As I read the budget resolution and the conference report, together with some additional documents that the Committee on the Budget and the ad-

ministration have issued, there are three separate items concerning Superfund. The bipartisan budget agreement establishes a reserve fund to provide \$200 million per year in mandatory spending for so-called orphan share spending for the Superfund program; is that correct?

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, it is my further understanding that in order to obtain the additional funding from the reserve fund, the budget resolution requires Congress to pass legislation providing for that additional mandatory spending; is that correct?

Mr. KASICH. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. OXLEY. Did the budget negotiators specifically contemplate that such legislation would be a comprehensive Superfund reform bill?

Mr. KASICH. Yes, section 204 of the conference report specifically states the additional funds will be available only after the authorizing committees report a Superfund reform bill.

Mr. OXLEY. I thank the gentleman. And did the negotiators also specifically contemplate a comprehensive Superfund reform bill when they wrote, in the addendum to the budget agreement, that "Superfund appropriations will be at the President's level if policies can be worked out?"

Mr. KASICH. The Superfund appropriations will be at the President's level if policies can be worked out.

Mr. OXLEY. We in the Committee on Commerce interpret that as the need for a comprehensive reform bill.

Finally, the addendum states that the Superfund tax shall not be used as a revenue offset. Does that reflect an agreement among the negotiators that the Superfund taxes will not be used to pay for tax relief?

□ 1400

Mr. KASICH. The gentleman is correct. Superfund taxes cannot be used for tax relief, as specified in section 105 of the conference report.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KASICH. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

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

Mr. Speaker, this budget resolution in order to balance the budget in 5 years caps discretionary spending and issues reconciliation directives to a number of House and Senate committees. These directives simply set forth targets that each committee must meet, but behind these reconciliation directives are major policy and procedural agreements.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, could we get unanimous consent to submit this entire colloquy?

Mr. SPRATT. I believe in order to be effective, it has to be read aloud.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this entire

colloquy language be put in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A colloquy is not permitted to be entered into the RECORD.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Budget leadership, the congressional leadership, and the White House have negotiated in earnest over the past 4 months. Our negotiations culminated in a document called the Bipartisan Budget Agreement of 1997, which is incorporated by reference in the committee report. In issuing reconciliation directives, what the resolution seeks is compliance with this agreement, and compliance is critical if we are to implement in good faith the bipartisan budget agreement of 1997.

To that end, I would like to engage the chairman of the Committee on the Budget in a colloquy to confirm his understanding of this bipartisan budget agreement and this budget resolution.

First, does the chairman remain committed to House consideration of two separate reconciliation bills, first, the spending bill, second, the bill providing for \$85 billion in net tax reduction from 1998 to 2002?

I raise this question because the House reconciliation directive allows either two bills or a single omnibus bill, and on May 19, 1997, Chairman KASICH sent me a letter to clarify that provision. In that letter the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] stated:

The procedural obstacles in the Senate may preclude the consideration of two separate reconciliation bills. For that reason, the committee reported budget resolution includes a contingency for the consideration of a single bill. I remain firmly committed to considering and presenting to the President two separate reconciliation bills, as envisioned in the Bipartisan Budget Agreement, and will work in good faith with all parties to achieve that end.

I understand that the other body has now resolved the major procedural problem by granting unanimous consent to waive the so-called Byrd rule, a provision that might otherwise have precluded consideration of a separate tax reconciliation bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the letter just referred to.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, May 19, 1997.

Hon. JOHN SPRATT,
Ranking Minority Member, Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPRATT: This letter is a follow-up to my comments at last Friday's mark up on the structure of the reconciliation process.

As you know, the budget resolution, as reported, establishes a structure for the consideration of two separate reconciliation bills in the House, the first for entitlement reform due on June 12 and the second for tax relief due on June 13.

The two-bill structure is consistent with the Bipartisan Budget Agreement which noted that "It is the intention of the Leaders

that Congress shall present the revenue reconciliation bill to the President after the spending reduction reconciliation bill. This assumes a good faith effort by all parties to enable such a legislative process to succeed."

Unfortunately, procedural obstacles in the Senate may preclude the consideration of two separate reconciliation bills. For that reason, the committee-reported budget resolution includes a contingency for the consideration of a single omnibus bill.

I remain fully committed to considering and presenting to the President the two separate reconciliation bills, as envisioned in the Bipartisan Budget Agreement, and will work in good faith with all parties to achieve that end.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. KASICH,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the bipartisan budget agreement clearly states it is the intention of the leaders that Congress shall present the revenue reconciliation bill to the President after the spending reduction reconciliation bill. This assumes a good-faith effort by all parties to enable such a legislative process to succeed. I remain committed to House consideration of two separate bills, one for spending, another for tax cuts, as I stated in a letter to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT]; however, the budget resolution does provide for the possibility of a one-bill reconciliation process and we consider this an option only if the good-faith efforts to proceed with two bills proves to be unsuccessful.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to ask about targets for spending and tax cuts. The budget agreement and budget resolution call for \$85 billion in net tax cuts over the 5-year period 1998 to 2002 to be enacted in the second reconciliation bill.

The first reconciliation bill includes entirely spending items, with two small exceptions, the increase in Federal employee retirement contributions, as technically a revenue increase, and the administration's proposal to tighten compliance with the earned income credit is actually scored as generating a small revenue increase as well as reduction in outlays.

Some have suggested that section 310(c) of the Congressional Budget Act could allow the first bill to include tax cuts offset by spending reductions that are deeper than those specified in the reconciliation directive. If so, tax cuts in the first bill, with \$85 billion of tax cuts in the second bill, could bring net tax reduction to more than the \$85 billion agreed upon in the first 5 years.

However one interprets section 310(c), I would maintain that it would breach the terms of the budget agreement to include tax cuts in the first reconciliation bill or to include tax cuts exceeding \$85 billion over 5 years in the second bill. This would also breach the revenue floor set by this resolution and trigger a point of order.

Does the chairman agree that the budget agreement calls for \$85 billion in net tax cuts over 5 years and that any greater amount would violate the agreement?

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, the House majority fully intends to fulfill the bipartisan budget agreement by providing \$85 billion in net tax relief for the next 5 years and 250 in net tax relief over 10 years.

I would like to point out one possible exception. The text of the bipartisan budget agreement when speaking of \$16 billion over 5 years to increase health care coverage for uninsured children says that the money could be used for Medicaid, for a program of cap mandatory grants to States or for other possibilities mutually agreeable.

Equally important, the agreement states that resources will be used in the most cost effective manner possible to expand coverage and services for low-income and uninsured children. To me, other possibilities do not exclude tax incentives or other tax provisions that assist in expanding health insurance coverage for our Nation's children.

I would further point out that the gentleman from South Carolina is correct that the \$85 billion in net tax relief over 5 years and the \$250 billion in net tax relief over 10 years does not include the revenue impact of the earned income tax credit reforms or changes in the contribution rates paid by Federal employees into their retirement programs.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, with respect to expanding health insurance coverage for uninsured children, I would like to note the following: First, the budget agreement specifies the \$16 billion provided as outlay increases and refers to it as funding. Neither term implies a tax cut.

Second, the budget resolution treats the entire \$16 billion provided as an outlay increase. And third, the phrase "mutually agreeable" refers to the parties who negotiate the agreement, the White House, the congressional leadership, the Committee on the Budget leadership.

Does the chairman understand the phrase "mutually agreeable" to mean these parties?

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, to me mutually agreeable means that the leaders of the Congress and the President must agree on the construction of a children's health initiative.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, there is one final issue that bears repetition even though you and I have been very clear on the matter.

The budget agreement and the budget resolution both include funds for five Presidential initiatives, \$16 billion for children's health care coverage, to which we were just referring, \$9.7 billion over 5 years to restore SSI and Medicaid benefits to legal immigrants already in the country who are or may become disabled, \$1.5 billion for food stamps, \$1.5 billion to ease the impact of increasing Medicare premiums on low-income beneficiaries, and \$3 billion for welfare to work.

In each case, amounts have been allocated to the committees of jurisdiction

and netted into the reconciliation targets for each committee. Although these committees have been given directives and targets that would allow them to spend these amounts, the agreement specifically provides additional resources solely for the stated purposes. The agreement in no way contemplates that this spending can be diverted to another program within a committee's jurisdiction or that it can be withheld to meet spending reductions that that committee is called upon to make.

This is my view. Is it also the view of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH]?

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, in each of the cases, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] listed the additional resources provided for these programs are the only agreed upon purposes.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, is it understood that we are evenly dividing the time between us?

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining time, the total time to discuss the conference report, be equally divided between the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KASICH. So how much time do we have, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. To clarify, the remaining time that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] has and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] has will be added together and split down the middle.

Mr. KASICH. Just like Solomon. How much time would that then give each side, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Each side has 24 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are about to vote in this House on a conference report that would produce an agreed upon balanced budget, the first balanced budget we have seen since 1969. It will have historic levels of mandatory savings, approaching \$700 billion over the next 10 years. It would extend the life of Medicare for 10 years, accompanied with structural changes of the program, including an adjustment of the reimbursement for managed care in Medicare that would allow rural Americans to have as much choice of the kind of health care they would like to receive as we get in urban areas.

Furthermore, it would change the payments to a prospective basis for home health care and skilled nursing facilities. It would also include in the premium the cost of the shift of home health care but, at the same time, allowing our poorest senior citizens to escape that burden.

But at the end of the day, the \$700 billion in mandatory savings has never been accomplished before in the history of this House. At the same time,

those areas of spending, called the non-defense discretionary, the programs that run the operation of the Federal Government, will grow over the next 5 years at one-half percent. They have grown by 6 percent over the last 10 years. So we have had a significant reduction in the increase of that program, with those programs only growing by one-half percent.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, of course contained in here is a tax cut that would be \$135 billion over 5 years that could be used to provide a capital gains tax cut to provide incentives for people who take risks, a lowering of the cost of the death tax, allowing people who spent a lifetime building small businesses to be able to pass on what they have earned and worked for for a lifetime to their children at a lower rate of taxation by the Government. It would also provide for family tax credits, something that we believe would help to provide incentives to keep the American family together, to help reinforce the purposes of the American family, which is to build a stronger society. In addition, there will be tax relief for moms and dads and students who have had to spend an enormous amount of money on the cost of education.

Mr. Speaker, this agreement is underlaid by very conservative economics. This presumes that the economy will grow over the period of the next 5 years by a very conservative estimate of 2.1 percent. That presumes at some point the economy will grow faster. It also presumes at some point the economy will grow slower.

To put that in perspective, the Reagan program of the 1980s had a projected growth in order to get this budget under control of about 4.4 percent. This is a far more conservative foundation, only arguing that this economy would grow by 2.1 percent.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I believe this agreement has bipartisan support and, therefore, will result in bipartisan enforcement. And in case any of my colleagues question it, as we know, we had a major fight here in the House of Representatives over transportation funding. Republicans and Democrats worked together to reject that amendment that we thought would begin to unravel this agreement. We were successful in being able to defeat that amendment in the U.S. Senate.

The President of the United States actually lobbied against the proposal by Senator KENNEDY and Senator HATCH to raise cigarette taxes to expand certain programs in the Federal agreement, and that was defeated.

I think we will have a commitment on both sides to try to enforce this, and I would ask my colleague from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT], to really work hard diligently with me, as I know he will, in trying to enforce this agreement. I have got news for everybody, this is not an agreement only to be enforced against the Democrats. It is an agreement to be enforced against the Republicans as well.

We have reached an agreement, honorable people have reached an agreement. We have got to do our best to keep that agreement, even at times when it is uncomfortable and even at times when particular Members of both parties might get very upset about it. I came on this floor last night and had four or five chairmen tackle me as I got into the well telling me how difficult it was and how we needed to have change.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, it is going to be necessary for us to maintain the integrity of this agreement. We need to do it as much as we can on a bipartisan basis. And frankly, our job is to call them like we see them, to make sure that we keep our word, and that is very, very important.

□ 1415

I know a lot of people in the country, a lot of the American people really wonder whether we can get a balanced budget under this agreement. The fact is there have been countless politicians who have promised it in the past. I think we have got the best opportunity that we have had at least during my career, because we have the specifics that will drive the policy changes that will begin saving money in the area of entitlements from the moment we pass those permanent changes in the law that will occur this year. I also believe the American people will see these tax cuts. There will in fact be an opportunity to give power back to people by putting more money in their pockets.

In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, it is important for the House, for Republicans and Democrats, to keep their word, to deliver a budget that the people have asked for in this country, accompanied by a return of their power and money, and influence. This is not the end of the day. Obviously we have tremendous challenges as it relates to the problems of Social Security, where in fact we are going to have to give Americans more control over their earnings and their investment opportunities. We are going to have to develop a more effective voucher program on Medicare, so in fact our seniors can have the same kind of choices that their adult children have. And clearly we are going to have to talk to the baby boomers about the concept of long-term managed care insurance and trying to move Medicaid into the area of help for the disabled and the children.

But we have got a huge challenge as baby boomers begin to retire. The Committee on the Budget is going to conduct a series of hearings about the coming wave. We will have to move forward with more creative and more innovative and more imaginative plans and programs, but this is a very big first step. If we can get this done, Mr. Speaker, then I believe we communicate to the American people that we are capable of handling a myriad of very sensitive programs in a very responsible way, gaining the support of

the American people that as we move to enact more bold initiatives affecting entitlement programs that affect their lives, they will have a higher level of confidence that we can get it right.

Furthermore, I do not believe this is the end of the day on the issue of tax cuts. I think there will be a lot more to be said about this issue, that in fact the Republicans will continue to push for more growth-oriented tax cuts, more tax cuts that enforce the American family but, bottom line, that reflect the values of rewarding people for hard work and investment and risk-taking and at the same time create the power in the pockets of the American people. We believe that is where the power ought to be.

For about 40 or 50 years Americans gave up a lot of their power, money and influence in the name of justice and progress, and frankly a lot of justice and progress was achieved in the United States. But many of us have gotten the sense, in fact the vast majority of Americans have gotten the sense over the last decade that frankly it is time to shrink the Government and let the American people have more power and more influence to heal the problems in their neighborhoods, in their States, in their communities and in their families. That is going to be the watchword, Mr. Speaker.

But I think we should celebrate today an agreement that will in fact bring about that balanced budget in a real way, with tax cuts provided, and something that represents a first step toward hope that at the end of the day the next generation, in fact, is going to have a beautiful America, consisting of the same kind of opportunities that we had as young men and young women. At the same time I believe, Mr. Speaker, this is the first step toward beginning to deal significantly with entitlement programs that really have resulted in less savings, less productivity, less wage increases, and have placed a tremendous burden on the American family.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the end of the day but it is a very, very bright start; really, frankly, more than that first glorious sunrise. The sun is above that right now. It has actually risen above the mountains, but we have got a way to go before we can ensure to everybody that the next generation of Americans are going to have the kind of security that we all pray that they will.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I would simply like to say that the gentleman stated as well as possibly could be stated the spirit of this agreement. I walked us through a tedious colloquy about compliance with different fine points in the agreement and important points in the agreement, but the gentleman stated it well when he stated that we all have to work together, Democrats and Republicans alike, to

see that this agreement is fulfilled in the form that it is intended as we pass a budget resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

(Mrs. CLAYTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the budget resolution agreement. An agreement is a compromise, a settlement, a consensus. An agreement does not necessarily provide all that we want but it does provide some things we want.

This agreement is no different from that. It does provide a balanced budget in 5 years that is good for the Nation, but it continues to have very harsh provisions that allow access to food stamps for hungry people only 3 months out of 3 years. That provision will prove to be bad for the Nation.

The agreement provides an additional \$16 billion over 5 years which will mean health insurance for 5 million children who are currently uninsured, and that is good. These additional moneys will help us, certainly, to have healthy children.

But the agreement does not extend health coverage for another 5 million children that would be left out, Mr. Speaker, and, worse, the agreement hurts hospitals in rural communities, although I know that the chairman does not think so. The agreement hurts hospitals in rural communities that face increases in their Medicaid disproportionate share hospital payments. We must work on this issue beyond this conference report.

This agreement is good for education, a national priority. The \$35 billion investment in education tax cuts, the increase of \$300 in Pell grants and the expansion of Head Start go a long way to feed the minds of our American children.

This agreement is also charitable to this Nation's hard-working families. The \$500 per child tax credit, the welfare-to-work credit, and the establishment of additional empowerment zones and enterprise communities are important. Those will go a long way to boost our economy. But the agreement is bad for those who want to work and cannot find a job.

I do look forward in the Committee on Agriculture next week to passing language governing the \$1.5 billion increase in funds to allow States to exempt up to 15 percent of their food stamp load. But those funds and the \$3 million in additional funds for welfare-to-work simply will not go far enough. Many who find themselves without work, without income, many without the ability to feed their families certainly need help. Again, we must continue to work on this issue beyond this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, indeed there are things we like about this. There are many things we do not. We will work, Mr. Speaker, to make sure that those who

are left out of this compromise be a part of the American dream.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN].

Mr. CARDIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference agreement, and I want to congratulate the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the chairman, and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT], the ranking member, for their ability to bring forward a conference report on the budget that carries out the spirit of the bipartisan agreement.

The key to our ability to balance the budget in 5 years and protect the priorities that are important to the American people is the fact that we have had Democrats and Republicans working together in a bipartisan manner in the best interests of our country. But now it is time for the committees to act. That is going to be more difficult.

Let me say on an optimistic note that yesterday the Committee on Ways and Means Subcommittee on Health met on the Medicare provisions and voted by unanimous vote on the Medicare provisions providing for \$115 billion of savings. Democrats and Republicans working together, we have a good Medicare proposal to include in the budget reconciliation. I would urge all the committees to work together in a bipartisan way.

Let me just say a word of caution. We have already seen in regards to legal immigrants that we have not had that type of working together between Democrats and Republicans on the committee of jurisdiction. I am deeply concerned that we have Democrats and Republicans working together to make sure that the revenues stay true to the agreement, that we do not have more revenue lost than the \$85 billion net over the 5-year period and \$250 billion over the 10-year period. We do not want exploding deficits. But unless we have Democrats and Republicans working on the bill that come forward in reconciliation to make sure that is the case, then I am afraid we will not enjoy the same type of bipartisan support that we see here today.

My word of caution is let us follow the example that we have seen to date and work together in a true bipartisan manner on all the ingredients of budget reconciliation. If we continue to work together as Democrats and Republicans, we will have a good budget reconciliation bill that will be in the best interests of the American people.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report and in support of the bipartisan agreement to balance the Federal budget.

What a long way we have come since 1995 and 1996, to have an agreement

that got a majority of both caucuses of the House and of the other body to support it. This is a bill which strikes the right balance between fiscal responsibility and making those investments which are needed to address the challenges facing our Nation, especially in the areas of children's health care, education and environmental protection.

But this agreement is only the first step. Now we must write reconciliation and appropriation bills to implement it. Our challenge is now to remain faithful to the agreement in writing the implementing legislation and to act in the same bipartisan good faith that has brought us to this point. And, as my colleague from Maryland just spoke, we must resist any temptation to undermine the agreement with extreme provisions or to fudge the numbers.

In particular, I would like to talk briefly about the Medicaid reconciliation language. I think we need to be very cautious with respect to disproportionate share as it affects heavily impacted hospitals, including our children's hospitals, and as it relates to protecting lower income elderly with the change in home health care to part B.

Overall, Mr. Speaker, I think this is a budget in the right direction. It is one where we showed that we could compromise and try and reach the goals that both parties seek. I am eager to see it come to conclusion, and hopeful that we can all support the reconciliation and appropriations bills in the same way we have this outline.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHERMAN].

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the budget resolution and the conference agreement. Like any agreement or compromise, it is imperfect, but it does provide some very essential elements. It provides that we will balance the budget by the year 2002, and as the chairman pointed out, it reaches that conclusion based on conservative economic assumptions.

I believe that a balanced budget will do more to spur business in this country than any of the business incentive proposals that may have arisen on the Republican side of the aisle, and will do more to help the poor than any of the Great Society programs that are popular on this side of the aisle.

It does not mess with the cost of living increases promised to Social Security recipients, and leaves the calculation of the CPI in the hands of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Finally, and I want to bring this to the attention of the House, this budget agreement is particularly good for the environment, particularly when it comes to the acquisition of environmentally important lands. As Tony Beilenson's successor, when I found myself on the Committee on the Budget, I wanted to focus on an issue that

was not making the biggest headlines but where I thought I could have an impact, and I wanted to focus on making funds available for parklands acquisition.

I want to thank the President for making parklands acquisition a priority. When the budget agreement came to the Committee on the Budget, I put forward an amendment that would specify that \$700 million of additional funds would be spent to acquire environmentally sensitive lands and that those funds would be spent in 1998.

□ 1430

I want to thank the chairman, who in a bipartisan fashion urged the support of that amendment, I want to thank the ranking member who prevailed in the conference, who fought to include that amendment in the conference report, and I want to urge my colleagues to support the conference agreement because it moves us forward. It quadruples the funds available, 1997 to 1998, for the acquisition of environmentally sensitive lands.

We need to balance the budget, and we also need to balance the use of our lands between economic activity and preservation for posterity. This budget moves in that direction.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, how many times have each of us heard from the people we represent, "Why can't you guys just get together in Washington and balance the budget?" I have heard it scores of times. Of course, there is nothing easy about getting together to balance the budget. That budget reflects innumerable spending priorities. There is wide difference of opinion between the parties in terms of some of those priorities. That budget contemplates the entire Tax Code of this country. Of course there is broad disagreement within this Chamber among Members in terms of how the Tax Code ought to be structured.

So there is nothing easy about getting together to balance the budget. But on the other hand, the facts surrounding our tackling this task this year have made it, if not now, never.

Four years ago, nearly \$300 billion deficit; this year looking at a deficit in the range of \$68 billion. We are almost there, just that final push required.

And so I salute the budget chairman in the House, budget chairman in the Senate, commitment of majority leadership in the Congress working with the President to reach this balanced budget reflecting agreements worked out between the parties, between the philosophies, on how to bridge the gap and finally get the job done.

As has been mentioned before, no agreement is perfect. I certainly would have written this differently. But on the other hand, I do think it is a reasonable balancing of interests, reasonable compromising of perspectives, and it leads us to a balanced budget.

Today is only, in a way, the ratification of the agreement, the committing of the promise for a balanced budget plan. The actual doing of the plan rests before the respective committees of jurisdiction, most particularly the Committee on Ways and Means, as this goes forward. It is in this respect the final tale of this bill will be told. Will it work, will it hold, or will it fall apart as the committees of jurisdiction simply refuse to live within the bounds of this agreement?

We are all going to have to swallow hard, both sides, members of every committee of jurisdiction, in abiding by the terms of this agreement, but failure to do so would be deeply disappointing to the people of this country. For too long they have asked us to work together to balance the budget, and we have told them no, we have not gotten the job done. Now we can get it done, and I am very pleased to urge a yes vote on this agreement.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PITTS].

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the balanced budget agreement of 1997. With the passage of this agreement today, we can move to the task of enacting the balanced budget plan. This agreement is a good first step toward the goals of balancing our budget, providing permanent tax relief for American families and reducing the size and scope of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I believe today that the American families deserve a break, a tax break, and the balanced budget plan will give American families some of the tax relief they deserve. Our congressional leaders and the President have come up with a plan which will give Americans \$135 billion in tax relief over 5 years and \$250 billion over 10 years in tax relief.

The tax relief package in this budget ensures that all Americans win. With it we can provide relief for families with children with a per child tax credit, the opportunity for people to keep their family farms and businesses with death tax relief, incentives for job creation and economic growth with capital gains tax relief, incentives for savings and investment with IRA expansion and relief for families who send their kids to college.

Some on the other side say that is too much. They claim American families can actually afford to pay more to Washington. I say they cannot. I urge the liberals to join their President in supporting real permanent tax relief for the American family by supporting this balanced budget agreement.

Mr. Speaker, not only does this conference report give tax relief, it reduces the size and scope of the Federal Government. In current dollars Washington will spend less than over the next 5 years in nondefense discre-

tionary spending than it has since 1969. That is the last time Washington balanced its books.

The congressional leaders and the Presidents have worked together to create a plan which will save the taxpayers \$961 billion over the next 10 years. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this important balanced budget agreement.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference resolution. I commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the chairman, and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT], the ranking member, for the work they have put into this resolution in setting the numbers into order for bringing about a balanced budget in 2002. That is something that certainly I and most Members of this body, both sides of the aisle, have agreed to in principle.

Two concerns I express today, and it has been gratifying to me to hear from the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] as well as from the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] the importance of enforcing these numbers. It is one thing today to pass this beginning, and that is the budget agreement that we have today. The proof of the pudding will be in the eating, though, and that is whether or not we actually make it to those numbers, and only by enforcing not only discretionary spending levels, but also entitlement spending levels and the tax cut levels, because if we cut more taxes than we have agreed to in this, the deficit will go up and we will not achieve that which we have said we intend to do today.

So I am very glad to hear the spirit in which both sides of the aisle, at least on the budget committees, have agreed that we will see to it that each bill, the tax bill and the other enforcement bills, will stand to the test of whether or not they meet these numbers so that we can all celebrate in 2002 by actually getting to that promised land of a balanced budget.

Again, I close by saying I commend the chairman for his work in this endeavor, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT], other Members who have been responsible for getting us to this point. I look forward to rolling up my sleeves now through a long hot summer and seeing that we actually do that which we say we are doing today.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN], a member of the committee.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, it is my great privilege to rise in support of this budget agreement today and to talk about just how important it is for the future of this great country that we live in.

A lot of people forget that it was back in the late 1980's that we had Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, and they promised the people that we were going to get to a balanced budget, and they went along for about a year, and then they gave up on that promise up and deficits went up, and then they made a new promise. It was Gramm-Rudman-Hollings of 1987, and they went along for about a year, and then they gave up on that promise and they missed their targets.

A lot of folks forget that we are in the third year of a 7-year plan to balance the Federal budget. For 3 years now the Republican Party after the takeover in 1994 has been talking about getting to a balanced budget by 2002, and we are in the third year. First 2 years are in the bank. They are done, and we are not only on track, we are ahead of schedule, and we are now passing our third budget resolution. I am happy to say, with support from both sides of the aisle. In a bipartisan way, working together, we have come to see how good this can be for the future of the country.

Because, see, our theory was this. The theory was if the Government borrowed less money out of the private sector; that is, we controlled the growth of Government spending, the deficit came down; Government borrowed less money out of the private sector, that meant there would be more money available in the private sector. With more money available, the interest rates would stay down, and if the interest rates stayed down, we expected then that people would buy more houses and cars and other things because the interest rates were low, and when they bought houses and cars, other people would go to work building those houses and cars, and that would mean the welfare rolls would come down and those folks would start paying taxes in what worked better than anyone ever imagined. There are job opportunities, unemployment is down. The deficit, in fact, is \$100 billion below what we projected just 2 short years ago.

And under this budget resolution that we are working with today, we are on track to balance by the year 2000. Medicare is restored for a decade. The American people get to keep more of their own money, and I think this is real significant.

I talked to some friends back in Janesville, Wisconsin, and they may not understand what CBO and OMB and all of these numbers really mean, but I said to them they have got one headed off to college, would a college tax tuition credit help? They said it sure will. And there are 2 kids that are still home in their house; they get \$1,000 for those 2 kids, \$500 per child. Do they understand the meaning of the \$500 per child and the college tax credit, and they sure understood those things. To a family earning 40 or \$50,000 a year, keeping \$2,500 more in their pockets, in their home, instead of sending it out

here to Washington, they understood that real well, and that is the significance of this budget agreement. We are not only balancing the budget, but we are letting the American people keep more of their own money.

And the picture gets even brighter. In this budget resolution we may even hit a balanced budget by the year 2000, and think what that means for the future of this great Nation.

So the chairman, congratulations on the great work, and as always to the people on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER].

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kindness. He knows I rise in opposition to this budget resolution. The remarks from the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] about how well we are doing economically and what path we are on, I wish someone from that side had said such kind words back in 1993 when we passed the legislation that led us onto that path.

Yes, there are some good things in this budget deal, but this budget is a bad deal for the residents of my city of San Diego, and it is a bad deal for America.

Yes, it is a balanced budget, but it is balanced on the backs of our Nation's veterans, children, the elderly, and working families. It is a bad deal that puts a deep freeze on funding for our Nation's veterans, and I speak here as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. It cuts real dollars from the Department of Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, if this is such a good deal, why are so many veterans organizations opposed to it: Paralyzed Veterans of America, AmVets, Blinded Veterans Association, Disabled American Veterans, Military Order of the Purple Heart, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Vietnam Vets of America?

These organizations know that this deal reneges on the promise America has made to our veterans. It cuts pensions for the neediest of veterans, freezes funding for veterans hospitals for the next 5 years and permanently cuts compensation for service-connected disabled veterans.

What happened to the promise that America made with our Nation's veterans? That promise has been forgotten in this deal.

The budget agreement compromises these promises to the past, it ignores our commitments to the future. It underfunds the Nation's infrastructure needs by billions of dollars and dramatically cuts investments in our Nation's future workers. Head Start, summer jobs, and education funding overall are cut while billions of dollars in corporate welfare are kept safe and sound. It makes the transition from welfare to work more difficult, and half of the Nation's 10 million uninsured children remain uninsured in this budget while lavish tax cuts are doled out to those making over a half million a year.

Americans deserve a better deal, a real balanced budget through kept promises, shared sacrifices, and necessary investments in the future. Today's budget resolution fails that test.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. GRANGER].

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, today we are taking an important step toward making the balanced budget agreement a reality. While approval of the conference agreement is just one step toward a balanced budget, this agreement is a giant step for America's future.

The last time we balanced the budget was 1969, the year my first child was born. I proudly watched that young man walk down the aisle to receive his Doctor of Jurisprudence just 3 weeks ago. That means my oldest child has not seen a balanced budget from this Federal Government since the day he was born.

□ 1445

My twins, a son and daughter, have never seen a balanced budget in their lifetimes.

Our children do not remember a balanced budget, so they do not know what difference it will make in their lives; but they are not alone, because millions of Americans have forgotten what it is like for the Federal Government to treat their money responsibly.

Today I would like to take a moment just to remind us. I have had a lot of different jobs in my life, and each position has taught me why this opportunity to finally produce a balanced budget is really important. I was the mayor of Fort Worth, TX, and as the mayor I learned that local communities need more power and less mandates from Washington. A balanced budget we will consider today will return power, money, and decisions back to families and communities.

I also founded two insurance companies, and as a small businesswoman I discovered that new jobs and opportunities can only be created with a growing economy. By forcing the Government to balance its books, a balanced budget will yield more than 4 million new jobs over 10 years and raise incomes by 16 percent. And this balanced budget includes a capital gains tax cut to unleash a rising tide of new jobs, higher incomes, and raised hopes. The capital gains tax reduction of this balanced budget will make the American dream a reality for millions of people.

I also was a public school teacher. I taught for 9 years, and I know there is nothing more important than education. By eliminating the deficit, a balanced budget will lower the cost of a student loan by nearly \$9,000. A college education will be more affordable to young men and women across the United States.

But my most important job convinced me the most critical reason why a balanced budget is so important, and that is my role as the mother of three

children. By reforming entitlements and providing a child tax credit, this balanced budget will make sure that America looks toward the future. It will make my sons and daughter, and your children, have the same kind of opportunities that people in this Congress have had.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE].

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to oversell this budget agreement. There is certainly much to criticize in the agreement. Some of the previous speakers have dwelt on these shortcomings, but I would like to begin my remarks by pointing out some of the positive qualities of this agreement.

First and foremost, it is bipartisan. There are many Democrats and there are many Republicans who will not vote for this agreement. But conversely, the majority in both Caucuses will no doubt be supporting the agreement, and it will pass by a substantial margin in this body.

That is important because we need a budget agreement that will survive the next election, whoever may be the majority in this body, and bipartisanship is critical if we are going to make some of the tough decisions and expect to make them stick for the length of time necessary to reach our goal; namely, eliminating the deficit.

Second, this budget agreement does rely on realistic economic assumptions, forecasts about what the economy will do, forecasts about the demands that will be placed upon the Federal Government for programs that are already well-established. It is critical that we have realistic assumptions, because altogether too often this country has based its so-called budget agreements on phoney assumptions, smoke and mirrors, and what we have seen is an unraveling of what was supposed to have been dramatic corrective action.

Third, this budget agreement does contain reforms and limitations on spending and on programs. This is not easy. There are many who are affected by these cutbacks in programs, and I think that we owe an explanation to these folks. Yet at the same time, we know that we cannot have long-term solvency in Federal operations without making some tough decisions. Yet, we must make these decisions in such a way that we know that in the outyears we can live with them. We will not see a future administration repudiate the agreement.

So these are positive attributes that I wish to emphasize, and at a later point I am sure we will have a chance to revisit some of the downside considerations.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA].

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time. I would also like to congratulate the chairman and the rank-

ing committee member for the work that they have done on this process, because I think what they have really enabled us to do is that they have taken away the debate about the size of Government, at least for the next 2 to 4 years; they have enabled us to develop a path to getting to a surplus budget.

We can start the discussion on how to pay down the debt. But they are also going to liberate all of the authorizing committees to really focus on solving the problems facing this country within the context and the framework of this budget, so that we can take a look at how more effectively and more efficiently we can address and solve the problems facing this country.

Specifically, the other committee that I serve on, the Committee on Education and the Workforce, we can now go back and take a look at the 760 education programs that we have, the 40 different agencies that are working on educating our kids, the \$100 billion that we spend each and every year and say, how can we improve education in America? In meeting with our ranking member, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK], we have already agreed that we can go forward and we can eliminate the 100 programs that have not been funded over the last number of years.

We know that we can work on consolidating programs. I expect that we are going to be able to work together on focusing on how to get parents more involved in the education process of our children, how we can get more dollars to the classroom.

We can take a look at why are we losing 30 to 40 cents of every dollar we spend in education, why are we losing it in the bureaucracy, so that we can definitely have more effective plans to deliver safe schools, so that we can move control back to the local level.

We can answer the question of why a local school may only get 6 percent of their dollars from Washington, but 40 to 50 percent of their paperwork, so that we can focus on developing an emphasis on basic academics in the classroom.

Education needs a major focus. We now have the framework to get that done. I thank the ranking member and the chairman for giving us this opportunity.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I would just say to my colleagues, I am amazed at this debate. I think of how far we have come. As far as the press is concerned, there is no story here, because Republicans and Democrats are not fighting like little kids. When Republicans and Democrats get together and help save this country for future generations, no story here.

Mr. Speaker, I think of this Chamber in 1989, when the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] introduced an amendment to start to balance our budget, get our country's financial house in order. Each year he took on that effort. It is

the culmination, since 1989, what we are seeing today with the work on a bipartisan basis, with the help of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] and others. I just first want to congratulate him for what he has done over these many years, with such good nature and freshness.

We are going to get our country's financial house in order and balance the Federal budget, and I think we are going to do it in less than 5 years with this agreement. We are going to save our trust funds for not just future generations, but for present generations, because Medicare is running out of money as we speak. Our plan will save it for the next 10 years. We are going to transform this caretaking society into a caring society. We are not just ending welfare and moving mothers into work, we are ending corporate welfare, we are ending welfare for farmers as well in this budget agreement.

We are moving from a caretaking society to a caring society, and in the process we are moving the power and the money and the influence back home where it belongs.

This agreement is not everything everyone wants it to be, but it does the basic things that both sides felt were important. We want it to slow the growth of entitlements and save our trust funds and we are doing that. We wanted tax cuts, meaningful tax cuts in particular areas, and we are doing that.

The other side in particular, and the President of the United States wanted some priorities for domestic spending, education, health care, and we are doing that.

So hats off to both sides of the aisle. Congratulations, in my judgment, on a job well done. Our work is cut out for us in the next few years to make sure we all live up to it.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, having no further requests for time, I will close for our side.

Mr. Speaker, this is the last lap in a long race. I came here in 1983, and we were just beginning to recognize and struggle with the long-term implications of the deficit then. There was Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, there was a budget summit in 1990, there was a Deficit Reduction Act in 1993. And in every one of those cases, which I supported deficit reduction, the best that we could say, the best that we could reach for was a partial effort. We did not even pretend in any of those cases to have a solution in the short term for the deficit we face down the road.

Today we are able to say credibly to the country and to our colleagues in the Congress, we are within reach of a balanced budget. Within the next 5 years, we can get it done, because today in truth we stand on the shoulders of those who came before us and acted before us in 1990. It cost us some of the people who supported what we did then. The results were largely

eclipsed by a recession, but it was significant. Among other things, we put on the statute book to this country two rules: the pay-go rule, which essentially says, if we want to expand or liberalize entitlements, we either have to pay for it or identify commensurate spending cuts elsewhere in another entitlement program; and the discretionary spending caps, which have worked. They have not been breached since 1991.

In 1993 we came back, because in 1990 the budget summit had not really yielded measurable significant results. We laid out a 5-year plan to cut the deficit, we hoped, by half; we barely claimed we would do that much. We extended the discretionary spending caps for 5 years, we reduced entitlement spending, and we were brazen enough, brave enough, some would say, to raise taxes.

The result was not, as some predicted, a disaster in the economy. The economy took note of what we did, the financial markets were pleased, revenues began picking up, interest rates started down, the inflation rates stabilized; and guess what? The revenues of the Federal Government began to pick up again. We restored the revenue basis of this Government.

For example, corporate income taxes have risen by \$71 billion between 1992 and 1996, up more than 70 percent, and that is part of the reason, at the end of the last fiscal year, fiscal year 1996, the deficit was \$107.8 billion, down 65 percent from the deficit predicted in 1993 when President Bush left office. That is substantial progress, and that is why I say we have come several laps, and we are not at the last lap. We are really talking about an effort today that is only partially the same size as the two previous efforts in 1990, and particularly in 1993.

Because we are within reach, and because we did this in a bipartisan way, this is as much a budget agreement as a balanced budget agreement. We have set this goal realistically and conservatively, and I think credibly before us, and I think we will achieve it if the economy does not go south on us. But at the same time, we have recognized that the country has other problems and the Government has other pressing priorities than just balancing the budget. And we do not make a lot of room for these other priorities, but we do recognize, for example, that middle income American families are struggling with the way and whether or not they can pay for their children's education. We are going to bring them more tax relief in the bill that we are authorizing in this budget resolution and anything that has been done in the last 20 to 25 years.

A couple of years ago we tried to enact universal health care, and we bit off more than we could chew. We have decided to back up and take it step by step, incrementally. We did Kennedy-Kassebaum last year. This year in this bill we set aside \$16 billion over the

next 5 years in order to implement measures so that America's children, mostly in working families who do not enjoy the benefit and security of health insurance coverage, can have health insurance coverage, another incremental step toward providing health insurance coverage by Americans who need it.

□ 1500

We went back to welfare reform. We took some of the hard and harsh edges off, particularly as they impact legal immigrants in this country. We did some things that needed to be done and could not have been done unless we did it in a bipartisan way. I am proud of the fact that these accomplishments can be accounted for by this agreement.

A lot of people, some commentators, some editorial writers, have said, can all of this be done? Can you really go after these ends and other policy goals and at the same time balance the budget? What about this \$25 billion a year in extra revenues that you added at the last minute to make this agreement possible?

In truth if we look, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] said, at the underlying economic assumptions, the economic forecast that underlies this budget, most of the premises are very basic and very conservative. For example, in no year over the next 5 years do we assume growth exceeding 2.3 percent. Compared to what is happening now, that is a very conservative assumption.

This agreement has not come easily. We have been at work at it for the last 4 months, long days, late nights, weekends, some bitter dissension. But I will say this: Throughout all of the negotiation, we have maintained a spirit of common purpose, cordiality, and civility which will serve us well now that we go into the implementation phase.

The gentleman from Ohio was correct to anticipate that there will be struggles, there will be problems as we deal with the authorizing committee and the Committee on Appropriations and try to bring them to fruition in the form it is conceived in this budget resolution. That is the big challenge before us. But if we maintain that same spirit of civility, cordiality, and common purpose, we can do it. We can put them to bed. We can carry it out as intended, and we can balance the budget in 5 fiscal years.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a letter from Senator ROTH, chairman of the Finance Committee, and the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. ARCHER], the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, with respect to the tax bill.

The letter referred to is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, June 4, 1997.

Hon. PETE V. DOMENICI,
Chairman, Senate Budget Committee, Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN R. KASICH,
Chairman, House Budget Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR PETE AND JOHN: Our Committees will soon begin marking up tax legislation to meet the reconciliation directives of the 1998 Budget Resolution. We will meet the Resolution's instructions of reducing revenues by \$85 billion over the five year period 1998-2002 and by no more than \$20.5 billion in 2002.

Furthermore, we can assure you that, consistent with the May 15, 1997 letter from the Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate to the President which stated, "It was agreed that the net tax cut shall be \$85 billion through 2002 and not more than \$250 billion through 2007," the ten year net revenue loss in the tax reconciliation bill will not exceed \$250 billion.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM V. ROTH,
Chairman, Finance
Committee.

BILL ARCHER,
Chairman, Ways and
Means Committee.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the next speaker is my dear friend, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. DAVE HOBSON. He has been of enormous help to me through this program, really since 1993. I have personally been working on this since 1989. But the gentleman came on the committee, along with my dear friend, the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. CHRIS SHAYS and the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. BOB FRANKS, and they were all particularly special, particularly my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. DAVE HOBSON, who would take my calls at 1:30 in the morning. I would wake him up, try to get his advice in certain areas. We had a lot of struggles and we have developed some very deep friendships on this committee as a result of this effort.

I want to suggest to the people here in the House and to the Speaker that what is remarkable about this debate is I thought that this was going to be like game one against Utah, where we would have to sink a basketball at the buzzer, and in that famous pose of Michael Jordan at the end, he just gave him that hand. We thought it would be a buzzer-beater to balance the budget. What we are seeing happening is a sea change in the attitude of the House of Representatives. Frankly, it is a sea change we are seeing in the Congress. It is one to embrace, it is one to be joyful about, it is one to celebrate, rather than the fighting, the dynamics of this whole debate of change to an era of less government and more power back to the people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the very distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOBSON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA). The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOBSON] is recognized for 3 minutes.

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

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, this is an exciting day for this Chamber and this country. This plan that we are going to approve today is one more example of our Congress keeping its promises to the people of this country. We said we would balance the budget and save Medicare, and we are. We said we would cut taxes, and we are. These are the things that this Congress came to Washington to do, and we are making good on our promises to the American people by passing this conference report today. The House and Senate worked closely on this budget, and the administration is also on board. Frankly, this is the way we should be doing legislation. This is the way people want us to do legislation, by people coming together, putting aside our partisan differences, and passing legislation that is good for the country as a whole, both today and tomorrow.

I just had my fourth grandchild, and I know a lot of times other people's grandchildren are not the most exciting things to hear about, but they are to them. But frankly, without this balanced budget plan, my grandchild will face a very tough future. Without this balanced budget, Government is going to go on spending and go on racking up more debt and mortgaging her future.

But we are going to put a stop to that right now. Like every American family and business, the Federal Government is now going to have to live within this budget, with less Government spending. We will see more job creation, more money for investment, and more private sector growth.

This budget also preserves one of our most important programs, Medicare. Millions of Americans have been spared crushing poverty because Medicare was there to share the cost of health care for seniors. But without some reform, this 30-year-old program was going to go out of date and Medicare would be doomed. This budget prevents medicare bankruptcy and also gives seniors new health care options. As a new senior myself, I do not mind that much. As a grandfather, I am interested in making sure my grandchildren get the benefit from Medicare also when it comes their time.

The Earth is not going to shake when we pass this conference report and the heavens will not part, as nice as the weather is outside. But in 20 or 30 years we just might hear people talking in such terms when they recollect the importance, frankly, of what we are going to do here in a few minutes. It is just one more example of this Congress doing what it said it would do to make our country a better place for everyone to live in.

I urge the passage of this conference report, and I want to thank both my chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], my special friend; our staff, who has done a great job; all the members of the Committee on the

Budget; and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] and his staff.

This has been one of the few times in recent memory when we have had a true bipartisan agreement, an agreement with ourselves and the President, and frankly, one we can all be very proud of, not only now but in the future. So let us all go out and pass this conference report, and move forward so all of our children and grandchildren are going to have the future we want them to have.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, veterans health care needs are critically important to the VA Committee. We will maintain a close watch on the impact of this year's budget development on veterans health care concerns. The administration's budget was a package flawed from the beginning. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the President's proposal did not balance. The administration also predicated a substantial portion of their veterans health care budget on an untested and risky legislative proposal allowing VA to retain and use third-party receipts.

I want to make that clear—it was an administration proposal that recommended a switch from fully appropriated funding of veterans health care to the use of third-party receipts. I have always supported using third-party receipts as a supplement, not a substitute, for veterans health care funding. Our committee believed that reliance upon keeping insurance receipts as part of the budget this year was premature. However, the budget agreement ignored our concerns, so we're going to do what we can to make this proposal work.

According to an analysis which came to light after the agreement was announced, there is a \$2.2 billion difference between proposed discretionary spending, mainly in VA health care, and what had been proposed in the President's budget for veterans.

Approximately \$1.1 billion is due to use of the CBO baseline projections for discretionary veterans spending—a technical estimating difference.

The other \$1.1 billion issue to agreements made by the negotiators to protect spending for certain priorities of the President.

During budget negotiations, the administration asked that spending for certain programs—not including veterans health care—be protected from future reductions. For instance, in 1998, the President insisted that of about \$258 billion in projected spending for nondefense discretionary spending, approximately \$127 billion be protected for categories such as international affairs, natural resources and environment, transportation, and education, training, employment and social services. The Budget Agreement includes \$33.6 billion in funding over 5 years for the President's domestic initiatives such as assistance to immigrants, nutrition assistance, welfare to work, children's health, Federal land acquisition, environmental reserve, and an offset for low-income Medicare premiums.

Under the agreement, total spending for veterans benefits and services would rise very slightly over the next 5 years, from \$40.5 billion in 1998 to \$42.6 billion in 2002, a 5-percent total increase over this period—compared with almost a 13-percent increase in overall Federal spending authority over the same period.

Spending for discretionary programs, mainly veterans health care, would remain at be-

tween \$18 and \$19 billion, while spending for mandatory benefits, mainly veterans compensation and pension benefits, would increase from \$23.3 to \$24.6 billion.

Ultimately, I support the budget agreement as one that is good for the country. This is a package that at least permits the advancement of the critically important third-party receipts issue. The bottom line is that discretionary spending levels were largely dictated by the President's negotiators, who worked overtime to protect his priorities. Since this budget—unlike the President's—actually eliminates the deficit in 2002, the rest of the discretionary categories, including veterans, had to pay the price for these decisions. However, the Appropriations Committee still has the flexibility within the discretionary caps to change the VA spending levels. Thus, it is just as important as ever to work with the Appropriations Committee to see that veterans health care and other needs are met, and I intend to work to that end.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I know of no other group who loves our country more than our Nation's veterans. They have answered our country's call, proudly worn our Nation's uniform and gone into harm's way when asked to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I believe most veterans support a balanced Federal budget which is fair and honest. This should come as no surprise to anyone. Again and again veterans have signaled their willingness to do their fair share to achieve this important goal. While veterans are clearly willing to do their fair share, our Federal budget should not be balanced on the backs of those men and women who have served our country honorably and well.

For many, their military service meant great hardship and sacrifice. Our Nation's veterans should not be asked to bear an unfair burden in balancing the budget—but that is exactly what is being asked of America's veterans today.

Earlier this year, the House Committee on Veterans Affairs considered the budget proposed for veterans. At that time, our committee expressed strong reservations about the budget proposed for veterans health care. That proposal called for a 5-year freeze in appropriations for veterans health care. To offset the devastating impact of this freeze, the Department of Veterans Affairs was to be given the opportunity to retain receipts it was able to collect from third-parties, such as insurance companies, for care which VA provided to some veterans.

After careful consideration and deliberation, our committee concluded, "in our view, there is too much uncertainty about the reliability of VA's projected third-party collections to hinge the provision of health care on these projections." Mr. Speaker, my view remains unchanged.

The budget plan before us jeopardizes the ability of VA to provide health care to veterans who have honorably served our Nation. Our Nation has a moral obligation to meet the health care needs of these veterans. Indeed, we have a special obligation to those veterans who have a service-connected disability and those veterans who otherwise would not receive the health care they need.

Many veterans' service organizations understandably have decided to oppose the budget resolution before us. I understand the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion,

Paralyzed Veterans of America, Vietnam Veterans of America, and the Disabled American Veterans are among the major veterans organizations to speak out in opposition to this budget resolution.

I believe their opposition is easily understood. Freezing appropriations for veterans health care and making VA health care delivery dependent on third-party collections clearly jeopardizes the health care benefits our veterans have earned. This policy simply asks too much of veterans who have already answered this Nation's call. Our veterans are right to oppose this budget resolution.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 84, the fiscal year 1998 budget resolution that outlines the parameters under which this Congress will balance the Federal budget and reduce the deficit to zero by the year 2002. This is a truly historic achievement that proves that when we work in a bipartisan fashion, we can achieve our goals of a smaller Government, lower spending, lower taxes, and a balanced budget that our constituents elected us to achieve. There is no such thing as a perfect agreement, but this plan is the best agreement we could develop, and is a tremendous step forward not only for the Congress, but more importantly, for the American people. This agreement demonstrates that by working in a bipartisan fashion, we have the capacity to govern and to compromise—and to listen to the voice of our constituents, which has clearly called for fiscal restraint.

Though our constituents have become increasingly cynical about Government, this agreement will help restore confidence in the institutions and processes of government, and it represents a triumph of the political system and a fulfillment of the voters' 1996 command to Congress to solve our budget problems in a bipartisan fashion. Passing the first balanced budget since man walked on the Moon, for all its faults, is a solid and constructive beginning.

We need to look no further than the States to find evidence of precedent for this balanced budget accord. In almost every State where a balanced budget requirement exists, their economies are rated "excellent" or "very good". The States have set the trend for this, and it is time the Federal Government began to operate in a similar manner and live within its means.

Our constituents will benefit unlike at any time in recent history if we truly place ourselves on a path to a balanced budget. The economic impact that the balanced budget agreement will have manifests itself to the typical family by lowering interest rates by up to 2 percent, raising investment returns, lowering credit card and car loan rates, reducing mortgage payments, lowering consumer product costs, and creating more jobs.

In March, when the budget talks seemed to be breaking down, I introduced a balanced

budget outline that showed that we could achieve a balanced budget essentially by splitting the difference between the President's 1998 budget and the 1997 Republican budget plan. I am pleased that this budget agreement reflects many of the goals and principles I outlined by using budget principles like a deficit reduction glidepath to zero with the deficit declining each year, reforming entitlement programs that preserve and protect Medicare and Medicaid, using Congressional Budget Office economic estimates, assumptions and scoring; introducing no new taxes; and forwarding tax cuts that are affordable and permanent—I forwarded a net tax cut of \$77 billion; the agreement is for a net \$85 billion tax cut.

Though we have a good starting point, we must remain steadfast in our desire to ensure that this budget agreement translates into a budget that does not inflate the deficit or tax cuts, and does not undermine the carefully crafted plan before us. I am concerned that we are including tax cuts without the assurance of a balanced budget, and am also concerned that stronger budget enforcement mechanisms were not included to ensure that the budget reaches balance by 2002. Though this legislation continues "pay-go" budget rules and discretionary spending caps, there are a number of other additional enforcement mechanisms that should have been included that would assure us that spending and revenue fulfill their estimates in the agreement so that deficit targets will be met and the budget can finally be balanced.

Congress must not rest on the initial success of this agreement, but must move forward—using the same framework used to reach this accord—to better address the long-term concerns of further entitlement and budget reform. We have some time to prepare, but we must begin that work soon. I am proud to have played a part in facilitating this agreement and to have the opportunity to see that it is properly implemented, that important Federal priorities continue to be met, and that the budget reconciliation process includes additional budget enforcement mechanisms that will place us, more firmly than ever, on a course to a balanced budget by 2002.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report. Although there are other reasons to oppose this budget agreement, I did want to highlight the progress that the conferees have made in regard to the provision of funds for the acquisition of lands for our national system of parks, refuges, forests, and public lands.

In recent years the administration has failed to request, and the Congress has failed to appropriate, adequate funding for Federal and State land acquisition for conservation and recreation. Despite a growing backlog of needs and willing sellers who desire that their lands be used for public purposes, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act has not

been used as intended for conservation purposes. Oil and gas revenues from offshore leasing, which are by law dedicated to the fund, have been coming at a rate of \$900 million annually, accumulating to total of over \$12 billion in the current fiscal year. Yet the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1997 for the National Park Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, Forest Service, and Bureau of Land Management was only \$179 million. The popular State Grant Program, which has been used to build recreation facilities across the country, has been zeroed out entirely.

Land acquisition is a vital part of our efforts to safeguard public health and enhance the environmental assets of the Nation. Many municipal drinking systems depend on pristine watersheds for clean water which can be protected by acquisition of forested lands. Threats to fish and wildlife species can be mitigated by acquiring prime refuge habitat. Acquisition for park enhancement can contribute to growth of the recreation industry, which already provides many more land-dependent jobs than logging, grazing, and mining. Tens of millions of fishermen and hunters depend on access to clean public waters and productive public lands.

The conference report has responded to these needs by including the President's budget requests for land acquisition, State assistance, and Everglades restoration as protected domestic discretionary priorities. The Interior Appropriations Subcommittee deserves a greater section 602(b) allocation of funds than it has received in the past, for these and other important priorities.

In addition, the budget agreement includes \$700 million over and above the President's requests for priority land acquisition. I applaud Chairman KASICH for this commitment of resources. This offers a much more sensible alternative to the complicated asset and land exchanges that have been proposed by the administration to acquire the Headwaters Redwood Forest in California and to protect Yellowstone National Park ecosystem by eliminating the threat of pollution from the New World mine. We have seen extraordinary success in Alaska with over 500,000 acres of land acquisition and conservation easements acquired by using funds provided through the *Exxon Valdez* settlement trust. The resources provided by the budget agreement can and should be used to duplicate that success across the country. This is a good step forward toward better utilization of the Land and Water Conservation Fund in the future.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a table displaying the policy assumptions in the reconciliation instructions set forth in the conference report accompanying House Concurrent Resolution 84.

RECONCILIATION ASSUMPTIONS BY AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE

(In billions of dollars)

Function	Proposal	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	1998-2002
----- AGRICULTURE -----							
600	Food stamps	0.300	0.300	0.300	0.300	0.300	1.500
	Subtotal, Agriculture	0.300	0.300	0.300	0.300	0.300	1.500
----- BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES -----							
370	FHA single family assignment program	-0.136	-0.145	-0.147	-0.128	-0.110	-0.666
600	Assisted housing	0.000	-0.088	-0.218	-0.294	-0.324	-0.924
	Subtotal, Banking and Financial Services	-0.136	-0.233	-0.365	-0.422	-0.434	-1.590
----- COMMERCE -----							
270	Lease excess SPR capacity	0.000	-0.001	-0.002	-0.004	-0.006	-0.013
550	Medicaid	-0.237	-1.771	-2.651	-3.901	-6.565	-15.125
550	Medicare low-income assistance	0.200	0.300	0.300	0.300	0.400	1.500
550	Children's Health Initiative*	2.500	2.700	3.200	3.700	3.900	16.000
570	Medicare *	-6.500	-16.800	-22.700	-29.000	-40.000	-115.000
950	Spectrum Auctions	0.000	-3.500	-3.500	-4.500	-14.800	-26.300
	Subtotal, Commerce	-4.037	-19.072	-25.353	-33.405	-57.071	-138.938
----- EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE -----							
500	Repeal appropriations. under Smith-Hughes	-0.001	-0.007	-0.007	-0.007	-0.007	-0.029
500	Student Loans	-0.241	-0.240	-0.151	-0.081	-1.050	-1.763
600	Welfare-to-Work grants*	0.700	0.700	1.000	0.600	0.000	3.000
	Subtotal, Economic and Educational Opportunities	0.458	0.453	0.842	0.512	-1.057	1.208

RECONCILIATION ASSUMPTIONS BY AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE

(In billions of dollars)

Function	Proposal	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	1998-2002
----- GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT -----							
<u>Direct Spending:</u>							
370	FECA reimbursement to Postal Service	-0.035	-0.034	-0.033	-0.032	-0.031	-0.165
950	Agency contributions to CSRS	-0.597	-0.591	-0.586	-0.582	-0.577	-2.933
	Subtotal, Government Reform and Oversight	-0.632	-0.625	-0.619	-0.614	-0.608	-3.098
<u>Deficit Reduction:</u>							
rev	Increase employee retirement contribution	0.000	-0.214	-0.423	-0.571	-0.621	-1.829
	Subtotal, Government Reform and Oversight	0.000	-0.214	-0.423	-0.571	-0.621	-1.829
----- TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE -----							
800	Asset sales	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.540	-0.540
400	Extend vessel tonnage fees	0.000	-0.049	-0.049	-0.049	-0.049	-0.196
	Subtotal, Transportation and Infrastructure	0.000	-0.049	-0.049	-0.049	-0.589	-0.736
----- VETERANS AFFAIRS -----							
700	Withholding for VA overpaid benefits*	-0.090	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.090
700	Extend VA income verification (pensions) *	0.000	-0.004	-0.008	-0.012	-0.016	-0.040
700	Extend OBRA home loan provisions	-0.011	-0.228	-0.227	-0.224	-0.219	-0.909
700	Medical care income verification *	0.000	-0.018	-0.019	-0.019	-0.020	-0.076
700	Extend medical care collections	0.000	-0.232	-0.241	-0.252	-0.262	-0.987
700	Medical care administrative cost	-0.118	-0.123	-0.128	-0.133	-0.139	-0.641
700	Extend nursing home pension provisions	0.000	-0.129	-0.203	-0.131	-0.174	-0.637
700	Loan sales enhancements	-0.005	-0.005	-0.005	-0.005	-0.005	-0.025
700	Round Down Compensation COLA	-0.023	-0.051	-0.088	-0.101	-0.128	-0.391
	Subtotal, Veterans Affairs	-0.247	-0.790	-0.919	-0.877	-0.963	-3.796

RECONCILIATION ASSUMPTIONS BY AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE

(In billions of dollars)

Function	Proposal	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	1998-2002
----- WAYS AND MEANS -----							
<u>Direct Spending:</u>							
550	Children's Health Initiative*	2.500	2.700	3.200	3.700	3.900	16.000
550	Assistance to immigrants (Medicaid portion)	0.400	0.400	0.300	0.300	0.300	1.700
570	Medicare *	-6.500	-16.800	-22.700	-29.000	-40.000	-115.000
600	Earned Income Credit (outlays)	0.000	-0.010	-0.028	-0.029	-0.030	-0.097
600	Raise unemployment ceiling	0.000	0.000	-0.200	-0.208	-0.216	-0.624
600	Assistance to immigrants	1.800	1.800	1.700	1.400	1.300	8.000
600	Welfare-to-work grants*	0.700	0.700	1.000	0.600	0.000	3.000
600	Administrative Fees on State SSI Supplements	-0.035	-0.075	-0.080	-0.090	-0.100	-0.380
700	Withholding for VA overpaid benefits*	-0.090	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.090
700	Medical care income verification *	0.000	-0.018	-0.019	-0.019	-0.020	-0.076
700	Extend VA income verification (pensions) *	0.000	-0.004	-0.008	-0.012	-0.016	-0.040
Subtotal, Ways and Means - Direct Spending		-1.225	-11.307	-16.835	-23.358	-34.882	-87.607
<u>Revenue:</u>							
rev	Earned Income Credit (revenue)	0.000	-0.003	-0.008	-0.008	-0.008	-0.027
rev	Net tax relief	7.400	11.300	22.400	23.400	20.500	85.000
Subtotal, Ways and Means - Revenue		7.400	11.297	22.392	23.392	20.492	84.973

RECONCILIATION ASSUMPTIONS BY AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE

(In billions of dollars)

Function	Proposal	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	1998-2002
----------	----------	------	------	------	------	------	-----------

----- TOTAL -----

Direct Spending:

Total	-5.519	-31.323	-42.998	-57.913	-95.304	-233.057
Dual Assignments	-3.390	-13.422	-18.527	-24.731	-36.136	-96.206
Total less dual assignments	-2.129	-17.901	-24.471	-33.182	-59.168	-136.851

Revenue:

Total	7.400	11.083	21.969	22.821	19.871	83.144
Dual Assignments	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Total less dual assignments	7.400	11.083	21.969	22.821	19.871	83.144

Items Which Are Assumed But Not Reconciled

COMMERCE						
Extend Nuclear Regulatory Commission Fees	0.000	-0.325	-0.336	-0.347	-0.359	-1.367

Items to Be Allocated When Legislation is Reported

COMMERCE AND TRANSPORTATION

Environmental Reserve Fund	0.200	0.200	0.200	0.200	0.200	1.000
----------------------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

Only FY 1998, 2002, and 1998 - 2002 amounts are reconciled.

* Denotes items reconciled to more than one committee

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

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 327, nays 97, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 166]

YEAS—327

Abercrombie	Doyle	Kelly
Ackerman	Dreier	Kennelly
Aderholt	Duncan	Kildee
Allen	Dunn	Kim
Archer	Edwards	Kind (WI)
Armey	Ehlers	Kingston
Bachus	Ehrlich	Klecza
Baesler	Emerson	Klink
Baker	English	Knollenberg
Baldacci	Ensign	Kolbe
Ballenger	Eshoo	LaFalce
Barcia	Etheridge	LaHood
Barr	Everett	Lampson
Barrett (NE)	Ewing	Latham
Barrett (WI)	Fattah	LaTourette
Bartlett	Fawell	Lazio
Bass	Fazio	Leach
Bateman	Flake	Levin
Bentsen	Foglietta	Lewis (CA)
Bereuter	Foley	Lewis (KY)
Berman	Forbes	Linder
Berry	Ford	Livingston
Bilbray	Fowler	LoBiondo
Bilirakis	Fox	Loftgren
Bishop	Franks (NJ)	Lowe
Blagojevich	Frelinghuysen	Lucas
Bliley	Frost	Luther
Blunt	Furse	Maloney (CT)
Boehlert	Gallely	Maloney (NY)
Boehner	Gejdenson	Manton
Bonilla	Gekas	Manzullo
Bonior	Gibbons	Martinez
Bono	Gilchrest	Mascara
Boswell	Gillmor	Matsui
Boyd	Gilman	McCarthy (MO)
Brady	Gonzalez	McCarthy (NY)
Bryant	Goodlatte	McCrery
Bunning	Goodling	McDade
Burr	Gordon	McHale
Burton	Goss	McHugh
Buyer	Graham	McInnis
Callahan	Granger	McIntosh
Calvert	Green	McIntyre
Camp	Greenwood	McKeon
Campbell	Gutknecht	McKinney
Canady	Hall (OH)	Meehan
Cannon	Hall (TX)	Meek
Capps	Hamilton	Menendez
Cardin	Hansen	Metcalfe
Carson	Harman	Mica
Castle	Hastert	Miller (FL)
Chabot	Hastings (WA)	Minge
Chambliss	Hayworth	Molinari
Christensen	Hefley	Moran (KS)
Clayton	Hefner	Moran (VA)
Clement	Herger	Morrell
Clyburn	Hilleary	Murtha
Coble	Hinojosa	Myrick
Collins	Hobson	Neal
Combest	Hoekstra	Nethercutt
Condit	Holden	Neumann
Cook	Hooley	Ney
Cooksey	Horn	Northup
Costello	Hostettler	Norwood
Cramer	Houghton	Nussle
Cummings	Hoyer	Ortiz
Cunningham	Hulshof	Oxley
Danner	Hutchinson	Packard
Davis (FL)	Inglis	Pallone
Davis (VA)	Jackson-Lee	Pappas
Deal	(TX)	Parker
DeLauro	Jenkins	Pascarell
DeLay	John	Pastor
Dickey	Johnson (CT)	Paxon
Dicks	Johnson (WI)	Pease
Dingell	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson (MN)
Doggett	Johnson, Sam	Peterson (PA)
Dooley	Jones	Petri
Doolittle	Kasich	Pickett

Pitts	Schaffer, Bob	Tanner
Pomeroy	Schumer	Tauscher
Porter	Sensenbrenner	Tauzin
Portman	Sessions	Taylor (MS)
Poshard	Shaw	Taylor (NC)
Price (NC)	Shays	Thomas
Pryce (OH)	Sherman	Thornberry
Quinn	Shimkus	Thune
Radanovich	Sisisky	Thurman
Ramstad	Skaggs	Tiahrt
Redmond	Skeen	Upton
Regula	Skelton	Vento
Reyes	Smith (MI)	Visclosky
Riggs	Smith (NJ)	Walsh
Riley	Smith (OR)	Wamp
Rivers	Smith (TX)	Watkins
Rodriguez	Smith, Adam	Watts (OK)
Roemer	Smith, Linda	Weldon (PA)
Rogan	Snowbarger	Weller
Rogers	Snyder	Wexler
Ros-Lehtinen	Solomon	White
Rothman	Souder	Whitfield
Roukema	Spence	Wicker
Royce	Spratt	Wise
Ryun	Stabenow	Wolf
Sabo	Stenholm	Woolsey
Sanchez	Strickland	Wynn
Sandlin	Stump	Young (AK)
Sawyer	Stupak	Young (FL)
Saxton	Sununu	
Schaefer, Dan	Talent	

NAYS—97

Barton	Hinchey	Payne
Becerra	Hunter	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Hyde	Pombo
Borski	Istook	Rahall
Boucher	Jackson (IL)	Rangel
Brown (CA)	Kanjorski	Rohrabacher
Brown (FL)	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Brown (OH)	Kennedy (MA)	Rush
Chenoweth	Kennedy (RI)	Salmon
Clay	Kilpatrick	Sanders
Coburn	King (NY)	Sanford
Conyers	Klug	Scarborough
Cox	Kucinich	Scott
Coyne	Largent	Serrano
Crane	Lewis (GA)	Shadegg
Crapo	Lipinski	Shuster
Cubin	Markey	Slaughter
Davis (IL)	McCollum	Stark
DeFazio	McDermott	Stearns
DeGette	McGovern	Stokes
Delahunt	McNulty	Thompson
Dellums	Millender	Tierney
Dixon	McDonald	Torres
Engel	Miller (CA)	Towns
Evans	Mink	Traficant
Filner	Moakley	Velazquez
Frank (MA)	Mollohan	Waters
Ganske	Nadler	Watt (NC)
Gephardt	Oberstar	Waxman
Gutierrez	Obey	Weldon (FL)
Hastings (FL)	Olver	Weygand
Hill	Owens	Yates
Hilliard	Paul	

NOT VOTING—10

Andrews	Goode	Schiff
Deutsch	Jefferson	Turner
Diaz-Balart	Lantos	
Farr	Pickering	

□ 1529

The Clerk announced the following pair: On this vote:

Mr. Turner for, with Mr. Jefferson against.

Messrs. CRAPO, MOAKLEY, and COYNE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. STUMP, MARTINEZ, and SKELTON changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 166, House Concurrent Resolution 84—conference report on the budget—I was ab-

sent. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

□ 1530

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Concurrent Resolution 84.

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

There was no objection.

FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1998 AND 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA). Pursuant to House Resolution 159 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1757.

□ 1530

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1757) to consolidate international affairs agencies, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and for other purposes, with Mr. LAHOOD (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. BROWN] had been disposed of.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 159, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

The perfecting amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]; and a recorded vote on the amendment by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], if requested.

Proceedings on the other postponed amendments will resume at a later time.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for the electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 200, noes 218, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 167]

AYES—200

Abercrombie	Gephardt	Neal
Ackerman	Gibbons	Obey
Allen	Gilchrest	Olver
Baesler	Gilman	Owens
Baldacci	Gonzalez	Pallone
Barrett (WI)	Gordon	Pascrell
Bass	Green	Pastor
Becerra	Greenwood	Payne
Bentsen	Gutierrez	Pelosi
Berman	Hamilton	Pickett
Berry	Harman	Pomeroy
Billbray	Hastings (FL)	Porter
Bishop	Hefner	Price (NC)
Blagojevich	Hilliard	Pryce (OH)
Blumenauer	Hinchey	Ramstad
Boehlert	Hinojosa	Rangel
Boswell	Hobson	Regula
Boucher	Hooley	Reyes
Boyd	Horn	Rivers
Brown (CA)	Houghton	Rodriguez
Brown (FL)	Hoyer	Rothman
Brown (OH)	Jackson (IL)	Roukema
Campbell	Jackson-Lee	Roybal-Allard
Capps	(TX)	Rush
Cardin	Johnson (CT)	Sabo
Carson	Johnson (WI)	Sanchez
Castle	Johnson, E. B.	Sanders
Clay	Kelly	Sandlin
Clayton	Kennedy (MA)	Sawyer
Clement	Kennedy (RI)	Schumer
Clyburn	Kennelly	Scott
Condit	Kilpatrick	Serrano
Coyne	Kind (WI)	Shaw
Cramer	Klecza	Shays
Cummings	Klug	Sherman
Danner	Kolbe	Sisisky
Davis (VA)	Lampson	Skaggs
DeFazio	Lazio	Slaughter
DeGette	Leach	Smith, Adam
Delahunt	Levin	Snyder
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	Spratt
Dellums	Lofgren	Stabenow
Dicks	Lowe	Stark
Dingell	Luther	Stokes
Dixon	Maloney (CT)	Strickland
Doggett	Maloney (NY)	Tanner
Dooley	Markey	Tauscher
Edwards	Matsui	Thomas
Ehrlich	McCarthy (MO)	Thompson
Engel	McCarthy (NY)	Thurman
Eshoo	McDermott	Tierney
Etheridge	McGovern	Torres
Evans	McHale	Towns
Fattah	McKinney	Upton
Fawell	McNulty	Velazquez
Fazio	Meehan	Vento
Filner	Meek	Visclosky
Flake	Menendez	Waters
Foglietta	Millender-	Watt (NC)
Foley	McDonald	Waxman
Ford	Miller (CA)	Wexler
Fowler	Minge	White
Frank (MA)	Mink	Wise
Franks (NJ)	Moakley	Woolsey
Frelinghuysen	Molinari	Wynn
Frost	Moran (VA)	Yates
Furse	Morella	
Gejdenson	Nadler	

NOES—218

Aderholt	Bateman	Bryant
Archer	Bereuter	Bunning
Armey	Bilirakis	Burr
Bachus	Bileley	Buyer
Baker	Blunt	Callahan
Ballenger	Boehner	Calvert
Barcia	Bonilla	Camp
Barr	Bonior	Canady
Barrett (NE)	Bono	Cannon
Bartlett	Borski	Chabot
Barton	Brady	Chambliss

Chenoweth	John	Poshard
Christensen	Johnson, Sam	Quinn
Coble	Jones	Radanovich
Coburn	Kanjorski	Rahall
Collins	Kaptur	Redmond
Combest	Kasich	Riggs
Conyers	Kildee	Riley
Cook	Kim	Roemer
Cooksey	King (NY)	Rogan
Costello	Kingston	Rogers
Cox	Klink	Rohrabacher
Crane	Knollenberg	Ros-Lehtinen
Crapo	Kucinich	Royce
Cubin	LaFalce	Ryun
Cunningham	LaHood	Salmon
Davis (IL)	Largent	Sanford
Deal	Latham	Saxton
DeLay	LaTourette	Scarborough
Dickey	Lewis (CA)	Schaefer, Dan
Doolittle	Lewis (KY)	Schaffer, Bob
Doyle	Linder	Sensenbrenner
Dreier	Lipinski	Sessions
Duncan	Livingston	Shadegg
Dunn	LoBiondo	Shimkus
Ehlers	Lucas	Shuster
Emerson	Manton	Skeen
English	Manzullo	Skelton
Ensign	Martinez	Smith (NJ)
Everett	Mascara	Smith (OR)
Ewing	McCollum	Smith (TX)
Forbes	McCrery	Smith, Linda
Fox	McDade	Snowbarger
Gallegly	McHugh	Solomon
Ganske	McInnis	Souder
Gekas	McIntyre	Spence
Gillmor	McKeon	Stearns
Goodlatte	Metcalfe	Stenholm
Goodling	Mica	Stump
Goss	Miller (FL)	Stupak
Graham	Mollohan	Sununu
Granger	Moran (KS)	Talent
Gutknecht	Murtha	Tauzin
Hall (OH)	Myrick	Taylor (MS)
Hall (TX)	Nethercutt	Taylor (NC)
Hansen	Ney	Thornberry
Hastert	Northup	Thune
Hastings (WA)	Norwood	Tiahrt
Hayworth	Oberstar	Trafficant
Hefley	Ortiz	Walsh
Herger	Oxley	Wamp
Hill	Packard	Watkins
Hilleary	Pappas	Watts (OK)
Hoekstra	Parker	Weldon (FL)
Holden	Paul	Weldon (PA)
Hostettler	Paxon	Weller
Hulshof	Pease	Weygand
Hunter	Peterson (MN)	Whitfield
Hutchinson	Peterson (PA)	Wicker
Hyde	Petri	Wolf
Inglis	Pitts	Young (AK)
Istook	Pombo	Young (FL)
Jenkins	Portman	

NOT VOTING—16

Andrews	Goode	Pickering
Burton	Jefferson	Schiff
Davis (FL)	Lantos	Smith (MI)
Deutsch	McIntosh	Turner
Diaz-Balart	Neumann	
Farr	Nussle	

□ 1548

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DAVIS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 167, I tried to record "yes" on this vote but the system did not register my vote. Please let the RECORD reflect I intended to vote "yes" on this amendment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 167, I was seconds late to cast my vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 167, the Campbell amendment to H.R. 1757, I was absent. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

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

RECORDED vote

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 189, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 168]

AYES—232

Aderholt	Goodlatte	Neumann
Archer	Goodling	Ney
Armey	Goss	Northup
Bachus	Graham	Norwood
Baker	Granger	Nussle
Ballenger	Gutknecht	Oberstar
Barcia	Hall (OH)	Obey
Barr	Hall (TX)	Ortiz
Barrett (NE)	Hamilton	Oxley
Bartlett	Hansen	Packard
Barton	Hastert	Pappas
Bateman	Hastings (WA)	Parker
Bereuter	Hayworth	Paul
Berry	Hefley	Paxon
Bilirakis	Herger	Pease
Bliley	Hill	Peterson (MN)
Blunt	Hilleary	Petri
Boehner	Hoekstra	Pitts
Bonilla	Holden	Pombo
Bonior	Hostettler	Portman
Bono	Hulshof	Poshard
Borski	Hunter	Quinn
Brady	Hutchinson	Radanovich
Bryant	Hyde	Rahall
Bunning	Inglis	Redmond
Burr	Istook	Regula
Burton	Jenkins	Riggs
Buyer	John	Riley
Callahan	Johnson, Sam	Roemer
Calvert	Jones	Rogan
Camp	Kanjorski	Rogers
Canady	Kaptur	Rohrabacher
Cannon	Kasich	Ros-Lehtinen
Chabot	Kildee	Royce
Chambliss	Kim	Ryun
Chenoweth	King (NY)	Salmon
Christensen	Kingston	Sanford
Coble	Klecza	Saxton
Coburn	Klink	Scarborough
Collins	Knollenberg	Schaefer, Dan
Combest	Kucinich	Schaffer, Bob
Cook	LaFalce	Sensenbrenner
Cooksey	LaHood	Sessions
Costello	Largent	Shadegg
Cox	Latham	Shimkus
Cramer	LaTourette	Shuster
Crane	Lewis (CA)	Skeen
Crapo	Lewis (KY)	Skelton
Cubin	Linder	Smith (MI)
Cunningham	Lipinski	Smith (NJ)
Danner	Livingston	Smith (OR)
Deal	LoBiondo	Smith (TX)
DeLay	Lucas	Smith, Linda
Dickey	Manton	Smith, Linda
Doolittle	Manzullo	Snowbarger
Doyle	Mascara	Solomon
Dreier	McCollum	Souder
Duncan	McCrery	Spence
Dunn	McDade	Stearns
Ehlers	McHugh	Stenholm
Emerson	McInnis	Stump
English	McIntosh	Stupak
Ensign	McIntyre	Sununu
Everett	McKeon	Talent
Ewing	Metcalfe	Tauzin
Foley	Mica	Taylor (MS)
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Taylor (NC)
Fowler	Moakley	Thornberry
Fox	Molinari	Thune
Gallegly	Mollohan	Tiahrt
Ganske	Moran (KS)	Trafficant
Gekas	Murtha	Walsh
Gibbons	Myrick	Wamp
Gillmor	Nethercutt	Watkins

Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller

Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf

Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—189

Abercrombie	Furse	Nadler
Ackerman	Gedjenson	Neal
Allen	Gephardt	Olver
Baesler	Gilchrist	Owens
Baldacci	Gilman	Pallone
Barrett (WI)	Gonzalez	Pascarell
Bass	Gordon	Pastor
Becerra	Green	Payne
Bentsen	Greenwood	Pelosi
Berman	Gutierrez	Pickett
Bilbray	Harman	Pomeroy
Bishop	Hastings (FL)	Porter
Blagojevich	Hefner	Price (NC)
Blumenauer	Hilliard	Pryce (OH)
Boehlert	Hinchee	Ramstad
Boswell	Hinojosa	Rangel
Boucher	Hobson	Reyes
Boyd	Hooley	Rivers
Brown (CA)	Horn	Rodriguez
Brown (FL)	Houghton	Rothman
Brown (OH)	Hoyer	Roukema
Campbell	Jackson (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Capps	Jackson-Lee	Rush
Cardin	(TX)	Sabo
Carson	Johnson (CT)	Sanchez
Castle	Johnson (WI)	Sanders
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Sandlin
Clayton	Kelly	Sawyer
Clement	Kennedy (MA)	Schumer
Clyburn	Kennedy (RI)	Scott
Condit	Kennelly	Serrano
Conyers	Kilpatrick	Shays
Coyne	Kind (WI)	Sherman
Cummings	Klug	Sisisky
Davis (FL)	Kolbe	Skaggs
Davis (IL)	Lampson	Slaughter
Davis (VA)	Lazio	Smith, Adam
DeFazio	Leach	Snyder
DeGette	Levin	Spratt
Delahunt	Lewis (GA)	Stabenow
DeLauro	Lofgren	Stark
Dellums	Lowe	Stokes
Dicks	Luther	Strickland
Dingell	Maloney (CT)	Tanner
Dixon	Maloney (NY)	Tauscher
Doggett	Markey	Thomas
Dooley	Martinez	Thompson
Edwards	McCarthy (MO)	Thurman
Ehrlich	McCarthy (NY)	Tierney
Engel	McDermott	Torres
Eshoo	McGovern	Towns
Etheridge	McHale	Upton
Evans	McKinney	Velazquez
Fattah	McNulty	Vento
Fawell	Meehan	Visclosky
Fazio	Meek	Waters
Filner	Menendez	Watt (NC)
Flake	Millender	Waxman
Foglietta	McDonald	Wexler
Ford	Miller (CA)	Wise
Frank (MA)	Minge	Woolsey
Franks (NJ)	Mink	Wynn
Frelinghuysen	Moran (VA)	Yates
Frost	Morella	

NOT VOTING—13

Andrews	Jefferson	Schiff
Deutscher	Lantos	Turner
Diaz-Balart	Matsui	White
Farr	Peterson (PA)	
Goode	Pickering	

□ 1558

Mr. FORD changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. MOAKLEY changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 168, I was unavoidably detained and missed the vote by seconds. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 168, the Smith of New Jersey amendment

to H.R. 1757, I was absent. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I want to raise an issue in regard to the Foreign Relations Authorization Act.

Sudan is located south of Egypt with its eastern boundary facing the Red Sea. It is one of the largest countries in Africa in terms of geographical area, approximately the size of one quarter of the United States with a population of some 29 million people.

Almost from the very time of independence from Britain and Egypt in 1956 the country has been divided by ethnic and religious differences. The largely Arabic Muslim North against the Sub-Sahara African Christian and Animist South.

Guerrilla warfare in the south has persisted for at least 32 years of their 41 years of independence. But, not until 1983 when the Sudan People's Liberation Army [SPLA] was created were substantial gains made in capturing towns from the control of the Khartoum Northern Government. The SPLA is under the leadership of Col. John Garang, a military officer, trained in the United States.

Following the 1989 coup, the relative free press was put under strict censorship.

I say all of this because the geostrategic importance of the Sudan is vital to our national interest. And Sudan's stability is vital to the region's stability. I too support sanctions which our administration already has put on them. Economic sanctions, military sanctions, visa restrictions on the government and its forces should be enforced; however, this places restrictions on humanitarian assistance that affects the poor and the innocent.

I went to southern Sudan in January of this year and meet with John Garang, the leader of the Sudanese Peoples Liberation Movement in the south and they seem to be conquering much of the northern territory.

As much as I believe that the Sudanese Government should not operate with immunity, we can not at this time in good faith cancel all the assistance to the men, women, and children that so badly need this. I agree that we should use sticks with the Sudan in that they have exhausted all of their carrot options. Yet this is not a stick, this hurts. It hurts the wrong people.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to stand beside Mr. PALLONE in offering this important amendment to H.R. 1757, the Foreign Affairs Authorization Act.

As with everything we do in this House, expenditures for foreign aid must be evaluated to ensure fiscal discipline. H.R. 1757 makes great strides toward reducing wasteful spending, and proposes to make a vital shift in how the United States meets its foreign policy challenges.

One of the significant shifts will be to improve the operations of the State Department by consolidating into its structure two Federal agencies—the U.S. Information Agency and the Arms Control Disarmament Agency. As we proceed with these long overdue changes in the U.S. foreign affairs establishment, we must not lose sight of our Nation's ability to affect change abroad. The United States must remain engaged and sensitive to our strategic interests in ambitious but fragile democracies like Armenia.

Armenia finds itself at a crossroads. The young republic is in a delicate rebuilding proc-

ess and struggles to reconstruct itself after having its growth impeded by harmful policies of the former Soviet Union. Armenia is striving to establish the type of government and free-market economy which will enable it to more easily integrate itself into the region. Regional integration in the Caucasus is of vital importance of U.S. foreign policy. Integration will yield additional economic stability for the region and help it to become a more attractive sector for U.S. investment. We must take action which facilitates the process.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am, with Congressman PALLONE, offering this reasonable amendment which encourages the President to seek cooperation from the governments of Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Turkey, as well as private companies with an interest in developing Azerbaijan's Caspian Sea petroleum reserves.

This amendment serves to encourage the construction of a pipeline route from Azerbaijan through Armenia. This pipeline would likely extend to Turkey and Mediterranean sea ports. No doubt, such an effort will improve relations between the neighboring countries by spreading the seeds of cooperation. The venture will serve the overall objectives the United States has for peace and prosperity in this region.

I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, as the House of Representatives debates the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, I wish to raise several issues that I believe deserve our close attention.

We must not neglect foreign affairs. As a former Peace Corps volunteer, I have seen first hand the tremendous need of people in other countries for basic assistance, and the enormous value of even our most modest assistance programs overseas. Unfortunately, our foreign assistance budget has suffered severely in our efforts to balance the budget. Development aid, disaster assistance, hunger and malnutrition programs, educational assistance, conflict resolution, and medical aid have all been cut drastically over the past several years, with serious consequences for the poorest and neediest people of the world.

I especially urge that we maintain our support of the United Nations. Although our country's many complaints about the United Nations receive the most attention, we rarely hear of the United Nation's tremendous good work: peacekeeping, assistance to children, conflict resolution, nuclear non-proliferation, and development assistance are just a few. Part of our support must include repaying our enormous debt to the United Nations, and I urge my colleagues to work to meet our unpaid U.N. obligations.

I also urge that we keep our focus on Latin America. Although the area has made great progress in democratization and free elections, less attention has been paid to the increasing problem of human rights abuses. Colombia and southern Mexico are just two areas where increasing militarization has led to greater violence and has put serious political and social pressure on local governments. We should give close examination to this problem and determine ways that the United States can help these countries demilitarize and reduce the level of violence.

Unfortunately, as in past years, this year's bill has become a battle over a woman's right

to choose. I must express my strong opposition to any amendments to this bill that would restrict the reproductive rights of women or, in an attempt to do so, limit or end all funding for international family planning. Earlier this year, a majority of the House recognized the importance of family planning to the health and welfare of our planet and voted to maintain U.S. family planning programs. Let us not go back on our own commitment to these important programs.

I thank my colleagues in the House and look forward to working with them to address these important issues.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska) having assumed the chair, Mr. LAHOOD, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1757) to consolidate international affairs agencies, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 1600

ESTABLISHING TIME LIMITATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION OF ADDITIONAL AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 1757, FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1998 AND 1999

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 1757 in the Committee of the Whole, pursuant to House Resolution 159, that each further amendment to the bill, and all amendments thereto, shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, except for the following amendments:

Amendments en bloc offered by the chairman of the Committee on International Relations pursuant to this unanimous consent agreement; the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. KENNEDY] regarding Indonesia; the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] regarding Cuba; the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] regarding Egypt; the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAXON] or the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL] regarding Palestinian land transactions; the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. NEY] regarding Libya; the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SANFORD] regarding authorization levels; the gentlewoman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY] regarding arms transfer code of conduct; the gentleman from California [Mr. CAPPS] regarding Tibet; the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] regarding counternarcotics authorities; the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON]; and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

It shall be in order at any time for the chairman of the Committee on

International Relations or a designee, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member of that committee or a designee, to offer amendments en bloc. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this unanimous-consent agreement shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to amendment, shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole, and may amend portions of the bill previously read for amendment. The original proponent of an amendment included in such amendments en bloc may insert a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately before the disposition of the amendments en bloc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not intend to object but I would like to ask a question or two about the unanimous-consent request. As I understand the unanimous-consent request, amendments that are not specifically listed will be allowed only 10 minutes of debate, 5 on each side?

Mr. GILMAN. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. HAMILTON. And the amendments that are listed which the gentleman has read would have unlimited debate?

Mr. GILMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HAMILTON. With respect to the votes pending, I think there are three, does the gentleman expect to have a vote on those today?

Mr. GILMAN. We are awaiting instructions from the majority leader.

Mr. HAMILTON. Can the gentleman tell us anything about the rest of the schedule with respect to the bill?

Mr. GILMAN. We anticipate taking up the rest of the bill next week.

Mr. HAMILTON. Will we also take up the European security bill next week?

Mr. GILMAN. We anticipate taking up the European security bill next week.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a question I think that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] mentioned. I think there were three of us that have amendments from last night. We have been sitting on pins and needles hoping that we could vote on these. We thought these three amendments would be voted on before the Campbell amendment and the Smith amendment. Now they have not. At this point we still are not clear when our three amendments would be voted on.

I would just like to urge on behalf of my colleagues that we vote on them today. If we do not vote on them and adjourn for next week, then the debate

is lost for all the time we spent yesterday evening when we were here until 8:30 talking about this. I will not object, but I would like the chairman, if he could, just to clarify again for me and for the other Members, when will we expect a vote on those 3 amendments?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEARNS. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have not had full clarification yet from the majority leader, but anticipate we will probably vote next week on the remaining amendments.

Mr. STEARNS. I will not object but I do protest that, that we are delaying them that much.

Second, it is very difficult for the Members that have these amendments to sit around their office and try and find out what is going on and then if they do not come down, the way we structured this, as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, is that if we do not show up these amendments will not even be voted on. Could the Speaker clarify that for me?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It occurs to the Chair that a recorded vote has been requested in each instance.

Mr. STEARNS. But even though it has been requested, if the Member who has the amendment, if he or she is not here on the floor at the rostrum, as I understand, that amendment will not be voted on because it was presented in a manner that it has to be presented by the Member again. Could the Chair clarify that? I was not clear on that last night.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A sufficient number of Members would have to stand at that appropriate time.

Mr. STEARNS. What this means is that we would have to stand and say there is a quorum not present, Mr. Speaker, and pending that, a quorum not being present, we request a quorum before we get a recorded vote, and then pending the quorum, then we would go ahead with the procedure asking for a recorded vote? Is that what we would have to do?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The committee would proceed under the way it normally disposes of requests for recorded votes.

Mr. STEARNS. The difficulty with that is last night we were here, we asked for a recorded vote, the assumption we had is we would get a recorded vote. Now the Chair is saying we will not get a recorded vote unless we are here.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I want to assure the gentleman that our staff will do everything possible to alert the gentleman if and when there is a vote so that the gentleman will be prepared to come to the floor to be present during that vote.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, with that assurance from the chairman, that is as good as gold.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5 p.m.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 5 p.m.

□ 1714

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska) at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1469, 1997 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR RECOVERY FROM NATURAL DISASTERS, AND FOR OVERSEAS PEACEKEEPING EFFORTS, INCLUDING THOSE IN BOSNIA

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time today to consider a conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1469) making emergency supplemental appropriations for recovery from natural disasters, and for overseas peacekeeping efforts, including those in Bosnia, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, and that all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration be waived, and that the conference report be considered as read when called up.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the previous order of the House, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1469) making emergency supplemental appropriations for recovery from natural disasters and overseas peacekeeping efforts, including those in Bosnia, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Wednesday, June 4, 1997, at page H3442.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

□ 1715

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 1469, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to once again come to the House with the conference report on the fiscal year 1997 emergency supplemental appropriations bill, H.R. 1469.

As Members of the House may recall, on April 24 of this year, the Committee on Appropriations reported out the bill, and roughly 2 weeks ago we had the bill on the floor. Unfortunately, we were unable to complete the conference quickly, and we had to adjourn over the Memorial Day recess prior to the completion of this very, very important bill that will provide disaster relief to the citizens of some 35 States.

Today we hope to remedy that situation because, after several weeks of negotiating with the Senate on the differences between the House and the Senate versions of this legislation, we have concluded conference yesterday and are able to bring this conference agreement to the House so that the process of providing that very necessary recovery for the vast number of natural disasters that have occurred around the country this year can be maintained.

This conference agreement includes \$8.9 billion in new spending authority for fiscal year 1997, of which the discretionary portion is fully offset by the rescission of previously appropriated funds and by including other offsets.

I might stress, Mr. Speaker, that the conference report, as promised when we debated this issue on the floor 2 weeks ago, is fully, and I repeat fully, offset in budget authority.

The major reasons for the increase over the House reported bill are an increase for veterans compensation and pensions and SSI, Supplemental Security Income, benefits for legal aliens. These were deemed by the administration to be necessary to provide for those benefit programs through the end of the fiscal year, and the conference

agreed that the benefits, if not paid for, might leave some individuals without compensation before October 1, 1997. It is intended that these sums, these additional sums, be included in this bill so that those people might be provided for.

A summary of the total conference report on the supplemental includes the following major categories: Nearly \$5.6 billion for disaster recovery, as I said earlier, for 35 States; another \$268 million for other appropriations; \$240 million for SSI benefits for legal aliens. All of that is offset in the domestic category of the budget by \$6.092 billion in rescissions. That leaves a deficit, or an extra amount of offset by about \$21 million.

In the peacekeeping provisions or the defense side of the bill we have some \$1.929 billion allocated to repay the Defense Department for what has already been outlaid in Bosnia and elsewhere in other operations around the world, and that is offset with moneys provided from the Defense Department of exactly that same amount of money.

Likewise, there are mandatory appropriations in the conference agreement, mostly for VA, of \$937 million. And, as I indicated, the entire discretionary amount is offset in budget authority.

There is \$3.3 billion of disaster relief bill going directly to FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, so that they can assist those people who have been devastated by floods, tornados, and other natural disasters.

There is \$500 million in this bill going to Community Development Block Grants. The people in Minnesota and the Dakotas have indicated that they are concerned that the traditional assistance of FEMA has not been direct enough, has not been flexible enough to go to the people who have lost their businesses, lost their homes, and who are virtually thrown out of their entire towns. And in order to get those folks back and their cities working, they feel that the Community Development Block Grants will be more effective in solving these problems. Hopefully, that will be the case.

There is \$650 million to be applied to transportation facility repair; \$585 million for flood control and navigation facility repair; \$166 million for watershed and flood prevention; \$197 million for the national park repairs; \$928 million for veterans compensation and pensions, as I mentioned earlier; and \$240 million for continued SSI benefits for legal aliens; \$1.26 billion for peacekeeping efforts in Bosnia and \$510 million for peacekeeping efforts in southwest Asia.

I would like to remind all my colleagues again that at the beginning of the 104th Congress; that is, the Congress preceding this one, we in the majority, the Republicans, began a policy of paying for all supplemental appropriations, saying to the country that no longer will we opt for the tradition that has been established in the past of

simply adding supplemental appropriations to what had previously been appropriated and not worrying about where the money comes from.

We adopted the policy of offsetting any additional or supplemental appropriations which had not been encompassed in the traditional appropriations process, which occurs in the fall, with rescissions of previously appropriated funds; that is, taking money out of other programs that we have already paid for and applying it to these supplemental needs so that there is no net cost to the taxpayer.

We have been successful. Every time we have come up with an additional or supplemental appropriation bill, we have offset it, since January 3, 1995, and I am pleased to say that we have done so again today. We have offset it with budget authority from other programs and other agencies. So I am proud to say again that this conference report complies with this policy, and that it is totally offset in budget authority.

The bill we brought to the House complied with this policy as does in this conference report. Mr. Speaker, the President has indicated, however, that because of two items, that do not have much to do with disaster relief, that he is going to veto the bill. I regret that. I hope that he does not do that.

Included in this conference agreement are matters that are very, very important to the majority of the Members of Congress and, admittedly, while they are not appropriation matters, I believe that the portions of this bill dealing with appropriations are not only acceptable but endorsed by the vast majority of the House, and I am proud of that.

But I believe also that the best thing to do is to go ahead and proceed with these extra issues because they are not consequential enough to deny aid to victims of natural disasters. One involves simply directing the Census Bureau not to sample, not to provide estimates of numbers of people in conducting the census every 10 years, as required by the Constitution, but to actually numerically count each and every person. Every person. No matter what background, no matter what ethnic identity, race, sex, or any other religious affiliation, count each and every person in America. And if the Census Bureau will do that, we will pay the bill for it, but we think that that is what the Constitution envisioned.

We hope that, in fact, the President would not veto this vital bill by saying, oh, well, let us just sample whoever is in America and not worry about counting them. We think that would be a terrible mistake, and so we have a provision in the conference agreement directing an actual count, and we have to do it this early because, otherwise, the Census Bureau will go ahead and make their plans. If we do it later on, they will say we were too late. So we have to address that issue now, and we just hope that that would not prompt the President to veto this very important bill.

Likewise, there is much concern from Members on both sides of the aisle about the fact that 2 years ago the Government closed down after the President did not sign four appropriations bills. A lot of people believe that that was unfortunate and that we should have avoided that mishap, and that we can avoid it by including in this bill what is known as a continuing resolution which says that if all of the appropriations bills for fiscal year 1998

are not passed, that full funding at 1997 levels will continue until such appropriations bills are passed.

That continuing resolution is included in this bill. All it says, or all it is, is an expression by the majority that says, Mr. President, we do not want to close down the Government. Just sign this bill with this continuing resolution and Government will stay open. If the President chooses to veto the bill because of that provision, I guess, in effect, he is saying that, well, he does not mind closing down the Government and he does not want to have a fail-safe that will keep the Government operating.

Be that as it may, he has given strong signals that he is prepared to veto the bill and I regret that, as I have said. I hope that he does not, but we will just have to confront it.

I believe the best thing to do at this point is for the Congress to express its views on the conference report and then let the President express his views. This will move the process forward. Should he veto it, we will re-address this bill. And it would be my expectation that we will still have a supplemental appropriations bill that provides disaster relief to the people that need it within a very few days under any circumstance.

But we are prepared to move this bill forward now. We hope that it will gain a majority of votes so that we can send it to the President for his signature, and we hope that he will sign it, and then we will be done with this and go on to the regular fiscal year 1998 appropriations process.

Mr. Speaker at this point I would like to insert a table reflecting the conference agreement into the RECORD.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTALS AND RESCISSIONS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 1997 (H.R. 1469)

Doc No.	Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - MILITARY						
CHAPTER 1						
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - MILITARY						
Military Personnel						
..... Military personnel, Army (emergency appropriations)		306,800,000	306,800,000	306,800,000
..... Military personnel, Navy (emergency appropriations)		7,900,000	7,900,000	7,900,000
..... Military personnel, Marine Corps (emergency appropriations)		300,000	300,000	300,000
..... Military personnel, Air Force (emergency appropriations)		29,100,000	29,100,000	29,100,000
Total, Military personnel		344,100,000	344,100,000	344,100,000
Operation and Maintenance						
..... Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps (by transfer) (sec. 101)		(23,000,000)	(23,000,000)	(23,000,000)
..... Overseas contingency operations transfer fund (emergency appropriations)	2,006,214,000	1,566,300,000	1,312,900,000	1,430,100,000	-136,200,000	+117,200,000
104-3 OPLAN 34A/35 P.O.W. payments	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
Total, Operation and maintenance	2,026,214,000	1,586,300,000	1,332,900,000	1,450,100,000	-136,200,000	+117,200,000
Revolving and Management Funds						
104-3 Reserve mobilization income insurance fund (emergency appropriations)	72,000,000	72,000,000	72,000,000	72,000,000
General Provisions						
..... Defense health program (sec. 102)		21,000,000	21,000,000	+21,000,000
..... Force protection initiatives (sec. 103)		10,000,000	10,000,000	+10,000,000
..... Additional transfer authority	(100,000,000)	(-100,000,000)
..... Red Cross reimbursement (sec. 104)	50,000,000	25,800,000	+25,800,000	-24,200,000
..... Family housing, Navy and Marine Corps (sec. 106)		6,480,000	6,480,000	6,480,000
Total, general provisions		37,480,000	56,480,000	63,280,000	+25,800,000	+6,800,000
Total, Chapter 1:						
..... New budget (obligational) authority	2,096,214,000	2,039,880,000	1,805,480,000	1,929,480,000	-110,400,000	+124,000,000
..... Appropriations	(20,000,000)	(57,480,000)	(76,480,000)	(83,280,000)	(+25,800,000)	(+6,800,000)
..... Emergency appropriations	(2,078,214,000)	(1,982,400,000)	(1,729,000,000)	(1,846,200,000)	(-136,200,000)	(+117,200,000)
..... (Additional transfer authority)	(100,000,000)	(-100,000,000)
..... (By transfer)		(23,000,000)	(23,000,000)	(23,000,000)
CHAPTER 2						
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - MILITARY						
Military Personnel						
..... Military personnel, Army (rescission)	-46,000,000	-57,000,000	-57,000,000	-11,000,000
..... Military personnel, Navy (rescission)	-11,000,000	-18,000,000	-18,000,000	-7,000,000
..... Military personnel, Marine Corps (rescission)	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	-5,000,000
..... Military personnel, Air Force (rescission)	-15,000,000	-23,000,000	-23,000,000	-8,000,000
Total, Military personnel	-77,000,000	-103,000,000	-103,000,000	-26,000,000
Operation and Maintenance						
..... Operation and maintenance, Army (rescission)	-174,000,000	-196,000,000	-196,000,000	-22,000,000
..... Operation and maintenance, Navy (rescission)	-51,000,000	-51,000,000	-51,000,000
..... Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps (rescission)	-17,000,000	-3,000,000	-3,000,000	+14,000,000
..... Operation and maintenance, Air Force (rescission)	-117,000,000	-117,000,000	-117,000,000
..... Operation and maintenance, Defense-wide (rescission)	-10,000,000	-10,000,000	-25,000,000	-25,000,000	-15,000,000
..... Environmental restoration, Army (rescission)	-250,000	-250,000	-250,000
..... Environmental restoration, Navy (rescission)	-250,000	-250,000	-250,000
..... Environmental restoration, Air Force (rescission)	-250,000	-250,000	-250,000
..... Environmental restoration, Defense-wide (rescission)	-250,000	-250,000	-250,000
..... Environmental restoration, Formerly used defense sites (rescission)	-250,000	-250,000	-250,000
..... Former Soviet Union threat reduction (rescission)	-2,000,000	-2,000,000	-2,000,000
Total, Operation and maintenance	-10,000,000	-10,000,000	-387,000,000	-395,250,000	-385,250,000	-8,250,000
Procurement						
..... Aircraft procurement, Army (rescission)	-9,085,000	-19,085,000	-19,085,000	-10,000,000
..... Missile procurement, Army (rescission)	-73,707,000	-26,707,000	-26,707,000	+47,000,000
..... Procurement of weapons and tracked combat vehicles, Army, (rescission)	-7,296,000	-22,696,000	-22,696,000	-15,400,000
..... Procurement of ammunition, Army (rescission)	-28,236,000	-32,236,000	-32,236,000	-4,000,000

**EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTALS AND RESCISSIONS
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 1997 (H.R. 1469) — continued**

Doc No.	Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
.....	Other procurement, Army (rescission)		-23,502,000	-23,502,000	-23,502,000
.....	Aircraft procurement, Navy (rescission)		-62,000,000	-66,000,000	-66,000,000	-24,000,000
.....	Weapons procurement, Navy (rescission)		-22,000,000	-22,000,000	-22,000,000
.....	Procurement of ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps (rescission)		-4,812,000	-812,000	-812,000	+ 4,000,000
.....	Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy (rescission)		-43,000,000	-61,700,000	-61,700,000	-18,700,000
.....	Other procurement, Navy (rescission)		-15,237,000	-15,237,000	-15,237,000
.....	Procurement, Marine Corps (rescission)		-5,207,000	-1,207,000	-1,207,000	+ 4,000,000
.....	Aircraft procurement, Air Force (rescission)		-114,650,000	-130,376,000	-130,376,000	-15,726,000
.....	Missile procurement, Air Force (rescission)		-193,195,000	-179,020,000	-179,020,000	+ 14,175,000
.....	Procurement of ammunition, Air Force (rescission)			-7,700,000	-7,700,000	-7,700,000
.....	Other procurement, Air Force (rescission)		-20,659,000	-33,659,000	-33,659,000	-13,000,000
.....	Procurement, Defense-wide (rescission)		-9,860,000	-29,973,000	-29,973,000	-20,113,000
104-44	National Guard and Reserve equipment (rescission)...	-62,000,000	-5,029,000	-13,029,000	-13,029,000	-8,000,000
	Total, Procurement.....	-62,000,000	-637,475,000	-704,939,000	-704,939,000	-67,464,000
	Research, Development, Test and Evaluation					
.....	Research, development, test and evaluation, Army (rescission)		-14,366,000	-22,366,000	-22,366,000	-8,000,000
.....	Research, development, test and evaluation, Navy (rescission)		-35,978,000	-26,478,000	-26,478,000	+ 9,500,000
.....	Research, development, test and evaluation, Air Force (rescission)		-150,396,000	-196,245,000	-196,245,000	-45,849,000
.....	Research, development, test and evaluation, Defense-wide (rescission)		-176,090,000	-182,714,000	-182,714,000	-6,624,000
.....	Developmental test and evaluation, Defense (rescission)		-890,000	-6,692,000	-6,692,000	-5,802,000
.....	Operational test and evaluation, Defense (rescission) ..		-160,000	-160,000	-160,000
	Total, Research, development, test and evaluation		-377,880,000	-434,655,000	-434,655,000	-56,775,000
	Revolving and Management Fund					
.....	National Defense Sealift Fund (rescission)		-35,000,000	-25,200,000	-25,200,000	+ 9,800,000
	Other Department of Defense Programs					
.....	Defense health program (rescission)			-21,000,000	-21,000,000	-21,000,000
.....	Chemical agents and munitions destruction, Defense (rescission)		-48,108,000	-48,108,000	-48,108,000
.....	Drug interdiction and counter-drug activities, Defense (rescission)		-2,000,000	-2,000,000	-2,000,000
	Total, Other Department of Defense programs		-50,108,000	-71,108,000	-71,108,000	-21,000,000
	General Provisions					
104-3	DOD-wide savings proposals (offset)	-4,800,000,000				
.....	Dual-use applications program (rescission)		-100,000,000			+ 100,000,000
.....	Revised economic adjustments, FY 1997 (rescission) ..	-307,000,000			+ 307,000,000	
.....	Foreign currency savings, FY 1997 (rescission)	-308,000,000			+ 308,000,000	
.....	Prior year unobligated balances (rescission)	-246,367,000			+ 246,367,000	
.....	Prior year rescissions	-982,500,000			+ 982,500,000	
.....	Military construction, rescissions (sec. 201)	-180,000,000	-235,000,000	-189,000,000	-9,000,000	+ 46,000,000
.....	Military construction, Navy (rescission) (sec. 202)	-6,480,000	-6,480,000	-6,480,000		
	Total, general provisions	-4,800,000,000	-2,030,347,000	-341,480,000	+ 1,834,867,000	+ 146,000,000
	Total, Chapter 2:					
	New budget (obligational) authority	-4,872,000,000	-2,040,347,000	-1,905,943,000	+ 110,715,000	-23,689,000
	Rescissions	(-72,000,000)	(-2,040,347,000)	(-1,905,943,000)	(-1,929,632,000)	(-23,689,000)
	Offsets	(-4,800,000,000)				
	Total, title I:					
	Discretionary budget authority (net)	-2,773,786,000	-467,000	-100,463,000	+ 315,000	+ 100,311,000
	Appropriations	(20,000,000)	(57,480,000)	(76,480,000)	(+ 25,800,000)	(+ 6,800,000)
	Rescissions	-72,000,000	-2,040,347,000	-1,905,943,000	+ 110,715,000	-23,689,000
	Offsets	(-4,800,000,000)				
	Emergency appropriations	(2,078,214,000)	(1,982,400,000)	(1,729,000,000)	(-136,200,000)	(+ 117,200,000)
	(By transfer)		(23,000,000)	(23,000,000)		

**EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTALS AND RESCISSIONS
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 1997 (H.R. 1469) — continued**

Doc No.	Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
TITLE II - EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR RECOVERY FROM NATURAL DISASTERS						
CHAPTER 1						
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
Farm Service Agency						
Emergency conservation program (emergency appropriations)	20,000,000					
104-58 Contingent emergency appropriations.....	17,000,000	65,000,000	77,000,000	70,000,000	+ 5,000,000	-7,000,000
Tree assistance program (contingent emergency appropriations)		9,000,000	9,500,000	9,000,000		-500,000
Total, Farm Service Agency	37,000,000	74,000,000	86,500,000	79,000,000	+ 5,000,000	-7,500,000
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account						
Loan subsidies:						
Farm operating loans:						
Direct			12,600,000	6,300,000	+ 6,300,000	-6,300,000
Guaranteed subsidized (contingent emergency appropriations)			10,000,000	5,000,000	+ 5,000,000	-5,000,000
Subtotal			22,600,000	11,300,000	+ 11,300,000	-11,300,000
Emergency disaster loans (contingent emergency appropriations)			18,000,000	18,000,000	+ 18,000,000	
Total, loan subsidies			40,600,000	29,300,000	+ 29,300,000	-11,300,000
Loan authorizations:						
Farm operating loans:						
Direct			(100,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(+ 50,000,000)	(-50,000,000)
Guaranteed subsidized			(110,000,000)	(55,000,000)	(+ 55,000,000)	(-55,000,000)
Subtotal			(210,000,000)	(105,000,000)	(+ 105,000,000)	(-105,000,000)
Emergency disaster loans			(59,000,000)	(59,000,000)	(+ 59,000,000)	
Total, loan authorizations			(269,000,000)	(164,000,000)	(+ 164,000,000)	(-105,000,000)
Commodity Credit Corporation Fund						
Disaster reserve assistance program:						
Livestock indemnity program				(50,000,000)	(+ 50,000,000)	(+ 50,000,000)
Natural Resources Conservation Service						
Watershed and flood prevention operations (emergency appropriations)	66,100,000					
104-58 Contingent emergency appropriations.....	18,000,000	150,700,000	171,000,000	166,000,000	+ 15,300,000	-5,000,000
Total, Natural Resources Conservation Service.....	84,100,000	150,700,000	171,000,000	166,000,000	+ 15,300,000	-5,000,000
Rural Housing Service						
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program:						
Rental housing (sec. 515):						
104-58 Loan subsidy (emergency appropriation)	250,000		250,000			-250,000
104-58 (Loan authorization)	(488,000)		(488,000)			(-488,000)
Rural housing assistance program (emergency appropriations)	750,000					
104-58 Contingent emergency appropriations.....			4,000,000			-4,000,000
Total, Rural Housing Service	1,000,000		4,250,000			-4,250,000
Rural Utilities Service						
Rural utilities assistance program (emergency appropriations)	1,000,000					
104-58 Contingent emergency appropriations.....			6,500,000	4,000,000	+ 4,000,000	-2,500,000

**EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTALS AND RESCISSIONS
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 1997 (H.R. 1469) — continued**

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT							
Housing Programs							
.....	Preserving existing housing investment		3,500,000	3,500,000	+ 3,500,000
104-3	Drug elimination grants for low-income housing (by transfer)	(30,200,000)	(30,200,000)	(-30,200,000)
Capacity Building for Community Development and Affordable Housing							
.....	National community development initiative (by transfer)	(30,200,000)	(30,200,000)	(+ 30,200,000)
Community Planning and Development							
104-71	Community development block grants fund (emergency appropriations)	100,000,000	500,000,000	500,000,000	250,000,000	-250,000,000	-250,000,000
.....	Emergency advance appropriation, FY 1998				250,000,000	+ 250,000,000	+ 250,000,000
Total, Department of Housing and Urban Development							
		100,000,000	503,500,000	500,000,000	503,500,000	+ 3,500,000
INDEPENDENT AGENCY							
Federal Emergency Management Agency							
104-58	Disaster relief (emergency appropriations)	541,000,000	3,067,677,000	3,100,000,000	3,300,000,000	+ 232,323,000	+ 200,000,000
104-58	Contingent emergency appropriations	438,000,000
Disaster assistance direct loan program account:							
.....	Community disaster loans (by transfer) (contingent emergency appropriations)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(+ 20,000,000)
.....	Salaries and expenses		5,000,000	-5,000,000
Total, Federal Emergency Management Agency....							
		979,000,000	3,072,677,000	3,100,000,000	3,300,000,000	+ 227,323,000	+ 200,000,000
Total, Chapter 10:							
.....	New budget (obligational) authority	1,832,000,000	4,329,177,000	4,353,000,000	4,731,500,000	+ 402,323,000	+ 378,500,000
.....	Appropriations	(753,000,000)	(761,500,000)	(753,000,000)	(931,500,000)	(+ 170,000,000)	(+ 178,500,000)
.....	Emergency appropriations	(641,000,000)	(3,567,677,000)	(3,600,000,000)	(3,550,000,000)	(-17,677,000)	(-50,000,000)
.....	Contingent emergency appropriations	(438,000,000)
.....	Emergency advance appropriation, FY 1998	(250,000,000)	(+ 250,000,000)	(+ 250,000,000)
.....	(By transfer)	(30,200,000)	(30,200,000)	(30,200,000)	(30,200,000)
.....	(By transfer) (contingent emergency appropriations)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(+ 20,000,000)
CHAPTER 11							
OFFSETS AND RESCISSIONS							
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE							
Office of the Secretary							
.....	Fund For Rural America (offset)		-20,000,000	-20,000,000	-20,000,000
Natural Resources Conservation Service							
.....	Wetlands reserve program (offset)		-19,000,000	+ 19,000,000
Food and Consumer Service							
104-3	The emergency food assistance program (offset)	-6,000,000	-20,000,000	-20,000,000	-20,000,000
Foreign Agricultural Service							
.....	Export credit (offset)		-16,000,000	-16,000,000	+ 16,000,000	+ 16,000,000
.....	Export enhancement program (offset)		-23,000,000	-13,000,000	+ 23,000,000	+ 13,000,000
Total, Foreign Agricultural Service							
			-39,000,000	-29,000,000	+ 39,000,000	+ 29,000,000
Public Law 480 Program Account:							
Title I - Credit sales:							
104-44	Ocean freight differential (rescission)	-3,500,000
104-44	Loan subsidies (rescission)	-46,500,000
Total, Public Law 480 program account							
		-50,000,000
Total, Department of Agriculture							
		-56,000,000	-98,000,000	-49,000,000	-40,000,000	+ 58,000,000	+ 9,000,000
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE							
General Administration							
104-44	Working capital fund (rescission)	-6,400,000	-6,400,000	-6,400,000	-6,400,000
Legal Activities							
.....	Assets forfeiture fund (rescission)		-3,000,000	-3,000,000	-3,000,000

**EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTALS AND RESCISSIONS
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 1997 (H.R. 1469) — continued**

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	Food and Consumer Service						
104-3	Child nutrition programs	6,250,000					
104-3	Special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children (WIC)	100,000,000	76,000,000	58,000,000	76,000,000		+ 18,000,000
	Total, Food and Consumer Service	106,250,000	76,000,000	58,000,000	76,000,000		+ 18,000,000
	Total, Chapter 1:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	229,350,000	300,700,000	366,850,000	354,300,000	+ 53,600,000	-12,550,000
	Appropriations	(106,250,000)	(76,000,000)	(70,600,000)	(82,300,000)	(+ 6,300,000)	(+ 11,700,000)
	Emergency appropriations	(88,100,000)		(250,000)			(-250,000)
	Contingent emergency appropriations	(35,000,000)	(224,700,000)	(296,000,000)	(272,000,000)	(+ 47,300,000)	(-24,000,000)
	(Loan authorization)	(488,000)		(269,488,000)	(164,000,000)	(+ 164,000,000)	(-105,488,000)
	CHAPTER 2						
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE						
	Economic Development Administration						
	Economic development assistance programs						
	(emergency appropriations)			54,700,000	50,200,000	+50,200,000	-4,500,000
	Contingent emergency appropriations		47,700,000			-47,700,000	
104-58	(By transfer)	(1,200,000)					
	Salaries and expenses (emergency appropriations)				2,000,000	+ 2,000,000	+ 2,000,000
	Contingent emergency appropriations		2,000,000			-2,000,000	
	Total, Economic Development Administration		49,700,000	54,700,000	52,200,000	+ 2,500,000	-2,500,000
	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration						
104-58	Operations, research and facilities (emergency						
	appropriations)	12,000,000					
104-58	Construction (emergency appropriations)	10,800,000	10,800,000	10,800,000	10,800,000		
	Total, National Oceanic and Atmospheric						
	Administration	22,800,000	10,800,000	10,800,000	10,800,000		
	Total, Department of Commerce	22,800,000	60,500,000	65,500,000	63,000,000	+ 2,500,000	-2,500,000
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE						
	International Organizations and Conferences						
	Contributions to international organizations, current						
	year assessment			100,000,000			-100,000,000
104-3	Arreage payments (advance appropriation, FY	921,000,000					
	1999)						
	RELATED AGENCY						
	Commission on the Advancement						
	of Federal Law Enforcement						
	Salaries and expenses		2,000,000		2,000,000		+ 2,000,000
	Total, Chapter 2:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	943,800,000	62,500,000	165,500,000	65,000,000	+ 2,500,000	-100,500,000
	Appropriations		(2,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(2,000,000)		(-98,000,000)
	Emergency appropriations	(22,800,000)	(10,800,000)	(65,500,000)	(63,000,000)	(+ 52,200,000)	(-2,500,000)
	Contingent emergency appropriations		(49,700,000)			(-49,700,000)	
	Advance appropriation, FY 1999	(921,000,000)					
	(By transfer)	(1,200,000)					
	CHAPTER 2A						
	FEDERAL FUNDS						
	Federal payment to the District of Columbia			31,150,000			-31,150,000
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS						
	Public safety and justice			(8,800,000)			(-8,800,000)
	Capital outlay			(22,350,000)			(-22,350,000)
	Total, District of Columbia funds			(31,150,000)			(-31,150,000)
	CHAPTER 3						
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL						
	DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY						
	Corps of Engineers - Civil						
	Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries,						
	Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi,						
	Missouri, and Tennessee (emergency						
	appropriations)		20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000		

**EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTALS AND RESCISSIONS
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 1997 (H.R. 1469) — continued**

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
104-58	Operation and maintenance, general (emergency appropriations)	39,000,000	150,000,000	137,000,000	150,000,000	+ 13,000,000
104-58	Flood control and coastal emergencies (emergency appropriations)	201,700,000	415,000,000	390,000,000	415,000,000	+ 25,000,000
104-58	Contingent emergency appropriations.....	50,000,000
104-58	Advance appropriation, FY 1998	30,500,000
	Total, Department of Defense - Civil	321,200,000	585,000,000	547,000,000	585,000,000	+ 38,000,000
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
	Bureau of Reclamation						
104-58	Operation and maintenance (emergency appropriations)	4,500,000	7,355,000	7,355,000	7,355,000
	DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
104-78	Energy supply, research and development activities (by transfer)	(19,700,000)
	Total, Chapter 3:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	325,700,000	592,355,000	554,355,000	592,355,000	+ 38,000,000
	Emergency appropriations	(245,200,000)	(592,355,000)	(554,355,000)	(592,355,000)	(+ 38,000,000)
	Contingent emergency appropriations.....	(50,000,000)
	Advance appropriation, FY 1998	(30,500,000)
	(By transfer)	(19,700,000)
	CHAPTER 5						
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
	Bureau of Land Management						
.....	Construction (emergency appropriations).....	1,793,000	393,000	393,000	-1,400,000
104-58	(By transfer) (emergency appropriations).....	(3,003,000)	(3,003,000)	(4,403,000)	(4,403,000)	(+ 1,400,000)
	Total, Bureau of Land Management.....	1,793,000	393,000	393,000	-1,400,000
	United States Fish and Wildlife Service						
104-58	Resource management (emergency appropriations)...	2,000,000	2,250,000	8,350,000	5,300,000	+ 3,050,000	-3,050,000
104-58	Construction (emergency appropriations).....	32,000,000	81,000,000	91,000,000	88,000,000	+ 7,000,000	-3,000,000
104-58	Land acquisition (emergency appropriations).....	15,000,000	15,000,000	5,000,000	10,000,000	-5,000,000	+ 5,000,000
	Total, United States Fish and Wildlife Service	49,000,000	98,250,000	104,350,000	103,300,000	+ 5,050,000	-1,050,000
	National Park Service						
104-58	Construction.....	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
104-58	Emergency appropriations	147,779,000	156,912,000	157,321,000	157,321,000	+ 409,000
104-58	Contingent emergency appropriations.....	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000
	Total, National Park Service	187,779,000	196,912,000	197,321,000	197,321,000	+ 409,000
	United States Geological Survey						
104-58	Surveys, investigations, and research (emergency appropriations)	1,300,000	4,290,000	4,650,000	4,650,000	+ 360,000
	Bureau of Indian Affairs						
104-58	Operation of Indian programs (emergency appropriations)	5,800,000	11,100,000	14,317,000	14,317,000	+ 3,217,000
104-58	Construction (emergency appropriations).....	5,000,000	5,554,000	6,249,000	6,249,000	+ 695,000
	Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs	10,800,000	16,654,000	20,566,000	20,566,000	+ 3,912,000
	Total, Department of the Interior.....	248,879,000	317,899,000	327,280,000	326,230,000	+ 8,331,000	-1,050,000
	RELATED AGENCIES						
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
	Forest Service						
104-58	National forest system (emergency appropriations)	25,000,000	37,107,000	39,677,000	39,677,000	+ 2,570,000
104-58	Reconstruction and construction (emergency appropriations).....	13,000,000	32,334,000	27,685,000	27,685,000	-4,649,000
	Total, Forest Service.....	38,000,000	69,441,000	67,362,000	67,362,000	-2,079,000

**EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTALS AND RESCISSIONS
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 1997 (H.R. 1469) — continued**

Doc No.	Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
Indian Health Service						
..... Indian health services (emergency appropriations)		1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000		
..... Indian health facilities (emergency appropriations)		2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000		
Total, Indian Health Service		3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000		
GENERAL PROVISIONS						
..... Recreation fees (sec. 5001)		7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000		
Total, Chapter 5:						
New budget (obligational) authority	286,879,000	397,340,000	404,642,000	403,592,000	+ 6,252,000	-1,050,000
Appropriations	(10,000,000)	(17,000,000)	(17,000,000)	(17,000,000)		
Emergency appropriations	(246,879,000)	(350,340,000)	(357,642,000)	(356,592,000)	(+ 6,252,000)	(-1,050,000)
Contingent emergency appropriations	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)		
(By transfer) (emergency appropriations)	(3,003,000)	(3,003,000)	(4,403,000)	(4,403,000)	(+ 1,400,000)	
CHAPTER 6						
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
Health Resources and Services Administration						
..... Health education assistance loans program			499,000	499,000	+ 499,000	
Office of the Secretary						
..... Public health and social services emergency fund				15,000,000	+ 15,000,000	+ 15,000,000
..... Emergency appropriations			15,000,000			-15,000,000
Total, Department of Health and Human Services..			15,499,000	15,499,000	+ 15,499,000	
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION						
..... Education for the disadvantaged			585,000,000	101,133,000	+ 101,133,000	-483,867,000
..... Advance appropriation, FY 1998			-386,824,000			+ 386,824,000
Total, Department of Education			198,176,000	101,133,000	+ 101,133,000	-97,043,000
RELATED AGENCY						
National Commission on the Cost of Higher Education						
..... Salaries and expenses		650,000		650,000		+ 650,000
GENERAL PROVISIONS						
..... Child care and development block grant (sec. 6004)			1,000,000	1,000,000	+ 1,000,000	
..... Supplemental security income program (sec. 6005)		240,000,000	240,000,000	240,000,000		
Total, Chapter 6:						
New budget (obligational) authority		240,650,000	454,675,000	358,282,000	+ 117,632,000	-96,393,000
Appropriations		(240,650,000)	(826,499,000)	(358,282,000)	(+ 117,632,000)	(-468,217,000)
Emergency appropriations			(15,000,000)			(-15,000,000)
Advance appropriation, FY 1998			(-386,824,000)			(+ 386,824,000)
CHAPTER 7						
CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS						
SENATE						
Contingent Expenses of the Senate						
..... Secretary of the Senate (by transfer)			(5,000,000)	(5,010,000)	(+ 5,010,000)	(+ 10,000)
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES						
Payments to Widows and Heirs of Deceased Members of Congress						
..... Gratuities, deceased Members				133,600	+ 133,600	+ 133,600
OTHER AGENCY						
BOTANIC GARDEN						
..... Salaries and expenses				33,500,000	+ 33,500,000	+ 33,500,000
Total, Chapter 7:						
New budget (obligational) authority				33,633,600	+ 33,633,600	+ 33,633,600
(By transfer)			(5,000,000)	(5,010,000)	(+ 5,010,000)	(+ 10,000)

**EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTALS AND RESCISSIONS
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 1997 (H.R. 1469) — continued**

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
CHAPTER 8							
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION							
Coast Guard							
.....	Operating expenses.....	6,473,000	1,600,000	+ 1,600,000	-4,873,000
104-3	Retired pay.....	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000	9,200,000	+ 5,000,000	+ 5,000,000
	Total, Coast Guard.....	4,200,000	4,200,000	10,673,000	10,800,000	+ 6,600,000	+ 127,000
Federal Aviation Administration							
.....	Facilities and equipment (Airport and Airway Trust Fund).....	40,000,000	-40,000,000
.....	Grants-in-aid for airports.....	15,520,000	-15,520,000
Federal Highway Administration							
Federal-aid highways (Highway Trust Fund):							
104-58	Emergency relief program (emergency appropriations).....	276,000,000	276,000,000	276,000,000	650,000,000	+ 374,000,000	+ 374,000,000
104-58	Contingent emergency appropriations.....	15,000,000	374,000,000	374,000,000	-374,000,000	-374,000,000
104-3	(Limitation on obligations).....	(318,077,043)	(318,077,043)	(933,193,000)	(694,810,534)	(+ 376,733,491)	(-238,382,466)
	Total, Federal Highway Administration.....	291,000,000	650,000,000	650,000,000	650,000,000
Federal Railroad Administration							
.....	Emergency railroad rehabilitation and repair (emergency appropriations).....	18,900,000	+ 18,900,000	+ 18,900,000
.....	Contingent emergency appropriations.....	10,000,000	24,000,000	-10,000,000	-24,000,000
	Total, Department of Transportation.....	295,200,000	704,200,000	700,193,000	679,700,000	-24,500,000	-20,493,000
RELATED AGENCY							
National Transportation Safety Board							
104-3	Salaries and expenses (emergency appropriations).....	20,200,000	14,100,000	29,859,000	+ 29,859,000	+ 15,759,000
.....	Contingent emergency appropriations.....	23,300,000	-23,300,000
GENERAL PROVISIONS							
Highway traffic safety grants (Highway Trust Fund):							
.....	Alcohol-impaired driving prevention incentive grants (sec. 8003).....	500,000	500,000	500,000
.....	National Driver Register (sec. 8004).....	2,500,000	2,500,000	+ 2,500,000
	Total, Chapter 8:						
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	315,400,000	730,500,000	714,793,000	712,559,000	-17,941,000	-2,234,000
	Appropriations.....	(4,200,000)	(47,200,000)	(26,693,000)	(13,800,000)	(-33,400,000)	(-12,893,000)
	Emergency appropriations.....	(296,200,000)	(276,000,000)	(290,100,000)	(698,759,000)	(+ 422,759,000)	(+ 408,659,000)
	Contingent emergency appropriations.....	(15,000,000)	(407,300,000)	(398,000,000)	(-407,300,000)	(-398,000,000)
	(Limitation on obligations).....	(318,077,043)	(318,077,043)	(933,193,000)	(694,810,534)	(+ 376,733,491)	(-238,382,466)
CHAPTER 9							
DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY							
Departmental Offices							
.....	Salaries and expenses.....	1,950,000	1,950,000	+ 1,950,000
U.S. POSTAL SERVICE							
104-3	Payment to the Postal Service Fund.....	5,383,000	5,300,000	5,383,000	5,383,000	+ 83,000
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT							
104-71	Unanticipated needs for natural disasters (emergency appropriations).....	200,000,000
INDEPENDENT AGENCY							
104-61	Federal Election Commission.....	1,709,000
	Total, Chapter 9:						
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	207,092,000	5,300,000	7,333,000	7,333,000	+ 2,033,000
	Appropriations.....	(7,092,000)	(5,300,000)	(7,333,000)	(7,333,000)	(+ 2,033,000)
	Emergency appropriations.....	(200,000,000)
CHAPTER 10							
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS							
Veterans Benefits Administration							
104-3	Compensation and pensions.....	753,000,000	753,000,000	753,000,000	928,000,000	+ 175,000,000	+ 175,000,000

**EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTALS AND RESCISSIONS
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 1997 (H.R. 1469) — continued**

Doc No.	Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
Immigration and Naturalization Service						
..... Construction (rescission)		-1,000,000		-1,000,000		-1,000,000
Total, Department of Justice	-6,400,000	-10,400,000	-6,400,000	-10,400,000		-4,000,000
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE						
National Institute of Standards and Technology						
..... Industrial technology services (rescission)		-7,000,000		-7,000,000		-7,000,000
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration						
..... Fleet modernization, shipbuilding and conversion (rescission)		-2,000,000			+ 2,000,000	
Total, Department of Commerce		-9,000,000		-7,000,000	+ 2,000,000	-7,000,000
RELATED AGENCIES						
Federal Communications Commission						
..... Salaries and expenses (rescission)		-1,000,000		-1,000,000		-1,000,000
Ounce of Prevention Council						
..... Direct appropriation (rescission)		-1,000,000		-1,000,000		-1,000,000
Total, related agencies		-2,000,000		-2,000,000		-2,000,000
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL						
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY						
Corps of Engineers - Civil						
104-3 Construction, general (offset)	-50,000,000		-30,000,000			+ 30,000,000
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
..... Energy supply, research and development activities (rescission)		-22,532,000		-11,180,000	+ 11,352,000	-11,180,000
Power Marketing Administrations						
104-44 Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration (rescission)	-2,111,000			-11,352,000	-11,352,000	-11,352,000
Total, Department of Energy	-2,111,000	-22,532,000		-22,532,000		-22,532,000
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
104-57 Clean coal technology (rescission)	-10,000,000	-17,000,000	-17,000,000	-17,000,000		
104-44 Strategic petroleum reserve (rescission)	-11,000,000	-11,000,000	-11,000,000	-11,000,000		
Total, Department of Energy	-21,000,000	-28,000,000	-28,000,000	-28,000,000		
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
Administration for Children and Families						
..... Job opportunities and basic skills (JOBS) (offset)		-700,000,000	-700,000,000	-700,000,000		
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION						
..... Federal family education loan program account (rescission)		-849,000			+ 849,000	
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION						
Federal Aviation Administration						
..... Grants-in-aid for airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund) (rescission of contract authorization)			-778,000,000	-750,000,000	-750,000,000	+ 28,000,000
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration						
..... Highway traffic safety grants (Highway Trust Fund) (rescission of contract authorization)			-10,600,000	-13,000,000	-13,000,000	-2,400,000
Federal Transit Administration						
..... Trust fund share of expenses (Highway Trust Fund) (rescission of contract authorization)			-271,000,000	-271,000,000	-271,000,000	
..... Discretionary grants (Highway Trust Fund) (rescission of contract authorization)			-588,000,000	-588,000,000	-588,000,000	
Total, Federal Transit Administration			-859,000,000	-859,000,000	-859,000,000	
Total, Department of Transportation			-1,647,600,000	-1,622,000,000	-1,622,000,000	+ 25,600,000

**EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTALS AND RESCISSIONS
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 1997 (H.R. 1469) — continued**

Doc No.	Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
INDEPENDENT AGENCY						
General Services Administration						
Federal Buildings Fund:						
..... Repairs and alterations (rescission).....		-1,400,000			+1,400,000	
104-44 Expenses, presidential transition (rescission)	-5,600,000	-5,600,000	-5,600,000	-5,600,000		
Total, General Services Administration.....	-5,600,000	-7,000,000	-5,600,000	-5,600,000	+1,400,000	
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT						
Housing Programs						
104-44 Annual contributions for assisted housing (rescission).	-250,000,000	-3,823,440,000	-3,850,000,000	-3,850,000,000	+173,440,000	
Federal Housing Administration						
..... FHA - General and special risk program account:						
Rescission			-85,000,000			+85,000,000
Total, Department of Housing and Urban Development.....	-250,000,000	-3,823,440,000	-3,735,000,000	-3,650,000,000	+173,440,000	+85,000,000
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
Federal Emergency Management Agency						
..... Salaries and expenses (emergency rescission)			-5,000,000			+5,000,000
National Aeronautics and Space Administration						
..... National aeronautics facilities (rescission of advance appropriation, FY 1998)		-38,000,000	-365,000,000	-365,000,000	-327,000,000	
Funds Appropriated to the President						
..... Unanticipated needs (emergency rescission)			-4,200,000	-4,200,000	-4,200,000	
Total, Chapter 11:						
New budget (obligational) authority	-391,111,000	-4,739,221,000	-6,575,800,000	-6,456,732,000	-1,717,511,000	+119,068,000
Rescissions	(-335,111,000)	(-3,903,221,000)	(-3,775,000,000)	(-3,725,532,000)	(+177,689,000)	(+49,468,000)
Rescission of contract authorization.....			(-1,647,600,000)	(-1,622,000,000)	(-1,622,000,000)	(+25,600,000)
Rescission of advance appropriation		(-38,000,000)	(-365,000,000)	(-365,000,000)	(-327,000,000)	
Offsets	(-58,000,000)	(-798,000,000)	(-779,000,000)	(-740,000,000)	(+58,000,000)	(+39,000,000)
Emergency rescissions			(-9,200,000)	(-4,200,000)	(-4,200,000)	(+5,000,000)
Total, title II:						
Discretionary budget authority (net)	2,991,910,000	1,162,101,000	-280,702,000	-135,511,000	-1,297,612,000	+145,191,000
Appropriations.....	(123,342,000)	(392,450,000)	(1,075,075,000)	(508,515,000)	(+116,065,000)	(-566,560,000)
Rescissions	(-335,111,000)	(-3,903,221,000)	(-3,775,000,000)	(-3,725,532,000)	(+177,689,000)	(+49,468,000)
Rescission of contract authorization.....			(-1,647,600,000)	(-1,622,000,000)	(-1,622,000,000)	(+25,600,000)
Offsets	(-58,000,000)	(-798,000,000)	(-779,000,000)	(-740,000,000)	(+58,000,000)	(+39,000,000)
Emergency appropriations	(1,740,179,000)	(4,797,172,000)	(4,882,847,000)	(5,260,706,000)	(+463,534,000)	(+377,859,000)
Contingent emergency appropriations.....	(568,000,000)	(711,700,000)	(724,000,000)	(302,000,000)	(-409,700,000)	(-422,000,000)
Emergency rescissions			(-9,200,000)	(-4,200,000)	(-4,200,000)	(+5,000,000)
Advance appropriation, FY 1998	(30,500,000)		(-386,824,000)			(+386,824,000)
Advance appropriation, FY 1999	(921,000,000)					
Emergency advance appropriation, FY 1998..				(250,000,000)	(+250,000,000)	(+250,000,000)
Rescission of advance appropriation		(-38,000,000)	(-365,000,000)	(-365,000,000)	(-327,000,000)	
(Limitation on obligations)	(318,077,043)	(318,077,043)	(933,193,000)	(694,810,534)	(+376,733,491)	(-238,382,466)
(Loan authorization)	(488,000)		(269,488,000)	(164,000,000)	(+164,000,000)	(-105,488,000)
(By transfer)	(51,100,000)	(30,200,000)	(35,200,000)	(35,210,000)	(+5,010,000)	(+10,000)
(By transfer) (emergency appropriations).....	(3,003,000)	(3,003,000)	(4,403,000)	(4,403,000)	(+1,400,000)	
(By transfer) (contingent emergency appropriations)			(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(+20,000,000)	
Mandatory budget authority	757,200,000	757,200,000	757,200,000	937,333,600	+180,133,600	+180,133,600

**EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTALS AND RESCISSIONS
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 1997 (H.R. 1469) — continued**

Doc No.	Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
Grand total, all titles:						
Discretionary budget authority (net)	218,124,000	1,161,634,000	-381,165,000	-135,663,000	-1,297,297,000	+245,502,000
Appropriations	(143,342,000)	(449,930,000)	(1,151,555,000)	(591,795,000)	(+141,865,000)	(-559,760,000)
Rescissions	(-407,111,000)	(-5,943,568,000)	(-5,680,943,000)	(-5,655,164,000)	(+288,404,000)	(+25,779,000)
Rescission of contract authorization			(-1,647,600,000)	(-1,622,000,000)	(-1,622,000,000)	(+25,600,000)
Offsets	(-4,856,000,000)	(-798,000,000)	(-779,000,000)	(-740,000,000)	(+58,000,000)	(+39,000,000)
Emergency appropriations	(3,818,393,000)	(6,779,572,000)	(6,811,847,000)	(7,106,906,000)	(+327,334,000)	(+495,059,000)
Contingent emergency appropriations	(568,000,000)	(711,700,000)	(724,000,000)	(302,000,000)	(-409,700,000)	(-422,000,000)
Emergency rescissions			(-9,200,000)	(-4,200,000)	(-4,200,000)	(+5,000,000)
Advance appropriation, FY 1998	(30,500,000)		(-386,824,000)			(+386,824,000)
Advance appropriation, FY 1999	(921,000,000)					
Emergency advance appropriation, FY 1998..				(250,000,000)	(+250,000,000)	(+250,000,000)
Rescission of advance appropriation		(-38,000,000)	(-365,000,000)	(-365,000,000)	(-327,000,000)	
(Limitation on obligations)	(318,077,043)	(318,077,043)	(833,193,000)	(694,810,534)	(+376,733,491)	(-238,382,466)
(Loan authorization)	(488,000)		(269,488,000)	(164,000,000)	(+164,000,000)	(-105,488,000)
(By transfer)	(51,100,000)	(53,200,000)	(58,200,000)	(58,210,000)	(+5,010,000)	(+10,000)
(By transfer) (emergency appropriations)	(3,003,000)	(3,003,000)	(4,403,000)	(4,403,000)	(+1,400,000)	
(By transfer) (contingent emergency appropriations)			(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(+20,000,000)	
Mandatory budget authority	757,200,000	757,200,000	757,200,000	937,333,600	+180,133,600	+180,133,600
Total appropriations in bill (net)	975,324,000	1,918,834,000	376,035,000	801,670,600	-1,117,163,400	+425,635,600
SUMMARY OF 1997 SPENDING						
Total discretionary spending, title I	2,098,214,000	2,039,880,000	1,805,480,000	1,929,480,000	-110,400,000	+124,000,000
Total rescissions and offsets, title I	-4,872,000,000	-2,040,347,000	-1,905,943,000	-1,929,632,000	+110,715,000	-23,689,000
Total discretionary spending, title II	2,431,521,000	5,901,322,000	6,681,822,000	6,071,221,000	+169,899,000	-610,701,000
Total rescissions and offsets, title II	-391,111,000	-4,701,221,000	-6,210,800,000	-6,091,732,000	-1,390,511,000	+119,068,000
Total mandatory spending, title II	757,200,000	757,200,000	757,200,000	937,333,600	+180,133,600	+180,133,600
Total spending in bill	5,286,935,000	8,698,402,000	9,244,602,000	8,938,034,600	+239,632,600	-306,567,400

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, on March 19 the President sent a request to this Congress for an emergency supplemental to pay for flood damage relief in some 35 States and to reimburse the Pentagon for additional costs incurred by America's responsibilities in Bosnia. That request was for around \$5 billion.

Today is June 6, almost 80 days after the President sent his request to this Congress. Today, this House is apparently about to send to the President a bill that contains considerably more money and, unfortunately, it also contains three blatant political riders which have nothing whatsoever to do with disaster recovery or military readiness. Those riders will, and, in fact, they are doing it right now, they are, for all practical purposes, resulting in a second Government shutdown for the areas of the country who are desperately awaiting relief from Washington and are not getting it because of these three riders.

The first rider is a political restriction on the census. Now, I happen to agree with the language of that rider. I do not like the idea of having sample census supplement the enumeration in the census. But I also recognize that that fight ought to be made on the State-Commerce-Justice appropriation bill. It does not belong on an emergency proposal to get help to 35 States which need it very badly.

□ 1730

There is also a second rider which has to do with constructing roads on environmentally sensitive public lands in some 17 States across the country, most especially Alaska. No matter how one feels about the provision, that language does not belong on an emergency appropriation bill trying to help the American people.

Thirdly, there is another rider, which is posed as being a benign rider, which will simply extend the activities of Government at the end of the fiscal year. In fact, that rider is a pernicious effort to create a new imbalance of power between the Congress and the Presidency, because the effect of that rider is to essentially allow the majority in this House to pass through the Congress those appropriation bills which they want to cut, but it allows them to hold back any appropriation bill which contains administration priorities. That means that the President is being asked to put himself in a hole in terms of being able to defend what he considers to be legitimate national priorities. No matter how one feels about that, that language again does not belong on an emergency appropriation bill.

Now, this bill is going nowhere. It is going to be vetoed over those three riders. The American people know that once again Congress is putting, by its action on these three riders, it is put-

ting partisan political considerations ahead of the needs of the American people, and I think we ought to see to it that that does not happen this evening.

What we ought to do is to stop the political games. We ought to stop the delays which are preventing real help from getting out there to real people. So I am simply going to ask people tonight to vote "no" on the proposition. A "no" vote will actually speed up the needed relief to the affected areas of the country because we could, in fact, tonight go back to conference, strip that bill of these three offending riders, and in that way enable aid to get to these areas in the fastest possible way.

That is what I think we should do. We should pass the effective equal, H.R. 1796, which I have deposited at the desk today, which will contain all of the provisions in this proposition before us today except those three riders that are causing this bill to go nowhere. That is the responsible thing to do if we are worried about meeting the needs of our troops in Bosnia, if we are worried about meeting the needs of the Americans in the affected areas.

I would urge a "no" vote on this bill, not only because it is delaying the needed aid to these areas, but because it also is rapidly getting us into a place where our military is going to have to take a number of actions which are not in the national interest of this country.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS], who deserves all the credit as the prime sponsor of the continuing resolution involved in this bill.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about a resolution that is geared to prevent the shutdown of Government. What is so wrong about that? The same voices that are saying we cannot pass legislation to prevent Government shutdown are the voices that the last time were heard, "You have shut down the Government. Why did you shut down the Government?"

This is a simple way, a commonsense way, and maybe that is why I cannot get it through to everybody, it is a commonsense way to prevent Government shutdowns.

What did the President say during the last time when the Government was shut down that should be part of the record for this debate here today? He said, and I quote, "It is deeply wrong to shut the Government down while we negotiate under the illusion that somehow that will affect the decisions that I would make on specific issues. As I said, this is only casting a shadow over our talks. I will continue to do everything I can in good faith to reach an agreement, but it is wrong to shut the Government down."

The President should be addressed in a way to indicate that this is exactly what we are doing: We are listening to his words, we should not shut down the Government. Same President, same arena.

In the last shutdown alone, the Federal Housing Administration was unable to insure single-family home loans for tens of thousands of deserving applicants, and many, many thousands of citizens could not get passports. Some veterans could not get benefits. Many Medicare claims could not be processed. Small businesses, lots of them, could not get loans to create new jobs, all of because of a shutdown.

We are asking in this particular amendment that we permit a commonsense way to prevent Government shutdown. The President said this about the cost of a shutdown on Saturday, January 20, 1996: "We believe that we can go a long way towards bringing the forces of goodwill to a measure that everyone agrees should occur to prevent Government shutdown."

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA].

(Mr. MURTHA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, let me talk a little bit about the problems we have in defense. I include for the RECORD three letters, one addressed to the chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security, the other addressed to Secretary Cohen from the Army, and the other addressed to Secretary Cohen from the Air Force.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC.

Hon. C.W. BILL YOUNG,
Chairman, Subcommittee on National Security,
Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR BILL, I want to thank you for your action to date on the FY 1997 Bosnia/Southwest Asia Supplemental request, but I want to share with you my concern and that of the Service Chiefs about the impact on operations and training if the supplemental is not approved soon.

In my testimony and discussions with Congress, I have emphasized the need for early action on the supplemental. Based on its likely passage by Memorial Day, few actions were taken by the Department to offset supplemental costs. However, since our request was not approved last month, the Chiefs of Staff of the Army and the Air Force have renewed their concern over the possibility of delayed passage of the supplemental. I have enclosed copies of recent memoranda from them. To ensure that their overall operations are properly funded, the Chiefs have indicated that they cannot risk being left with no options for funding Bosnia/Southwest Asia costs if the supplemental is delayed much longer.

I remain hopeful that quick action can be taken on the supplemental to preclude the disruptive impact to the Department's programs, especially those related to maintaining our readiness capability.

Sincerely,

BILL.

U.S. ARMY,
THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, DC, June 3, 1997.

Hon. WILLIAM S. COHEN,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I need your assistance in expediting the Bosnia Supplemental currently on the Hill. In early April, I advised Congress that in the absence of supplemental funding or the clear assurance that such funding would be forthcoming, I would be forced to begin actions in early May that would result in a degradation of readiness. I have not initiated the planned actions to deal with the lack of supplemental funding because the progress made had convinced me that supplemental funding would be forthcoming.

Recent developments indicate passage of the supplemental may be at risk. This puts the Army in the position of having to provide fourth quarter resource allocation to the field without having supplemental funding in hand. We have a fiscal responsibility to ensure that the allocation of fourth quarter resources is done within current limitations. There are several actions presently under consideration to cope with this situation. Each will have direct readiness and quality of life implications. Actions include the cancellation of Army participation in JCS exercises, Combat Training Center (CTC) rotations, home station training, weapons qualification training, and the deferral of some real property and depot maintenance. Some of these actions could carry over into the next fiscal year. For example, canceling home station training in the fourth quarter of this fiscal year could impact on CTC rotations in the first quarter of FY 1998.

We continue to monitor the supplemental very closely. As the situation develops, the Army will initiate any and all actions necessary to train and operate within the means available to us.

Very Respectfully,

DENNIS J. REIMER.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, DC, June 3, 1997.
Memorandum for the Secretary of Defense

From: HQ USAF/CC, 1670 Air Force Pentagon, Washington, DC 20330-1670
Subject: FY97 DoD Contingency Supplemental

I understand that quick passage of the Supplemental may be in jeopardy. The purpose of this memorandum is to make you aware of the impacts of delayed passage (beyond June) on Air Force day-to-day operations.

The Air Force is currently cash flowing over \$700 million in support of Bosnia and SWA operations. We are doing so out of third and fourth quarter funding but are fast running out of flexibility and must soon take very dramatic action to avoid incurring an anti-deficiency in our O&M appropriation. On or about 1 July, Air Force commanders must begin taking the following kinds of actions:

Severely curtail or cease non-flying training—skill and proficiency levels reduced, e.g., weapons maintenance.

Severely curtail or cease flying training—squadrons and wings stand down—aircrew readiness degraded.

Cease all non-mission critical travel.

Defer further depot maintenance inductions—aircraft grounded.

Terminate benchstock fills—aircraft spares and consumables inventories drained.

Park non-mission critical vehicles.

Place moratoriums on all but safety related facility maintenance, including runway repair.

Impose civilian hiring freezes.

I know you are aware of the importance of this issue. We are well beyond the point where we can avoid serious disruption to Air Force operations if there is no supplemental. Timing is now critical.

RONALD R. FOGLEMAN,
General, USAF, Chief of Staff.

Mr. Speaker, we started doing our business as soon as we got the request. Chairman YOUNG called the subcommittee together. We recognized the concern of the military if we did not replenish their supplies, because of the Bosnia operation. There are a number of people that were against the deployment to Bosnia, but our position in the Congress has always been, we are going to take care of the troops.

So we went to work immediately trying to make sure that we did our part in this supplemental. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations recognized the need. He has been on this subcommittee for years, and he recognized the need to do something immediately about it. Let me say that the military is really in a bind. The quicker we get this done, the sooner we will alleviate the problems in the military. But let me go back a few years and show you the difference.

In 1977, Johnstown, PA had a disastrous flood. The legislation had run out for flood relief. At that time it was handled by the Small Business Administration. I stayed for 2 or 3 days in Johnstown, and I recognized we could not do anything until we got legislation to extend and extended the coverage for the Small Business Administration.

I came back to Washington, talked to the Speaker at that time, who was Tip O'Neill. He called the President of the United States, Jimmy Carter. Within a week, we had passed the necessary legislation and we could go forward with opening up the disaster relief centers that were needed so desperately in our area.

The Federal Government spent \$350 million in a very small area, within about a 4- or 5-month period, because of the cooperation of everybody in the House Chamber. There were no extraneous matters on the legislation. Everything was done in order to expedite it.

I know how those people feel. I understand their pain. We went through it. Three times we have had disastrous floods in our area. We are, in effect, shutting down the Government because of extraneous material. Here we are with the CR. If we could not do our job, the Government shuts down. The Committee on Appropriations realizes the importance of passing this legislation without a continuing resolution.

I remember the President of the United States standing up there with a continuing resolution passed under the Democrats, it was 2 or 3 feet thick, and he said this should never happen again. What we are doing here is trying to

pass a continuing resolution, when we do not even know what would be in this, because we shut down the Government a year ago.

That is a mistake, and I feel very strongly that the Committee on Appropriations does not need the advice of the Whole House in telling us how to do our business. We do our business. We pass the legislation. If we had an opportunity, we would pass this legislation without any extraneous matters.

The census hurts Pennsylvania, this census matter that they are trying to pass in this legislation. So I would hope that we would pass this quickly, the President will veto it and get it back here, so we can get this flood relief and this defense relief that is so desperately needed for the people out there passed and signed into law and get help to them.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], the very distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to echo some of the thoughts that my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] has just spoken of. I would remind the Members, and as I have told Mr. MURTHA, when I was 5 years old and lived in a little house on the banks of the Allegheny River in western Pennsylvania, I had an opportunity to watch that little house get knocked off of its foundation by the flooded Allegheny River, and at that point we had no idea where we might be going to live. So I know firsthand, although it has been a while ago, I know firsthand the feeling and frustration of people that lose their homes because of natural disasters, and in this case floods.

Also, I would say that the needs of the Army and the Navy and the Air Force and the Marine Corps and the Coast Guard need to be met and need to be met quickly. In support of the work of the Committee on Appropriations, and especially the Subcommittee on National Security, we have done our job. We did it well.

When we got the request for the supplemental for the Armed Services, we were asked to wait until the disaster supplemental was sent also from the White House, so we did wait for that. It arrived at the end of March. The subcommittee marked up the defense supplemental on April 16. We were through the full committee on markup on April 24. The Senate passed the supplemental on May 8. The supplemental went to the House floor, was defeated by an overwhelming vote on that side, unfortunately. So we had to bring the supplemental rule back to the House again on May 15. We finally passed it and went to conference on May 20.

On the first day of the conference, the conferees on the national security issue, the defense supplemental, settled our differences with the other body, and we were prepared to move that legislation then. We recognized the need

that the Armed Services had. We did not delay. We have been prepared to go on this issue ever since May 20.

So I hope that we can settle this issue today. I hope that we can send it to the White House. I hope the President will recognize that what we are doing here is in good faith, sign this bill, get the disaster relief where it is needed, and get the money to the military before they have to stand down their training and other issues that might seriously affect readiness.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER].

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

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the sampling prohibition buried deeply within this measure. Legislating census methodology is not only wholly inappropriate, but holding disaster victims hostage to its political aims is unconscionable. For them, this is a Government shutdown.

Consider this: We have just told the world's premier statistical agency that they cannot use statistical methods. The truth is that sampling and statistical methods are not new to the census, but even decades-old traditional uses would be banned, and would guarantee that tens of millions of Americans all across this country will be missed and millions more will be double-counted. Even worse, errors resulting from this count will reverberate and compound themselves year after year in the maldistributions of hundreds of billions of dollars over the next decade.

Without sampling, we will never be able to count every head by simply relying on return census forms and dedicated amateur enumerators. Who says so? Well, in 1991 the now Speaker of the House urged the use of statistical methods to improve the count. GAO and the Commerce Inspector General criticized the Census Bureau for not going far enough to incorporate sampling, and three separate panels of the National Academy of Sciences recommended the use of sampling and statistical methods to make the count more accurate.

Dr. Barbara Bryant, President Bush's director of the Census, said that the most accurate count possible will be the one that combines the best techniques for direct enumeration with the best known technology for sampling and estimating the unmeasured.

□ 1745

The bill before us rejects those judgments. There is nothing unconstitutional about the use of sampling or statistical methods. But prohibiting its use and holding disaster victims hostage to this very bad idea is unconscionable. This is for them a government shutdown. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this conference report.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise to ask the chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations to engage in a colloquy.

The conference agreement contains an appropriation for the emergency repair and renovation of the Botanic Garden, which we all know is absolutely necessary. As the gentleman knows, the Joint Committee on the Library has jurisdiction over that program. Does the jurisdiction of the Joint Committee on the Library extend to the direction of the expenditure of the funds for the renovation project that is contained in this supplemental?

Mr. WALSH. My response is yes. This is a supplemental appropriation which supplements the regular fiscal year 1997 appropriation for the salaries and expenses of the Botanic Garden. The language in that supplemental says, and I quote, "for an additional amount that is an additional amount over and above the appropriation in the regular appropriations bill and under the same terms and conditions as the regular fiscal year appropriation."

The regular fiscal year appropriation clearly states, at 110 statute 2406 in Public Law 104-197, that "all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Botanic Garden are under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library."

I confirm, therefore, that the repair and renovation project are covered by the terms and conditions of the basic appropriation. That means it will be conducted under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee and I thank the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. WALSH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. STOKES. I thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the U.S. census sampling language contained in the emergency supplemental appropriations bill. The prohibition of sampling will guarantee a miscount of the American people. The U.S. Census Bureau and the National Academy of Science's research and evaluations have proven that statistical sampling is absolutely necessary to improve the accuracy of the census count. In addition, the U.S. Department of Commerce inspector general has determined that the use of sampling to measure and correct the census undercount is the only way to eliminate the historic disproportionate undercount of people of color and the poor.

Mr. Speaker, the House leadership must not deny the American people their constitutional right to be counted. This is an issue of fundamental fairness and basic economics. Not only is the count used for reapportioning the House of Representatives, it is used in determining the allocation of billions upon billions of hard-earned taxpayer dollars.

To deny the American people their right to be accurately counted in the U.S. census is not only a blatant act of discrimination, it is also irresponsible. The 1990 census failed to count an estimated 4 million people and cost the American people a record high of \$2.6 billion. The census counting system is broken and must be fixed. I ask my colleagues to join with me in voting "no" on the conference report.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I speak as the representative of the citizens of this country that have perhaps been hit the hardest by all of the natural disasters addressed in this bill.

The bill before us represents some of the very best and some of the very worst inclinations of this body.

Six days after the dikes broke in Grand Forks and the city was inundated, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations was kind enough to add relief in the markup on this bill to respond to our situation. The very next day, the Speaker of the House gave up personal family time over the weekend to come and view the area. Two days after that the majority leader led a bipartisan delegation also to view the area and assess the damages. The very next week meaningful relief was added to the bill on the House floor, thanks to the work of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE], another bipartisan effort.

Then, just when it looked to the people of the country that Congress perhaps could act in a bipartisan way to meaningfully respond to a disaster, the games started and brought the whole effort to a screeching halt, leading up to the disgraceful exit of this body at Memorial Day recess without addressing the flood disaster.

The bill before us still contains the political games that have slowed this effort and delayed relief to the people that need it, but I ask that it be enacted and sent to the White House. I have become convinced that we need to move this relief measure forward and that playing this silly game out, sending the bill up with the veto bait attached, ensuring the veto which will come, ensuring the sustaining of the veto which we know will then come, will then get us to a position where the bill can be passed, as it should have been all along, with just the relief component, so that at last, at long last, the families that I represent and others throughout the area that I am from, families that in some instances do not

have homes to go to tonight, families that will not have seen their children for 6 weeks, a city that does not know which way to turn until this bill is passed, only then can we begin the process of moving forward. Despite the reservations, I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WICKER], a very distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WICKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly rise this afternoon in favor of the conference report. I would like to address one of the three objections mentioned by the distinguished ranking member of the full committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin, and that deals with the issue of census sampling. The distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin says that he agrees with the language of the conference report on sampling but he simply does not believe it is appropriate in this particular piece of legislation.

What are we talking about? There are people in the administration and in the Census Bureau who are proposing essentially to count approximately 90 percent of the people of our country and then to guess at the other 10 percent based on a computer sampling. That is the issue we are talking about.

Mr. Speaker, we need an accurate count of every American. Constitutional principles dictate that we count every American. I am constantly amazed by the wisdom and foresight of our Founding Fathers. The U.S. Constitution, in Article I, section 2, calls for "an actual enumeration" of the people. Not a sample, not a guess.

Further, the 14th Amendment of the Constitution calls for apportionment based on "counting the whole number of persons in each State," not just some of them and not guessing at the others. Each and every one of our constituents needs to be counted.

This "Census Guessing Scheme 2000," as I call it, is not only unconstitutional but it is also inaccurate. According to independent studies from Congress, the proposal has a margin of error of up to 35 percent. We do not need to have an estimate where there are 100 people and it could be 65 or it could be 135. That is not the way it should be done. We will provide the money to count each and every American.

This issue is essential. It goes to the franchise of our citizens. It rises to constitutional dimensions, and it needs to be settled right now. I cannot for the life of me understand why the President of the United States would veto this essential bill on this particular issue.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PETERSON].

(Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this

conference report because it has the needed resources that we need in our community. I would also like to thank my friends in the majority for putting this bill together and making this a priority coming out and seeing our area. I represent the city of East Grand Forks and some other communities that have been damaged by this flood and, believe it or not, we have I think more damage to homes and more damage to businesses in our community than they have had in Grand Forks. We are a smaller community, a community of 9,000 people. We do not have the resources of some of the bigger communities, and we really need this legislation to help us put this community back together. We have to move probably 40 percent of this community. We have to rebuild the entire downtown area. We have got a lot of work ahead of us. We very much need this legislation.

One thing that really disturbs me and disturbs the people of our area is that we have got these extraneous items that are attached to this bill. The mayor was here yesterday. They are very frustrated that we are getting partisan political issues added to this bill that have no business being included, they have nothing to do with this bill, and it is really unfortunate that we are in this situation. This bill is going to be vetoed, and we are going to have to go through this process.

The other thing I would say is am really disappointed that we are not going to be here tomorrow and we are not going to be here Monday. We were planning on being here and I think we ought to be here. That way we could have the President veto the bill and we could have this thing shuttle back and forth and we could get it passed.

Every week that we lose is more of a problem for us. We are in a very cold climate. We have a very short window of opportunity to rebuild this community. If we have to wait until Tuesday and we have got more vetoes and more going back and forth, it is going to put us in a bigger problem. I reluctantly support this agreement in its current form and hope that we can get through this process, get to a clean bill and get the money to the people of the area that need it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, it is tragic that we now see Members whose districts have been impacted seriously by the floods being put in the situation of a bill that is now unacceptable because it continues to carry riders.

One of the most egregious riders in this legislation is the one that deals with the issue of roads and public lands, the RS-2477 roads, if you will. Just as the floods destroyed much of the property of the people in the upper Midwest and in California earlier this year, this rider is designed to destroy much of the wilderness and the public

lands in the United States. The reason it is on this legislation is very simple. It could not pass the House of Representatives any other way and it cannot pass the Senate any other way. It may not even be able to get out of a Senate committee. Yet what we find is the sponsors of this measure are the chairs of those committees but they do not want to subject it to public scrutiny. They want to put it on a rider in appropriations that is supposed to speak to the desperate situation of people who have lost their homes, their lives, their property. That ought not to be allowed. This amendment ought not to be allowed. This amendment suggests that if you find any historical trail, any tracings of somebody going across public lands, that somehow that can then be exploited and turned into an improved road. Then of course that improved road is used to say that that land will not qualify for wilderness because it has a road on it. It is a little bit like the young man who killed his mother and father and then pleaded for mercy from the court because he was an orphan. This ought not to be allowed. This should be subjected to hearings in committees. This should be subjected to a full debate in the House of Representatives where it will be overwhelmingly on a bipartisan basis rejected. But the senior Senator from Alaska decides that he would rather hold the flood victims hostage. The senior Senator from Alaska has decided rather than have open debate, he would rather stick it into a bill for people in a desperate situation.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think that the rules prohibit the last statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). Is the gentleman making a point of order against the words?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I do not ask that the gentleman's words be taken down because of the lateness of the day. But I would make a point of order that the gentleman's words were out of order.

□ 1800

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am perfectly clear to stand to be corrected, if that is the case, and I guess I need to be reminded again about how we identify who is being talked about if we are talking about somebody in the Senate? What does one say? A Senator?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members not to mention specific Senators in a derogatory manner.

Mr. MILLER of California. Can we get fingerprints on the resolution then, or how do we do this?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York.

(Mrs. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would request the opportunity to place in the RECORD an earnest letter from my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], urging the Secretary of Commerce to adjust the population numbers to support sampling to reflect the fact that 300,000 people were missed in Georgia. The letter is dated April 30, 1991.

How times have changed. I feel it is very wrong to legislate on the CR and certainly to change the census law banning sampling on the CR.

The letter referred to follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 30, 1991.

Hon. ROBERT A. MOSBACHER,
Secretary of Commerce, Department of Commerce, Washington, DC.

DEAR ROBERT: Based on recent press reports, it appears that there has been an undercount of the Georgia population in an amount in excess of 200,000. I respectfully request that the Census numbers for the state of Georgia be readjusted to reflect the accurate population of the state so as to include the over 100,000 which were not previously included.

Needless to say, if the undercount is not corrected, it would have a serious negative impact on Georgia. For example, if the population is adjusted to reflect the 200,000, then Georgia would be entitled to an additional congressional seat. In addition, without the adjustment, minority voting strength in Georgia will be seriously diluted. Based on available information, without an adjustment to compensate for the undercount, minorities in Georgia could lose two State Senate seats and 4-5 House seats. As a result of conversations with black legislators, it is my understanding that they have not only concurred with this request, but stated that they believe it is required under the Voting Rights Act.

In addition to these repercussions, the failure to make an adjustment based upon the admitted undercount would seriously affect federal funding which Georgia receives. In effect, Georgia would be required to utilize funds to provide for an additional 200,000 for which it was not receiving funding.

Based on these factors, I strongly urge you to adjust Georgia's population figures to reflect the correct population. I would appreciate your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

NEWT GINGRICH.

By including the sampling ban in the disaster relief bill you're effectively dumping on two segments of the population. Those who need flood relief, so they can recover their homes and businesses, and those minorities and poor—who are constantly overlooked by the majority in this House.

The House leadership talks a lot about inclusion. What's worse, the language in this bill prevents the bureau from checking for duplications, or even from making sure enough people are employed to do the door-to-door visits.

This bill even forces the Census Bureau to make mistakes and not tell anyone about it. I want to be clear about this. The 1990 census missed 10 million people. It then overcounted 6 million. It was the most inaccurate, unfair census in history.

Sampling would correct this attack on democracy. We need to let Americans know they can count on us not to count them out.

In fact one House leader talked a little more about inclusion. I have an earnest letter from my colleague, NEWT GINGRICH, urging the Secretary of Commerce to adjust the population numbers to reflect the fact that 300,000 people were missed in Georgia. The letter is dated April 30, 1991. How times change.

Banning sampling from the year 2000 census is a tidy way of making sure millions of Americans, mostly minorities and poor people, are not counted, and therefore have no representation on this floor.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote no on this supplemental. I voted yes the first time, hoping that it would be fixed in conference frankly. The ravages of rain and flood have victimized hundreds of thousands of our fellow citizens. Yet we are holding them hostage, very frankly, holding them hostage so that we can get some special issues addressed and to try to hold the President of the United States in a position of being hostage himself.

That is not what this body ought to do. We should have long before this passed a clean supplemental appropriation for the victims of the floods and to supplement our troops keeping peace in Bosnia.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the chairman of our committee who would have tried to do that and who wanted to do that, in my opinion. His leadership was sound, it should have been followed.

Mr. Speaker, I will not support this supplemental.

I rise in opposition to this conference report.

We are simply continuing the delay in getting much-needed aid out to the Midwest. The President has made it clear that he will veto this bill based on provisions that have nothing to do with providing disaster relief to our fellow Americans.

This bill provides more than \$5 billion for victims of disasters in 33 States. I support that funding which could have been approved before the Memorial Day recess, sent to the President, and signed into law.

I voted against the Memorial Day adjournment because I felt we could and should have finished work on a clean supplemental bill.

Instead, about a month after House passage, all we have is a bill that will be vetoed. How many more days, weeks, or months do my Republican friends want these disaster victims to wait?

Ironically, one of the administration's chief concerns is the automatic CR provision. In the name of preventing another Government shutdown next fall, the Republican leadership has sacrificed relief for victims of disasters. By giving the President a bill he cannot sign, we will effectively shut down many Federal disaster relief efforts. If we get about the business of getting our work done, there would be no fear of a shutdown.

The time we have spent dicker over extraneous provisions could have been used getting to the regular appropriations bills.

Holding disaster relief political hostage is not fair and it's not responsible. We ought to pass a clean appropriations measure and we ought to do it today.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I find our failure to reach agreement on the provision of funds for sorely needed public school repairs, and a deserved and overdue pay raise for police officers in the District of Columbia, highly regrettable.

District Subcommittee Chairman TAYLOR's concern and frustration with the pace of reforms in the District and with the District's leadership are not without some justification. However, I would remind my colleagues that these funds were sought by the control board, not the mayor.

Moreover, such concerns, however justified, must not lead us to turn a blind eye to the legitimate and pressing needs of both the District's citizens and those who do their very best, day in and day out, to serve and protect them—and us.

It will be unfortunate indeed if the District's schools are not able to open on time this September because we, who are in a position to preclude that outcome, declined to do so—and purely out of spite.

Mr. Speaker, the District's children, and the courageous Metropolitan police officers who protect the public safety of the District's residents and visitors—using scant resources, and in the face of increasing danger to their own lives—deserve better.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee to craft a fiscal year 1998 funding bill which will address responsibly the education and public safety needs of the District.

In the meantime, I hope, for the sake of the victims, that we will soon put politics aside and pass a disaster relief bill the President can sign.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PASCRELL].

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

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, this is a critical issue. This is a rider based on whim and certainly not science. In fact, the National Academy of Sciences has endorsed sampling as an accurate and effective way of doing the census.

The census spent \$35 million in 1995 in 3 communities in the United States to carry out this sampling. This is not guess, this is not whim, this is science. We have the state-of-the-art. We cannot count heads by counting noses. We have done it in the 1970, 1980 and the 1990 census.

Follow the science like it's always being talked about. We have the facts; let us use it, Mr. Speaker. This is not doing it by whim or guessing.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Both gentleman have 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Then I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE]. Mr. Speaker.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, for yielding this time to me.

I do not have to tell my colleagues how frustrating this entire process has been for me, and I would add that I believe that the patience of the people in the heartland is wearing very thin, and to the credit of the Committee on Appropriations they have tried under, I think, some very trying circumstances to move this process forward, but we are here today, it has been frustrating. This process has certainly tried my soul.

But the disaster victims cannot wait any longer, and I believe that the credibility of the Congress and the Presidency is at stake if we fail to deliver on the commitment that we have made to the people who are in need.

Now I have been a proponent from the very start of this thing to keep this particular disaster relief bill clean from all the unrelated things that have been attached, but nevertheless the fact is that we are going to be voting on a bill today that includes those provisions, and I would simply ask that as we send this bill to the White House that the White House would not delay disaster assistance any further and not veto the bill over a provision that asks that we count people accurately or over a provision that will keep the government from shutting down. Those are both things that are attached to this bill.

I believe that we cannot afford to wait any longer. In my State, in particular, the construction season is very short. We have very short summers and long winters, and we have to get the work underway. There are things in this bill that are important to the people that I represent as well as to many other people around this country.

We have made a commitment. The Congress, the House and the Senate have approved this legislation. It is time that we deliver and that we get on with it and send it to the President, and I would call on the President as well to sign this bill and to get the disaster assistance out there, and I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for having yielded this time to me.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to point out that the gentleman from South Dakota has from the very inception of the floods in his State, in Minnesota, and North Dakota been there along with the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY]. They have been working very, very hard to try to move this bill forward. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PETERSON] and others; the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] likewise, have all really knocked themselves out to try to move and progress this bill and make sure that it was signed into law by the President so that we could quit dicker-ing with it legislatively.

Through no fault of theirs has this process been prolonged, and I just want to compliment the gentleman from South Dakota as well as the others for their strenuous hard work. They have made their case here. It is up to us to

produce, and I urge the President to sign this bill so it will not go on any longer as well.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, this is an exceedingly important bill for hundreds of thousands of victims of disasters in 35 States. The area I represent has seen \$2 billion in losses and nine people die in the floods of January. We need this bill. But sadly it has become for those people in the affected areas another Government shut-down because we are walking right into the face of an inevitable veto, deferring even longer than is necessary the help that the people who elected us to come here and deal with their basic problems fundamentally need.

My constituents understand a Christmas tree. They understand how in Congress so often we tack on extraneous amendments that really impede our ability to get the job done. In this case there are two giant ornaments, one of which is an attempt, a partisan political attempt, to frustrate the most accurate census we could have, that census which the National Academy of Sciences and judicial experts say is not only constitutional, most accurate.

In addition, they attempt to cut back on the budget agreement in the name of keeping Government open.

This bill needs to go to the President, come right back here to be passed again.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding this time to me, and, Mr. Speaker, when the worst flood in 500 years swept through the Northern Plains 2 months ago, it was a natural disaster of historic proportions. Neighborhoods were evacuated, city blocks went up in flames, entire towns were under water. Overcome by these waters, the people called out for help. And how have the Republicans in Congress answered this call for help?

Well, I will tell my colleagues how. They have tried to high-jack this disaster relief legislation, loading it down with unrelated, politically motivated provisions that have nothing to do whatsoever with disaster relief, provisions that would slash student aid, deny veterans medical aid, devastate our national parks, and prevent the Census Bureau from taking an accurate census in the year 2000.

The American people know what an emergency is. They know that an emergency demands help and it demands help immediately. So what is the leadership of the majority doing in response to this flood? They are tinkering with mathematical formulas for the census in the year 2000.

Now what if the Founding Fathers had sent Paul Revere out on his midnight run, but asked him to drag along an iron bathtub, pick up a kitchen sink

on his way to Lexington? Now, sadly, this disaster relief bill, with all of this political baggage, turns this into a legislative pack horse that will not be able to get out of the starting gate. The Republican leadership should send the President a clean disaster relief bill that deals with just that, disaster relief.

This whole process, Mr. Speaker, reminds me of how the Republicans shut down the Government not once, but twice, in an attempt to force their agenda on the American people. That was wrong, and this is wrong.

I urge my colleagues to quit holding flood victims hostage. Exploiting these suffering families for their own political agenda is just plain wrong. Let us get on with the business of a clean bill that we can send to the President and take care of the needs of the American people.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this conference report.

I want to talk briefly about the census. My subcommittee supervised, and funded the census in 1990, and we are doing the same, of course, for the year 2000 census. We want every American counted, not guessed at, not estimated, not manipulated. Counted. Nothing less than the U.S. Constitution says that every American shall be actually enumerated. It does not say guess, estimate, pontificate, manipulate. It says count, enumerate, and we are following the U.S. Constitution when we say there shall be no sampling.

We have never done sampling in the history of this country. This is a complete new departure. We insist in the House that there not be manipulation of the population count used to make up this body that governs the country. If one does what they want to do, if they want to guess, if they want to manipulate, try it. We will not stand for it because the Constitution says you shall actually enumerate citizens for the purpose of the apportionment of the U.S. House.

That is the way it has been, that is the way it shall be, and that is the way the Founding Fathers said that it should be done. We will not allow sampling. It is unconstitutional.

Lower courts have issued contradictory opinions on whether or not sampling is even possible.

Sampling is not the solution to the problem that we encountered in the 1990 census. The undercount in 1990 was because we had a cumbersome form, we did not market it, we did not send people out to find correct addresses. We had bad address lists. There was ineffective advertising, promotion, outreach and the like. We are correcting that in the census for 2000. We are appropriating nearly \$4 billion to the 2000

census for the purpose of counting Americans.

Mr. Speaker, we want to count everyone in the inner cities, in the rural areas and every part of the country, and that is why we are spending \$4 billion for that very purpose.

Now if we use sampling in the census, we are going to have the courts questioning the result for years to come, and we will have the census thrown out. We will have wasted \$4 billion. More importantly, we will have a defective census and count of citizens that will not gain any confidence anywhere in the country. It is a prescription for chaos, Mr. Speaker. The bill that is before us prohibits sampling in the census and requires that we count every single American because we think every single American is important.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], chairman of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my chairman yielding this time to me, and, Mr. Speaker, I currently have the privilege of being the chairman of the subcommittee of appropriations that deals with the disaster relief part of this bill. Throughout my career I have made a very serious effort to attempt to, where I could, eliminate partisan vitriol from subjects that relate to our subcommittee, but specially in the area of disaster relief.

□ 1815

When we recessed not so long ago, I was working in the conference dealing with this major bill. During that conference we had two or three items that were hanging up the bill, so we could not get the work done before that recess. Everybody but everybody knew there was enough money in the FEMA, that is the Federal Emergency Management Agency pipeline, to fund that which we could do in the very short term. There was some discussion of a slimmed-down version to make people feel good, but the facts were there was enough money to cover that 10-day period.

Because of that, I was astonished, while working in my district, to hear the President of the United States using his weekly radio address to suggest that one way or another, the Congress had walked away from those disaster victims. He suggested that they were unconcerned about the people of South Dakota, North Dakota, and Minnesota, and he said, as they go on vacation, ladies and gentlemen, disaster does not know of a vacation.

I was astonished that the President would take that position, when he knew full well, or at least he should have known, that there was money in the pipeline to cover that very short recess.

Now we find ourselves, we found ourselves today considering legislation in which the Republican committees have added \$3.5 billion more than the President requested for disaster relief and put extra money in a housing program to make sure we can solve the problems of moving families from the floodplain way beyond the President's request in these cases, way beyond the President's request. And now we find ourselves with that same President who is talking about our vacation, threatening to veto this very important measure, because of two technicalities really, one having to do with the census in which we suggest at least everybody ought to be counted; and the other end has to do with whether we allow the President to deal with a continuing resolution, shutting down the House or not. He wants to strike the language that would eliminate the shutting down of the House.

I cannot understand why he would want to do that. Nonetheless, on technicalities, he is going to veto this bill and presume that that is not a vacation, presume these people do not have this problem any further.

Mr. President, you should sign this bill if you really care about those people in the disaster areas of this country.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of respect and affection for my friend from California [Mr. LEWIS], but I come from a rural area, and I know that a lot of folks in this Congress do not understand much about small towns in rural America. In fact, a lot of them do not know the difference between a jersey and a guernsey. But I have to say that, if my colleagues think that there is enough money in the disaster pipeline to deal with the problems of rural areas, my colleagues need to think again.

There is not enough money in the pipeline to help with the crop planting that is essential if farmers are to recover in a number of States in this country. There is not enough money in the pipeline to deal with livestock replenishment, which is crucial to any farmer who has lost his operation or his herd. There is not enough money in the pipeline to deal with the long-term housing problems that each of these mayors have. They need to know how to plan, and they cannot plan if they do not know what this Congress is going to do.

There is enough money in the pipeline to deal with the short-term emergency problems that people have, with the exceptions of some of the agricultural problems I have just laid out, but there is not enough money in the pipeline to enable people to plan for the long-term recovery of these communities. When one is a mayor trying to hold one's city together, every day counts.

What I want to say to my colleagues is simply this: The committee majority

knows that these riders should not be in this bill. The committee majority tried to cooperate. In fact, the chairman of the committee—and I have great respect for him—the chairman of the committee tried to bring a clean bill to this House. But the leadership of his party had other ideas. So now, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], my good friend, is once again being asked to make a good argument for a bad case. He makes a very good argument, but the case is still bad.

I want to suggest that the 80-day delay which has been caused by the insistence of the majority party leadership in adding these three extraneous riders has effectively resulted in a second government shutdown for all of the areas of the country who need this help. There are 35 States who are still waiting for government to work for them, now, in their area on their problems. They are not interested in Washington games or Washington problems. They are interested in the problems of Carolina, of Florida, of California, of North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota, and the other areas. That is what they want to see action on.

In my view, the quickest way to end this political nonsense is to vote no on this bill, make the committee go back to work tonight, strip those riders out of this bill so that we can send the President a bill which is respectable, responsible, and can be signed. If we do not do that, this bill is going nowhere. We will all simply be back here next week doing what duty ought to require us to do this week, which is to end the Washington games and get on with helping real people with real things.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

This bill provides \$8.9 billion for people who are afflicted by disasters in 35 States, as well as to repay the Defense Department for the money that has been spent in Bosnia and Southwest Asia and elsewhere.

This money is needed. Yes, there are two extraneous provisions. There has been some criticism from the other side of the aisle that those extraneous provisions are in there. But, as recently as 1993 the other side put extraneous provisions on supplemental disaster bills. This is not new. It has always happened. Throughout the history of Congress it has happened. These are important provisions. If the President wants to veto the bill and say to the American people that he does not want to count each and every American in the census, if he wants to say that he does not mind shutting down Government, he will veto this bill. I hope he does not. People need help, and this bill will let them have the opportunity to get that help.

I urge my colleagues, do not get caught up in the political squabbles, do not rationalize this bill to death. Move the bill, vote for the bill, and, Mr. President, sign the bill.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report. I do so reluctantly because it has many important provisions, including badly needed funding for flood relief measures in California and elsewhere across the country. As senior Democrat on the House committee with prime stewardship responsibilities for natural resources, I recognize that the conference report would provide significant assistance for repairs and enhancement of Yosemite National Park facilities and also would help with the restoration of watersheds, road decommissioning, and other flood-related priorities in our national forests.

But what makes this conference report unacceptable are the utterly nongermane legislative riders stuck into this conference report that have absolutely no relationship to the plight of flood victims and the needs to restore flood damage national parks. They will bring down this conference report, and make no mistake, they will delay much-needed, and unanimously supported, relief for the victims of the recent flooding as well as for peacekeeping in Bosnia.

The nongermane rider on RS 2477 road rights-of-way, a matter within jurisdiction of the Committee on Resources, should concern every Member of this House regardless of your position on the issue, because it is an insult to the jurisdiction and the rules of this House.

RS 2477 is a 19th-century statute enacted in the same era of Western giveaways of public resources that also produced the Mining Law of 1872. RS 2477 was repealed by Congress in 1976, so the current debate concerns only rights-of-way which were valid at that time. An amendment narrowly adopted in the other body was intended to overrule the Secretary of the Interior's current policies, leaving it to the States to determine which rights are valid and where roads can be built in national parks and other public lands.

The conferees have adopted an alternative that will establish a commission with members from affected States to determine the fate of these public lands that belong to all the American people. The commission is mandated to recommend changes in Federal law regarding road rights-of-way on Federal lands, ignoring the option that current policy on the Department of the Interior should be maintained and implemented. Should the Secretary of the Interior agree with the commission recommendations, the legislation provides for fast track consideration of legislation implementing the changes, including discharging of committees from consideration of the bill, limitations on amendments, and restrictions on debate time on the House floor.

Let me make a few clear statements on this provision.

First, this legislation is an insult to the House.

This is a big issue for the chairman of the Appropriations Committee on the other side, and he demanded that this section be inserted into the report. Last year, he brought us the Government shut-down by demanding inclusion in a continuing resolution of a nongermane rider concerning the Tongass Forest in Alaska. Apparently, the chairman of the Senate Appropriations committee intends to use every appropriations bill, CR, and supple-

mental to promote his personal anti-environmental agenda. The House had better think about whether that is the way in which we will allow major environmental issues to be resolved.

Second, we don't need a commission to get this issue before the Congress. All the chairman of the Senate committee needs to do—if this is so important to his State—is to call up his Alaska colleagues who chair the respective authorization committees and demand that they bring such legislation out of the committees through the normal legislative process. Instead, we are subjected to this utter contempt for the regular legislating process.

Third, this provision allows Members of the other body, who surely are neither members of the House Resources committee nor the House Rules Committee, to dictate with no input whatsoever from those committees of jurisdiction the provisions of important national legislation to be considered by the House, as well as the conditions under which that legislation will be considered: who gets to speak, for how long, and what form the resulting bill may take.

With all due respect, any member of either committee who votes to sanctify this process needs to reconsider why he or she is serving on that committee.

We don't mandate fast track for bills affecting health care for children. We don't mandate fast track for bills to assist farmers, or seniors, or students, or taxes. We don't even fast track emergency supplementals. But now, we are told, we must fast track RS 2477, and we have nothing to say about it. Just how much insult is this body prepared to accept?

The reason that we have not considered RS 2477 road right-of-way claims is because Senator STEVENS and others know full well that the House and the Senate would reject this giveaway for many of the same reasons that we have repeatedly voted to stop the giveaway of land claims under the Mining Law of 1872. Because it is a huge ripoff that threatens taxpayers and our public resources.

What is at stake here is a very serious threat to the integrity of our national parks, forests and other public lands throughout the West. In Alaska, Congress has created a world-class system of over 100 million acres of parks and other conservation areas which is riddled with claims to road access by miners with bulldozers, among others. In Utah, local development interests are anxious to use these road claims to prevent Congress from designating new wilderness areas on the public lands, and even illegally bulldoze to assert claims that the products of such activity negate inclusion of the area in future wilderness designations.

Mr. Speaker, the President made a serious error when he agreed to accept the anti-environmental the timber salvage rider on the 1995 Rescissions Act. We all learned a lesson from that experience, and he was right to veto Interior appropriations riders like the plan to increase logging in the Tongass National Forest. He should not be held hostage to this attempt to carry this pave-the-parks rider on the backs of flood victims. And I urge my colleagues to stand up for themselves and for the rights of this House and reject this conference report so that this insulting and inappropriate rider will be removed.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on H.R. 1469, the emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1997.

This conference report will allow for supplemental appropriations which was originally introduced to provide assistance to flood victims. Unfortunately, the pain and suffering of those flood victims was not enough to prevent good old-fashioned partisan Hill politics from corrupting this bill.

There are serious problems with the emergency supplemental appropriations which are so great that the President indicated early in the conference process that if they were included he would veto the bill.

The conference on H.R. 1469 today will only delay the much-needed assistance that the flood victims are waiting on.

Contained in the emergency supplemental appropriation's conference bill is a provision to create an automatic continuing budget resolution if funds have not been appropriated at the close of an agency's fiscal year.

There is an important reason that this Nation's Founding Fathers explicitly established that Congress is accountable for administering the Federal Government. We must remain accountable for tough decisions and not allow ourselves to give into anxiety over how or when we will resolve budgetary matters between the Congress and the administration.

We should not place the Federal Government on automatic pilot with changes like the one suggested in this emergency supplemental funding legislation. There are programs which should be reduced in funding or changes made to meet current or foreseeable future situations.

A major part of the Congress' work deals with the authorization and appropriation of the Federal Government's spending.

Last year, I joined with many of our colleagues to address the problems of the last Congress' budget disagreements. I attempted to avoid the Government shutdowns which occurred by introducing legislation to raise the debt ceiling limit to avoid a Federal Government default of its financial obligations and insulate critical agencies.

I stood with many Members on the issue of the budget crisis and fought to resolve the issue.

I believe that this conference report would complicate the budget process by attempting to meet the Government's obligations without requiring the Congress to do its job.

The reconciliation directives in a budget resolution usually require changes in permanent laws. They instruct each designated committee to make changes in the laws under the committee's jurisdiction that will change the levels of receipts and spending controlled by the laws.

The 435 Members of the House who have the honor of being Members of this body must and should insist on remaining accountable for all of their actions.

The constituents of the 18th Congressional District deserve no less than my best effort to participate actively and enthusiastically in all of the business of the people's House as their elected representative.

We should not give into the anxiety created by our experience of the last Congress. We should work with each other during the budgetary process through our management of this House to do this job well.

With over 200 years of history to support the way we have provided funds to operate the U.S. Government there is no precedent for making this amendment law.

I am further concerned with the supplemental appropriation's legislation by the inclusion of language which would effectively and permanently bar the use of statistical sampling for the 2000 Census and beyond.

The subject of the Census was so serious that it was addressed in article I, section 2 of the Constitution of the United States. It explicitly states that, "The actual Enumeration shall be made within three years after the first Meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent Term of Ten Years." The proposed change to the 2000 Census and beyond would require large increases in funding to attempt to physically count every resident of the United States, which would be a tremendous waste of taxpayer dollars.

Three separate panels convened by the National Academy of Sciences have recommended that the Census Bureau use sampling in the 2000 census to save money and improve census accuracy. The conclusions of this unbiased professional group of scientists should be respected by allowing the version of the conference bill to reflect their conclusion regarding statistical sampling.

The ability to take samples during the 2000 census will insure that any undercounting which may occur in this census because of sparsely populated regions of our State and the dense populations of our cities, can be held to a minimum. Undercounting the results of the 2000 census would negatively impact Texas's share of Federal funds for block grants, housing, education, health, transportation and numerous other federally funded programs. The census, as you know, is also used in projections and planning decisions made by every State, all counties within those States and their city governments.

I would like to ask that my colleagues join in opposition of this conference report.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1469, the Disaster Recovery Act of 1997. The disastrous floods of January 1997 had an enormous impact on my congressional district in California and the effects of the flooding will be with us for years to come.

The scenes last month of the Red River flooding in North Dakota and South Dakota are very familiar to my constituents. The flooded homes, the damaged businesses, and the destroyed crops are what people in my district will remember of this winter's floods. What they will also remember is the tremendous outpouring of help from their neighbors and friends. The community response to the flood disasters was truly overwhelming.

I would like to take this opportunity to personally thank those men and women in the various agencies of the Federal, State, and local governments that worked tirelessly to ensure that all residents were protected from harms way. I am certain that my fellow northern California colleagues will agree with me when I say they did an extraordinary job considering what they were up against. I know that my constituents will be forever grateful.

I think it is very important to note that, just as bad as the Red River flood damage was, my district was equally crippled by the floods. My constituents have an incredible challenge ahead of them to rebuild and recover from the damage. Damages from the California floods are expected to exceed \$1.6 billion. In my district alone, San Joaquin County endured an estimated \$59 million in damages to homes, over \$12.5 million to businesses, \$13 million to agriculture, and \$14.7 million to infrastructure. Of the area I represent in Sacramento County, the damages to agriculture have not yet been determined, but it is estimated that there is over \$1 million in damages to homes.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues just one of the very important issues that have arisen from the California floods this winter. This issue concerns the Cosumnes River in the northern part of my district, which lies in Sacramento County. The levees along the Cosumnes suffered catastrophic failure resulting from this year's California floods. More than 30 levee failures allowed river waters to flood homes and destroy fertile farmlands along the Cosumnes. H.R. 1469 provides assistance to local officials in my district for the repair, restoration, reconstruction, and replacement of the levees along the Cosumnes River.

I would like to reinforce that the figures listed above are purely estimates and more than likely will increase as floodwaters subside. However, we all need to recognize that the flooding in northern California is not necessarily over. More flooding is expected in the near future when the Sierra Nevada snowpack begins to melt. Since final estimates of damage caused by the floods have not been determined in all cases, I believe Congress must be vigilant in its efforts to ensure that additional emergency funding requests are met if they become necessary.

It is my hope that I do not have to return to the House floor next year and speak on this subject again because my district is underwater. However, I feel that without common sense policy towards flood control systems to prevent future flood calamities, we will continue to live with the fear of future flooding.

It is unfortunate that flooding has become a way of life for many communities throughout the United States. As my constituents in the 11th Congressional District of California can attest to, flooding at any level can be devastating. It is essential that this Congress pass H.R. 1469, which provides much needed assistance for urgent levee repair programs as well as other Federal natural disaster emergency programs.

In the interest of protecting the lives and property of my constituents, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1469 to assist in resolving these problems caused by the California floods.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that we are finally considering the conference report to the emergency supplemental appropriations bill. Our Nation has faced an unusual array of natural disasters recently and the bulk of the money in this bill is earmarked for recovery efforts. It is my hope that the President will sign this legislation so that Americans impacted by these disasters can continue the process of rebuilding their lives.

Mr. Speaker, as the author of a provision in the conference report that extends the San Carlos Apache Tribe Water Rights Settlement

Act of 1992, I want to clarify one aspect of the settlement agreement. Section 6003 of the conference report to H.R. 1469 contains a section allowing the United States, and subsequently, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, to take over the operation of the Black River Pump Station from Phelps Dodge Corp. This section also provides for the lease of 14,000 acre feet per year of the tribe's Central Arizona Project [CAP] water to Phelps Dodge Corp. for a term of up to 50 years, with a right of renewal based upon a finding by the Secretary of the Interior.

The language is clear, understandable, and supported by Department of Interior officials, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, and Phelps Dodge Corp. But to avoid any confusion regarding the intent of the provision, I want to further clarify the language relating to the \$5 million lease payment which Phelps Dodge is required to make to the tribe at the beginning of the initial lease term. This sum constitutes a one-time prepayment for the first 4166 acre feet of water which will be delivered in each year during the 50 year term of the lease. In effect, Phelps Dodge Corp. will be paying the tribe in advance for the delivery of 208,300 acre feet of CAP water, that will be delivered under the lease at the rate of 4166 acre feet per year over the 50 year initial lease period. The remaining water to be delivered each year under the lease will be paid for by Phelps Dodge Corp. as provided in the legislation.

Thank you and I appreciate the opportunity to clarify this provision.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the inclusion of provisions in this conference report to require the Census Bureau to conduct, as the Constitution says, an "actual enumeration" rather than using the statistical technique known as sampling. Following the 1990 census we had a debate over whether to use the number resulting from the actual enumeration or a number adjusted by sampling. This time the bureau does not even intend to try to count everyone. As I understand it, the plan is to try to count 90 percent of the people and estimate the rest.

I oppose the use of sampling for several reasons. It would leave the census numbers open to political manipulation and would tend to undermine the public's confidence in the census. We have seen various administrations manipulate the FBI, IRS, and reportedly even the Immigration and Naturalization Service for political gain. Once we move away from a hard count what guarantee do we have that this or a future administration will not manipulate the census numbers for partisan gains?

A member of the other body has recently stated that we should all support sampling since we all rely on something similar, public opinion polls, to get elected. The problem with this thinking is that we may use polls to guide us but we don't let them determine the winner. I would have no objection if the bureau uses sampling to determine where there may have been an undercount, and then goes back in and redoubles its efforts to count those people. That would be analogous to the way we use opinion polls. But to rely on sampling rather than a physical count is comparable to changing election returns if they are at variance with the polls.

Sampling is said to adjust for undercounts in major cities. But once you estimate how many people are in a given city, to what wards, neighborhoods and precincts do they belong?

How can State legislatures and school boards and city councils be apportioned if we don't know where these estimated people live? Is sampling really accurate enough to tell us if some small town has 3,300 people instead of the 3,000 from a hard count? When a State, such as Wisconsin, has hundreds of towns of such size, will sampling adjust for an undercount there the way it might in Los Angeles or some other major city? In 1990 an entire ward in one town in my district was missed. The community leaders pointed this out during the postcensus review and the mistake was corrected. For 2000 the bureau will not do a postcensus review, presumably because no one can know what mistakes were made since everyone wasn't supposed to be counted anyway.

Will the undercount of Indian reservations, of which there are several in Wisconsin, be corrected? My understanding is that the bureau plans to do a hard count on Indian reservations. Yet native Americans were among the most undercounted in the last census. How then can it be claimed that the reason the bureau wants to use sampling is to correct for past undercounts?

I do believe that it is appropriate to bring this issue up in an appropriations bill as the main argument of those supporting sampling is that it will save money. Well that may or may not be true but that can't be the only basis for designing the census. The cheapest possible census would be if the numbers were just made up altogether. We obviously aren't going to do that but the point is that saving money is not the one and only goal. Fairness is a goal and sampling is unfair to smaller communities and rural States. Following the Constitution, which calls for an actual enumeration, is a goal and the Supreme Court has never ruled on the issue.

What happens if we complete the 2000 census using sampling to estimate 10 percent of the population and then the Supreme Court throws it out? Then we will have wasted the \$4 billion spent on the original census not to mention who knows how much in litigation. Rather than saving money, sampling could end up costing the taxpayers two or three times as much money as a hard count if we have to redo the whole thing.

I believe a greater effort should be made to reach all Americans to provide an accurate hard count. 50 percent of the undercount from the last census was caused by people never receiving the forms. Better mailing lists and better coordination with the Post Office and local governments can correct this problem. Approximately 32 percent of the undercount can be corrected through the use of easier to read forms and perhaps an 800 information number. The rest will have to be reached through better outreach. Instead the bureau plans to spend less money on outreach, figuring that sampling can make up the difference.

I don't believe the bureau's plan will provide for the fairest and most accurate census.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned, however, about rescissions of trust fund moneys and additional transportation spending that is included in this bill and is unrelated to disaster relief.

The bill rescinds almost \$1.6 billion in contract authority, including nearly \$900 million from the transit program.

These rescissions were included in the House bill and were stricken by the Transpor-

tation Committee on a point of order. Yet this bill adds them back in.

The spending provided for highways by the Senate goes beyond correcting any error and directs funding to specific States. This is unnecessary and I am opposed to this type of extraneous provisions in a disaster supplemental bill.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this supplemental emergency assistance measure. I very much regret that the substance of this proposal has superimposed issues on the emergency response provisions included in the bill. This is being used as a way of avoiding full debate and attempting to force the President to accept such policy and law that he and others oppose.

The emergency funding in this measure is very much needed in Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and the other States affected by flooding and natural disasters this spring. I supported the House-passed measure and helped improve that measure when we initially considered this matter 3 weeks ago, with the expectation that in counsel with the Senate and administration the differences concerning the controversial unrelated riders could be resolved.

I was very disappointed that the House didn't conclude its work on this emergency measure prior to the Memorial Day congressional recess, and now after nearly 2 weeks of delay, the end product before the House, and to be sent to the President not only doesn't resolve the matter of the controversial riders and changes in law, but increases the total number of problems and exceptions.

Our GOP colleagues in the past Congress shut down the Government in an attempt to enact into law massive cuts in health care, education and the environment—a GOP retreat from basic programs that form the foundation of trust and the tools that the American families need to care for themselves and one another. And the GOP Congress in the last session proposed a massive tax break giveaways which would have made deficit reduction and the goal of balancing the budget a mirage.

When the Government was shut down for months, based on the GOP refusal to back down from these radical positions and wild proposals, the American people rightly rejected the GOP tactics just as they rejected the policies on their merits. The fight to add antishutdown language to this bill is an effort to rewrite history and in the bargain to try and gain an advantage for GOP spending priorities. The American people need neither revisionist history or a rearrangement of the congressional powers regarding the power of the purse. Congress should accept its responsibility with the constitutional and legal framework to pass the annual spending measures and work out differences with the President in time to avoid government shutdowns.

The GOP census rider is a blatant attempt to attack the technical and scientific means of counting our population every decade for a Republican partisan advantage—it is unfair, unworkable, and unacceptable.

The new GOP rider from the Senate in this conference report undercuts the Federal Government's role to manage public lands in the 17 Western States and would slice and dice the Federal lands, parks, and wilderness into pieces and in the end cost billions of taxpayer dollars to buy back that which the American

people already own. This legislative blackmail under the guise of "rights of way access" and a newly minted Commission is just one more in a series of ongoing efforts to deny the American people their natural heritage of landscapes and public domain. This Civil War era policy made little sense in 1866 and makes no sense in 1997.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of the much-needed help for natural disasters and Bosnia peacekeeping, we must not permit this pattern of policymaking to become successful. Vote "no," and if this passes, the President will veto it. Hopefully, we will uphold such a veto and then enact a measure which will not include these controversial provisions in a timely manner.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to oppose the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act conference report. Although this bill will provide needed relief for disaster victims—which I support—for the victims of this bill, it will be a disaster. This is not a clean bill—this is not a good bill.

This bill is loaded down with extraneous items that have no place in this measure. One item is an antienvironmental rider which diminishes the quality of our public natural resources.

However, the most disturbing item is the prohibition of statistical sampling in the census. This language, inserted by the conferees, was not agreed to by the full House. This is a blatant attempt to legislate through an appropriations bill.

As a representative of California's 37th Congressional District, I am particularly opposed to any language that would impair the Census Bureau's ability to make an accurate count of the U.S. population. Too many Americans were left out of the count during the last census. Ten million Americans were not counted and 6 million were counted twice—which distorted our attempts to ensure equal representation for all Americans. In 1990, 800,000 people were undercounted in California. California represented 20 percent of the 1990 undercount.

This undercount was not uniform across the population. The undercount between the African-American population and the non-African-American population rose dramatically to reach the highest level since 1940. In 1990, the census was six times more likely to leave out an African-American than a non-Hispanic white American. The 1990 census left out Hispanic-Americans at a rate of seven times the undercount for non-Hispanic white Americans.

The Census Bureau is developing a design for the 2000 census that corrects past mistakes and makes the upcoming census the most accurate in our history—and sampling is one tool that will help. An accurate count of the population is required to apportion congressional seats. An accurate count brings fairness to the distribution of billions of dollars in funding and planning decisions such as school and highway construction.

We can't afford to leave Americans out of the census. This bill is, in fact, muddier than the flood waters it purports to clean up. I urge my colleagues to vote against this conference report.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I regretfully must oppose this spending legislation, which commits taxpayers to foot the bill for dozens of special-interest items having nothing to do with disaster relief.

First, the House-Senate compromise bill costs \$200 million more than the House bill.

Second, it includes \$262.2 million in non-emergency spending, an increase of \$150.4 million over the House passed version.

Third, it includes such nonemergency items as: \$35 million for the Advanced Technology Program of the National Institute for Standards and Technology under the Commerce Department; \$2 million for the Commission on the Advancement of Law Enforcement; \$3 million for Ogden, UT, in anticipation of the 2002 Winter Olympics; \$650,000 for the National Commission on the Cost of Higher Education; \$101 million in education grants; \$33.5 million for Botanic Garden Conservatory in DC; \$15 million for health research; \$1.9 million for the Denver Summit of the G-8, June 20-22, 1997; \$16 million to the Customs Service for the Automated Targeting System; \$5.383 million to the U.S. Postal Service to subsidize free and reduced rate mail; \$12.3 million for a multistory parking lot in a Cleveland, OH, Veterans' Administration facility; \$1 million "special purpose grant" of which \$500,000 goes to a parking lot and \$500,000 for renovation of the Paramount Theater in Ashland, KY; and \$30.2 million for HUD Demonstration Act purposes.

This is supposed to be an emergency measure to help flood and disaster victims. The inclusion of such expenditures indicates it is not. In the exercise of fiscal prudence, I must therefore vote "no".

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report to accompany H.R. 1469, the emergency supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1997. This important legislation is key to the long-term rehabilitation of communities devastated by natural disasters across this great country. It is also essential to ensure our continued military preparedness through the replenishment of critical defense accounts.

Mr. Speaker, the Energy and Water Development chapter of the emergency supplemental appropriations bill represents the dedicated efforts of Members from both sides of the aisle and from both sides of the Hill to deliver needed assistance to those areas of our country which have suffered the crippling effects of uncontrolled floods. From the Pacific Northwest to the Ohio Valley, from the Deep South to the Great Plains, floodwaters have been especially furious during the past year. We have all been deeply touched by the heart-wrenching images of dislocated families, destroyed homes, and inundated cities. Recognizing the emergency nature of these consequences, the Subcommittees on Energy and Water Development have acted expeditiously, responsibly, and in good faith to help flood victims get back on their feet.

The conference agreement includes \$585 million for the Corps of Engineers and \$7.4 million for the Bureau of Reclamation to address flood related needs. These desperately needed funds will support the rehabilitation of levees, the repair of Federal flood control

works, and the performance of emergency dredging. These public works are more than mere infrastructure; they represent a foundation for the continued vitality, protection, and economic viability of the towns, villages, and cities that constitute a free and strong America.

In order to help pay for emergency disaster assistance, the conference agreement includes a rescission of \$11.2 million from the Energy Supply, Research and Development account of the Department of Energy. Another rescission of \$11.3 million from the Western Area Power Administration will also help offset the costs of this supplemental bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate and thank the members of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development for their dedicated efforts in producing this critical legislation. I am especially appreciative of the efforts of the ranking minority Member, the Honorable Vic Fazio. His cooperation and hard work have been indispensable, and I look forward to continuing our bipartisan working relationship as we move on to the consideration of the regular appropriations bill for fiscal year 1998.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the conference report.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I rise in firm opposition to a ban in the fiscal year 1997 Supplemental Appropriations Conference Report that disallows the use of statistical sampling in the 200 census. We must not dictate to the experts in the U.S. Census Bureau how they are to conduct this most important, Constitution mandated count of our population. Furthermore, this ban would ignore the need to restore accuracy to the census by accounting for groups grossly undercounted in the last decennial census—minorities and low-income individuals.

The bill language states, "the proposed use of statistical sampling by the Bureau of the Census exposes taxpayers to the unacceptable risk of an inaccurate, invalid, and unconstitutional census." Rather, a ban on the use of sampling poses this unacceptable risk and increases the cost to taxpayers for the 2000 census.

All evidence reviewed from the 1990 census clearly demonstrates the inaccuracy of a persistent undercount. The Census Bureau acknowledges that this last decennial count failed to include more than 4 million residents—the highest undercount ever recorded. These included a disproportionate number of racial and ethnic minorities in this country. Hundreds of thousands of Asian-Pacific-Americans were not counted by census, at an estimated rate of 2.3 percent. For Hispanics this rate was 5.0 percent and for African-Americans, 4.4 percent. It is inexcusable that these rates were two times, five times and four times greater than the undercount for white Americans. Inaccuracy to this degree itself is an invalidation.

As to the claim of unconstitutionality, a letter of May 8, 1997, from Census Bureau Director D. Martha Farnsworth Riche to Speaker GINGRICH recapped three options from the U.S. De-

partment of Justice under the Carter, Bush, and Clinton administrations: "All three opinions concluded that the Constitution and relevant statutes permit the use of sampling in the decennial census. Every federal court that has addressed the issue had held that the Constitution and federal statutes allow sampling." the clear constitutionality of the use of census sampling has been stated repeatedly, in a nonpartisan manner.

Sampling opponents further claim that this new methodology would only be to the benefit of large cities. A recent dear colleague from a supporter of the ban stated "If a smaller town in undercounted, chances are we would never even know about it much less be able to adjust the census." This situation existed under previously used methods. However, under new sampling methods, the Census Bureau would in 2000 adjust for the undercount to the census block level in every single poor and rural community, rural and urban, for greater accuracy and fairness. The sampling plan would also:

Complete the count of those who do not mail back their form or phone in the answers—only 65 percent of households mailed back the census form;

Include those people missed in the census—about 10 million in 1990—and remove duplications—about 6 million in 1990; and

To collect information from a sample of the population for poverty, highway, and housing programs.

Sampling is necessary because it would:

Save approximately \$500 million in taxpayer dollars, rather than spend more money for a census that is less accurate;

Locate those people traditionally missed and take out those counted twice; and

Allow the census to provide correct numbers for the distribution of Federal funds.

By the words of the Commerce Department's Inspector General, in a recent report to the Senate, the use of sampling to measure and correct the undercount is the "only proven method to correct the greatest obstacle to an accurate count." The General Accounting Office supports this recommendation as well.

Three separate panels convened by the National Academy of Sciences [NAS] recommended the use of sampling in the 2000 census for improved accuracy and savings, instead of greater cost, "Simply providing additional funds to enable the Census Bureau to carry out the 2000 census using traditional methods, as it has in previous censuses, will not lead to improved data coverage or data quality." We must not ignore the counsel from these scientific, statistical experts.

We are here today to say that everyone counts—whether you are a person of color, poor or elderly, whether you are a recent immigrant or a citizen, whether you live in an urban or rural area. The charge of the Census Bureau is to make an accurate count of all those within our borders.

The simple fact is that in a country as immense and diverse as ours, we should use the most advanced methodologies to assure an accurate census count of all our population, even those that are hard to reach. Not because we want a certain political party to

gain seats in the Congress. Not because we want to favor urban areas over rural areas, but because we want a fair and accurate enumeration of our population.

Too many times in our history it has been the person of color and the poor that have gone uncounted. If we do not allow sampling in the 2000 census history tells us that we will once again make many of these individuals invisible, like they simply do not exist.

This attack on utilizing a scientifically proven method of enumeration is an attack on the people of color in this country. It is another example of the Republican effort to downgrade, to diminish the voice of minorities in this country. We cannot allow this to happen.

This is not simply a technical issue of concern only to statisticians. The accurate count of our population has enormous consequences from the apportionment of our elected offices to the allocation of Federal and State funds. And if people of color and the poor are not accurately accounted for their voice in our Government and our communities is weakened.

For the sake of an accurate and fair census, we must reject any legislation to limit the use of sampling in the 2000 census. We must ensure that everyone counts. I urge my colleagues to oppose this egregious language in the fiscal year 1997 supplemental appropriations bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 201, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 169]

YEAS—220

Aderholt	Capps	Foley
Armey	Chabot	Forbes
Bachus	Chambliss	Fowler
Baesler	Chenoweth	Fox
Baker	Christensen	Franks (NJ)
Ballenger	Coble	Frelinghuysen
Barcia	Combest	Gallegly
Barr	Condit	Ganske
Barrett (NE)	Cook	Gekas
Bartlett	Cooksey	Gibbons
Barton	Crane	Gilchrest
Bateman	Crapo	Gillmor
Bereuter	Cubin	Gilman
Berry	Cunningham	Goodlatte
Bilbray	Danner	Goodling
Bilirakis	Davis (VA)	Gordon
Bliley	DeLay	Goss
Blunt	Dickey	Graham
Boehlert	Dingell	Granger
Boehner	Doolittle	Greenwood
Bonilla	Dreier	Gutknecht
Bono	Duncan	Hall (TX)
Brady	Dunn	Hamilton
Bryant	Ehlers	Hansen
Bunning	Ehrlich	Hastert
Burton	Emerson	Hastings (WA)
Buyer	English	Hayworth
Callahan	Ensign	Herger
Calvert	Everett	Hill
Camp	Ewing	Hilleary
Canady	Fawell	Hobson
Cannon	Fazio	Hooley

Horn	Minge	Shaw
Hostettler	Molinari	Shimkus
Houghton	Moran (KS)	Shuster
Hunter	Morella	Skeen
Hutchinson	Myrick	Skelton
Hyde	Nethercutt	Smith (NJ)
Istook	Ney	Smith (OR)
Jenkins	Northup	Smith (TX)
Johnson (CT)	Nussle	Smith, Linda
Johnson, Sam	Ortiz	Snowbarger
Kasich	Oxley	Solomon
Kelly	Packard	Souder
Kim	Pappas	Spence
King (NY)	Parker	Strickland
Klecza	Paxon	Stump
Knollenberg	Pease	Sununu
Kolbe	Peterson (MN)	Talent
LaHood	Peterson (PA)	Tanner
Latham	Petri	Tauscher
LaTourette	Pitts	Tauzin
Lazio	Pombo	Taylor (MS)
Leach	Pomeroy	Taylor (NC)
Lewis (CA)	Porter	Thomas
Lewis (KY)	Portman	Thornberry
Linder	Pryce (OH)	Thune
Livingston	Quinn	Tiahrt
LoBiondo	Radanovich	Trafigant
Lucas	Rahall	Walsh
Luther	Ramstad	Wamp
Manzullo	Redmond	Watkins
Matsui	Regula	Watts (OK)
McCarthy (NY)	Reyes	Weldon (FL)
McCollum	Riggs	Weldon (PA)
McCrery	Riley	Weller
McDade	Roemer	White
McHale	Rogan	Whitfield
McHugh	Rogers	Wicker
McIntosh	Ros-Lehtinen	Wolf
McIntyre	Royce	Young (AK)
McKeon	Ryun	Young (FL)
Meek	Saxton	
Metcalfe	Sessions	

NAYS—201

Abercrombie	Etheridge	Lofgren
Ackerman	Evans	Lowey
Allen	Fattah	Maloney (CT)
Baldacci	Filner	Maloney (NY)
Barrett (WI)	Flake	Manton
Bass	Foglietta	Markey
Becerra	Ford	Martinez
Bentsen	Frank (MA)	Mascara
Berman	Frost	McCarthy (MO)
Bishop	Furse	McDermott
Blagojevich	Gejdenson	McGovern
Blumenauer	Gephardt	McInnis
Bonior	Gonzalez	McNulty
Borski	Green	Meehan
Boswell	Gutierrez	Menendez
Boucher	Hall (OH)	Mica
Boyd	Harman	Millender-
Brown (CA)	Hastings (FL)	McDonald
Brown (FL)	Hefley	Miller (CA)
Brown (OH)	Hefner	Miller (FL)
Burr	Hilliard	Mink
Campbell	Hinchey	Moakley
Cardin	Hinojosa	Mollohan
Carson	Hoekstra	Moran (VA)
Castle	Holden	Murtha
Clay	Hoyer	Nadler
Clayton	Hulshof	Neal
Clement	Inglis	Neumann
Clyburn	Jackson (IL)	Norwood
Coburn	Jackson-Lee	Oberstar
Collins	(TX)	Obey
Conyers	John	Olver
Costello	Johnson (WI)	Owens
Cox	Johnson, E.B.	Pallone
Coyne	Jones	Pascarell
Cramer	Kanjorski	Pastor
Cummings	Kaptur	Paul
Davis (FL)	Kennedy (MA)	Payne
Davis (IL)	Kennedy (RI)	Pelosi
Deal	Kennelly	Pickett
DeFazio	Kildee	Poshard
DeGette	Kilpatrick	Price (NC)
Delahunt	Kind (WI)	Rangel
DeLauro	Kingston	Rivers
Dellums	Klink	Rodriguez
Dicks	Klug	Rohrabacher
Dixon	Kucinich	Rothman
Doggett	LaFalce	Roukema
Dooley	Lampson	Roybal-Allard
Doyle	Largent	Rush
Edwards	Levin	Sabo
Engel	Lewis (GA)	Salmon
Eshoo	Lipinski	Sanchez

Sanders	Slaughter	Towns
Sandlin	Smith (MI)	Upton
Sanford	Smith, Adam	Velazquez
Sawyer	Snyder	Vento
Scarborough	Spratt	Visclosky
Schaefer, Dan	Stabenow	Waters
Schaffer, Bob	Stark	Watt (NC)
Scott	Stearns	Waxman
Sensenbrenner	Stenholm	Wexler
Serrano	Stokes	Weygand
Shadegg	Stupak	Wise
Shays	Thompson	Woolsey
Sherman	Thurman	Wynn
Sisisky	Tierney	Yates
Skaggs	Torres	

NOT VOTING—13

Andrews	Goode	Schiff
Archer	Jefferson	Schumer
Deutsch	Lantos	Turner
Diaz-Balart	McKinney	
Farr	Pickering	

□ 1841

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Goode for, with Mr. Turner against.

Messrs. MORAN of Virginia, BROWN of Ohio, and INGLIS of South Carolina changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. TAUSCHER changed her vote from "nay" to "yea".

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, on Rollcall No. 169, the Conference Report for H.R. 1469, I was absent. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to return to Washington, DC, today due to a death in my family and missed the following votes:

Rollcall vote No. 165, passage of the rule on House Resolution 160. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Rollcall vote No. 166, on agreeing to the Conference Report House Concurrent Resolution 84, the FY 1998 Budget Resolution. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Rollcall vote No. 167, the Campbell Amendment (No. 52) to the Smith Amendment (No. 41) on H.R. 1757, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Rollcall vote No. 168, the Smith Amendment (No. 41) to H.R. 1757, to prohibit U.S. population assistance for foreign organizations that perform abortions in foreign countries, or lobby for changes in such laws. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Rollcall vote No. 169, on agreeing to the Conference Report H.R. 1469, the Disaster Recovery Act. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

REPORT ON NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 105-94)

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. COMBEST] 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 International Relations and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 204 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1703(c)) and section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1641(c)), I transmit herewith a 6-month report on the national emergency declared by Executive Order 12938 of November 14, 1994, in response to the threat posed by the proliferation of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons ("weapons of mass destruction") and of the means of delivering such weapons.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 5, 1997.

□ 1845

TRIBUTE TO DEPARTING PAGES

(Mrs. FOWLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as chairman of the House Page Board to pay tribute to our departing pages. I know I speak on behalf of all of my House colleagues when I say thanks for a job well done. You, the pages, have had a unique and historic experience and one which we hope will serve you well as you continue your education and begin your careers.

So much of what we do in Congress is done for the next generation, for you, our pages, who are here in the back of the room today are the next generation. You can be proud that what we have done in this Congress has not only been done for you but with you. Like each Member of Congress, you are now a part of this institution, and as of Friday you will be a part of its history. Some of you may even be part of its future, returning some day as staff members or even Representatives yourselves like the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS], and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WICKER], or our late colleague, Representative Emerson, the former chairman of the Page Board.

We know that whatever path you choose in life, it will have been enriched by your experience here in the United States House of Representatives. As you prepare to graduate on Friday, we want you to know that this entire House is grateful for your serv-

ice to us and to our country. We wish you all well.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I will include for the Congressional RECORD the names of the pages that we salute today:

Joshua Abrons, Clinton Bonelli, Joshua Booth, Justin Boyson, Elizabeth Bracken, Brett Bruen, William Carr, Marny Cavanaugh, Holli Cavender, Amanda Charters, Kari Charters, Virginia Cloutier, Sara Cobb, Katie Dewberry, Kathryn Eddy, Ryan Edmunds, Jami Feinberg, Ashley Fellers, Lisi Fernandez, Elizabeth Frank, Stephanie Freund.

Wayne Green, Page Griffin, Ryan Hemker, Antonia Henry, Kim Holcomb, Edward Holman, Peter Janelle, Christina King, Todd Koehler, Mary Konitzer, Matt Kummernuss, Sam Langholz, Sarah Lash, Melissa Leuck, Mary Elizabeth Madden, Jennifer Madjarov, Kevin Marlow, Kevin McCumber, Aric Nesbitt, Erik Newton.

Philip Nielsen, Luke Peterson, Melissa Poe, Aaron Polkey, Sabrina Porcelli, Jennifer Scott, Mary Megan Siedlarczyk, Lizzie Smart, Brandon Snesko, Howard Snowdon, Paul Soderberg, Katie Sylvis, Megan Taormino, Erin Tario, Maria Toler, Tyson Vivyan, Pete Voss, Angela Williams, Timothy Willimason, Sarah Wilson.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FOWLER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of minority whip BONIOR and the chairman of our Caucus, the gentleman from California, Mr. FAZIO, all of the leadership and all of the Members on this side of the aisle, I am very pleased to join the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida in congratulating our pages.

Mr. Speaker, the pages represent, as the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER] said, the future. I have risen before on this floor and talked about the page program. I was privileged to be President of the Maryland Senate, and one of the duties of the President of the Maryland Senate was to recruit high school students for the page program.

I would tell, Mr. Speaker, the young people, if I could address them directly, consistent with the rules, I would tell them that this experience will affect you for all of your lives. You will be better citizens. You have had an experience that few citizens in our Nation have. You have been on this floor and seen democracy in action. You have seen how conscientious the Members of this House are.

Too many Americans, I say, Mr. Speaker, if I could directly to the pages, too many Americans do not have a full understanding of how hard Members work. How conscientious they are and how much they care about doing the right thing for their country, irrespective of whether they are conservatives or liberals, moderates, Republicans, Democrats or Independents. You have learned that firsthand. So you will have something that millions and millions of your neighbors and friends and relatives will not have had: firsthand experience, how the greatest

democratic institution in the world works.

And you will have the opportunity to go back and tell our fellow citizens, too many of whom tend to be cynical, that the system works and that they need to participate, not necessarily run for Congress, maybe some of you will do that, but to participate by voting, by speaking out, by writing, communicating, by involving themselves in the democratic process.

I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, to join the very distinguished gentlewoman from Florida as a former member of the Page Board, never a page but an intern to a Member here, so like you, having had an early experience, I say to our young people, go back to your communities, go back to your schools, go back to your States and help teach democracy. Make our country better. We will be the better for it.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FOWLER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona, former member of the Page Board.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me. I thank her for taking this time for those who serve here to take a moment out of our day at the end of this week and at the end of a year of experience for our pages to thank them. Normally we stand in the well of this House here and we address our colleagues who are out here in front of us. But this evening we stand here and address the pages who stand behind the rail over there and have served us so well and, I might add, the pages who sit behind me over here at the documentarian's table.

To all of these pages, let me say that we thank you. We thank you for the service that you have given, we thank you for the confidence that you give us in the future of our country.

I began, as I think most of the pages know, I began my own service in public service, my own service in Government nearly 40 years ago when I came here as a page. In those days the program was quite different and I came as a sophomore in high school and stayed through my senior year.

I know from that experience what a difference it has made in my life, how it has fundamentally changed my own life. When I think back on the class of 1960, two of whom in addition to myself have served this House so ably, Donn Anderson, the Clerk of the House, Ron Lasch, who is the Republican floor assistant over on our side. And I think of the others who have not chosen to participate in the Congress of the United States but participate in their own communities and participate in our public life in other ways.

So what the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] said is so very true, that no matter where you go, no matter what career, no matter what profession you follow, no matter where life takes you, this experience will always

be a profoundly important one for you. I cannot make any other prediction for you, but I can guarantee you that, 40 years from now, you will look back on this experience and say that it has been an extraordinarily important one for you.

There are many people who have said that the page program is unnecessary, that it is too difficult, that we really ought to change it, that we ought to not have high school students, that we ought to have regular employees doing the work. We have resisted that through the years. I think there has been strong support in this House of Representatives to keep the page program as it is for young men and women who come to us from all over the country, from all walks of life, all communities, from every kind of ethnic and economic background because of what they represent and because of what they stand for as the future of our country and for the hope that they give us and the message that they take back to their communities. So you are a part.

The gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER] has said, now, of the history of this House of Representatives and your service is not forgotten. We have a lot of people who make the flow and the work in this House go well. It takes a lot of people for an organization this big to carry on its daily activities. It may seem to you sometimes that your work has not been that important, but collectively and together it is a vital cog of the machinery of the House of Representatives that makes this place function smoothly, not always so smoothly but usually smoothly, to function smoothly and to function well.

I think that each and every one of us has enjoyed the opportunity over the course of this last year or, for some of you, the last 5 months to get to know you, to get to understand your hopes and your dreams, your aspirations. Through you we also understand just a little bit better about the young people of America, about the hopes for our country and for ourselves. So we thank you for the service that you have given us and we thank you even more for what you represent for this country.

Speaking personally, I want to say I wish you all very well. I know that you are going to go back to your schools and your communities and I predict each and every one of you is going to be a great and wonderful success with your life. We hope we have contributed to a little bit of your understanding and we hope that when you go home to your schools next year, to your communities this summer, and you hear somebody say about how bad government is and they express the cynicism that I know you have heard before and we will all hear again, that you will say, stand up and say, but there are a lot of good people that are involved and there are a lot of people that work hard, a lot of people that care. And this is what the process is all about and

this is what democracy, this is what liberty, this is what our freedoms are all about. You are a part of that and we thank you for that service. Godspeed.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FOWLER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan, another member of the Page Board.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

The very first vote I cast in the House of Representatives in January 1977 was to cast my vote to elect Tip O'Neill Speaker of the House. And the best assignment that Tip O'Neill gave to me many, many years ago was to serve on the Page Board. It has been a very enjoyable assignment. It has been an assignment where my hope for the future has been sustained every year as class after class of pages have come through.

Let me say this from the bottom of my heart. No class, no group of pages has surpassed or been better than this class this year. Indeed, you made the chairman, myself as ranking member, our job very, very easy this year. You have been extraordinarily good. There is a program in America, a very good program for young people called Close Up, and it is a great program. And I always meet with my Close Up students. Some of you may have participated in that at one time. But no group of young people see the Congress and the Government as close up as you. You have seen history. You have seen us at our best, and sometimes perhaps you have seen us at our worst. But you have seen Government. I think that you leave here not with cynicism but with hope and trust in the Government.

When I was about your age, Franklin D. Roosevelt was President of the United States. He spoke these words many, many years ago, but I think they are as applicable today, perhaps even more so, than when he spoke them. He said there is a strange cycle in human events; to some generations much is given, of other generations, much is expected. This generation of Americans has a rendezvous with destiny.

□ 1900

Meeting you, the pages, this year, I am very confident that all of you can meet the challenges of that rendezvous, and I ask that God bless you.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FOWLER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to say, as my colleagues, to all of the pages who will be leaving this evening, thank you very much for a job well done. I guess tomorrow night is the time. But thank you very much for a job well done.

This has been an outstanding class. Many of you know that I served 4 years as a page in Congress from 1963 to 1967. Some of the defining moments in my

life were based on that time period: The day President Kennedy was shot, the vote on the test ban treaty, the debates over civil rights.

Paging has changed since that time. It is a much more select group, for one, than when I started. Screened academically. A very carefully run program today, producing some outstanding results.

We have talked about how hard Members work, but we need to take note of how hard you have worked, and, hopefully, you have learned some lessons during this time. Hard work and attention to academics, focus, the long hours you put in and the discipline that you have had to find in yourself, with all of the different things going on around you has been helpful and will put you in great stead as you progress through life, whether you stay active in politics and government or whether you do not. But we have seen some good results.

And we have shared some good times together. The passage of the balanced budget today, I think, is a fitting tribute to you, because we do this with our next generation in mind, as we put together a balanced budget resolution that hopefully will lead to the first balanced budget in a generation by the year 2002, to give your generation an opportunity to succeed. And it is with you in the future that we did this.

The experiences that I have had have stayed with me through my life and defined what I have done. I have always had an appreciation for government, but whether you end up running for office, staying active in government and politics, or just going out and being ambassadors to your community, we have given you an opportunity that few young people have. I know you have learned from this and will take it with you.

And from our experience here and from our perspective as Members, we wish you Godspeed in the time ahead and thank you for a job very well done. We are proud to have been a part of the process that you have undergone in the last few months.

Mrs. FOWLER. Before I yield further, Mr. Speaker, I understand that we can have the pages come up and sit. The Parliamentarian says it is okay, so that their parents and friends at home can see you better.

So while we complete honoring you, why do you not come have a seat in our chairs so that you can enjoy this better.

So if the gentleman from Mississippi does not mind for just one minute, hopefully the cameras will get a good view of them and the folks back home can see them as well and these great young men and women that we are honoring now.

And I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] for coming up with this great idea of having them come forward. We should know someone from the media would come up with this sort of idea.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FOWLER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and also thank the gentleman from Arizona for his excellent idea of bringing these young people forward.

Let me add my comments to those very eloquent remarks that have been made this evening on behalf of the pages and to thank you for your time of service here.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS] mentioned that he was a page for 4 years in the United States Senate. I was a page for only 1 month, and that was in 1967, in October of 1967, and it is hard for me to believe that it has been almost 30 years since I came here to serve as a congressional page for the honorable Jamie Whitten, who later on became chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and served 53 years in the United States House.

But this is a very excellent group of young people, Mr. Speaker. They are a particularly good looking group, too. And they worked mighty hard for us and they performed good service for their country and for the United States House of Representatives.

They have seen us on the floor in debate, they have seen us also in a more human sense walking up and down the back aisles there and in the cloakrooms. And I simply would say to these young people, I hope you will go back as goodwill ambassadors for this House of Representatives and for our system of government; the greatest system of government ever known to the mind of man, the oldest Constitution existing on the planet today.

You have seen a great deal of history. You saw the second inauguration of President Clinton, you saw the reelection of a Republican majority for the first time since the 1920's, therefore you saw divided government and all of the challenges that that brought for us, a President of one party and a Congress of the other party having to come together. And today you saw the fruition of that, rising to the occasion to pass on a bipartisan basis a balanced budget which will bring us to the first balanced budget since I was in high school.

Some of you today had the opportunity to see Mother Teresa of Calcutta. Others may have had to see that on closed circuit. But you really saw a remarkable little piece of history there with Mother Teresa. And to see this distinguished lady receive the Medal of Honor from Congress, a woman slight of stature, with very little personal wealth, and to think of the impact that that one individual has had across the face of the globe. I am certainly glad that you had that opportunity.

Mother Teresa wished for us today and for our children joy, peace and love, and she expressed the prayer that we would persevere in the time to come, and that is my wish and my

prayer for you as you leave this job. Godspeed to you and thank you very much.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FOWLER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank the page board for making such a great selection of such a fine group of young people to be here to serve their country and to specifically help us.

We heard my colleagues all say about the fact that they were pages or they worked as a staff member here when they were very young and the memories they had. I was never a page. The first time I came on the floor of the House of Representatives was when I was sworn in in 1987. And so I say to you what a grand opportunity you have had at such a young age to be here in the Chamber of the House of Representatives where all the joint sessions are held, where all of the policy is molded here, where your friends and families can turn on C-SPAN and see what is happening, but you are here and you have been part of it and it is going to continue to be part of you. You will have been touched in so many ways that you will realize many of them at a later time.

I very much appreciate the kind of service that you have given us. I have always found, and I know my colleagues agree, I have always found that despite the hour, you have been upbeat, you have been enthusiastic, you have at least smiled and pretended to have been enthusiastic about what you did. When we had requests, you were always there, always responded to us.

As a matter of fact, I was always amazed, I think that you could recognize more Members of Congress than I thought I could at times, because you had the pictures and you knew who it was.

I can remember sometimes in the Cloakroom where you had a message for somebody and somebody might have been sleeping, and you say is that so-and-so; now, do I dare to wake him? It happened very rarely, but there were nights when we were here very, very late and you were here very, very late.

I recognize the fact that you also had to go to classes, and I think 10 o'clock was the cutoff; that if you were here up until 10 o'clock, you might not have class the next day, but you would have to make up for it. Whatever. My point is, for young people you had to juggle a very burdensome schedule that was exceedingly difficult, because you had to study, you had to be awake, you had to be alert, you had to follow through with your own studies as well as come here and move around and move with the rhythms of this very vibrant House of Representatives.

I am sure at times you wanted to change the schedule yourself, and you might have felt that had you been there you would have had voting in a more timely manner.

I was lucky this time, too, because I was able to nominate somebody who became a page with you, Christina King, and I know she did a great job, and I have always been very proud of her and she would pop into the office to say hello. But I felt that each and every one of you were my pages. It is because of the way you handled yourself, the way you handled your jobs. Any one of you I could have stopped and asked for something and you would have been very responsive.

I know there were times when we were rather tired, and maybe despondent, although we do not really get too despondent around here, but we would look to you and you would enliven us because you represented the future and you represented people who have an enthusiasm, who have an energy, who have personality, who work hard and who are driven by ethics.

So I commend you. I want to thank you. Again, I know that this will be part of your lives in the future; that you will all do well. I know you have all met each other, and I think that is pretty exciting, people from so many different States, and you realize that each State is not an individual country, that each State does have much in common with the other and that people are people.

So when you go out into the world, and I remember something from "Everything I Needed to Know About Life I Learned in Kindergarten," and that is when you go out into the world, watch out for traffic, hold hands, and stick together. And I hope that you will have an opportunity to be able to stick together as you go out into the world. And I personally thank you very much.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FOWLER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have an opportunity to say a few words. I am actually here by mistake. I was just passing by and stumbled in and said, wow, look at this. This is a great looking group, I said to myself. I think you would probably look better than the crowd that sits in here every day. So I decided to sit and to listen, and I am glad I did.

I would like to first of all congratulate the page board members who have taken an interest, and to the chairperson, the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER], for the outstanding job that she has done with the leadership of this very important board, and also the ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE], who I have the privilege of serving with on the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Let me just echo what my colleagues have said. It just has not been said by everyone, so I am going to simply join in with the praises to you.

I have the opportunity sometimes, when I bump into some of you as I ride the trolley, and I will say hello and ask your names and where you are from

and what grade you are in, because I am always curious and interested in young people. I think that young people are indeed our most valuable possessions and as a nation we have an obligation to try to make opportunities for young people because that will guarantee that this great Nation will continue to be great.

I started my career as a schoolteacher. I was a secondary schoolteacher in the city of Newark. Many of the young people there did not have many opportunities. I brought them to the local YMCA and they were able to have opportunities at the local YMCA in Newark. They became involved in a program called Youth in Government, where they were able to become mock legislators, and they would go to the statehouse to be legislators during a period of time where they would learn legislation. So you have had that opportunity to really be here to see how legislation is crafted and created.

Your work is so important. When you go back, I think you have to be diplomats. You have to talk to your colleagues and tell them about your opportunities, and you have to encourage them to become interested in government. You know, young people are not as interested in our elective process as they ought to be, and I think you have a responsibility now, an obligation, to go back and tell young people when they become 18 that they should register to vote; that we need to have people participating in the electoral system to make it strong and to make it good.

So you have an obligation that goes forth from this place and this time to tell them, the cynics, that they have to get involved, that if they dislike what is going on, they have to change it.

□ 1915

Senior citizens vote. That is why we have so much senior citizens, housing. Have you heard of any young people's housing lately? No. Well, we have got to get young people involved. We have to get them participating.

So I am just here, like I said, to congratulate all of the pages. I, too, will have the opportunity to have my first page that will be coming in on Sunday, Andre, from the town of Irvington; and I feel very, very excited about it. Our Page Board selected him, and I really have not met him yet. I am going to meet him on Saturday and his family before he comes down. So I am just as excited, I think, as he is. It is a tremendous program. Keep up the good work.

Just one other thing. There is an interesting thing that happened in my district. Three little boys, 9, 10 and 11, found \$500 in Newark, cash. But they also found the name of the person with this \$500, and what these boys did was to go to a lady in the neighborhood and said, "We found this \$500," it was about a week ago, and they said that it should be returned to the person.

When we found out about it, we found out that none of these three boys ever

owned a bike, none of them had ever been to a summer camp, they lived in public housing, and they lived in very impoverished situations, lived with relatives, grandparents. But for them to say that this did not belong to them and to try to find the person that it belonged to, and actually these little boys, and it just happened a week ago, were ridiculed by some of the kids in the neighborhood. How stupid it was, they said, for them to give back \$500 that they found, that they should try to get it back to the person who lost it and that they do not even own a bicycle.

I do not know, but they probably got about five bicycles each by now because the community came out. They are going to go to camp for the first time in their lives. They are going to go there with all nice new clothes on because we want to make sure all of that happens.

So I just say that to say that the future belongs to those who prepare for it. Our Nation, I believe, is in good hands because of people like you. You have to go back to your neighborhoods and convert others to being just like you.

Mrs. FOWLER. On behalf of all of the Members of the House, we want to thank the pages for their service and wish them well in their future endeavors.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take a moment from our legislative business to recognize and commemorate the end of a tour of duty for our 1996-97 House pages. This year, 61 young men and women from across America took time away from their families and friends to come to Washington and perform a time-honored public service.

The tasks of a House page are not always glamorous, but are nonetheless necessary and valuable. They serve as messengers and aides. They learn about the workings of Government and observe history being made. In fact, I believe some of my colleagues in this House once had the honor of serving in the page program.

I wish I could take the time to name all of our pages, but allow me to at least make mention of those in our Michigan delegation: Ryan Hemker, Virginia Cloutier, Antonia Henry, Paul Soderberg, and Aric Nesbitt.

I have had the privilege of sponsoring one of these fine pages: Ryan Hemker of Coldwater, MI. Ryan, a top student at Quincy High School, has demonstrated all of the characteristics we have come to expect from our pages. He is industrious, intelligent, and a true leader in the page program. It was my privilege to have the opportunity to get to know him and the other pages in this year's program.

Now, as their term as pages comes to a close, I wanted to salute these young people for their efforts, their dedication, and their enthusiasm to serve the Members of this, the people's House. I am confident that their contributions here will be long remembered and that they will distinguish themselves in their communities just as they have here in Washington.

To all of our pages, I offer my best wishes and thanks.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1469) an act making emergency supplemental appropriations for recovery from natural disasters, and for overseas peacekeeping efforts, including those in Bosnia, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the resolution (H. Con. Res. 84) a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal year 1998 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002.

HOURLY OF MEETING ON SATURDAY, JUNE 7, 1997

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Friday, June 6, 1997, that it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Saturday, June 7, 1997.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM SATURDAY, JUNE 7, 1997, TO TUESDAY, JUNE 10, 1997

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Saturday, June 7, 1997, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, June 10, 1997, for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. DREIER. 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 California?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS
WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HULSHOF] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HULSHOF. Mr. Speaker, as Members know, this is National Small Business Week. I want to take time out to recognize the thousands of men and women back home in Missouri's Ninth Congressional District who run and own small businesses. I cannot think of a more worthy group to honor.

Small business, as is often said, is the backbone of our economy, accounting for 99.7 percent of the Nation's employers and for 47 percent of all sales in this country. In fact, in the 12 calendar months between December 1994 and December 1995, employment in small business-dominated industries increased 2.7 percent, creating 1.25 billion new jobs, or 75 percent of the total new jobs in the economy.

There are many small businesses back in Missouri's Ninth Congressional District that deserve praise, but tonight I want to highlight one of them, the Twainland Cheesecake Co. and Cafe in Hannibal, MO, owned by Lynn Carr. Twainland Cheesecake Co. and Cafe employs 14 women in a cheesecake-making operation where they make 110 types of cheesecakes. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I have not brought samples for the House. But I would extend a personal invitation for Members to come to Hannibal, MO to try some of Ms. Carr's famous turtle cheesecake. Nonetheless, Lynn Carr is an American success story.

At age 29, Lynn Carr could not read. In the mid-eighties, for a period of time Lynn Carr was homeless. Lynn Carr spent most of her adult life either on welfare or in low-paying jobs. She continued to believe in the American dream. She prayed for a better life. She kept in her heart a ray of hope, a sliver of self-esteem.

Eventually Lynn learned how to read and earned a GED, the equivalent of a high school diploma. She got a loan, she put her talents to work, and the rest is history in the making. She started a cheesecake business in Hannibal, MO's historic downtown.

This is a success story, Mr. Speaker, but there is more. Lynn Carr has decided to launch her own private welfare-to-work program, giving other women a chance to succeed just like she did. Using her words, she says, "Such as I have been given, I want to give back to the community." Lynn knows that some people will never break out of the welfare cycle. "But," she adds, "then you have people who were like myself who are just down on their luck and need a hand up instead of a handout." She went on to say, "If we could just save one or two families and change their lives for the better, then it is all worth it."

To further give back to the community, Lynn Carr plans to open a larger factory employing up to 50 women. She

wants to give jobs to unemployed and undereducated women living in poverty. She hopes to have a learning center and a day-care center on site. Women will enter the program by working in the day-care center, where they can learn parenting and nutritional skills. After several weeks, the women will then divide their time between the cheesecake factory and the learning center. In order to qualify for work, a woman would be required to get a GED certificate. While doing this, Lynn Carr hopes to inspire others with motivational programs.

Mr. Speaker, motivation is not a problem once you get the chance to meet Lynn Carr. Lynn Carr is a living example of how an individual can lift themselves up one rung of the ladder at a time, become a successful business person, and then, to make the picture complete, invest in other individuals living in the community.

Congratulations are in order for Lynn Carr and the thousands of other men and women who are responsible for the thriving small businesses in Missouri's Ninth Congressional District and across this great country.

FLOOD RELIEF AND FLOOD
PROTECTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the emergency supplemental flood relief measure with heavy heart. I voted against it even though it had some funds for West Virginia. But the problem was that, as this bill moved along designed to provide flood relief and flood prevention for hard-hit areas, it got loaded up with things having nothing to do with floods.

My constituents sometimes express wonder and confusion and anger at the fact that the Congress can start out with goal A in mind and somehow load it up with not just goal A but goals B, C, and D even though they have nothing to do with goal A, and that is what happened here.

I want flood relief as much as anyone does. The people who already need flood relief, the people who need emergency housing and emergency response, that money is there. This goes to stream bank rehabilitation, assistance to farmers to assist with their crops where fences were damaged, rebuilding streams, that sort of thing.

I want that as much as anybody. But in order to get that, I was going to have to vote for a lot of other extraneous language that had nothing to do with flood prevention and flood rebuilding. I was going to have to vote for controversial language dealing with potential Government shutdowns. So I was faced with a quandary hereof, if I voted for the money to rehabilitate the river bank around flood-hit Herbert Hoover High School, I could in the future be endangering some level of Pell

grants for students attending that high school. That did not make any sense to me.

This bill got loaded up with controversial language about how to conduct the census in the year 2000. We have got floods in 1997, and somebody wants to put in controversial language about conducting a census in this country in the year 2000. We better hurry up and pass this clean flood relief bill or there will not be as many of us to count in that next census if we do not do something about flood prevention.

It is quite clear that the President has already said, and he said weeks ago, that if we load this bill up and do something besides flood relief, he is going to veto it. So this bill, because it has passed the Senate and passed the House, will go to the President hopefully this weekend. He will veto it. It will come back to the Congress right away, and hopefully next week it can be a clean bill, one that deals only with flood relief and flood protection.

I voted 2 weeks ago, maybe more than 2 weeks ago, for a version of this bill as it left the House. And the reason was that I wanted to keep it moving, hoping that in the other body and that in the congressional deliberations that take place between the House and the Senate that it would get cleaned up, the extraneous provisions would be taken off and it would deal with just flood protection and flood relief. Not only were those provisions not taken off, more were added, including the controversial census counting measures.

So Mr. Speaker, it is my great hope that when the bill is vetoed, it will be back on the floor next week, little time will be lost, and it will come back as a clean bill. I was greatly frustrated when, after having voted for this bill just 2 weeks ago, the Congress immediately took a 10-day break over Memorial Day to go home. So where was the sense of urgency that I think was so important?

So Mr. Speaker, it is my great regret that what started out as flood protection and flood relief turned into a vehicle for everybody's wish list, having nothing to do with flooding. Unfortunately there were a lot of provisions that stayed in this bill that had nothing to do with flood relief and flood protection. But the good news is that the Congress can correct that, it ought to be in session this weekend, but the Congress can correct that early next week, pass a clean bill, and get it back to the President.

Mr. Speaker, let us make sure that everyone in this country understands we can have flood protection and flood relief. It should be done immediately. That should be the goal of this Congress. We should debate controversial measures that have nothing to do with flood protection and flood relief; we can debate those other days, other times, when there is not as much urgency around those issues as there is around this one.

I am looking forward, Mr. Speaker, next week to seeing a clean bill so that Republicans and Democrats alike can join in providing what everyone agrees needs to be done, genuine flood protection and flood relief.

□ 1930

AMERICAN TROOPS IN BOSNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the issue of United States troops in Bosnia, I sincerely believe enough is enough. First President Clinton said that America's commitment in Bosnia would only last one year. Then he announced the extension of our military presence in Bosnia until June 1998. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am extremely disappointed to learn that the President has indicated that American troops may be there even longer.

Our troops have been in Bosnia long enough. They should not spend another day in Bosnia. I believe that our soldiers should not be placed in harm's way for a mission that is not in America's vital national interest.

Our troops have been in Bosnia for 2 years and the American public still questions our role. Mr. Speaker, is this mission truly in our national interest? Have we not achieved our goal? When will we be able to bring our troops home?

President Clinton stated this past weekend that progress in Bosnia has been slow. As we all know, the conflict in Bosnia is a regional conflict that resulted from centuries of hate among ethnic groups. It cannot be solved quickly.

The fact is America has already fulfilled our commitment made under the Dayton peace accord. At present, America has dedicated more than \$6 billion to the Bosnia mission. I want to repeat that, Mr. Speaker. At the present time America has dedicated more than \$6 billion to the Bosnia mission.

Every dollar we spend on this mission is a dollar we cannot spend on critical military priorities, like research and development, procurement or troop readiness. The military budget is already being drained and costs like this one in Bosnia only makes it harder.

I hate to think that we are closing military bases due to the shrinking defense budget and yet we continue to spend billions of dollars on a regional conflict in Bosnia. This is not in the best interests of the American people. The United States can no longer afford to be the world's policeman. Although we are the most powerful Nation in the world, the simple fact is we just cannot have American troops peacekeeping between every warring faction around the world.

Although the President is the Commander-in-Chief, Congress has a vital role and a necessary role in determining military policy. President Clinton has misled us long enough about the troops in Bosnia. At this point there is no telling how long he plans to keep our troops in Bosnia.

When the lives of American soldiers are at stake, we in Congress have a responsibility to make our voices heard. For too long our troops in Bosnia have been forgotten. I urge my colleagues to join the bipartisan effort to bring our troops home by the end of this year, 1997.

MFN FOR CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I have taken out this time to talk about an issue which has come to the forefront. Many people are addressing it, and we apparently will be voting on this issue the week of June 23, most likely the 25th of June, that being whether or not we should renew most-favored-nation status for the People's Republic of China.

There are a wide range of issues that are addressed here, whether it is arms proliferation, human rights, the kinds of things that have come to the forefront, trade issues. I will say that I am very concerned about every single one of them. But I would like to take this few minutes to talk about an issue which has troubled me greatly.

I should say at the outset that, as has been the case in the past, I am very, very strongly supportive of maintaining most-favored-nation trading status for the People's Republic of China because in the 4,000-year history of China, the single most powerful force for positive change in that period of time has been economic reform. Let me say how important that has been and an issue which is of concern to me and many others, and that is the policy of forced abortion that exists in China.

It is terrible to have the so-called one-child policy that exists there. I believe that we should do everything that we can to change that, because that policy cannot be tolerated. Mr. Speaker, not many people know that the policy of engagement and economic reform which has existed in China is undermining the one-child policy there.

There is a young woman, 27 years old, who lives in a tiny town called Dongguan which is in the Guangdong Province which adjoins Hong Kong. Her name is Ye Xiuying. She worked for \$35 a month as a factory worker in this area. A plant was opened up from a U.S. business, and she was able to establish her own small business near this plant. Her income went from \$35 a month to \$1,200 a month, an amazing growth, something that has empowered her.

Because of the fact that she was able to gain such economic strength, she

was able to pay the government the one-time \$1,800 charge, and in fact not suffer an abortion as many of the provinces have imposed in China but in fact have her second child. She in fact had a girl, something that the government opposes. They want to have boys. She was able to have a second child; she was able to have a girl.

As I listen to many of my colleagues talk about the idea of sending a message to the government of China by bringing an end to most-favored-nation trading status, that kind of policy would in fact encourage more abortions in China. As we listen to people regularly claim that we will be able to bring an end to the human rights violations, the saber rattling in the Taiwan straits, the horrible treatment of Tibet, the transfer of weapons, the military buildup in China if we end our contact with them through most-favored-nation trading status, clearly they are wrong.

Because if we look at the recent past in China, during the great leap forward under Mao Zedong, 60 million people were starved. Also under Mao, during the cultural revolution, 1 million people were murdered by the government. And, of course, the world was not made aware of this.

What has happened? As we opened up China, and did in fact what Ronald Reagan said he wanted to have done in Eastern and Central Europe when he said, "Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall," so that those in Eastern and Central Europe could mingle with the West, the same thing has been happening with China. It would be tantamount to declaring economic and political war with China if we were to tamper with or revoke what is an inappropriate name to describe it, most-favored-nation trading status, which simply means regular trading arrangements that exist there.

Mr. Speaker, if we look at the fact that we have not solved every problem there, and I demonstrate my outrage over the human rights violations, I have talked with dissidents, I marched to the Chinese Embassy following the Tiananmen Square massacre to demonstrate my outrage, I have come to the conclusion that what would happen if we revoked MFN would be that we would not be isolating China from the world but we would in fact be isolating the United States of America from the most populous nation on the face of the earth.

There are many missionaries today who are very involved in China and, yes, there is religious persecution and it is unacceptable, reprehensible and should be addressed. But if we ended MFN, we would clearly jeopardize the chance for those missionaries who are there from the United States and other parts of the world to be successful.

Mr. Speaker, I simply say when this vote comes up in 2 weeks, I urge a vote against the resolution of disapproval so that we can do everything, including undermining the one-child policy.

REVITALIZING AMERICAN EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Ms. GRANGER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, the poet Maya Angelo once said a cynical child is one who has made the transition from knowing nothing to believing nothing.

Mr. Speaker, the goal of education is not just to grant knowledge to our students, it is also to give them hope. Sadly, many of our schools today fail on both counts. Yes, it is true that many of our young people today are not able to write words or calculate numbers as they should, but perhaps more profoundly, many of our young people are discouraged and disillusioned. They have lost hope in themselves and they have lost hope in America. That is an American tragedy.

The effects of this tragedy are felt everywhere. We can sense it in our inner cities where crime is rampant and violence is a way of life. We can see it in the eyes of an 18-year-old dropout who has aged far beyond his years and lives life knowing his best years are already over. We can hear it in the voices of thousands of young people, people for whom the promise of America has long since been lost.

These precious young people are the ones who ultimately pay the price when our schools fail. These young people are the victims of schools that have failed them and communities that have given up on them. This is a situation we must and we can do something about.

I believe that no first-class nation can have second-class citizens. But being an optimist, I believe there are also answers. To those parents and students who have been failed by our schools, I say yes, you have lost much but you have not lost everything. To those teachers and principals who are trying to make a difference, I say yes, you are doing many good things, you are building their futures and you are building ours.

Tonight I rise not to condemn American education but to challenge it. I want to challenge teachers to work harder and students to study longer. I want to encourage school administrators, school board members and school principals to create safe environments, better schools, and more creative classrooms. I want to urge moms and dads not just to be parents at home but also partners in the schools.

We can revitalize American education. We have all the necessary ingredients. We have the best teachers in the world and the brightest young minds, if only we can create a climate where teachers and students can do what they do best, teach and learn. I believe we can do that and I know we should. Today more than ever our schools and our children need our help.

When our children head off to college, they need our help even more. To-

night I think help has arrived. Tonight, I am pleased to introduce, along with the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. DUNN], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PITTS], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], the majority whip, and others, the HELP Act, the Higher Education and Learning Promotion Act.

This legislation is designed to give families an additional option for their \$500-per-child tax credit which both the President and the Congress are pledged to support. This historic legislation would allow our families to begin financing higher education through savings instead of debt.

As an incentive to encourage families to save and invest for their children's college education, this legislation would allow parents to invest this child tax credit in an education savings account. These accounts will earn interest tax free and can be withdrawn tax free for their child's education, and families will be able to double the amount of the tax credit if they choose to invest in an education savings account.

This would give families the option of using this tax credit and other savings to help plan for their children's future. A family with two children will be able to invest \$1,500 each year for each of their children in an education savings account. That is \$3,000 for their children's education.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the HELP Act is an important part of revitalizing American education, and I urge my colleagues to include this important proposal in the upcoming tax relief package for families.

Mr. Speaker, with the help of parents and teachers and the hope of our young people, we can build schools which will train fertile minds, prepare young lives and foster dreams. Our vision is a glorious one, an America where our children are not only well educated but, more importantly, an America where our children believe in themselves and they believe in their country. Mr. Speaker, the future is theirs but the responsibility is ours.

TRIBUTE TO SMALL BUSINESS ENTREPRENEURS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege this evening as well to pay tribute as we are this week to the small business entrepreneurs in our country, those who continue to drive the economic engine that makes this the greatest economy in the world. I have some personal history with that. My grandfather came to this country from Norway back around the turn of the century to pursue his American dream, and he and my great uncle, who did not speak a word of English, came through Ellis Island, ended up in the middle of South Dakota, and went into

the hardware business and had the opportunity like so many people at that time who came here, the freedom to succeed and the freedom as well to fail. But they came here because the opportunity existed in America. The South Dakota landscape just abounds with wonderful stories of entrepreneurial success, people who have taken risks. Some have succeeded, some have failed.

□ 1945

But many out there have been willing to move forward in a way that will continue to advance the American dream in this country, and I look at countless examples of those, and particularly in my State of South Dakota most of the businesses in our State are small businesses. We are a State which consists of many small towns and many main streets, and without those small businesses our State would not have the economic life that it does. It is our life blood.

So this evening and this week we have paid tribute to those many people.

I had the opportunity to have lunch 2 days ago with Richard and Janet Cone of Cone Ag Service, Inc., in Pierre, which is this year's small business award winner in South Dakota. They were here to celebrate and to be recognized, and they are just one of many who have taken again advantage of the opportunity that is afforded us in this country and then part of the American dream.

As you look at those that have succeeded in South Dakota I harken back to, and for those who have traveled in my State you will know as you drive down Interstate 90 you will see countless signs for a place called Wall Drug. Wall Drug is a wonderful story about someone who started with an idea of free ice water and 5-cent coffee, and to this day those continue to be their trademarks, free ice water and 5-cent coffee, and they have turned that into a wonderful marketing masterpiece. It has been incredibly successful and provides jobs and opportunities in that small community.

I think of Mike's Jack and Jill in Webster, SD, a good friend of mine. The mayor of that community is someone who is very involved in the community. And one of the things that I think you witness when you see small businesses that have success in this country is the commitment that they have to corporate and to civic responsibility and citizenship. They have enjoyed the freedoms that we have in America, and they have also taken very seriously the responsibility to contribute and to give back, and most of the people in those small towns are those who are consistently involved in their municipal governments and their civic organizations and their service organizations and the Little League baseball teams, and I can give you many, many examples of that.

But we have a small business culture in this country, an entrepreneurial culture that we want to continue to promote, and one of the things I think that we can do is encourage the self-sufficiency, the independence that will allow and give those people the environment they need in which to prosper and to continue to succeed in their businesses. Most of the people who are in small business are people of character. They are visionaries. They are people of incredible commitment and dedication, and they have a very, very strong work ethic, and that is something I think we want to continue to encourage.

One of the things in the debate that we are about today, this week and just earlier today approved the budget resolution which includes some tax relief for those who are out there creating the jobs and making the investments and taking the risks that continue to drive this economy forward, and I believe that we need a government that lends them a helping hand, that will be a partner with them and that reinforces those values and those traditions rather than destroying them. And one of the things that we are talking about doing in this budget resolution is bringing estate tax relief, and that is something that I think will encourage the family farms to continue, the small businesses to continue as we allow and make it easier for small business entrepreneurs to pass on that family business to the next generation.

We are talking about lowering the tax burden on savings, investment and job creation, the capital gains tax, and that is something as well that I think will be an enormous benefit to the small businessowners in this country and enable them again to continue to do what they do best, and that is to make those investments that build the economies in those small towns and continue to contribute to the fabric of this Nation and to encourage innovation, entrepreneurship, and many things and many qualities that we look to in this country and the things that I think have for so long defined what we have come to know as the American dream, and that is that when you come to this country, we have the opportunity again to succeed, the freedom to fail. But we have remarkable success stories out there, and I think it is very fitting that this week we pay tribute to those small businesses that continue to drive this economy and renew our commitment to making, creating an environment that is conducive for them to succeed and to prosper.

So I look forward to working toward that end.

THE CENSUS HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH HELPING FLOOD VICTIMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). 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, I think it is very important to bring some light and some sense to the actions of this House just a few minutes ago. Unfortunately, I think that there was more of an eagerness to play politics as opposed to responding to a simple question that my 11-year-old son, Jason Lee, raised with me last evening, and that was a concern for those individuals in South Dakota and other parts who suffered a lot this spring, Americans who we have a great concern for and have really attempted for the past couple of weeks to effectively and through the right way provide funding for their needs. Unfortunately, a political game was played tonight, and in this emergency supplemental appropriations we did not do the right thing. We did not do the right thing because we did not get to the bottom line, and that is to provide the support needed for those in the military who needed training to be able to provide assistance to these communities that have suffered from this terrible flooding and fires. We did not do the right thing by providing the moneys for community development funds for rebuilding of their housing.

Mr. Speaker, what we actually did was play politics. We proceeded to cut the moneys less than what was already included in the budget. We proceeded to cut discretionary funding and defense funding, although there are some who think that that money was included.

We also tried to do damage to a very important aspect of the American psychic and the American responsibility, and that is to count its citizens.

We did tonight something that had nothing to do with helping the citizens in South Dakota and other places that were negatively impacted. We put a straightjacket on the census. We declared Americans uncountable. We said that they are not important to find out who lives in the rural communities and urban centers. In an emergency appropriations bill we put in a straightjacket on taking the census for the year 2000.

I would argue does that make any sense? It certainly does not. Apples and oranges; somebody said mangoes and papayas.

What we did was to deny to American cities and rural communities the right to get their fair share of the tax dollars by denying the procedure of sampling and taking the census. Do you realize that we counted some 6 million people twice in the last census in 1990 and did not count 10 million citizens? It does not make sense when we began to distribute funds that we would find a circumstance where this Congress will straightjacket a function that is so very important to this Nation. In fact, the Constitution said the actual enumeration shall be made within 3 years after the first meeting of the Congress of the United States, with every subsequent term of 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, the census is written into the Constitution, and yet playing

politics instead of voting and putting forth the response to those citizens in the West who need our help, we now have intermingled and strangled this emergency supplemental appropriations bill so that the President will veto it because what it says is that we are not going to count our citizens and distribute our tax dollars fairly.

I almost wish we could go back to the drawing board and answer the question of my son, age 11: Why can we not simply just give them the money and give them the money fairly and straightly to deal with their problems and stop the politics?

I hope that we will be able to clear the air, if you will, to take this terrible language out of this supplemental appropriations bill so that we do not stranglehold the counting of citizens and we be able to move forward in the year 2000 and use a sampling that gets every one of our citizens. No matter where they are, whether they are homeless or not, they deserve to be counted so that we in America can distribute funds for education, the environment, Medicare and Medicaid, and not use your moneys frivolously, so that States who need more money because there are more people can fairly receive those funds instead of looking into smoke and mirrors and trying to decide who is in our State and who is in our country.

Every child, every senior citizen, every working man and woman, every person in this country deserves to be counted in the census, and yet on this day of June 5, 1997, instead of giving money to the people who need it, we are fooling around and hiding the ball in the census in the year 2000.

Someone said it does not seem to match two things: census and money for the folks who need it. You are right, it does not. Let us do the right thing and make sure that we pass a appropriations bill that serves those folk in South Dakota and other places who just simply ask to be treated like Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRADY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BRADY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the House has finished its legislative business for the week.

The House will meet for pro forma sessions at 9 a.m. tomorrow and 10 a.m. Saturday. Of course there will be no legislative business and no votes on those days.

On Tuesday, June 10, the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning session and 12 noon for legislative business. Members should note that we do expect recorded votes soon after 2 p.m. on Tuesday.

As our first order of business on Tuesday, June 10, the House will consider the following four suspensions: H.R. 848, Extending the Deadline for AuSable Hydroelectric Project in New York; H.R. 1184, Extending the Deadline for Bear Creek Hydroelectric Project in Washington; H.R. 1217, Extending the Deadline for Hydroelectric Project in Washington State; and H. Con. Res. 60—Relating to the 30th Anniversary of the Reunification of the City of Jerusalem.

After suspensions, the House will resume consideration of H.R. 1757, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act. The House will also vote on previously ordered amendments to that bill.

On Wednesday, June 11, and Thursday, June 12, the House will meet at 10 a.m. and on Friday, June 13, the House will meet at 9 a.m. to consider the following bills, all of which will be subject to rules: H.R. 1758, The European Security Act; H.R. 437, The National Sea Grant College Program Reauthorization Act of 1997; and H.J. Res. 54, Proposing an Amendment to the U.S. Constitution Authorizing the Congress to Prohibit the Physical Desecration of the U.S. Flag.

Mr. Speaker, we should finish legislative business and have Members on their way home by 2 p.m. on Friday, June 13.

THE CONTINUING EDUCATION DISASTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, we have had two important pieces of legislation in the past few days, one related to disaster. As the gentlewoman from Texas has just related, we had a bill to deal with the disaster relief. I think the whole bill is about \$8 billion, and \$5 billion of that was for disaster relief for places that are very much in need of help and they need it now. We recognize in this Nation and repeatedly the Congress comes to the aid of any States, any communities that have natural disasters.

Today I want to talk about the continuing education disaster that many of my colleagues, Democrats as well as Republicans, who just do not believe that we have an education disaster raging in our big cities, our inner city communities, and New York is just one, but Chicago, Los Angeles, Cleveland, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, all over, you have a problem that cannot be resolved or solved with business as usual.

We have a disaster. It is a man-made disaster, but it is a continuing disaster

in that we are not providing education of the kind that is needed in order for young people to cope with the 20th century demands, let alone to go into the 21st century.

We talk a lot about the need for computer education, computer literacy. We applaud the fact that telecommunications are being introduced, and now at an affordable rate in schools. Recently we had a landmark action by the Federal Communications Commission where they followed the mandate of legislation that we had passed, and they created a universal fund for schools and libraries so the schools and libraries can get at a 90-percent discount in the poorest areas the wiring for telecommunication services, computers, even just more telephones, and they can have a 90-percent discount indefinitely. They will be able to pay a telephone bill that costs \$1 with 10 cents. That is what a 90-percent discount means.

The poorest districts in America will have a 90-percent discount, and even the wealthiest districts in America will have a 20-percent discount. That is a major piece of government action that creates hope. But in the big city school systems there is not enough in place at this point to take advantage of this new revolution in the provision of assistance for telecommunications to schools and libraries.

The education disaster is there now, the education disaster grows worse because of demands on our school systems and the need for education and the complexities of the kind of education needed are increasing while our schools are falling further and further behind.

I want to speak in particular about New York City because we have just returned recently from a recess where I had the opportunity to get closer to problems in my district, problems that I thought I understood very well before. I find that they are even worse than I have imagined, that there are problems with dimensions that shock even myself, and I have been in Congress now for 15 years. Before that I was an elected official in the New York State Senate, and before that I was an official in the New York City government. But the magnitude of these problems in New York City education are staggering, and an experienced observer is shocked by some of the things that happen, and I want to talk about that.

Just first a footnote on the two important pieces of legislation that passed this past few days. One, the budget conference report that passed today where the Senate and the House now agreed on a budget, and basically I think the White House has agreed on most of the elements of that budget too.

□ 2000

It is important to note that that budget agreement does not have to go to the White House for the signature of

the President. Budgets do not have to go to the White House. They are agreements between the Senate and the House.

The President started the process with his budget. In this case, the President sat in with the representatives of both Houses and they reached an agreement. I did not vote for that agreement because there were a lot of things missing there that I felt ought to be there.

One of those things, of course, is the \$5 billion for construction initiatives for schools which was proposed by the President to help stimulate construction of new schools or to renovate existing schools or to rehabilitate existing schools, to remove the danger of safety hazards from schools. If schools have asbestos problems, if they have lead pipe problems, any of those problems could have been taken care of in this \$5 billion initiative.

Now, the President initiated this, and we thought that in the budget agreement this would be a major item that would emerge intact. But unfortunately, Members of Congress, either in the House of Representatives or the other body, insisted that the \$5 billion initiative for school construction be taken out. They were adamant, and the President finally yielded. Many of them insisted it should be taken out because they want to make the argument that local governments, the cities, the States, and the citizens of the States must be fully responsible for school construction.

I want to just quickly note that they would still be mostly responsible, no matter what the Federal Government does. A \$5 billion initiative to help with school construction would be just a tiny portion of the amount of money needed. The General Accounting Office estimates that we need \$135 billion to bring our schools into the 21st century, \$135 billion. So if the Federal Government is responsible for just \$5 billion, it will not begin to solve the problem, but it will be a stimulant, and evidently, because we continue to fail to make the necessary promises at the State and local level, we need this Federal stimulant.

So it is unfortunate that the budget conference report that went forward today does not have that \$5 billion for school construction.

We will not cease the fight, we will not give up. We are not elected to give up, we are not elected to stop the fight. Between now and the time that we adjourn sometime in the fall, we will continue to fight. The members of the Congressional Black Caucus have made this a priority item. We appeal to all of our comrades, all of our colleagues, to make certain that they keep sight of the fact that this is a major item of the budget.

There is a bill that has been introduced by my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY], and 190 signatures were on that bill to carry forward the President's \$5 billion construction initiative. So we think

there is enough support to keep this item on the agenda. We think that it is not incompatible with the budget agreement that has already been made.

Within the context of that budget agreement there is room for the school construction initiative to be revitalized. In the area of capital gains tax reductions, maybe corporate tax credits, corporate tax writeoffs of some kind could be used as a device to return to some kind of school construction initiative of an appropriate magnitude.

We also passed the supplemental appropriation that I just mentioned before, which contains the disaster relief for communities that are suffering from floods and from exorbitant amounts of natural disasters that have occurred in the last 6 months. We think that is very much in order, but as I said before, disaster relief of another kind is needed in our big cities.

Mr. Speaker, I have no problem with voting for disaster relief. I voted for \$8 billion for California with its earthquakes and mud slides. I voted for \$6 billion when we had to give money for the hurricane that took place in Florida, and \$6 billion for flood relief in the Midwest several years ago. We apportion large amounts of Federal resources into helping people who need help.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, New York does not have earthquakes, it does not have floods. We have not had any mud slides. So New York is a donor State. We continue to pay more into the Federal Treasury than we ever get back, so we deserve some consideration, and probably most of the big cities deserve some consideration in terms of another kind of disaster relief. First of all, of course, our colleagues here in the Congress have to recognize that it is a disaster. What is happening in our big city schools is a disaster.

I had a discussion with one of my Democratic colleagues just yesterday who insisted that we should not have the Federal Government involved in school construction. It is a disaster. We find no other way to relieve the disaster. Bad decisions have been made, the wrong decisions have been made by local officials in some cases and by State officials. We have unfortunately allowed a situation to develop which is so far out of hand now that it has to have help from the outside, we must have help from the outside.

Most of the help, as I said, will not come from the outside, but we need the stimulus. We need every public official at the city level, county level, and the Federal level, every public official should be put on the spot by having the Federal Government say, "Here is part of the money, a small part of it. If you will just match it, if you will show some incentive, some initiatives, then we can go forward and provide the additional share to accomplish the task."

I am not apologizing at all for local officials or for State officials. The mayor of the city of New York cut the school budget by more than \$1.5 billion

over the last 3 years. Part of the cuts that took place there were cuts that had an effect on the budget for renovation and for repairs and for school construction. So decisions being made by local elected officials are part of the problem. The State has not come forward with any great new initiative on construction in a long time. Decisions being made at the State level are part of the problem.

Recently we had a State environmental bond initiative on the ballot, and the Governor came out and campaigned for that, identifying with the environmentalists, whom he had previously called beatniks and in various ways ridiculed, but suddenly the power of the environmentalist vote led the Governor to come out and campaign. The Senator from that State came out and campaigned, and they all are now on the environmentalist bandwagon.

We are happy about that. We passed the bond. I was happy to note that in that bond issue they specifically said that they would give some small amount of the environmental cleanup money to New York City so that New York City could get rid of its coal-burning schools. Coal-burning schools in New York City. We still have coal-burning schools.

They said in the brochure that urged people to come out and vote that funds would be available for 30 schools to change their boilers from coal-burning boilers to gas or oil boilers, eliminating the coal dust in the air that is perpetuating and increasing epidemic asthma and some other respiratory diseases. So we were proud of the fact that specifically they had mentioned relieving us of coal-burning furnaces.

Despite the fact that I have been in New York a long time, I thought well, that would be the elimination of a major problem, 30 coal-burning schools will be no longer there. I did not know it at the time, but throughout the city we have almost 300 coal-burning schools, almost 300, and 30 means that we are going to eliminate 10 percent with this environmental bond issue.

I know the numbers, when we start talking about New York City, always people's eyes glaze over or they just lose track because the numbers are so great. We have 1,100 schools in New York City, 1,100 schools serving nearly 8 million people, so the numbers are great. But out of that 1,100 schools, we have some which are way back in the previous century. They burn coal, and that coal in a city of 8 million people living in a relatively small space, we can see how the coal dust alone is a major environmental hazard being perpetrated at a place where young kids congregate on a regular basis. So we are creating a major problem. It is a disaster.

If one will not accept the general condition of the school system as a disaster, then at least accept the fact that when it comes to safety and health, we have a disaster in 300 schools that burn coal. In our Federal construction ini-

tiative, if nothing else, the Federal construction initiative should set us free from those coal-burning schools, but that is not the case.

We have in the budget conference report a proposal for tax cuts, and some colleagues have said well, since we did not get the President's initiative in terms of the budget as an outright item, then let us look at the tax cuts that are proposed in the budget agreement. There is a provision for 85 billion dollars worth of tax cuts over a period of 5 years, \$85 billion in tax cuts are part of the agreement, and \$35 billion of that \$85 billion are related to education, related to tax credits for tuition, to merit scholarships, to a number of items that are important, and they belong in there and they should be in there.

However, in addition to that, we ought to have at least \$5 billion more of that tax cut dedicated to doing something to deal with the construction crisis, the school facility crisis, the safety and health crisis in our schools with respect to the big cities. Fifty billion dollars in tax cuts, somehow there ought to be created an imaginative way to get corporations and businesses involved to the tune of \$5 billion in tax writeoffs or tax credits, or some way to have \$5 billion of that \$50 billion in tax cuts contributed toward solving the construction problem, the facility problem, contributed toward being a stimulant to solving the construction and facility problem in our school systems.

Construction is a major kingpin in the whole effort to improve our schools. Construction is at the core of it in the sense that if we do not have buildings that are adequate, then nothing else that we do will have the proper impact. If children are in overcrowded schools as they are in New York City, we had a finite, very dramatic example of what the problem is last September, when on the day the school opened 91,000 children did not have a place to sit.

Now, it did not mean that we did not have 91,000 seats, but it meant we had a lot of the 91,000 with no place to sit anywhere. No matter how much we adjusted the system, transferred the schools from one community to another, busing youngsters further away, we still had large numbers who had no place to sit and places had to be found in hallways, places had to be found in storage rooms, places had to be found in corners of cafeterias, in assembly halls, all kinds of places that were not classrooms.

In addition to that, we had to increase the size of the classes. Even if we had the money for additional teachers, we did not have a place for the teachers to teach, so the number of children in each class had to be increased. So all of the classes in certain areas of our city have more children than they are supposed to have according to the agreed-upon contract with the teachers. Instead of 26 at certain

grade levels, you have 35. That is a big difference in terms of the quality of teaching.

So just the magnitude of the problem that you see in numbers and in overcrowding creates a situation that makes it harder for the teacher to do their job. But of course if you add to that the safety hazards, the asbestos that is a problem that we still have not dealt with in many of the schools, and we add to that the lead poisoning, lead being in some of the pipes and the paint.

We add to that of course the fact that some schools are so old that the top floor, they have two floors, if one goes up to the second floor one will find that the walls of the classrooms on the second floor are continually shedding off because of the dampness, and the roofs that have been repaired over and over again no longer can be repaired to keep the water out, it just keeps coming in, or the money needed to properly repair the roofs and the walls is just not there.

So we have manifestations of a physical problem that directly impacts upon the children in the school. If the walls of the room are damp, there is a health hazard and a distraction. If windows are knocked out and not replaced right away, that is a distraction. If the lighting of the school is improper, that is a distraction. We know what good schools look like. We can travel from New York City to the suburbs and find what good schools look like.

□ 2015

Even within the city we have a two-tiered system. There are some neighborhoods that have excellent schools that would pass muster anywhere, but there are too many that have schools that belong to another century. Instead of carrying us forward to the 21st century they are still lingering in the 19th century.

So we have right now a window of opportunity to do something about education in general, and the effort to improve education in general has to start specifically with the physical facilities, or the physical facility improvement becomes symbolic of what we really want to do. If we are not willing to do the basics, if we are not willing to give a child a comfortable place to sit, a place to sit which is conducive to learning, then the other efforts become a little ridiculous.

We talk about all third-grade children should learn to read and be reading on third-grade level when they get to third grade. We talk about the fact that we want all students when they graduate to be able to measure up to certain standards. We want to be first in math and science. We have six goals that became eight or nine goals. They are all laudable goals, but how do you recognize these goals when you cannot provide a safe place to sit? How do you talk about a national curriculum, we would impose a national curriculum, where every subject of five or six sub-

jects will be more or less taught the same way and have the same outcome aspirations, the same attempt to get to certain levels? When we talk about that in the context of falling schools, walls crumbling down, leaking roofs, and asbestos in the wall, you begin to generate cynicism and hopelessness.

We have a revolution going on with telecommunications, but if you cannot bore a hole in the wall because when you bore the hole the asbestos comes out, then we cannot wire the schools that have the asbestos problem. So construction becomes a symbol. It becomes a kingpin.

Construction of facilities, if they are not proper, then we usually find that other matters are not being taken care of either. Where we have construction problems, when we start asking questions, we find we have other problems. If we do not have school facilities that are proper, then usually those same schools do not have adequate supplies. The same schools have broken machinery or broken equipment. The same schools do not have quality teachers.

In my district, one of the districts that we have, they have the largest number of substitute teachers in the city, teachers who are not really certified teachers. The requirement is that you be certified, or the requirement is that teachers have to meet certain standards, but if they are not there and you have to hire substitutes, you take people who are not well trained.

This problem takes place in the same places where you have the space and facilities problem. It is symbolic. Communities that do not take care of their schools physically are not doing other things that are necessary to promote opportunities to learn.

Opportunity to learn standards, as I said before on this floor many times, is a set of standards that nobody wants to talk about. Everybody wants to talk about new curriculum standards, all across the Nation to have the same set of curriculum standards. They want to talk about new testing standards, where we test students across the Nation and compare their achievements. But in order to have students master the new curriculum, in order to have them pass the test, we need to create an opportunity to learn. It is simple common sense and simple logic. Part of the creation of an opportunity to learn, of course, is they have to have a safe place to sit, a place that is conducive to learning.

So cities are neglected. They are neglected partially for racist reasons. Large numbers of minority groups are congregated in cities. Cities are neglected partially because of income numbers. Large numbers of poor people are congregated in cities. Poor people do not vote in the same percentages as other people. It is a political problem. It is a problem that local officials and State officials have neglected.

How do we break out of it? Large percentages of our population live in

cities. Large percentages of our population that are the work force of tomorrow are not being appropriately educated. We have an anti-city bias in this country. The anti-city bias is played out in the compromise that we have to make on the Constitution.

The Constitution appropriates Representative's seats by population, so that is a one man-one vote ratio. Places which have the most population get the most power, the most votes in the House of Representatives. But the great compromise was that each State should have two Senators. No matter how small the State is, they have two Senators, so we have Senators in large numbers who are elected by rural and suburban constituencies and they do not have big city populations, and the policy-making in this country has gone that way over the last 50 years: more and more neglect of big cities by the Federal Government, and the same pattern is played out often at the State level, where you have Governors being elected by non-city populations also.

So we have a problem that cries out for resolution. We have a disaster that needs attention. We have a window of opportunity now. I am standing here because I will not give up. I hope my colleagues will not give up. I appeal to everybody out there with common sense to understand this magic window of opportunity.

The cold war is over. We do not have to dedicate large amounts of resources to fighting the evil empire of the Soviet Union anymore. We have a President who wants to be known as the education President. He has put forward a very progressive, a very comprehensive program.

We have the leadership of the majority in the House of Representatives stating that they are committed to the improvement of education in America. There is a disagreement on how we should approach it, but we can resolve that disagreement probably sometime in the future, maybe, but the important thing is that both parties, both houses of Congress and the White House, are committed to improving education.

We have a window of opportunity. There is a need for people to come to this floor and talk specifically about how we take advantage of that window of opportunity. There is a need for us not to allow a Potemkin Village approach to be taken to education; that is, we have a few outstanding examples of what is happening that is progressive and positive in the country, and we hold up those examples and say, great, we are doing a great job, and we fool ourselves and we fool the American people in general, and make them think that we are really progressing and we have an appropriate education system.

Any system of education in America which does not educate most of the population is a failure. We cannot exist, we cannot survive if the total population is not educated. The elite

education may be the best in the world, the education of the graduate students and the scientists and technicians at the very top. The Ph.D. degrees in our higher education institutions, they may be the very best education in the world but they are educating a very small percentage of the total population. The world does not run on the basis of Ph.D's, top scientists, or top technicians. The world runs only when people all up and down the scale have some degree of education.

The example I have used before is when you get on an airplane, do not worry about the pilot. The pilot has the best training in the world. I think we spend more to train pilots than we do any other occupation. Pilots of airplanes in America especially have the best training that you can get, the most up-to-date training. They have rigorous standards imposed upon them.

We may complain about the FAA not being tough enough on airlines in terms of certain safety requirements of the planes and certain equipment failures, et cetera, but nobody ever complains about inadequate training of pilots. So they are well educated.

But when you get on a plane, you had better worry about the guy who put the oil in the oil pits. You have to worry about the man who put the gasoline in, if he read the meters right. You have to worry about the mechanic who tightened the bolts, and a whole array of people who did not go to graduate school, who did not receive very expensive and thorough training. All of them, too, they have to be educated.

It is true of our total society. There is hardly an operation within our society where we do not have people all up and down the scale who need more education in order to do the job well. If they do not do the job well, then we may have some disasters resulting. Serious things happen when people who do not necessarily have high education credentials do not have the education they need to do their job at whatever level they have to do it.

We have serious consequences when the productivity of the total society goes down, because the people who are needed for those production jobs at various levels are not there. We cannot exist and compete as a Nation if we neglect large numbers of our students in our inner-city communities. We need an across-the-board approach where the suburbs, the cities, everybody is keyed to being given the best education possible. Opportunities to learn and opportunity to learn standards have to be important to everybody.

I want to describe the comprehensive approach that we talked about when I was the chairman of the Subcommittee on Select Education. We reorganized the Office of Education, Research, and Improvement. We said, you have to take a comprehensive approach. I am talking mainly about construction and the need to address ourselves to school facilities and provide a safe environment, a healthy environment as step

one. But we have to have an overall comprehensive approach. That is basic and that is No. 1. The comprehensive approach means that every aspect of the problems related to education have to be examined.

A comprehensive approach means that Americans should stop oversimplifying what is necessary to educate our children. Everybody is an expert on education. They think they are experts in education.

While it is important that everybody be in on the dialogue, because the dialogue means that maybe they will wake up to how important it is, and when the time comes to vote for elected officials, the time comes to select the people who are going to educate our children, we are aware; everybody needs to be aware. But let us not assume that everybody is qualified to determine how our schools should operate.

We should not oversimplify. We do not oversimplify in the area of defense and armaments. We know experts are needed. All of us have a stake in what happens in terms of the protection we receive from the Department of Defense, but we do not oversimplify and assume we can do it. We should not oversimplify in education. We should understand everything across-the-board, and that is one point we tried to make when we reorganized the Office of Education, Research and Improvement.

We called for certain institutes: an institute for the education of at-risk students to deal with some of the problems that our inner cities face with our students.

We called for an institute for early childhood education. More and more we are learning that early childhood education is critical, because children learn more in their early years than we imagined, and what happens in those early years can set the tone for the ability of a child to learn for the rest of their lives.

We called for an institute for curriculum improvement. We also called for an institute for governance and management. I am going to talk a bit about governance and management of schools, because I think that governance at the macrolevel, governance at the level of the Congress of the United States, means we ought to make decisions here about education which are really going to promote the improvement of education.

Governance at the microlevel means that down at the local education level, the superintendents of schools, the school principals, we have to have the best governance and the best management there, too.

Although improving facilities and physical environments is critical, there are other problems. One of those problems I stumbled upon when I was in my district for the past district work period that surprised me greatly.

We have a space problem in New York, as I said before. There were 91,000

young people that did not have a place to sit when school opened last September. As a result of that space problem, one group that I worked with, the Central Brooklyn Martin Luther King Commission, which is dedicated to improving education in central Brooklyn, that group decided to join with me in making a survey of the schools in my congressional district.

We wanted to make a survey to find out who are these schools, which schools still have a major space problem, which schools have overcrowding to a degree that is unacceptable. As we started to make the survey, we started by checking written documents and found that they were of little use, because people were not telling the truth. You would have a situation where a school would state that they had no overcrowding problem, but when you went to the school you found out that they had three lunch periods. One school had five lunch periods.

□ 2030

Why do schools have three lunch periods? Because they are overcrowded, and they cannot get the students a lunch period in a reasonable amount of time. So instead of having one or two lunch periods, there are so many children they have to have three. I found one school that had to have five. Most people cannot comprehend this because even I find it hard to comprehend.

I discovered in my district a school where children start eating lunch at 9:45. They have to eat lunch at 9:45 because the school is so crowded that is the only way they will get lunch served. The last ones are served at 2:30. The first lunch period begins at 9:45. It is that overcrowded. So no matter what they say on paper about not being overcrowded, you can tell by just asking how many lunch periods do you have.

But then you can walk around and find groups of kids sitting in the halls. You can find storage rooms which have groups of kids, obvious things are happening when you walk around and look that you see that indicate that you still have a major overcrowding problem.

There is one overcrowding problem, there is one aspect of this problem that really shocked me that I could not see with my own eyes, and that is in one of the districts, district 23. I do not want to bore anybody, but in New York City we have 32 school districts which are subunits of the local education agency. The board of education comprises the local education agency for New York City. It is broken down into 32 subdivisions. Each one of the subdivisions has a superintendent. And the overall board of education has a chief executive officer who is called the chancellor.

So in my district I have parts, in my congressional district I have parts of five subunits, five local school districts. These local school districts are all shaped by natural neighborhood

boundaries so they are not all the same size. But if you have a situation in a city as a whole where overcrowding is taking place, the last thing you expect is to find any district that does not have an overcrowding problem. You certainly do not expect to find a district that has empty classrooms, that has a situation where construction is not the problem but governance and management are the problem. And because of the governance and management of this particular district, because of its problems, you have overcrowding increased in the surrounding districts. And I am talking about district 23, which covers an area that became famous in 1967 and 1968, the Ocean Hill-Brownsville District.

Ocean Hill-Brownsville became famous because it was one of the first experiments of community control and the local community control effort clashed with the teachers union. And we had a long strike in New York City that got national and sometimes international attention. So Ocean Hill-Brownsville is the place, a district that comprised the district boundary of district 23.

Our overcrowding survey led to this discovery: that district 23 does not have an overcrowding problem but a shrinkage problem, where despite the fact that districts all around it are overcrowded and getting worse in terms of their population increase, the number of pupils going to school at district 23 is shrinking. It was a phenomenon which I decided to look at in far greater detail, and you cannot examine the overcrowding problems in this district without knowing some of the history.

Ocean Hill-Brownsville had national attention when they had the great teachers strike, but then it moved off the front page when peace came. There was a settlement. Unfortunately that settlement included a takeover by the local political club, the assemblymen of the local political club politically moved in in an election and they gained control of the local school board. And you had peace, but the peace was a peace with corruption, a peace with violence in the schools, low attendance. The district became known as a place which was an extension of the patronage system, the local clubhouse. It did not matter whether people did their job right or not, as long as they were approved by the local clubhouse.

It took a long fight to get rid of the political takeover of district 23, Ocean Hill-Brownsville. I was a part of the struggle to set the district free. We finally freed it of political control, and one of our rallying cries was, stop political interference and let the educators educate.

As the State senator for that area, I certainly worked hard to make certain that other elected officials would not get involved anymore in hamstringing the quality of education within the Ocean Hill-Brownsville school district.

The problem is that that was a stupid position to take.

Politicians, public officials should never say that they are not going to be involved in local schools or education at any level. Yes, public officials should not interfere. They should not seek to use schools for patronage, but district 23 is a perfect example how when the public officials back away, they are no longer looking, leave it to the educators, terrible things can happen.

What has happened in district 23, because we took it out of the spotlight for 14 years, minimum political scrutiny, certainly no political interference, a superintendent was selected 14 years ago. And that superintendent has been there 14 years in a situation which is very unusual in New York City. Most school superintendents do not survive, do not stay in one place for 14 years. So we have a superintendent of this particular district who has been there 14 years.

The district is so bad, however, parents are fleeing the district. They have no overcrowding problem because parents have decided they do not want their kids to go to the school, to the district schools. So large numbers of schools have empty space in a city which is racked by the problem of overcrowding. District 23 has no overcrowding problem. The parents are pulling their kids out in great numbers.

The same district, the State has been observing the quality of education there. The overall citywide school board of education has been observing and several schools are under probation to make it simpler. They call them cert schools, schools which are under review. At least five schools are under review. Two schools recently were taken over by the chancellor for the overall school system. And the chancellor has what he calls a chancellor's district where he has created a district out of the 32 districts. Any long time, low performing schools are taken and put into a special supervisory situation where the chancellor's office oversees these schools. So two schools have been taken and at least three more are on the list in district 23.

I am giving you a case history related to governance and management and how governance and management in this particular case exacerbates our space problem.

The parents have made a decision. They know what is going on. Instead of fighting to improve the school district, they are just pulling the children out. Parents voted, nevertheless, to get rid of the old school board. They voted out the old school board. So in addition to understanding what is going on to the extent where they refuse to let their children go to school in the district, they also put forth an effort to get rid of the old school board and voted a new school board.

The new school board now decides that the district superintendent who has been there for 14 years has had an

opportunity to prove that he can educate children and can run a decent system. He can meet the challenges of that particular district or he cannot. They assume he cannot. Things have steadily gotten worse. District 23 is now at the very bottom of the list in terms of math and reading achievement. They have citywide tests, and you compare the scores from one district to another, this district is on the bottom. So it is pretty clear that the superintendent cannot, who has been there 14 years, cannot do the job.

The new school board votes not to renew his contract. Instead of him gracefully admitting he cannot do the job, this particular superintendent has decided to wage war against the new school board. They voted not to renew his contract. That is the procedure. You start advertising for other superintendents and they are in the process of doing that. But in the meantime the present superintendent is using the resources of the school system, the children, the parents to fight against the policy decision of the present local school board and he is determined to stay there. They are now reviewing resumes of people who want to become superintendents in the district. Among the resumes the old superintendent, who has been there 14 years and failed miserably, has submitted his resume. The old superintendent, still the present superintendent until June 30, also recommended five principals for tenure. As he is going on, he recommends principals for tenure. Once principals are recommended for tenure and receive tenure, they cannot be fired. According to the way the system operates, tenure means you are there and you cannot be moved.

Three of these five principals that were recommended were from these lowest performing schools. Again, the new school board decided to meet the challenge. They challenged the superintendent's recommendation of the five principals for tenure and said these are people who have failed and the failure is illustrated dramatically and documented by State records and by the chancellor's own criticisms of the district. Nevertheless, because of the arcane laws that relate to tenure, they will receive tenure, five failed principals will receive tenure. That is the way the law is written. If the superintendent recommends you, all the years that you have been there he has given you a satisfactory rating, there is no way to deny tenure.

So we are saddled probably with five principals who have created a problem by overseeing the lowest performing schools. The majority of the teachers in this district are also substitute teachers, because the word gets around that it is not a good place to be and it is hard to get good teachers to come in. Those old teachers who were there, were the best, lured out to other districts or they were even encouraged to retire because part of the mayor's reduction of the budget for the board of

education in the past 3 years has been an incentive plan to encourage the most experienced teachers and administrators to retire. More experienced people make higher salaries. If you get rid of the experienced people with the higher salaries, you lower your budget. But nobody bothered to use common sense and said, if you get rid of experienced people, you also lower the quality of everything there: administration, teaching.

So we have a massive failure that is exacerbated by the fact that the city and the State are encouraging experienced people to leave the system and new people coming in have no mentors, no way to be trained.

We have one element after another which piles on this disastrous situation within district 23. Most of the teachers who teach math and science in junior high schools did not major in math and science in junior high schools. You have a situation where there is a total collapse. There is a total collapse.

Education is not taking place in district 23, Ocean Hill-Brownsville; 11,000 children go to school here. Again, the figures in New York are very grandiose figures. This is one of the smallest districts in New York City. Each school district is supposed to comprise no less than 15,000 youngsters. They only have 11,000 because so many have fled. They have fled the disaster.

The district right next to it, district 17, has 30,000 pupils. District 18 has 20,000 pupils. They have an overcrowding problem in that district because the parents do not want their children to go to school in district 23.

You have a situation where education is not taking place in district 23. There has been a total collapse. But nevertheless the superintendent, Michael Vega—I am using his name because I think it is outrageous what is happening there—Superintendent Michael Vega is still insisting that he should remain a superintendent. He is waging war against the school board that is trying to remove him.

He is using the resources of the school, sending notes home with kids to parents. He has parent-teacher associations that he has cultivated over the years, very small groups, only a handful of parents involved. But they are the ones who get involved so they are elected. They are the officers. He has cultivated them and they are assisting him as he wages war against the district to try to remain in the district where he has been for 14 years, failed totally. The district has collapsed all around him and we have a war going on.

For that reason, Michael Vega becomes a parasite. Michael Vega in that district becomes the enemy of education. All the parents need to understand, he is the enemy of education. We have a situation where moral indignation is appropriate from every level. We should have moral indignation by every elected official in the area.

The chancellor of the whole school system was given new powers by the

State legislature just this year in early January. No, late last fall, he was given new powers, and he can move in and do things that he could not do before in local districts. So the moral indignation of the chancellor is needed. The chancellor has criticized the system for its failure. Nevertheless, Michael Vega continues to move in ways which might result in him being reappointed as the superintendent.

We have a commissioner of education for the State. The moral indignation of the commissioner, the powers of the commissioner should be brought to bear to get rid of a situation with respect to governance and management which is totally unacceptable.

We have a powerful United Federation of Teachers, a union. They should weigh in against this immoral situation. The mayor should weigh in against this situation where because of our arcane procedures and laws, a superintendent who has been there 14 years, failed, and an attempt is being made by the newly elected board to move him out, he still feels that he has the power. And he is still using the resources of the taxpayers, the resources of the district to fight the decision to be moved.

□ 2045

I have given this case history example, because I want to admit that all of the problems of our schools are not going to be resolved by any action by a government at the Federal level or by action at even State level. There are problems at the local level that have to be taken care of, and we have to deal with them as elected officials by confronting our own constituencies with the problems.

I served as a commissioner of a community development agency in New York with responsibility for the community action program, and we were major proponents of community control. We pushed hard for community control. And when the law was changed to set up community school districts, we were the major advocates and major proponents of community control.

What we have witnessed is that when we put local people in control, parents of the students in that area, poor people who live in the neighborhood, we can have some dramatic results that we would never expect. Corruption is not limited to middle class or rich people. Corruption takes place quickly also among people who are poor and who are local and who have something at stake in the system.

We were shocked to find that we could have a situation where one job, maybe pays \$15,000, to get one job secured, a member of a school board will move to ruin the lives of 15,000 youngsters. They do not care. They logroll with each other about jobs and they put in people who are not responsible and they allow all kinds of horrible situations to go on when their kids are in the schools and their neighbors' children are in the schools. It is shocking.

And for that reason, of course, I supported reforms which allowed the chancellor to have the power to step in.

Well, superintendents, like Michael Vega, chief executive officers, they are paid very well. They are supposed to make certain that laymen do not get away with these kinds of excesses. But instead of being the force that makes certain that professional education goes on, many superintendents become part of the problem. The corruption is driven from the office of the superintendent, a kind of corruption which we cannot arrest anybody for, a corruption which is an acquiescence to low standards, an acquiescence to mediocre, incompetent people in order to gain friendships.

For this superintendent, the most important thing is that he maintain friendships with enough people to get the votes he needs in order to continue there. And since the votes were taken away and the old school board that supported him was thrown out, he now is attempting to go to another level and get the power of the parents in each individual school, those few that he has nurtured along, and will promote a little revolution to maintain himself in power.

We should not let this exist, and I am taking this opportunity to give this case history here because I want to sound the alarm for people back in the 11th Congressional District, those who live in the District 23 area. The people who live in District 17, which is next to District 23, this is their fight too because their district is overcrowded as a result of kids fleeing from District 23. People whose children go to school in District 18, their district is overcrowded because children are fleeing from District 18.

It is a ridiculous situation, because throughout the whole city we have a shortage of places to sit, of classroom space, and District 23 has a surplus because nobody wants to go to school in District 23. We must deal with that situation.

We have a window of opportunity to really improve education in America. From where I stand, from where we are placed in the hierarchy of decision-making, the Members of Congress are not to take lightly this opportunity. We have a window of opportunity where the Nation is not faced with any great crisis, the Nation can focus its attention on education in a way it never could before, starting with the Federal Government.

We are not the major players in the education scenario. At best, we have only a minor role, but that role is important. The Federal Government is the stimulant. The Federal Government pushes things. The percentage of money spent by the Federal Government on education at most is about 7 percent. States and local governments provide the rest of the money for education, but despite this small percentage, Federal participation in education, through title I, through Head

Start, through various programs at the higher education level, Federal participation has a stimulant effect that is a very positive one.

We would not have certain kinds of standards that exist in our school settlements if it had not been for the impetus of the Federal Government. The education of children with disabilities, special education programs, would not exist if it were not for the Federal Government. The States and the localities are paying a greater percentage of the money, but the standards are being set and the high quality of education is being driven by the fact that the Federal Government is involved.

We have an opportunity to take advantage of certain historical events that have occurred recently. The fact that the Congress passed the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and in that act they mandated that the FCC should find a way to give some kinds of special attention to schools and libraries with respect to lowering the cost for telecommunications by having the providers pay into a universal fund, that has happened now. It has come to pass.

On May 7 the Federal Communications Commission voted to establish a universal fund for libraries and schools. That universal fund will provide the necessary funding at a 20-percent discount for the richest schools and a 90-percent discount for the poorest schools. That is an opportunity we should not pass up.

We have an opportunity in that there is agreement between both parties that the Federal Government has a major role in education, and in this Congress, the 105th Congress, there is a greater possibility that we will have some positive steps taken on a bipartisan basis than ever before.

So let us not fail to understand how serious it is. We have a disaster out there. It may not be in all our communities, in the suburbs, in the rural areas, but we might want to take a look and accept the fact that in the inner cities of our Nation we have a disaster.

We have a disaster that is not unique to New York. It exists in practically all of our inner-city communities. We need help. We need disaster relief. We do not have floods, we do not have earthquakes, we do not have mud slides. God did not do it directly, it is a man-made crisis, and partially it is made by bad decisions that have been made at every level, bad decisions by the Governors, bad decisions by the local mayors, and of course at the local level the school boards often make bad decisions also, but the Federal stimulus is the best thing that we have to offer, and we should make certain that from where we are we continue the Federal stimulus to assist education, starting with a revival of the construction initiative that the President put forth before.

Let us not give up. We need the \$5 billion construction initiative in the Federal budget.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, my colleague in the chair, and to everyone else who is here, let me first of all apologize for making you stay late, but I have delayed my own departure this evening. I could be almost home with my family. I have delayed my own departure this evening by better than 3 hours, because I think what I have to talk about is very important.

And regardless of what my colleagues may think about my legislative voting record and regardless of what they think about anything else, I hope they realize that I am not one of the Members of the House who rises to speak every day; I am not up on every subject every day acting as though I am an authority on everything, but when I do know something, and when it is important to my district and when it is important to this Nation, I think I have a responsibility to speak up on it.

The matter I am going to talk about now is a matter that is of importance to everyone throughout this entire Nation. It is going to mean whether or not our economy expands, it is going to mean whether or not we have jobs or whether or not our industry moves offshore. That is what I believe. That is what many other people across this country believe. That is what many other Members in this Chamber believe.

We will get the answer to this question, I believe, by the middle of July. We do not have to wait very long. Probably, at most, about 6 weeks. Because the Environmental Protection Agency is in the process of recommending new air quality standards, this at a time when we have been cleaning our air, the air quality. And, believe me, my district is around Pittsburgh, PA, once described as hell with the lid off. Back in the days when people had to sweep off their lawns because of the dust that came from the mills. Back in the days when if we hung our clothes out, they probably were dirtier when we took them off the line than when we washed them and hung them out. We had to shake off those clothes to get the dust off. People would go to work in the morning, and by the time they got to work they had black rings around their collars from the dust that would settle on their bodies.

We had tremendous problems with air quality. Towns like Donora, PA, saw people dropping dead in the street from the pollution. We know about air pollution.

A group called GASP, the Group Against Smog and Pollution, was born in Pittsburgh out of this fear for people's health. As a news reporter for 24 years, I covered our city as we were cleaning up the air. As a father of two young children, I want clean air. But I

am convinced by the EPA making these standards more stringent, while we are cleaning our air, that in fact our air will remain dirtier longer, and there are scientists who agree with me on that.

We have already set the finish line in this race to clean our air. We have definitive goals that we want to reach. And once we begin this process, those goals are erased and we extend the time out 10 years, 12 years, in fact, we really do not know how long, until we will actually have to hit those very same goals or goals which may be a tiny bit more stringent.

So if we are concerned, for example, about the health of that asthmatic 8- or 9-year-old child on the playground, and we do not want that child to breathe dirty air, to have to gasp to get air in their lungs, then we should agree with what Carol Browner of the EPA is about to try to do, unless we want action now. Because what she wants to do will perhaps clean the air up, but it will do it when that 8- or 9-year-old child is in college.

So instead of hitting ozone targets that say, for example, if we have a goal that we have to reach by 1999, well, we may not have to hit that goal until the year 2010. So we are going to wait 10 more years, 11 more years, 12 more years until we hit those goals.

There is not only the problem of making that asthmatic child wait longer for the air to be clean, there is the problem that we have with our economy. Industries across this Nation have spent tens of millions of dollars, hundreds of millions of dollars individually, billions of dollars untold since the 1990 clean air amendments to clean the air. And now, all of a sudden, we are saying, wait a minute, what we said to spend money on, the particulate matter, that is the soot that is in the air, the soot which rises up out of the smokestacks of this country, we are not measuring it in a small enough measure. Instead of 10 microns, we want to make it 2.5 microns.

Sounds very scientific, but what we are saying is we want to measure smaller particles, but we are not saying what those particles should be. And we do not have enough science because, understand, we only have 50 monitors in this whole Nation which can measure 2.5 microns of the soot, the particulate matter, that EPA now wants us to go to. Fifty monitors are not enough and do not supply enough data that we can be sure that we are going to take this course of action which will cost over a million jobs, I believe, and others agree with me, and will cost untold billions of dollars.

Let me tell my colleagues about my district a little bit and why I am probably a little more concerned, and other people who are from what we call Rust Belt regions, have the same concerns.

In southwestern Pennsylvania, as we cleaned up that air that I talked about a few moments ago, partly because we were cleaning that air up, partly because the companies were investing in

those air pollution control devices instead of making capital improvements in the processes in which they were manufacturing the product, in other words dollars are going in to scrubbers in their smokestacks, where we needed that, we needed that to improve our health, but those dollars were not available to upgrade their manufacturing base, to buy new equipment, to invest in R&D and new technologies. And so many of our manufacturers fell behind.

□ 2100

Over a 13-county area in southwestern Pennsylvania we lost in the 1970's and 1980's 155,000 manufacturing jobs. As I said earlier, I was a reporter back then. I stood outside many of those steel mills, many of those glass plants, car manufacturing plants, car part manufacturing plants, and watched as thousands upon thousands of workers walked out of the door for the last time.

Now, as we are trying to rebuild that economy, we had a chance, at least a shot, a few weeks ago to lure back an automobile manufacturing plant. They were looking to occupy a 1,000-acre site, provide 2,500 families in southwestern Pennsylvania with jobs. But when they took a look at Pennsylvania being part of the Northeast ozone transport region, when they took a look as what was going to happen or what was going to be proposed perhaps with these new air pollution regulations, they said, we are not going to move there, we are not going to provide that opportunity.

I am not making this story up. It was published in the Pittsburgh Business Times. The company said they would have had to purchase over \$3 million in pollution credits to locate in Pennsylvania. But if they went upwind, where much of our pollution comes from, to our sister States to the west, they would not have had to purchase those very expensive credits.

What the EPA is proposing to do in tightening the regulations does not do anything to improve those States like Pennsylvania, which are getting dirty air from other States. And we have counties across this Nation, we have cities across this Nation, if we vacated them completely, moved all the manufacturing out, took all the cars out, moved all the vehicle traffic out, moved all the people out, those regions at certain days of the year would still be out of compliance.

Much of this particulate matter is found in nature. What are we going to do about that particulate matter in the air, that dust that is found in nature? Let me tell my colleagues, I understand that the EPA has a pretty bad track record in my State of Pennsylvania. It is a real credibility problem. So when they say, trust us, we are going to improve air quality by tightening these regulations in the midst of the air getting cleaner, so they are going to tell us, first of all, stop doing what

is working, stop doing what we told you to do before, do something new.

I am saying to them in Pennsylvania, your word is not very good. Because you see, you told us in Pennsylvania that we needed to go to a centralized emissions testing and then Gov. Robert Casey began to implement that system. He moved the necessary legislation. And we even had a contract with a company called Envirotech Systems. It was a company out of Arizona. They were hired to run this testing system. It was a 7-year contract that could have given this Envirotech Systems company profits of over \$100 million a year.

Many of us knew that this was a bad idea. The people of Pennsylvania did not want it. We fought it. We gathered over 100,000 signatures on petitions and we opposed the testing system. As it turned out, EPA had misled Pennsylvania, we did not have to go to that centralized system.

This was not necessary for Pennsylvania to comply with the Clean Air Act amendments of 1990. But by this point, we had the contract. By this point, we were stuck with 86 E-check centers built around the State's 67 counties. In late 1995, Envirotech threatened to sue Pennsylvania on that contract. They wanted more than \$350 million for expenses and for loss of profits.

But then we had a new Governor, Tom Rich. His administration decided it was better to deal with them, to strike an agreement. So he reached a settlement calling for the State of Pennsylvania, the citizens of Pennsylvania, to pay \$145 million to Envirotech. We settled it. Of that \$145 million, that big whoops by the EPA that they misled Pennsylvania, not one penny of that \$145 million cleaned up one speck of air.

I believe that these EPA proposed revisions to the national ambient air quality standards for ozone and particulate matter are really going to be costly to us as a Nation. It will, in fact, keep the air dirtier longer, as I said. It will cost industry. It will cost jobs. We really have to take time to think about what we are doing.

First of all, there is a question as to why we are moving ozone standards, which is, in effect, smog, at the same time we are moving the particulate matter standard, which of course particulate matter, as I said, is soot. We have to do something in regard to particulate matter, but all we have to do is review it.

Why do we have to review it? Well, the American Lung Association filed suit against the Environmental Protection Agency because every 5 years they are to review these standards. They had not done that since 1987. In 1992, 5 years later, they were to review these standards, but they had not. They do not have to tighten, they do not have to make it harder for Americans to clean up the air. All they have to do is stick with what is working still, stick

with good science, stick with what is improving the health of this Nation. But they have decided, I think, that they are going to take another course of action.

We have a problem with the fact that they have put ozone in with us because there was no lawsuit involving ozone. But they have thrown ozone in. What is the reason that they have decided to include ozone with the particulate matter? We do not know exactly what that reason is.

We had Ms. Browner in front of the Committee on Commerce, two of our subcommittees, for over 8 years. I am still not sure why it is that she has decided to blend those two issues together. But for sure, they would not have to do anything regarding the smog issue or ozone until next year. But for some reason, we are moving these two very complex issues together. The present standard for ozone is 0.12 parts per million averaged over a 1-hour period. The Scientific Advisory Board said that they thought it would be better to reduce that to a range from 0.12 parts per million to somewhere between 0.07 and 0.09 and do it over an 8-hour period.

I have no problem with going to an 8-hour period. But also we heard from one scientist after another is that there is no bright line where there are health benefits derived by the public within this range. So they have chosen somewhere in the middle that have range 0.08, which will in fact throw 400 counties, distribute counties across this Nation out of compliance.

What happens when you are out of compliance? Well, businesses in your region, businesses in the noncompliance area will not expand. They are not going to invest more money, and certainly other companies like that automobile plant that I mentioned are not going to move into your region. So economically you are strangled, you are hung up, you are not going to grow, jobs will not occur. And when you do not have jobs, people do not have health benefits, cannot afford to go to the doctors and they derive bad health benefits from that, just as if they were breathing the dirty air.

Let me take time right now to recognize my dear friend from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the ranking member of the Committee on Commerce and the Dean of the House of Representatives. He has been here continuously longer than any other Member of the House. And I think, beyond a shadow of a doubt, everyone recognizes that he knows more about the Clean Air Act, the clean air, and the amendments and this issue than anyone else in the House of Representatives. It has been my pleasure to work with my colleague and to learn from him as we have moved through with this issue.

I recognize now the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. JOHN DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my dear friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK], who has provided

such valuable leadership in addressing the important issue that he now raises in the House. I want to commend him for his distinguished and able service here on behalf of the people that he serves and on behalf of the people of the United States. I also want to thank my colleague for his kind remarks towards me.

Mr. Speaker, the situation here is a serious one. It is interesting to note that we are making, according to Administrator Browner, significant progress in cleaning up the air and that that progress will continue for at least 5 years and that no change in the Clean Air Act is necessary to continue significant progress in terms of evading pollution. It is interesting that in the same appearance before the Committee on Commerce, in which she said those things, she had to admit that much of what are the supporting facts or science with regard to the changes that EPA proposes with regard to particulates and ozone, she does not know the answer and she does not have the science upon which she can base the judgments that she needs to.

Certain facts are very clear. The air is getting better, the air is getting cleaner. Significant progress will be made. One of the admissions made by Ms. Browner before the Committee on Energy and Commerce was that the changes she is suggesting will not significantly result in major improvement in air quality between now and the year 2002.

In addition to this, it is plain that the economic consequences of the rule-making now proposed by EPA will be very, very significant in terms of jobs, opportunity for our people, and competitiveness. It is very plain that the jobs in industrialized America will move to unindustrialized areas and that new brownfields will be created and new greenfields will be torn up for industrial change.

It is also very plain that significant loss of economic opportunity and economic impetus for this country impends and that the consequences of these rules being adopted will be that the United States will see significant jobs lost to Mexico, Canada, and other places around the world as American industry moves out.

One might ask why that situation will obtain. The answer is very simple. What is going to transpire is that the rules suggested by EPA will create no less than 400 nonattainment areas in the United States and those areas, while getting cleaner, will be legislated into nonattainment by the rules that are being suggested by EPA.

The consequences of this are that those areas will become subject to sanctions, will become subject to transportation limitations, will become subject to losses of jobs stemming from losses of building permits, and to changes which will be imposed on industry with regard to the fashion in which business is conducted.

More importantly, business will be faced with the significant problems of

achieving building permits. Ordinary citizens will face significant risk to lifestyle; and while those lifestyle changes are impossible to predict at this time, the rules which could be imposed on those areas could include things like controls on barbecuing, house painting, on running of power mowers, operation of motor boats, and other things in the areas which are nonattainment.

The consequences in terms of lost jobs, lost opportunity, loss of quality of life by Americans is indeed significant. While it is impossible to predict exactly what the consequences of this will be, they will be extremely onerous and need not be imposed upon American industry and upon American citizens.

The cost to the American people of the changes that this is going to impose will be enormous. One of the interesting things is that if we had, for example, a fourth grader playing in a grade school playground here in Washington, DC, under existing rules and regulations, that child is going to live in an area that meets existing standards by 1999, a mere 2 years from today. If EPA adopts the new standard, EPA hopes to force continued progress. But this attainment deadline will not be enforced, at least according to the transitional guidance issued by EPA with the proposed rules.

Instead, EPA will provide a new attainment date with the new standard. That allows States to take up to 12 years to bring an area into attainment. So in point of fact, what will transpire to this child is that 12 years after today he will live in an area which has reached attainment if all goes well.

If the past is prologue for the future, we know that EPA and the States will use the maximum amount of time allowed. So in point of fact, that child, instead of seeing the cleanup of his area or her area in 2 years, will observe it in a period of 12 years.

The number of counties that are going to be put into nonattainment area is significant, as I mentioned, better than 400 in the United States. It is interesting to note that amongst that number will be a significant number of counties in the State that I have the privilege and the pleasure to represent. Some 26 counties in Michigan will be legislated from attainment into nonattainment. Some 26 counties in Ohio will find same situations.

EPA's standards may result in cleaner air, but they may also result in significant hardship which will be imposed because of the requirements for sanctions and other things to be imposed.

□ 2115

It should be noted that of the 50 States, all 50 will see questions raised about the validity and the propriety of their State implementation plans. The consequence of this is again to subject every county within those States to the possibility of sanctions, penalties

and other things. And failure to comply with these will subject the cities, the counties and the States to the strong possibility of citizen suits which will take control away from the local units of government, away from the States and put them into the courts. The consequences of this, I reiterate to my colleagues, are indeed serious. I commend again the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania for his leadership. One of the questions I did not mention that is going to confront us is the Clean Air Act as now constituted requires all Federal highway funds to be withheld by EPA as an automatic sanction for nonattainment areas, whether they be counties, whether they be cities or whether they be States. As a result, industrial and transportation projects can be delayed years and decades by the Clean Air Act requirements in nonattainment areas where good faith effort is now being made by the citizens and by their governments to comply with the law. These changes suggested by EPA are extremely destructive, hazardous of economic growth, unneeded and will result in serious hardship not only for American industry and competitiveness but also for the people of the United States. I would hope that those who are within reach of my voice or are observing what I am saying will take to heart what I have said and communicate with the administration about their concerns of the unwisdom of this kind of unnecessary step.

Mr. KLINK. I thank the gentleman for his input again and just laud him for everything that he has done to help us on this issue. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] was the author and worked with us all on a letter to the administration where we as Democrats sought to sit down with our President to talk about the seriousness of this matter. We have been relatively quiet up until now, working very hard behind the scenes, trying to get through to the administration, trying to talk to Administrator Browner. The administration has dragged their feet. They do not want to seem to want to sit down and talk to us. We have issued letters, we have made phone calls. Many of us have buttonholed people who work at the White House who we think are close to the President trying to impress upon them how serious we are. I will not stand idly by and watch the same kind of degradation to our industrial base that I watched during the 1970's and 1980's. I know that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] likewise will not watch that in his State of Michigan or anywhere else in this country. Yet we have not heard from the administration. So now we have prepared a piece of legislation. I am hoping, and we have gotten a great start, it is going to be a bipartisan bill. We are working with our friends on the Republican side to say, "Don't change the standards. We're cleaning the air. The economy is moving forward." This is not something where we want to

have EPA say 5 years from now, billions of dollars later, millions of jobs lost later, "Whoops, we made a mistake."

We know that it will take at least 2 years, Mr. Speaker, for the only 2 companies that manufacture these PM-2.5 monitors to make enough to get them distributed around this Nation. Then according to the law, it has to be monitored for at least 3 years to have the data. Two years to manufacture and distribute, 3 years to collect the data, adds up to 5 years. At the end of that 5 years, by law, this matter will have to be reviewed again or there will be another group suing the EPA. We are saying, take that 5 years, make sure that the science is right and as Carol Browner said herself, as other people in the administration have said, as scientists have said, during that 5 years nothing is lost because we are cleaning the air. We are moving forward with improving the breathability and the healthiness of the air across this country.

I would mention one other thing that really bothers me. Industry is on our side on this issue. Labor is on our side on this issue. In southwestern Pennsylvania, the American Lung Association of western Pennsylvania is on our side on this issue. Also on our side are the State legislatures of Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina and South Dakota, along with Tennessee, Utah and West Virginia. All of these legislatures and many of them, both the State House as well as the State Senate have passed resolutions or concurrent resolutions saying, "Don't do this. You're throwing it back on us, Federal Government. It is up to us, the State, to do the State implementation plan. We've begun our State implementation plan. We're cleaning the air. Now you're moving the finish line farther down the road, making it more expensive, making it more difficult and in fact stopping us from cleaning the air."

Who else is on our side? The Governor of Arizona, two Governors of Arkansas, both of which followed the current President into the governor's mansion. The Governor of Delaware has written a letter. The Governor of Florida, the Governor of Georgia, the Governor of Illinois, the Governor of Indiana, the Governor of Kansas, the Governor of Kentucky, the Governor of Louisiana, the Governor of Michigan, the Governor of Mississippi, the Governor of Missouri, the Governor of Montana, the Governor of North Carolina, the Governor of Ohio, the Governor of Pennsylvania, the Governor of South Carolina, the Governor of Tennessee, the Governor of Texas, the Governor of Utah, the Governor of Virginia is with us as is the Governor of Wisconsin, the Governor of Wyoming, and then we have had many governors join together and sign letters together. We

have had letters from people within the Clinton administration, including Jerry Glover of the Small Business Administration, the Department of Air Force at Wright Patterson because you understand, Mr. Speaker, that the Defense Department may not be able to have aircraft flying in certain areas at certain times of the day because of the particulate matter given off by the exhaust of those aircraft. The same goes for commercial aircraft. I do not know what we would do, and we would really be in a pickle, it would seem to me, if our Nation would be attacked during a bad pollution day. I do not know if EPA would try to stop us from defending ourselves with these aircraft taking off or not.

That is almost how stupid all of this sounds. But we have a stack of resolutions, and I would tell my colleagues they are better than a foot high. These are letters, they are resolutions from industries and from State legislatures and governors across this Nation, telling us, this will impact their area negatively. It will inhibit their ability to clean the air. We talk about particulate matters. As I said this is something, the smaller particulate matter which is soot is composed of sulfates and nitrates and acids and ammoniums and elemental carbon and organic compounds, but a lot of this particulate matter also can be derived through industrial activities, through farming, mining, through driving down a dirt road. Because the particulate matter is 2.5 microns, which again I hate to get technical, but because it is of a certain size, does not necessarily mean it is as toxic as some other substance of that size. It does not mean it is as dense as another substance of that same size. Do toxicity and density and other kinds of things like this cause one particular PM-2.5 particle to cause you worse health effects than others? Is it when you have a blend of various substances that are taken into your lungs that you have a worse health matter? We do not have the answer, but yet it appears that the EPA and Director Browner are on their way down this pathway to hell for this country economically by rushing us into this before we know that we have all the scientific facts.

Again I would not ask my colleagues to depend on me because I am not a scientist, I am a lowly former news reporter, who has now been elected to Congress, who studied this issue. Let me call on those who I do know and I want to give Members some quotes.

Dr. Joe Mauderly is the current chairman of the scientific panel who has made their recommendations. As he appeared before the Committee on Commerce, he said, "While I support the proposed change for ozone as logical from a scientific viewpoint, I have to point out that it should also be considered that an equal or greater overall health benefit might be derived by using the Nation's resources to achieve compliance with the present standard

in presently noncompliant regions, than by enforcing nationwide compliance with a more restrictive standard."

In other words, what he is saying is we might be better off to make sure that we continue to clean the air to the specifications that we must adhere to now in areas that are in noncompliance rather than put everybody else to new levels of compliance and just start throwing money at that before we have all of the science.

He also points out that he is concerned about New Mexico and other arid regions with alkaline soil. He says, "The substantial portion of soil derived PM, particulate matter, that can exist as PM-2.5 may cause noncompliance with a standard aimed at controlling a different class of PM." In other words, what we are saying is you can have no industrial activity, none. But if you live in an arid region with alkaline soils, such as New Mexico, in nature, you might find yourself out of compliance. Yet we will be forcing industries across this Nation into trying to attain goals that are not attainable.

Let me just again go to Dr. Joe Mauderly, present chairman again of CASAC. He said, "I do not believe, however, that our present understanding of the relationship between PM and health provides a confident basis for implementing a standard that necessitates crippling expenditures or extreme changes in life-style or technology." That is exactly what this would do. First of all, we are going to have a crippling change in technology because we have got to get those PM-2.5 monitors manufactured. We have to get them out there. We have to get the readings and we have to make a determination as to exactly what is the impact of that.

It is going to cause crippling expenditures for industry. They know that. I have a little company that is in my district that was formerly owned by Arco, it is now owned by a company from Canada and we are happy to have Canadian companies come here and provide jobs for Americans. It is always good when that can occur. It is called Nova Chemical. They make styrofoam like you would find on the underside of the dashboard of your car or sometimes in the roof and the other components of the automobiles.

This is a small company, a small chemical company down in Beaver County, PA. But since the 1990 standards went into effect, this small company has spent \$40 million cleaning up the air. Just down the Ohio River a little bit farther in Midland, J & L Specialty Steel, they make stainless steel. We are proud because they are expanding right now, they are putting in a new specialty steel line. I do not know if they would or would not have done this if they when they began the process had been threatened with these new pollution regulations, because they have spent about \$160 million cleaning the air. And they have given us great benefits. They are not complaining

about that because they live in the community, just like the folks at Nova Chemical and Zinc Corp. of America, and USX and Allegheny Teledyne. They live in our community, they want the air to be clean, they have made the expenditure, but now we are moving the finish line farther away from them. That is a problem which all of this country will have to deal with. We have just reached for better or for worse, we will see how it goes, a balanced budget agreement, very historic, the first time since 1969. It was derived as the President sat down with the majority in the House of Representatives. But the basis for that agreement, as I understand, not having been in the room, were some very rosy economic assumptions. Those economic assumptions that we have made would go right out the door if all of a sudden our industry across this Nation were crippled by these new proposed standards. You can forget about it. People will not be taxpayers, they will be tax recipients because the jobs will not be created and in many regions they will lose the jobs. I know that the President, I know the administration, I know that Ms. Browner is hearing from the same mayors that we are hearing from, from the same county commissioners, and other local officials that we are hearing from. They are concerned about the impact that these kinds of changes at the midpoint of this race would have on their ability not only to clean up the air but their ability likewise to have a vibrant economy. Eventually it is up to them, it is up to the States to reach attainment, it is up to the locale to reach the attainment.

□ 2130

Yvonne Atkinson Gates, who is on the board of commissioners of Clark County, NV; that is where Las Vegas is, and everybody knows Clark County. It is booming, they are building homes, they got tremendous amounts of economic growth. But she told our committee this:

Since the economy of Clark County is almost entirely based upon tourism, EPA's designation of our county as nonattainment will do damage to our ability to market our community as safe and clean.

When you are in nonattainment, and as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] said, 400 counties like this would be out of attainment; when you are out of attainment, there is a stigma that is involved. If you want to apply to expand your plant or to put a new plant in, you are in nonattainment, you have got problems. It is going to cost a lot more. You probably will not even attempt to do it. If people are seeking building permits as they are in Clark County to build those thousands upon thousands of homes each month as that area booms and grows, they will not be able to have building permits.

Now a lot has been said about the change of lifestyle, would people be

able to burn their wood burning stoves, would they be able in rural areas to burn brush and leaves and trash as they have in the past? That is going to be up to the local communities to have to make that decision as to how they comply. They may feel and they may indeed not have any alternative but to say to the citizens of this country you are going to have to change your lifestyle, you are going to have to have a new vehicle that burns reformulated gas whether you like it or not. You might have to have a car that is the California style car with the air pollution control, and the cost, 1,500 or \$2,000 more. What will that do for your ability to be able to afford to buy new cars? What will that do to the automobile industry in this country? What will that do for the auto parts industry of this country?

Let me jump just across the border. Let us go to San Jose, CA. Trixie Johnson, vice chair of the National League of Cities, told the Committee on Commerce about this proposed change of air pollution standards. Many of the State implementation plans developed as a result of the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments are just now being implemented. The implementation strategies incorporated in these plans have not been in effect long enough to determine their impact. And now we are saying to the States with that plan you have been working on, that plan that you have had in mind to clean up the air in your state so that you can comply with the federal law, forget about it. Start over again. The target used to be here. Now we are moving it way over there. See if you can hit that. And it is up to you and your industries and your citizens to figure out how to do it. We are out of it, we are the EPA. We are bigger than you. We could change the rules as we move along.

That is exactly what we are being told.

Dr. Barbara Beck I thought was very good when she was in front of the committee. She was from Gradient Corporation. About the ozone standard she said again remember we do not have to move on ozone now. We have to take a look at PM. We do not have to change it; we just have to review it according to the courts. But ozone could wait a year. But about this she said although the approach used by EPA in support of its recommendations is conceptually sound, multiple biases in the analysis result in an overall over estimate of the risk and hence an over estimate of the potential benefits.

Well, if their science is so good, let us take time while we are still cleaning the air, and I remind you again I cannot say it enough that the folks at EPA, including Miss Browner, agree with me, we are still cleaning the air. No matter what we do, the air is going to get cleaner. So let us make sure we are doing it right. Let us make sure that something good is happening.

And I would say to the administration sit down and talk with us. Do not

meander into this. You are taking on this Nation. You are taking on these State legislators, these Governors, these industries, these labor unions. This is a government of the people, by the people, for the people. We want clean air, we are getting clean air. You are ignoring us. You are saying you do not have to sit down and talk to us.

And I am saying we have waited patiently long enough. Now it is time for us to take matters into our hands so that we have a fallback position. We cannot depend on the fact that you are going to talk to us. We cannot depend on the fact that you are going to say to us the industries in your state will be fine because we are going to be realistic about dealing with this. We have to go back to that centralized emission system that you forced Pennsylvania to go to that cost us \$145 million to settle with that Envirotech company from Arizona that did not clean up any of the air.

Now that \$145 million, they will take it kind of personally because that money came out of the pockets of the taxpayers of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. It was money we could of used to educate our children. We could have used it for mass transit improvements that would have certainly cleaned up the air. We could have used it for so many things, for Medicare or Medicaid payments to take care of the needs of our citizens. But we had to use it because EPA said, whoops. Now I am afraid what they did to Pennsylvania they may be on the brink of doing to the entire United States of America.

And there are other complications. You see, a corporation could take this as an excuse and say you know we really got this agreement called NAFTA which gives us an ability to move south of the border or north of the border and sell our goods in the United States just as if we were located there and we do not have pollution standards like we have in the United States, but of course that air is going to blow across the border to Texas and across the border to the northern States from Canada, but companies would be able to do that. They would have that option.

This issue does not stand unto itself. There are other issues that come into play as to whether or not these jobs will still be American jobs, these plants will still be American plants.

So we are concerned. We have some very grave concerns about whether or not we are headed in the correct direction.

I want to just mention again something that I think is extremely important, and that is this issue of the slower cleanup, and I mentioned this before, and I know that Mr. DINGELL talked about it. This, I think, and the reason I repeat it is because it is probably the most important issue; we are, Mr. Speaker, going to continue to make progress in seeing the air get cleaner. Regardless of whether we have a new ozone standard or new particulate standard, we are cleaning up our

air as it pertains directly to ozone though. For the next 5 years we know that the air is going to continue to get cleaner through the continued implementation of the existing ozone provisions of the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments. However EPA has stated now that the existing attainment deadlines for ozone are not going to be enforced.

You understand this; we have got a rule right now that says this is the standard, .12 parts per million over a 1-hour period. They want to go to .08 parts per million over an 8-hour period, and I will admit an 8-hour period makes sense, but why from .12 to .08 throwing hundreds of counties out of attainment because when you do that the EPA said that they will not enforce the deadline at which those standards must be reached.

So now you have said, as I said in the very beginning, as Mr. DINGELL reiterated, to that child who is 8 or 9 years old who is on the playground having problems breathing, you said to the location where they are located if 1999 is the deadline that you have to reach .12 parts per million, forget about it, we have got a new standard, and we are going to give you 10 or 12 years longer to reach that deadline.

In addition, the States that have implementation plans are going to stop right now. They are going to quit because now we have moved the target. This is bad policy. We need to know more about the science. We have to do more studying. The ramifications are hard for all of us to grasp, but we know they will not be good. This new standard is going to disrupt the clean air progress that we could make under existing ozone standards, and we do not have to do it. There is no reason that we should be taking this on.

Let me reiterate again about these PM-2.5 monitors, 50 of them exist. We have to manufacture more, we have to get them implemented, get them located, rather, around this country, gather the information. That also is going to cause a long delay in knowing where we stand with PM-2.5.

Is there a combination of PM-2.5 molecules that is worse than others?

We have other questions. Why in the Pittsburgh region and other regions across this country as we clean up the air have we seen increased incidences of asthma?

There are more asthma cases as the air has gotten cleaner. Why is that? Well, there is speculation it may have to do in poorer areas with the fact that we have insect infestations in homes. There is speculation it could have to do with the fact at one time we had hardwood floors and now we have gone to wall to wall carpeting and there is dust mites and all kinds of particles like this in carpeting. But we do not have the answer. Without having that answer, without understanding why we are seeing more asthma as the air is cleaned up, we have got this rush to judgment on behalf of the EPA.

It is a bad policy. It is going to hurt the country, and it is not going to ben-

efit the children and other asthmatics across this country. That is the problem that we have. The EPA is charging forward without the ability to implement the new PM standard. They are charging forward on ozone without really having to do that, without really having the answers to many of these questions.

Again, I know the White House has heard from us, the White House has heard from local officials, from State officials, from State legislators. They have heard from people in the administration that have the same concerns that RON KLINK has, that the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. DINGELL] has, and thus far the silence from the White House has been deafening.

I will say one more time we have lost enough jobs in southwestern Pennsylvania and other industrial regions of this country. We have felt the implications of those job losses. Families have been ruined, lives have been ruined, individuals have been ruined, communities have been ruined. We now have one of the largest populations percentagewise of senior citizens in the entire Nation because many of our youngest and best and brightest had to move away. We are finally getting to the point where we are regrowing our industries and what we are saying to our children and grandchildren: Come back to Pennsylvania. Jobs exist again. And now the EPA wants to bring all of that crashing down around our ears.

If we must go to war on this issue, then, Mr. Speaker, we will go to war on this issue. We have done it before. I have been involved in some battles that I have lost, but I have been involved in some that I have won. I hope that we still have time to sit down and to work this matter out and that cooler heads and calmer minds and good science and the best interests of the people, the workers across this country, will prevail.

But I am preparing a piece of legislation that will keep the standards as they are, maintain the status quo and continue to clean the air at the rate we are cleaning it, and we are ready to move that. We have got Republicans working with us, Democrats working with us, and we will move that legislation, and I think that we can get it moved through the House. I think there is enough interest in it.

Let us make those on the other side tell us why they want to delay cleaning up the air, why they want children to be gasping longer, why they want to cost people their jobs, why they want to shut down industries in this Nation.

As for me, let us continue the progress that we have made in rebuilding the industrial base of this Nation, the industrial might of this Nation, and let us keep making the progress that we have done on cleaning the air and seeing the health improvements that we have seen across this country.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. TURNER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of family business.

Ms. MCKINNEY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) after 5 p.m. today on account of official business.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of attending son's school graduation.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WISE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DREIER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCINTOSH, for 5 minutes,, on June 6.

Ms. GRANGER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BRADY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ARMEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. THUNE, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WISE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LANTOS.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

Mr. ROTHMAN.

Mr. KLECZKA.

Mr. SANDERS.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

Mr. KUCINICH.

Ms. KAPTUR.

Mr. TOWNS.

Mr. TORRES.

Mr. CONYERS.

Mr. ORTIZ.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

Mr. KLINK.

Mr. BERMAN.

Mr. MOAKLEY.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts.

Mr. HINCHEY.

Mr. FORD.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DREIER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. KING.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia.

Mr. LARGENT.

Mr. FORBES.

Mr. KASICH.

Mrs. ROUKEMA.

Mr. HOUGHTON.

Mr. RADANOVICH.

Mr. SAXTON.

Mr. COMBEST.

Mr. MCINTOSH.

Mr. POMBO.
Mr. COBLE.
Mr. PAUL.
Mr. HUNTER.
Mr. PAPPAS.
Mr. SMITH of Michigan.
Mr. SPENCE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KLINK) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey in two instances.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
Ms. WATERS.
Mr. DOYLE.
Ms. ESHOO.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 6, 1997, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3641. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Regulation Governing the Fresh Irish Potato Diversion Program, 1996 Crop [FV-97-80-01] received June 3, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3642. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Limes Grown in Florida and Imported Limes; Change in Regulatory Period [Docket No. FV-97-911-1A IFR] received June 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3643. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Quality Control Provisions of the Mickey Leland Childhood Hunger Relief Act [Workplan Number 93-018] (RIN: 0584-AB75) received May 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3644. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Environment), Department of the Navy, transmitting notification of the Secretary's intent to study a commercial or industrial type function performed by 45 or more civilian employees for possible outsourcing, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2304 note; to the Committee on National Security.

3645. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Eighty-Third Annual Report of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System covering operations during calendar year 1996, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 247; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

3646. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—State Energy Program (Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy) [Docket No. EE-RM-96-402] (RIN: 1904-AA81) received June 3, 1997,

pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3647. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Occupant Crash Protection; Child Restraint Systems (National Highway Traffic Safety Administration) [Docket No. 74-14; Notice 119] (RIN: 2127-AG82) received June 2, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3648. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources; Standards of Performance for Nonmetallic Mineral Processing Plants; Amendments [IL-64-2-5807; FRL-5836-2] received June 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3649. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Arizona—Maricopa County Ozone Nonattainment Area [AZ 68-0011; FRL-5835-8] received June 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3650. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Approval of Source-Specific VOC and NOx RACT Determinations [PA83-4062a; FRL-5835-2] received June 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3651. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Approval of VOC and NOx RACT Determinations for Individual Sources [SIPTRAX No. PA-4057a; FRL-5835-4] received June 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3652. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Regulations of Fuels and Fuel Additives: Extension of the Reformulated Gasoline Program to the Phoenix, Arizona Moderate Ozone Nonattainment Area [FRL-5834-4] received June 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3653. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants Emissions: Group IV Polymers and Resins [AD-FRL-5836-6] (RIN: 2060-AE37) received June 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3654. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Final Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutant Emissions from Wood Furniture Manufacturing Operations [AD-FRL-5836-8] received June 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3655. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Des Arc, Arkansas) [MM Docket No. 97-31, RM-8930] re-

ceived June 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3656. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Idaho Falls, Idaho) [MM Docket No. 97-14, RM-8916] received June 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3657. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Driggs, Idaho) [MM Docket No. 97-39, RM-8905] received June 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3658. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Homedale, Idaho) [MM Docket No. 97-15, RM-8927] received June 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3659. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy Management Staff, Office of Policy, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Indirect Food Additives: Adjuvants, Production Aids, and Sanitizers [Docket No. 96F-0370] received June 3, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3660. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions by David J. Scheffer, of Virginia, to be Ambassador at Large for War Crimes Issues, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on International Relations.

3661. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions by John Christian Kornblum, of Michigan, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States to the Federal Republic of Germany, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on International Relations.

3662. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a letter notifying Congress that on May 29 and May 30, due to the uncertain security situation and the possible threat to American citizens and the American Embassy in Sierra Leone, approximately 200 U.S. military personnel, including an 11-member special forces detachment, were positioned in Freetown to prepare for the evacuation of certain U.S. Government employees and private U.S. citizens (H. Doc. No. 105-93); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

3663. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 1996 through March 31, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3664. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting the semiannual report to Congress on Audit Follow-up for the period October 1, 1996, through March 31, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3665. A letter from the Chief Executive Officer, Corporation for National Service, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 1996, through March

31, 1997; and the semiannual management report for the same period, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3666. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the annual report on the valuation of the U.S. Coast Guard Military Retirement System for plan year ending 1995, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3667. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—General Provisions, Definitions: Change in Organizational Title from Field Director and Field Area to Regional Director and Region (National Park Service) (RIN: 1024-AC60) received June 3, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3668. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Using Hook-and-Line Gear in Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No. 961107312-7021-02; I.D. 052897B] received June 3, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3669. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Shortraker and Rougheye Rockfish in the Aleutian Islands Subarea [Docket No. 961107312-7021-02; I.D. 052897A] received June 3, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3670. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Whiting Closure for the Mothership Sector [Docket No. 970403076-7114-02; I.D. 053097A] received June 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3671. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Groundfish of the Gulf of Alaska; Pollock in the Western Regulatory Area [Docket No. 961126334-7025-02; I.D. 053097B] received June 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3672. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the transfer of public lands to certain California Indian Tribes; to the Committee on Resources.

3673. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Big Sandy River, mile 2.1 to mile 3.1 (Coast Guard) (RIN: 2115-AA97) received June 2, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3674. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Security Zone; Elizabeth River, Norfolk, VA (Coast Guard) [CGD 05-97-032] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received June 2, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3675. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulation: Fireworks Displays within the

First Coast Guard District (Coast Guard) [CGD01-97-009] (RIN: 2115-AE46) received June 2, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3676. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Weighted Average Interest Rate Update [Notice 97-33] received June 3, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3677. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Information Reporting on Transactions with Foreign Trusts and on Large Foreign Gifts [Notice 97-34] received June 3, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3678. A letter from the Assistant Commissioner (Examination), Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Investment Credit on Transition Property [Utilities Industry Coordinated Issue] received June 3, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3679. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration, transmitting the report of the 1994-1995 Advisory Council on Social Security, Volumes I and II, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 907(d); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DREIER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 162. Resolution waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1469) making emergency supplemental appropriations for recovery from natural disasters, and for overseas peacekeeping efforts, including those in Bosnia, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes (Rept. 105-120). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CANADY: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 54. Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States (Rept. 105-121). Referred to the House Calendar.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 1277. Referral to the Committee on Commerce extended for a period ending not later than June 9, 1997.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GILMAN:

H.R. 1795. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to remove the dollar limitation on payment of benefits from a defined benefit plan maintained by a State or local government for the benefit of employees of

the police department or fire department; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OBEY:

H.R. 1796. A bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for recovery from natural disasters, and for overseas peacekeeping efforts, including Bosnia, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ARMEY (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. TALENT, Mr. BOB SCHAEFFER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. BLILEY, and Mr. BOEHNER):

H.R. 1797. A bill to provide scholarship assistance for District of Columbia elementary and secondary school students; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. BAKER (for himself and Mr. BACHUS):

H.R. 1798. A bill to reform the program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development for disposition of single family properties in the inventory of the Department for use for the homeless; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. BARCIA of Michigan (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. CAMP, Mr. DELLUMS, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. SOLOMON, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. STRICKLAND, and Mr. STUPAK):

H.R. 1799. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to provide for greater local input in transportation planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BOEHLERT (for himself, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. KIND of Wisconsin):

H.R. 1800. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude gain or loss from the sale of livestock from the computation of capital gain net income for purposes of the earned income credit; to the Committee of Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of California (for himself and Mr. MILLER of California):

H.R. 1801. A bill to authorize the United States Man and the Biosphere Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana (for himself and Mr. CONDIT):

H.R. 1802. A bill to suspend United States development assistance for India unless the President certifies to Congress that the Government of India has taken certain steps to prevent human rights abuses in India; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. CLAY (for himself and Mr. MARTINEZ):

H.R. 1803. A bill to assist State and secondary and postsecondary schools to develop, implement, and improve career preparation education so that every student has an opportunity to acquire academic and technical knowledge and skills needed for postsecondary education, further learning, and a wide range of opportunities in high-skill, high-wage careers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 1804. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 210 Seminary Street in Florence, AL, as the "John McKinley Federal Building"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE:

H.R. 1805. A bill to amend the Auburn Indian Restoration Act to establish restrictions related to gaming on and use of land held in trust for the United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. DOYLE (for himself, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. COYNE, Mr. COBURN, Mr. GORDON, Mr. KLINK, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. NEY, Mr. FOLEY, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ROHRBACHER):

H.R. 1806. A bill to provide for the consolidation of the Office of Fossil Energy and the Office of Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency of the Department of Energy; to the Committee on Science.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. WEYGAND):

H.R. 1807. A bill to impose a limitation on lifetime aggregate limits imposed by health plans; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 1808. A bill to prohibit the relocation of certain Marine Corps helicopter aircraft to Naval Air Station Miramar, CA; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1809. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers a credit for a portion of the expenses of providing dependent care services to employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. GRANGER (for herself, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. PITTS, Mr. DELAY, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. WELLER, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. PAUL, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BRADY, and Mrs. MYRICK):

H.R. 1810. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (for himself, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mrs. CHENOWETH, and Mr. HILL):

H.R. 1811. A bill to ensure the long-term protection of the resources of the portion of the Columbia River known as the Hanford Reach; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. HEFLEY (for himself, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. CRANE, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. HOSTETTLER):

H.R. 1812. A bill to provide for the elimination of the Department of Education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KLECZKA (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Ms. CARSON, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. STARK, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FROST, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 1813. A bill to protect the privacy of the individual with respect to the social security number and other personal information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Banking and Financial Services, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LUTHER (for himself and Mr. RAMSTAD):

H.R. 1814. A bill to provide for the termination of further production of the Trident II (D-5) missile; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. McDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DELLUMS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. FROST, Mr. MILLER of California, and Mr. TORRES):

H.R. 1815. A bill to protect the privacy of health information in the age of genetic and other new technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1816. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a credit against income tax for tuition and related expenses for public and nonpublic elementary and secondary education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETRI:

H.R. 1817. A bill to require that employers offering benefits to associates of its employees who are not spouses or dependents of the employees not discriminate on the basis of the nature of the relationship between the employee and the designated associates; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RIGGS (for himself, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. GREENWOOD):

H.R. 1818. A bill to Amend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROTHMAN (for himself, Mr. FROST, and Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN):

H.R. 1819. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the establishment of lifetime learning accounts for the purpose of accumulating funds to pay the qualified expenses related to higher education and job training of the taxpayer and the taxpayer's family; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STUPAK (for himself and Mr. CAMP):

H.R. 1820. A bill to delay the application of the substantiation requirements to reimbursement arrangements of certain loggers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 1821. A bill to require the Attorney General to add to schedule III of the Controlled Substances Act, the "club" drugs ketamine hydrochloride and gamma hydroxybutyrate; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each

case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. TAUSCHER (for herself, Mr. MCINTYRE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. FROST, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BOYD, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FORD, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. SNYDER, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. MINGE, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. FAZIO of California, and Mr. TIERNEY):

H.R. 1822. A bill to establish State infrastructure banks for education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WEYGAND:

H.R. 1823. A bill to reduce the incidence of child abuse and neglect, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYNN (for himself, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. FROST, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. BALDACCIO):

H.R. 1824. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to increase the annual Government-wide goal from 20 percent to 25 percent for procurement contracts awarded to small business concerns, small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, and small business concerns owned and controlled by women; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA):

H. Con. Res. 92. Concurrent resolution to recognize the value of continued friendly relations between the United States and the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. WELLER, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. LINDER, Mr. LAZIO of New York, Mr. PAXON, Mr. SAXTON, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MANTON, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. STARK, and Mr. SOLOMON):

H. Con. Res. 93. Concurrent resolution concerning the Palestinian Authority and the sale of land to Israel; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H. Con. Res. 94. Concurrent resolution condemning the military coup d'etat of May 26, 1997, in Sierra Leone; to the Committee on International Relations.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

116. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relative to Resolution No. 2 memorializing the President, Congress, and the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States to design and implement adjustments to the Federal milk marketing order system that are equitable to Minnesota's family dairy farmers;

including reassessment of the use of wholesale price indicators derived from trade on the Green Bay Cheese Exchange; to the Committee on Agriculture.

117. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to Assembly Resolution No. 107 memorializing the United States Department of State to adopt a guarantee of unimpeded access to orphaned and abandoned children by Americans as a tenet of foreign policy when negotiating treaties; to the Committee on International Relations.

118. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to Senate Joint Resolution 9 urging the United States Congress to pass legislation to open the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska, to oil and gas exploration, development, and production; to the Committee on Resources.

119. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution 8 requesting the United States Congress to enact legislation requiring out-of-state mail order sellers to collect and submit use taxes on goods delivered in those states that impose them; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

120. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relative to Resolution No. 1 memorializing Congress to support legislative initiatives to mitigate the economic competition among the states that has resulted from the adoption of targeted business incentive programs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

121. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Iowa, relative to House Concurrent Resolution 23 requesting that the Congress of the United States maintain and renew its commitment to America's corn growers and this Nation's ethanol industry by supporting a tax exemption and by taking other actions to increase this Nation's commitment to the production and use of ethanol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

122. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution 177 urging the United States Congress to adopt a local purchase requirement for the purchase of cigarettes by military and Coast Guard facilities in Alaska and Hawaii; jointly to the Committees on National Security and Transportation and Infrastructure.

123. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, relative to Senate Resolution 97-S 971 memorializing the President and the Congress to improve funding for Federal assistance programs for legal aliens; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Agriculture.

124. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution 242 urging Hawaii's Congressional Delegation to support Federal proposals to redirect revenues from the Federal motor fuels tax increases into the Highway Trust Fund; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Budget, and Transportation and Infrastructure.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Ms. KAPTUR introduced a bill (H.R. 1825) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel *Mighty John III*; which was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 15: Mr. SNYDER.
H.R. 18: Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. HEFNER, Ms. MOLINARI, and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.
H.R. 45: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 66: Mr. HOLDEN and Mr. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 76: Mr. WAMP, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. STARK, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 123: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. COOK, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SPENCE, and Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.
H.R. 158: Mr. CLAY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. STUMP, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. CAMP, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. TURNER, Mr. REYES, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. LINDER, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. FAZIO of California.
H.R. 159: Ms. DUNN of Washington.
H.R. 160: Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska.
H.R. 176: Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, Mr. EHLERS, and Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 195: Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 197: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 198: Mr. BAKER and Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 218: Mr. CHAMBLISS and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 222: Mr. PORTER and Mr. BAKER.
H.R. 404: Mr. PACKARD.
H.R. 409: Mr. PALLONE, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mr. BISHOP, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. COOK, and Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 411: Ms. KILPATRICK.
H.R. 465: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 484: Mr. CHABOT and Mr. STUMP.
H.R. 536: Ms. MOLINARI.
H.R. 586: Mr. BUNNING and Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.
H.R. 588: Mr. GOODLATTE and Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.
H.R. 611: Mr. STOKES, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. KLINK, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 612: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. SPENCE, and Mr. BALDACCIO.
H.R. 674: Mr. PICKERING.
H.R. 712: Mr. WISE.
H.R. 768: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. CANADY of Florida.
H.R. 807: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 836: Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. GILLMOR.
H.R. 840: Mr. ENSIGN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. CLYBURN.
H.R. 883: Mr. NETHERCUTT.
H.R. 901: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. BRADY, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. DELAY, and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.
H.R. 939: Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 955: Mr. CLYBURN.
H.R. 978: Ms. VELAZQUEZ and Mr. GIBBONS.
H.R. 981: Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. YATES, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.
H.R. 982: Mr. CANADY of Florida.
H.R. 1010: Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska.
H.R. 1022: Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 1031: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 1032: Mr. KOLBE.
H.R. 1068: Mr. DEAL of Georgia and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1070: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma and Mr. ACKERMAN.
H.R. 1077: Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut.
H.R. 1104: Mr. RUSH, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, and Ms. STABENOW.
H.R. 1126: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. Bentsen, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 1129: Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DICKS, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. GILCHREST.
H.R. 1146: Mr. DOOLITTLE.
H.R. 1151: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 1153: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 1160: Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 1165: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1169: Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. OLVER, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.
H.R. 1176: Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 1219: Mr. VENTO and Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 1220: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 1231: Mr. LAFALCE and Mr. COLLINS.
H.R. 1247: Mr. FORBES, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. CRAPO.
H.R. 1288: Mr. LINDER.
H.R. 1290: Mr. EHLERS.
H.R. 1298: Mr. ENSIGN and Mr. NORWOOD.
H.R. 1299: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. SMITH of Michigan.
H.R. 1320: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1354: Mr. THOMPSON and Mr. KIND of Wisconsin.
H.R. 1355: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. BLILEY.
H.R. 1357: Mr. CANADY of Florida.
H.R. 1373: Mr. MOAKLEY.
H.R. 1375: Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. LAFALCE, and Ms. MOLINARI.
H.R. 1380: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 1404: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. RUSH, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. NADLER, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. FILNER, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. FARR of California, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. FURSE, Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. DIXON, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. SCHUMER.
H.R. 1427: Mr. MICA.
H.R. 1437: Mr. NADLER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 1441: Mr. MCINTOSH, Mrs. THURMAN, and Mr. HULSHOF.
H.R. 1442: Ms. WATERS, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 1456: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 1474: Ms. SANCHEZ.
H.R. 1504: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. BOEHLERT.
H.R. 1506: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 1507: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. WISE.
H.R. 1519: Mr. GALLEGLY, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. JACKSON.
H.R. 1524: Mr. SNYDER and Mr. DICKEY.
H.R. 1525: Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, and Mr. HILLIARD.
H.R. 1532: Mr. LAZIO of New York, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. EWING, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mrs. EMERSON, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. PAXON, Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. HORN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr.

KINGSTON, Mr. DREIER, Mr. DELAY, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. SHAW, Mr. FORBES, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. WOLF, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. POMBO, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. JONES, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. COLLINS.

H.R. 1565: Mr. WATKINS and Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 1572: Mr. CLEMENT and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.

H.R. 1573: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington, and Mr. POSHARD.

H.R. 1580: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1583: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 1596: Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BRYANT, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. BONO.

H.R. 1620: Mr. RIGGS.

H.R. 1682: Mr. FROST and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 1683: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1711: Mr. REYES, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. SISISKY, and Mr. BONILLA.

H.R. 1719: Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. STUMP, Mr. PICKETT, and Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.R. 1737: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 1765: Mr. SNYDER and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1766: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. COMBEST.

H.R. 1776: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. CAPPS.

H.R. 1777: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. CAPPS.

H.R. 1783: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1789: Mr. POMBO.

H.J. Res. 54: Mr. RODRIGUEZ and Mr. CASTLE.

H.J. Res. 64: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mrs. MYRICK.

H.J. Res. 67: Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. CONDIT, and Mr. GOODE.

H.J. Res. 76: Mr. SCHUMER and Mr. CRAPO.

H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. LANTOS.

H. Con. Res. 60: Mr. BASS, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. EHLERS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. DIXON, Mr. QUINN, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. FILNER, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. TALENT, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. EHRlich, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LINDER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. DELAY, Mr. BERRY, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. HUNTER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. JONES, Mr. PAXON, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. TORRES, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MCCRERY, Ms. ESHOO, and Ms. DELAURO.

H. Con. Res. 75: Ms. FURSE.

H. Con. Res. 80: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. KAPTUR,

Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. KLUG, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. GORDON.

H. Con. Res. 91: Mr. McNULTY and Mr. WAXMAN.

H. Con. Res. 139: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. BALLENGER.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1525: Mr. PASCRELL.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

16. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Board of Directors, Federation of Asian People on Guam, relative to Resolution No. 97-1 commending and supporting Representative George Miller on his legislation to strip CNMI of many of its immigration and labor powers; to the Committee on Resources.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 143

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 5, 1997

No. 76

Senate

The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Lord of all life, Who has made work in Government one of the highest callings and the formulation of public policy a crucial ministry, we ask You to help us bless this weekday and keep it holy. Give us a renewed sense of mission today as we go about the tasks of this day. Help us to find a solution to the present impasse over the disaster relief bill. You are present in this Chamber.

May we keep our attention on You as the only One we must please. With that ever present before us, we will work with excellence because we are accountable to You. So may every word we speak, every relationship we enjoy, and every task we tackle be done with a sense of Your presence. May we never forget why we are here—to serve You by being servant leaders of the people of our land. Living and working is a privilege. Thank You for another day in which we can do both with enthusiasm. In the name of our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able majority leader, Senator LOTT of Mississippi, is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. Thank you, Mr. President.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now be in a period for morning business from the hour of 12 noon to 2 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the following exceptions: Senator HUTCHINSON of Arkansas from 12 to 12:30 p.m., and Sen-

ator DORGAN, or his designee, from 12:30 to 1 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

SCHEDULE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, the Senate will be in a period for morning business until the hour of 2 p.m. to accommodate a number of Senators who have requested time to speak. At 2 p.m., it is my hope that we will begin debate on the supplemental appropriations conference report. We are working to get a 2-hour debate agreement on that supplemental conference report, of course, to be followed by a vote.

Then after that debate, the Senate will, hopefully, be able to begin consideration of the budget resolution conference report with 3 hours of debate on that. Therefore, Senators can expect votes on both the supplemental appropriations conference report and the budget conference report before the Senate adjourns this evening. I thank my colleagues for their attention.

I might also note, we hope to be able to confirm the nomination late this afternoon of Elizabeth Anne Moler to be Deputy Secretary of Energy.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. HUTCHINSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

CHINA'S MOST-FAVORED-NATION STATUS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to the administration's proposal to renew most-favored-nation status for China, and I rise as an original cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 31, the resolution of disapproval of MFN.

First and foremost, I want to recognize my good friend and colleague from

North Carolina, Senator JESSE HELMS. Over the years, Senator HELMS has dedicated himself to making this body and the American people aware of China's human rights record of abuse. I sincerely thank the Senator and his staff for their leadership on this very important issue.

Mr. President, yesterday, June 4, 1997, was the eighth anniversary of the violence in Tiananmen Square. It has now been 8 years since the suppression of prodemocracy protests in China; 8 years since the killing of hundreds of unarmed civilians by the army in Beijing. In 1989, we all watched with amazement as these courageous Chinese students marched in Tiananmen Square. Today, they are all gone.

During their struggle, they defied the tanks, they looked to the United States for inspiration, they quoted our Declaration of Independence and, through it all, Mr. President, United States policymakers have responded that economic engagement would stop China's abuses of human rights. As far as I can tell, it is, in fact, profit projections that are primarily driving our foreign policy.

How can the United States consider renewing MFN for China when the Chinese authorities still have taken no steps to publicly investigate the circumstances of the killings and bring to justice those found responsible for human rights violations? Instead, the families of victims and people attempting to gather information about those killed are themselves subjected to harassment and intimidation in a continuing attempt by authorities to conceal the facts of what occurred 8 years ago.

The Chinese Government defines the 1989 protest as a "counterrevolutionary riot." I believe this definition has been used since 1989 to justify the imprisonment of many people who are the victims of human rights violations. Thousands of political prisoners—thousands—arrested during the crackdown, including prisoners of conscience, are

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S5293

believed to be imprisoned today. How can this Congress accept the administration's proposal to renew MFN for China? How can we stand here in good faith and look the other way? By turning a blind eye to this oppression in the interest of trade opportunities, I believe the United States is sending a clear and unmistakable message. It is the wrong message. The message to the Government of China is one of commendation rather than one of condemnation.

It has been almost 3 years since the United States formally delinked American trade with China for its human rights performance of abuse. So I say to my colleagues, much has changed in China in the last 3 years, but the changes that have occurred in China have not been changes for the better. We now see a human rights situation in China that is worse by every measure—persecution of Christians, forced abortions, sterilizations of the mentally handicapped, kangaroo courts for Democratic dissenters, incarceration of political dissidents, and, Mr. President, the near extinction of the expression of any opinion contrary to that of the Communist regime.

I am deeply concerned with the mounting campaign of religious persecutions waged by the rulers of China. Regarding China's deprivation of fundamental human rights and religious aspirations, continuing MFN to China is effectively equivalent to a policy of appeasement.

The Roman Catholic Church has been made, for all practical purposes, illegal in China. Priests, bishops, and people of faith have been imprisoned and harassed. For example, Zheng Yunsu, the leader of a Jesus family, a Protestant community in Shandong Province, is one of many people who are behind bars simply for practicing their faith. He was arrested during a police raid on the community in 1992. He was later sentenced to 12 years imprisonment for disrupting public order and "swindling." His four sons and other members of the group were also imprisoned. I believe that they are all prisoners of conscience.

Mr. President, such persecutions of religious groups has followed a substantial religious revival in China over the past 15 years. In the Christian community, much of the expansion has been in religious groups that conduct their activities outside the Protestant and Catholic churches still recognized by the government, though they are greatly restricted.

Many peaceful but unregistered religious gatherings have been raided by police, and those attending those services have been beaten, threatened, or detained, and many of those detained are required to pay heavy fines as a condition for their release. Those regarded as leaders are usually kept in custody and either sentenced to prison terms or administratively detained without charge, without trial. And this, Mr. President, is the regime to

whom we would grant most-favored-nation status.

In January 1994, two national regulations on religious activities came into force. Notably, Mr. President, they banned religious activities which undermine national unity and social stability. Under the broad rubric of these two regulations, any activity could be construed as undermining the Chinese Government and, therefore, constitute a threat punishable by arrest, prosecution, imprisonment and bodily harm.

These regulations also require that all places of religious activities be registered with the authorities according to rules formulated by China's Religious Affairs Bureau, an innocuous-sounding agency. This means, in effect, that religious groups that do not have official approval may not obtain registration and that those involved in religious activities in unregistered places may be detained and punished. Provided in these new regulations are detention and criminal penalties for any violation. And this is the regime to whom we would grant normal trade relations and most-favored-nation status.

During this past year, police raids on religious gatherings organized by independent groups have continued, with hundreds of Protestants and Catholics reportedly detained as a result. More than 300 Christians were reported to have been detained in what appears to be a crackdown by police on unregistered Protestant houses and churches. And this is the Government to whom we want to extend MFN.

I believe there is evidence of an intensified Chinese repression of religious liberty. This repression ranges from ransacking homes in Tibet in search of banned pictures of the Dalai Lama to destroying or closing 18,000 Buddhist shrines last spring. Ministers, priests and monks are routinely arrested, imprisoned, tortured and sometimes killed for the mere expression of their faith. For example, let's take the case of Pastor Wong, who runs 40 evangelical churches. He was released in December after a fourth arrest for spreading the Gospel. This time, Mr. President, the government captors broke several of his fingers with pliers. This is the government to whom we would like to extend, again, MFN.

I believe it is the obligation of the American Government to uphold the principles of democracy and freedom that we claim to espouse. By renewing MFN status to China, we are turning a blind eye to the oppressed in the interest of expanded trade opportunities. There must be some things that are even more important than the almighty dollar.

Mr. President, in Paul Marshall's critically acclaimed book, "Their Blood Cries Out," an authoritative book of religious persecutions around the globe, the case of Bishop Su is documented. During Bishop Su's 15 years in China's prison system, he was subjected to various forms of torture. One beating was so severe that the instru-

ment of the beating actually splintered. Then the police ripped apart a wooden door frame and used it to continue the beating until it, too, disintegrated into splinters. The bishop was then hung by his wrists from a ceiling and beaten around the head.

As appalling as this story is, in another encounter, this bishop was placed in a cell containing water at varying levels from ankle to hip deep where he was left for days unable to sit and unable to sleep. And, again, this is the regime to whom we would give most-favored-nation status.

Every year, countless numbers of people are detained without charge in breach of the law or sentenced without trial to years of reeducation through labor at the discretion of police and local officials. For those who are charged, sentences are frequently imposed after unfair trials, with the verdict decided beforehand. In many cases, such verdicts even carry the death penalty.

The Chinese legal system, like, I suppose, all legal systems, supports the established political and governmental institutions. However, it does not do so in a way that is consistent with the rule of law and fundamental human rights. The rule of law becomes subordinate to higher political goals, including the defeat of perceived political enemies within the nation of China.

The vagueness and contradictory provisions of the law in China lead consistently to Chinese arbitrary enforcement and provides an open invitation to abuse of power. Repressive criminal legislation and the extensive system of administrative detention means that virtually anyone can be detained at the whim of individuals who happen to be in a position of power.

As we discuss MFN for China, a vast array of laws and regulations continues to be used to detain or imprison political opponents or to warn political dissidents against opposition.

The Chinese say over and over again that there are no political prisoners in China. Such an assertion is absurd on the surface and it flies in the face of overwhelming evidence. People are routinely imprisoned because of their political views or beliefs, but are categorized simply as counter-revolutionaries, administrative detainees, or criminals. In January 1995, for instance, a Ministry of Justice official was cited as stating that 2,678 prisoners convicted of counterrevolutionary offenses were currently in jail. I believe, Mr. President, that this figure represents only a fraction of the real number of political prisoners held in China today.

Furthermore, I believe that this figure excludes many thousands of people who are jailed for political reasons but convicted of other offenses or held under various forms of administrative detention who have not even been charged or tried.

We all know that grave human rights violations have continued in China

since 1995. They range from the arbitrary detention of people who peacefully express their views to gross violations of the physical integrity of the person and their very right to life. Dissent and any activity perceived as a threat to the established political order continues to be repressed.

So as we debate MFN for China, thousands of political prisoners, including members of religious and ethnic groups, are in jail simply for expressing their views. Torture and ill-treatment continue to be common practices during arrest in police stations, detention centers, labor camps, prisons, and this often results in the death of these victims.

It is my understanding, Mr. President, that at least a thousand people have been executed in China since the launch of a nationwide anticrime campaign in 1996. I call out to my colleagues that we must put pressure on China to stop these mass executions, many of which are carried out after only show trials.

The political authorities in China have instructed the judiciary to speed up procedures to sentence offenders, including those liable to the death penalty. And I believe the result is untold miscarriages of justice.

If we grant MFN to China in view of these practices, then we too are guilty of a miscarriage of justice. If we renew China's MFN status, as the administration wants us to, then I think we are derelict in our duty, this Congress' duty to uphold the principles of dignity and fundamental freedoms.

If we really want to engage the Chinese, we have to show that we are willing to confront them when they break the rules. We have not done that. And we will not do that by granting them most-favored-nation status.

For 4 consecutive years, from 1991 to 1995, the Chinese Government has successfully used a procedural motion to block any resolution critical of its human rights record being debated by the U.N. Commission on Human Rights. Mr. President, no government should be allowed to choose the extent to which it will abide by international human rights laws. No government should be allowed to manipulate human rights issues to further its political aims.

Newspapers in early April reported that China has been selling Iran the components of chemical weapons for several years. This was one in an ongoing series of reports about the Chinese military. The Chinese are also said to be dealing in nuclear weapons with Pakistan, buying advanced jet aircraft from Russia, and contracting for Russian-made aircraft carriers equipped with surface-to-surface missiles.

This is the nation, this is the government, this is the regime that we say, "You deserve again to have most-favored-nation status renewed," a nation that has a growing military capacity, that is increasing its military defense spending, has an expansionist view of

its own territorial goals and has snubbed us at every turn in our seeking conciliation and moderation in their foreign policy?

It seems while the administration would like Congress to renew MFN to China, they were and are fully aware of China's supplying Iran, Iraq and other enemies of the United States with deadly weapons—conventional, chemical, and nuclear.

Robert Einhorn, Deputy Secretary of State for Nonproliferation, has recently stated:

These dual-use, chemical-related transfers to Iran's chemical weapons program indicates that, at minimum, China's chemical export controls are not operating effectively enough to ensure compliance with China's prospective obligation not to assist anyone in any way to acquire chemical weapons.

Mr. Einhorn has also confirmed reports that China has been providing Iran with advanced C-802 cruise missiles capable of threatening United States warships in the Persian Gulf. Moreover, Mr. President, he testified to a Senate panel that:

We have information of discussions between Iran and China about additional conventional weapons sales. We expect there will be more.

That is what our State Department is saying about China's export controls.

Mr. President, as for still other reports that China has been running a brisk sale of mobile, nuclear-capable M-11 nuclear components to Pakistan—2 years after it pledged not to do so—Mr. Einhorn said those reports are, in fact, correct.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues, can China, under the current regime, be trusted to honor its treaty obligations? If China, our partner in engagement under the Clinton administration policy of constructive engagement, if China, our partner in engagement, supplies Iran, Iraq, and other enemies of the United States with deadly weapons, what in reality does that make China?

Mr. President, the biggest question of all in this year's MFN debate should be, is United States trade with China in effect subsidizing a military buildup that will soon threaten not only Taiwan, Japan, and China's other Asian neighbors, but even our own national security?

Mr. President, militarily, the administration has sought to strengthen Taiwan. We have shipped Patriot missiles to Taiwan, and Taiwanese pilots are at this moment in the United States being trained to use the F-16 jet fighters that America has also pledged to send to our ally.

When the Chinese in effect blockaded Taiwan during a missile-testing exercise off its coast in March of last year, the President—and I commend him—responded with a firm show of America's force dispatching the *Independence* in the area.

I ask, why, even though we deplore the Chinese military buildup in diplomacy and counter it in strategy, do we continue to help to finance it in trade?

Mr. President, these are some very serious questions that go unanswered by the administration in their attempt to renew MFN to China. I am very concerned with the administration's obvious neglect and disregard for the United States Department of State's "China Country Report on Human Rights" for 1996. Mr. President, the findings are absolutely horrific. I urge my colleagues to listen closely as I read one passage from this report. I quote:

Overall in 1996, the Chinese authorities stepped up efforts to cut off expressions of protest or criticism. All public dissent against the party and government was effectively silenced by intimidation, exile, the imposition of prison terms, administrative detention, or house arrest. No dissidents were known to be active at year's end.

I repeat, "No dissidents were known to be active at year's end."

I continue the report:

Serious human rights abuses persist in minority areas, including Tibet and Inner Mongolia. Controls on religion and other fundamental freedoms in these areas have also intensified.

This report debunks the logic of engagement. We were told that the situation in China was going to get better. That is what I was told when I first came to Congress in 1993, that if we will grant MFN to China, if we will extend that again, that this policy of engagement would result in better human rights conditions in China. But they have not improved. The situation has only grown worse.

I am astonished that the administration can justify renewal of MFN status for China, with what is provided in the report: the sale of women, religious persecution, forced abortions, forced sterilizations, continued disappearances of political rivals, et cetera. This important and vital report, overlooked by the administration, clearly states there are no free dissidents left in China today—not one, none.

I understand the importance of trade. It is important to Arkansas. It is important to America. It is important to our farmers. It is important to our manufacturers. But, Mr. President, I am convinced either the President has not read the State Department's report and/or the administration has ignored its findings.

Furthermore, China's human rights abuses, as described by the State Department, should be met with a heavy price, not a prize. Granting China special status only perpetuates their illegal and indecent actions toward the Chinese people.

Some would say, you cannot talk that way about China. Some would say that this will offend China. But then Ronald Reagan had many critics when he called the Soviet Union the "evil empire." Our goal is not to isolate China, but to awaken China to its inhumanity to its own people.

Mr. President, before I yield the floor, I just want to make one more plea to my colleagues not to turn a blind eye to the oppressed in the interest of trade opportunities. I urge my

colleagues to stand up and voice their opposition to the treatment of the Chinese Government toward their own people. Mr. President, I urge this administration to rethink a narrow-minded, nearsighted, and unengaging solution to human rights abuses.

For 16 years—for 16 years—the United States has extended MFN status to China, and in doing so, we have tacitly endorsed everything from forced abortions to the sale of dangerous weapons to our enemies.

I was talking to one of my colleagues early this week, and I told him that I have looked for 3 years for some scintilla of evidence that engagement has worked, I would like to vote for MFN, but I have not seen any evidence at all that this policy has improved the condition of the Chinese people or improved the human rights situation for those being oppressed in China. His response to me was, "TIM, it takes time."

Mr. President, time has run out for the thousands and thousands, who, today, find themselves in prison, and the families who have lost loved ones because of the oppressive regime that rules China.

The United States must stand for something once again. The debate is about more than dollars and cents. It is about our values as a nation. Others of my colleagues have said, "Well, we can't tell them what to do domestically." I would simply raise the question that it seems to be that the evidence is mounting daily that they have sought to tell us what to do domestically through influencing American elections.

Eight years ago, the world looked on in awe and admiration for those thousands of students who stood with courage in Tiananmen Square. Tiananmen Square must not become a haunting but fading memory to the world and to the American people.

So I ask my colleagues this question: Does not a little part, a little piece of the soul of this Nation die every time we turn away and allow freedom to be extinguished anywhere on this globe?

Let us make a difference. We must confront China's abuses. The price of not doing so is simply too high.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREE- MENT—CONFERENCE REPORT TO ACCOMPANY H.R. 1469

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at 2:30 p.m. today the Senate begin debate on the conference report to accompany H.R. 1469, the supplemental appropriations bill, and there be 2 hours for debate, to be equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member or their designees, and following the conclusion or yielding back of time, no further debate be in order, or motions to recommit, and the vote on adoption of the conference report occur at 5:05 p.m. this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. And, without objection, rule XII is waived.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I am also asked to report to the Presiding Officer that all Members should be on notice that a vote will occur at 5:05 p.m. this evening on adoption of the supplemental appropriations conference report.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SHELBY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. SHELBY pertaining to the introduction of S. 831 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE 1897 ORGANIC ACT

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to advise my colleagues that yesterday, unfortunately, we were not in morning business so I could not make this statement, but yesterday marked the 100th anniversary of the passage of the 1897 Organic Act which created the Forest Service. On that day, June 4, 100 years ago, Congress passed the Forest Service Organic Act which allowed the first on-the-ground management of the forest reserves.

Prior to this date 100 years ago, forest reserves totalling approximately 17 million acres had been established in 1891 and 1893. In the spring of 1897, another 21 million acres of forest reserves were added to the system. This latter addition was the result of a Presidential Commission on National Forests established in 1896. The commission included notable scientific and conservation leaders at that time.

However, the addition of the second round of reserves was sufficiently controversial that Congress moved in early 1897 to attach an amendment to the 1898 general appropriations bill to eliminate the reserves and transfer the 21 million acres back into the public domain for disposal. Outgoing President Grover Cleveland pocket vetoed the bill on his last day in office. This created a situation in which the Government had no money to operate and the new President, William McKinley, quickly called Congress into an extra session on March 15, 1897, to reconsider eliminating the reserves.

In this special session of Congress a compromise was framed which took the form of the Forest Service's 1897 Organic Act and which restored the 21 million acres of forest reserves. I think it is rather ironic, Mr. President, as we consider today various and sundry conflicts over salvage riders and the management of various forests, including

the Tongass National Forest in my State, that 100 years ago Congress had the same kinds of conflicts. But the national forests that we have today serve as a living testimony to our ability to resolve those conflicts.

My understanding is that other Members will join me today, Senator SMITH and probably Senator CRAIG, with regard to further statements on the significance of this particular date, June 4, 100 years ago, 1897, and further elaborate on the circumstances and conditions of the forests and the transition that has occurred in that 100 years.

However, I think it noteworthy that there are many changes in the names, many changes in the boundaries of the national forests in the years that have followed that event 100 years ago, but the basic land areas that were set aside in the Western States between 1891 and 1907 are still with us today. From 1907 until today another 44 million acres have been added to our national forests, mostly in the Eastern States. These lands, for the most part, were old, worn out farms, lands that were cut over, but today represent some of the most important forested recreation and timber producing areas that we have in the Eastern United States.

The Organic Act of 1897 allowed for the organization and active management of the reserves by forest rangers rather than no management at all, which had been the case from 1891 until that time. The well-known and revered Gifford Pinchot was hired on June 25, 1897, and he recommended the adoption of three basic goals for the management of the forest reserves. The first was permanent tenure of forest land; the second was continuity of management; and the third was the permanent employment of technical trained foresters. Because the tradition within the Department of the Interior was to hire political appointees rather than technically trained foresters, Pinchot was successful in 1905 in securing the transfer of the forest reserves to the Department of Agriculture where it is today.

I think it is a little bit ironic that today the new Chief of the Forest Service is a political appointee who most recently served in the Department of the Interior. Nevertheless, technically sound management continues within the Forest Service.

The major section of the 1897 act was a statement of reason for establishing the forest reserves. The act stated, "no public forest reservation should be established, except to improve and protect the forest within the reservation, or for the purpose of securing favorable conditions of water flows, and to furnish a continuous supply of timber for the use and necessity of citizens of the United States." Let me repeat that: "securing favorable conditions of water flows, and to furnish a continuous supply of timber for the use and necessity of citizens of the United States." That was the purpose.

Mr. President, for the most part of 100 years of management of the reserves, the Forest Service has relied extensively upon the double provisions of water flows and timber. Today, however, with ecosystem management as the Forest Service envisions it, improving and protecting the forests seems to have taken the forefront. I, for one, believe that all three criteria are important to assure that we can continue the balanced, predictable, and sustainable management of our national forests.

One interesting difference from the way the world seems to work today is the way the Forest Service was able to complete the implementation regulations for the Organic Act by June 30, 1897. Today it is difficult for the agency to produce regulations in 25 months, let alone get the job done in 25 days, which is what they did in 1897.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Organic Act, which established the philosophy of active management of the forest reserves, the first national forest timber sale occurred in the Black Hills National Forest in South Dakota in 1899. This sale was offered in the spirit of the then recently passed Organic Act because Gifford Pinchot believed that the science of forestry could be applied to manage the forest reserves on a sustainable basis.

We will be displaying a photograph as I speak. I think it is noteworthy, Mr. President, to recognize the significance of what this represents, because I have here for my colleagues' attention an enlarged photograph of the first timber sale that occurred in the United States on national forest lands. This is how it looks today, Mr. President. I think you will agree that this photograph shows a healthy, well-managed forest, which 100 years later confirms Pinchot's belief in forestry and the renewability of the resource. Since the time of that first sale, forestry and forest practices have progressed exponentially, reflecting modern knowledge and technologies and a heightened concern for ecology and all of the ecological functions of the forest.

This picture is an actual portrayal of the area in question today. This area in the Black Hills National Forest in South Dakota was cut in 1899. I am going to have an easel put up so that during the remainder of my remarks it can be viewed.

Finally, Mr. President, the Organic Act of 1897, although modified many times by the Congress, set the standards for the management of the national forests for an entire century. The vast national forest lands were set aside, and they are still in existence to this day. Controversy about the management of those forest lands, of course, continues, much as it did a century ago. The national forests are still under attack from some quarters. Management is being pressured to change. Special-interest groups are highly polarized. But the fact is that there are national forests, and I think it speaks

well that 100 years ago a young country with vast resources would save and manage millions of acres for the people, and that is just what we have done. Were we less forward-thinking people then, as some people seem to believe we are today? If we were, there would be nothing left to argue about. But that is not the case.

In conclusion, Mr. President, for the most part, the legacy of the Forest Service for the last 100 years has been responsible stewardship by dedicated professionals within the Forest Service.

Finally, as a commemoration of today's anniversary, I am sharing with each of my colleagues a most important book on forest ecology called "Pacific Spirit: A Forest Reborn." This book, which was written by Dr. Patrick Moore, is going to be given to each Member of this body. Dr. Patrick Moore is a forest ecologist and is one of the cofounders of GreenPeace. That is a rather interesting reference. Here is a cofounder of GreenPeace writing a book on forest ecology—"Pacific Spirit: A Forest Reborn." It is interesting that Dr. Moore now advises the Forest Alliance of British Columbia, an industry-sponsored organization in Canada. Some Members might think it ironic that I would send my colleagues a work by a former GreenPeace activist and founder of GreenPeace. But Dr. Moore sums up his position in this way:

As a lifelong environmentalist, I feel the need to speak out because I cannot agree with claims made to the world by some of my environmentalist colleagues about the total destructive impact of forestry in general and clear-cutting in particular.

It is the final irony today, I guess, that it takes a founder of GreenPeace to speak to us on the proposition that clear-cutting has value and is an adequate and recognized means of timber harvesting.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. DORGAN. Am I correct that I am to be recognized under a previous unanimous consent agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. The Senator has 30 minutes.

THE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I don't think I will use the entire 30 minutes. I wanted to come to the floor of the Senate today to speak again about a piece of legislation that we will take up in about an hour and 45 minutes. It is a supplemental appropriations bill to provide resources and money to help those who have been victims of a disaster in our country—especially, and most importantly, the disaster that has occurred in our region of the country, the Red River region, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota.

There are moneys in this bill for other regions as well, and there have

indeed been other disasters, although none quite as substantial as the one that has occurred along the Red River; that is why this bill is so critically important to us.

I was a conferee on the conference committee and, last evening, the conference committee reported out the bill, H.R. 1469, an act making emergency supplemental appropriations for recovery from natural disasters and for overseas peacekeeping, and so on. It is emergency supplemental appropriations for recovery from natural disasters. That is the purpose for this bill. Congress will consider that, as I indicated, in about an hour and 45 minutes.

I want to make two points today. The first is short, and the second is a bit longer. The first is this: Inside this piece of legislation is a substantial amount of help, an enormous amount of additional resources that will go to a number of regions of the country, especially our region, to try to help the victims of the disaster that visited our region. We are enormously grateful for that. There are many Members of the U.S. Senate, on both sides of the political aisle here, who pulled together and rolled up their sleeves and said, "Let us help." The help in this bill is substantial. It is very substantial, and it will help our region in a manner that I can hardly describe. So we are enormously grateful to every Member of this Senate and this Congress who helped us get to this point. That is the first point. Thanks to everyone who helped.

The second point is this: The resources inside this legislation are only going to be available when the President signs the bill. Time is urgent to deal with the needs that exist in our part of the country and to respond to the victims of the massive flooding that occurred in the Red River Valley. The reason I mention that time is a serious problem is because, 14 days ago, the Congress left for the Memorial Day recess and left this bill unfinished, and so 14 days have elapsed since that time. Now it appears that Congress will pass this bill this afternoon, and it contains unrelated, controversial items that almost certainly will be vetoed by the President because he has said time and time again that if it contains especially the central item dealing with Government shutdowns, he will be constrained to veto the bill.

I rode with President Clinton on Air Force One to Grand Forks Air Force Base one morning, and he visited with several thousand people who were then living and sleeping in an airplane hangar, a series of four hangars, sleeping on cots because they had been evacuated from their homes. Two cities, Grand Forks, ND, and East Grand Forks, MN, were nearly totally evacuated due to the flood waters that destroyed the two communities. Thousands of people were in airplane hangars sleeping on cots, wondering what would come next. President Clinton came that day. One of the points he made was that the

Congress and the President certainly will help. He said, "I hope very much that in the construction of a disaster relief bill, Congress will not add unrelated amendments, controversial, extraneous amendments that will slow down or derail the bill." He made that point in the airplane hangar to the thousands of people who were there for good reason—because there is a tendency in Congress to add unrelated things to other pieces of legislation. I don't expect that that habit will discontinue. But it is unusual for that to happen on a disaster bill. It is not the usual course of events for someone to seize a disaster bill like this and say, oh, by the way, I have an unrelated issue that is very controversial and I think we can force the President to sign it by including it in a disaster bill.

That is not the way most Members of Congress have treated disaster bills in the past. Disaster bills deal with disasters. They have resources that are needed by victims. The Congress, by and large, has decided that they will not toy with or play with or play political games with a disaster bill. Yet, today, despite my enormous gratitude for all of the wonderful resources that are in this bill, this bill contains a couple of—especially one—totally unrelated, very controversial items that the President certainly will veto.

So what happens as a result of that? More delay. Probably another week's delay, at least. What happens to the victims of the flood along the Red River during that week? They will wait, they will wonder, and they will not have answers about their future.

It is unfair to them to do this. Now, some say—and I read in the papers in the last few days—that delay doesn't matter; there is money in the pipeline. FEMA has money and they are helping the victims of this disaster. Why are you saying that delay is a problem here?

To anyone who says that, they must be saying it without the facts. The facts are this. In Grand Forks, ND, a city with which I am well familiar because I have been there many, many times prior to, during, and since the flood, about 600 homes were totally and completely destroyed as a result of the flood and probably another 800 were severely damaged. The people who lived in those 600 homes are not ever moving back. The question is, what happens to them? They are going to have to describe a new flood plain up in Grand Forks, and those homes are going to have to be bought out, and the money will hopefully be used to build new homes somewhere else. But there isn't money in the pipeline to buy out those homes. The HUD money in this bill is not available until the bill is signed. The result is that the city can't make decisions until the money is there, and the result is that all of those citizens and families, many of whom are now split, wake up in a bed that is not theirs, in the home of a stranger that took them in, or in a motel, or in a

shelter someplace, or in a city 100 miles away, all of those people will continue to wait because the city can't give an answer because they don't have the money. And the city doesn't have the money because this is delayed.

Now, let me, if I might, go through a couple of charts to describe this point. The Grand Forks Herald runs this editorial every day. It is a city of 50,000 people, 90 percent of whom were evacuated. I have said that 600 homes were totally destroyed and another 800 were severely damaged. The Grand Forks Herald says in its editorials, "10 Days Since the Congress Let Us Down." That was actually a few days ago. But, today, they will have had a different number. Every single day, the number of days "since the Congress let us down." The Fargo Forum, 70 miles down the road, wrote "Act Now on Flood Relief Bill." It is a long editorial saying "don't delay and add extraneous amendments to this kind of legislation." The Grand Forks Herald, again, wrote: "11 Reasons to Pass Federal Disaster Bill Now." It describes the urgency and the need for the legislation.

Now, let me, just in case my colleagues don't recall—and I assume most of them do—review again how we got to where we are now. In our region of the country, we had nearly 10 feet of snow, 3 years worth of snow in 3 months. The last quantity of snow was nearly 2 feet—the worst blizzard in 50 years, we are told. This illustrates what happened during that blizzard. Telephone poles snapped like toothpicks and 80,000 people were out of power. In many cases, the power wasn't restored for some long while, despite the fact that day and night crews were working on poles. You can see these poles that were put in. These power poles were snapped off like toothpicks and 80,000 people were without power. In the middle of that, the Corps of Engineers is furiously building dikes because the Weather Service says we will now have a severe flood.

So the snow begins to melt. We have a 500-year flood.

This is farmland. It doesn't look like it. It looks like an ocean. All you can see is the barn and a silo, and water for as far as the eye can see.

This is a poster that shows one of our communities along the Red River. All of this is farmland. It now looks like a lake. This is before all of the snow had melted. This little Red River became a lake nearly 150 miles long and anywhere from 20 to 30 miles wide. That is what the citizens of this region face.

What did that look like? When that came through our town, it looked like this—a river that had no bank, a river that became part of the community in every home, in every business; Grand Forks, ND, and East Grand Forks, MN, totally inundated. In East Grand Forks, 9,000 people evacuated, most of them with only the shirts on their backs, totally evacuated. In Grand Forks, ND, 90 percent of the 50,000 population had to evacuate, many of them with no notice at all.

So here is what the Grand Forks neighborhoods looked like—all throughout the town with water reaching the tops of automobiles.

In the downtown area we had severe flooding. Then we had a severe fire. In the middle of the flood a fire destroyed 11 buildings; parts of three blocks in downtown Grand Forks.

These courageous firefighters fought that fire in some cases working only with fire extinguishers in ice cold water up to their waists and their chests, suffering hypothermia; and parts of three blocks of downtown Grand Forks burned down.

Here is what it looks like. Here was a block. There is nothing left. In the middle of the flood it looks like Dresden.

Here is another view of downtown Grand Forks flooded and destroyed and ravaged by fire; the fire skipped throughout the downtown.

I might say to the Presiding Officer that this downtown is still uninhabited. If you go there today—and I have been there very recently—there is almost nothing going on here because there is almost nothing left. Every one of these buildings was severely destroyed, and the new floodplain in any event when it is drawn, will take a major part of the downtown and destroy it further because the buildings will be uninhabitable.

The Grand Forks Herald in the middle of all of this says, What kind of flood is this? "Red Cross Tops 1 Million Meals." How bad was that disaster: People in shelters, people evacuated all across the region, and the Red Cross serving 1 million meals.

The water is gone. That water stayed a long, long time. The National Weather Service predicted a severe flood with a record 49 feet which would have been a record of all time on the Red River; 49 feet. But it wasn't 49 feet. It was 54 feet. And it inundated everything, and literally brought both of those communities to their knees; to a standstill.

What has happened in Grand Forks now? These are some pictures that are not quite as clear. But Grand Forks now has streets. When you drive down the street, there is only a narrow path to drive down because in all of these homes that were destroyed or severely damaged by this flood homeowners are ripping all of the things out of these homes that need to be taken out; the streets are littered as far as you can see up and down the street with just this kind of scene.

The citizens who go back and take a look at what they have seen this. This is a home that I stopped at not too many days ago. This is a home that is sitting on top of a car. Incidentally, I was on a Coast Guard boat. And this is in an area called Lincoln Park. We were on a boat through this area. All of these homes were completely under water. It took those homes right off the foundation. And this home now comes back and sits on top of a car. It and 600 of the neighboring homes are destroyed and will never ever be inhabited again.

In the same neighborhood, this is what happened when the flood inundated the home.

The reason I am showing these pictures, Mr. President, is some say that there is not an urgency here at all. I don't know how many have seen what happens in a flood. But here is what Grand Forks residents, when they went back to homes that are now uninhabitable, see. They see personal belongings that are unrecognizable. They see all of the appliances that are destroyed. And they see the job of taking them out to the street and putting them on the sidewalk.

Then we have people now in Grand Forks and East Grand Forks—thousands of them—who this morning didn't wake up in their homes because their homes aren't available to them. They are destroyed. They wake up in a neighbor's home, a friend's home, or a stranger's home who took them in; a motel, a shelter, in a town 10 miles or 20 miles or 50 miles away, and in some cases 100 miles away. And they are asking the city of Grand Forks, "What next?" The city leaders of Grand Forks say to them, "Well, what we are going to do is we are going to help you. The Federal Government is going to give us the resources to help you. We are going to buy out some of these homes. We are going to help some of those businesses restart. We will help some of those folks in rebuilding a new home."

I talked to a couple down at the Lincoln Park area. They lived in their home for 43 years, and had a half-hour notice as the flood waters coursed through the dikes and destroyed their entire neighborhood. Now they are living in travel trailers, wondering about their future. "What next?"

Every one of those lives is on hold at this moment waiting and watching and wondering when Congress will pass the disaster relief bill. The answer is, this afternoon.

That is the good news.

The bad news is that what Congress passes this afternoon has in it unrelated, extraneous amendments put there, in my judgment, only for political purposes—only to bait the President; only to say to the President, "Sign this." We are going to shove it right down that narrow alley and dare him to sign it. The President has already said that he won't sign this. This is an amendment that deals with Government shutdowns on October 1. It doesn't have merit.

I don't know. Maybe we should debate that. It ought not be debated on a disaster bill. And Members of this Congress know it. If any other Member of this Senate was faced with the same circumstance with their constituents whose lives are on hold and who are waiting day after day after day—if anyone else were in the same situation, they would be here to do what I am doing to say this makes no sense.

Those who have visited my State and the Northern States in our country know that we have a very short con-

struction season. We don't have 12 months out of the year to rebuild. We have a very short construction season. Every single week you lose means that part of your community begins to bleed to death. That is why this week and last week was so important. It is why next week is so important. It is why I am so upset with those who insist on putting unrelated amendments that they know will require a veto of this bill.

Mr. President, we are not the first region of the country to suffer a disaster—earthquakes, fires, flood, tornadoes all over this country. And in all of the years that I have been in both the U.S. House and the U.S. Senate I have been one who said my constituents in North Dakota want to be there to help. You are not alone when you suffer a disaster. We want to help you. I do not recall a time since I came to the Congress when in the middle of a disaster bill people said, "Oh, by the way, we are going to play this like a fiddle. We have an agenda here." This isn't about victims. It is about politics. I do not recall a time when that has happened on a disaster bill. It has happened on other bills, and it has happened on both political sides of the aisle—both Republicans and Democrats. We will probably never change that because of the rules of the Senate probably are never going to change. But, generally speaking, in most cases Members of the Congress and the Senate have not done this with disaster bills.

We are going to vote on this bill this afternoon. It contains critically needed aid for this region of the country.

There are thousands and thousands of people who are not back in their homes. Seven-thousand apartments in Grand Forks, ND, are uninhabitable right now. So the 7,000 people in the apartment complexes aren't back and won't be back until they get some answer; until some moneys are available, until the construction begins, until the money is in the pipeline to get that done. And there are those who say, "Well, gee, nothing is being held up. FEMA has money." They just do not understand it. They are plain flat wrong. Yes, FEMA has money. FEMA has money to deal with the day-to-day needs of someone who tomorrow needs money to buy a meal, or needs money to rent a hotel room. But FEMA does not have the money that gives a community the ability to make the decisions to buy out the neighborhoods, or to describe the new floodplain and help people rebuild homes and businesses. FEMA doesn't have that money. That money is not available. That money is only available when legislation of this type passes and is signed by the President of the United States.

So, if I hear one more time anyone in this Senate say, "Well, gee, there is money in the pipeline, no one is disadvantaged," I urge them to do this. Buy an airplane ticket, and I will go with you. And let's go to Grand Forks, ND. There is probably going to be a

city council meeting the night that you get there, and there will probably be 500 or 1,000 people there. And every single one of them will ask you the question: "If there is money in the pipeline, show us where. Where is the money that will allow us to make the decisions to get on with our life? Where is it?" If anyone who alleges that, again, buy a ticket, and come to East Grand Forks, MN, or Grand Forks, ND, or Watertown, SD, and tell those citizens where the money is. They won't do that because they can't. This are dead flat wrong.

They are playing a game on this bill, and they ought not play a game on this bill. They know it.

I raised the question yesterday: "Why don't you pass this bill, and then extract the emergency portions of this bill; just the emergency portions alone?" Extract that, and pass it as a separately enrolled bill. And if the President vetoes it, then at least enact the emergency portions of it so people who have been victims of a flood and fire and blizzards are not going to be victimized again by delay.

But it fell on deaf ears because that is not what people want. There are some—not all—who want something more than this. They want political points. They want a political issue. I guess they will get it. Not from me, but they will get it because they will have a veto in a day or two, I suppose. And then people will go home for the weekend having not passed the disaster relief, and then come back next week and start juggling all of this again. In the meantime, 3 weeks will have gone by at a time when it is critical for the people of North Dakota and South Dakota and Minnesota to make decisions about their future.

Mr. President, I regret taking so much time of the Senate today. I know other Members wish to speak on other issues. We will also have a chance to discuss for 2 hours the disaster bill itself in the middle of the afternoon. But I wanted those who watch these proceedings to know what the facts are.

The facts are that there have been thousands—tens of thousands—of victims of a natural disaster. That disaster was visited on them through no fault of their own; jerked out of their school; pulled out of their homes. The homes destroyed; the schools are closed.

The timing is urgent that this get done.

Let me end the way I began with two points.

One, we are enormously grateful for what is in this bill for disaster relief. We are enormously troubled by the time and the delay it has taken and will take to get this to the President for signature. My hope is that very soon all Members will understand the urgency of disaster relief for those victims who need it today.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CAMPBELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

(The remarks of Mr. CAMPBELL pertaining to the introduction of S. 837 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BRYAN. I thank the Chair. I thank my friend and colleague from Colorado for his courtesy in securing my recognition after him.

(The remarks of Mr. BRYAN and Mr. BOND pertaining to the introduction of S. 838 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, let me also ask unanimous consent that, following my comments, the Senator from Missouri be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CRAIG. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Nicole Elizabeth Narotzky and Margaret Joanna Smith be allowed to be in the Chamber during this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair. I thank my colleagues.

100th ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOREST SERVICE ORGANIC ACT OF 1897

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, yesterday was the 100th anniversary of the passage of the Forest Service's Organic Act, so it is an appropriate time to reflect on how recent Congresses have addressed Forest Service issues.

Let me also say to my colleagues, yesterday had sent to each one of your offices a book by Douglas MacCleery called "The American Forests: A History of Resiliency and Recovery."

During the 104th Congress, the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee conducted the first extended series of oversight hearings on the management of our Federal forests in almost 20 years. As these hearings proceeded, we also consulted with experts in the field of forestry management, participated in and evaluated the results of the Seventh American Forest Congress, and asked the General Accounting Office and others to evaluate the current state of the management of our national forests. As a consequence of these efforts, we have formed some conclusions about the management of our national forests,

and today I would like to share these with my colleagues.

Notwithstanding considerable contemporary controversy, the Forest Service remains a top performer among Federal agencies. The breadth of contemporary controversy over Federal forest management and the cacophony of interest group outcries from all ends of the spectrum tend to obscure the simple fact that much of the time the Forest Service carries out its duties quite effectively.

Over the decade, the quality of management employed on our Federal forests have been reflected in the integrity of the resources involved. Since the turn of the century, and particularly over the last several decades, the science of resource management has improved dramatically. Our federally owned forests are arguably managed under the most advanced scientific principles and the most stringent environmental controls that have been applied to any managed ecosystem in the world.

In a historic context, the return on this investment in scientific management is striking. Many Federal forests which some view today as pristine ecological preserves were, earlier in this century, little more than worn-out farm lots. Species of megafauna which were dangerously close to extinction at the turn of the century are now flourishing on our Federal forests.

The National Forest System provides more recreation opportunities than any other land ownership category in the country. Wood from our national forests made a significant contribution to the American dream of affordable housing for post-war America, and must still continue to make an important contribution to our national fiber needs today.

The heat generated by present-day conflicts over Federal forest management makes it easy to forget that our national forests are century-long success stories. But this perspective is essential to retain as we go about the task of addressing contemporary problems and improving on our performance in forest resource management.

Notwithstanding the barrage of negative publicity generated by the pleadings of special interests, I remain highly impressed by the commitment of Forest Service professionals of all disciplines and at all levels. Moreover, after more than 15 hearings on an array of related subjects, I am convinced that the majority of people—those not vested in a particular resource management outcome—are, after a reasonable opportunity to offer their thoughts, prepared to defer to the judgment and expertise of the Forest Service in resource management decisions. In this regard, I have reached four specific conclusions from our oversight.

First, budget reductions and downsizing have left the agency with significant management problems. Throughout the system there are national forests with critical gaps in re-

source management expertise and/or personnel shortages. I have come away from our oversight convinced that we simply must find a way to provide the agency with the resources to do the job we want done. I urge my colleagues to join me in this search.

Second, despite these current fiscal constraints and various and sundry controversies, the spirit of Forest Service employees remains surprisingly strong. This spirit shone through in much of the testimony received from agency employees, particularly during field hearings. I believe we must act now to avoid squandering this endangered resource.

Third, the breadth and quality of resource and environmental expertise within the Forest Service, even stressed by budget constraints, is nonetheless unique among related Federal agencies. For example, I have come to conclude that the Forest Service's specialists possess: as much or more expertise in endangered species conservation as the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; as much or more expertise in managing anadromous fish habitat as the National Marine Fisheries Service; and as much or more expertise in maintaining or restoring water quality in rural, forested watersheds as the Environmental Protection Agency.

Fourth, in response to probative questions, we finally began to hear the acknowledgment, from other Federal agencies that this expertise exists and that the Forest Service could, in their view, be trusted to use it. I am not convinced that their actions yet reflect these words, but I was glad to hear them, nonetheless.

Most people still strongly support multiple-use management despite well publicized assertions to the contrary. After listening to over 200 witnesses from all quarters, I have come away convinced that we should continue to use our federally owned forests for a wide variety of purposes as long as these activities do not damage the lands. I believe that the majority of the populace agrees that we should protect wildlife habitat, allow recreation, permit harvesting of trees, grazing of animals, and development of minerals on these lands, and that these activities—if conducted judiciously—can be compatible. I do not believe that the "zero harvest," or "cattle free" philosophies are as widely supported as their proponents maintain. For example, at the seventh American Forest Congress, the 1,500 participants voted 91 percent to 4 percent to defeat an extremist proposal to eliminate commercial harvest on public lands.

Moreover, I also strongly suspect from what we heard that most people believe that the way to decide the best mix of uses on Federal forests lands is to give the Forest Service—particularly the resource professionals on the ground—as broad and independent a responsibility as possible to conduct studies, develop comprehensive plans, consult with the public, and then implement the results. Unfortunately,

most of the developments in contemporary resource policy over the past 15 years have worked to reduce the forest Service's responsibility.

That is why last December, I began circulating comprehensive revisions to the 1976 statutes that govern the management of our Federal forest lands. These statutes have not been changed since Congress passed them two decades ago and are in dire need of modernization. The world that we face today is much different than the one we faced in 1976, even as it is different than the one that we faced in 1897.

Over the course of the last 4 months I have held a series of six informal workshops on the draft that was circulated for the first time last December. These workshops included representatives from all points of view, and were conducted to be as informal and discursive as possible in hearing all points of view. Since concluding these workshops a few weeks ago, we have been reworking our proposal for introduction this summer. I hope that we can, in this centennial year of the passage of the original Organic Act, make some positive changes—in a bipartisan fashion—that will provide a mandate to carry sustained and enlightened forest stewardship forward for another century.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous unanimous-consent agreement, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Idaho. I commend him on the work he does in forestry, an area in which I have great interest. We have seen tremendous developments in this area. Agri-forestry and many related concepts are very important new ways in which we cannot only benefit our environment, but maintain profitable revenue-producing opportunities for landowners, and we think that updating the law is very important.

I look forward to working with my colleague. I appreciate his leadership.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, we have just heard about the history and origins of the 1897 Organic Act of the U.S. Forest Service. I would like to describe what our forests were like a century ago and compare this to where we are today as a nation of enlightened forest stewards. Consider the following turn-of-the-century snapshot of the condition of the Nation's forests and wildlife that confronted our early conservation leaders:

Wildfires commonly consumed 20 to 50 million acres annually—an area the size of Virginia, West Virginia, Maryland, and Delaware combined.

There were about 80 million acres of cut-over land that continued to be either idle or lacking desirable tree cover.

The volume of timber cut nationally greatly exceeded that of forest growth.

There were no provisions for reforestation in our system of laws. Aside from a few experimental programs, long-term forest management was not practiced.

Also at the turn of the century, wood was still relatively cheap. Because of this, large quantities were left behind after logging. Sawmills were inefficient. The use of wood in buildings was based on custom, rather on sound engineering. Huge volumes of wood simply rotted.

Massive clearing of forest land for agriculture continued. In the last 50 years of the 19th century, forest cover in many areas east of the Mississippi had fallen from 70 to 20 percent or less. In the last decade of the 19th century, America's farmers cleared forests at the average rate of 13.5 square miles per day. And much of this land included steep slopes that were highly erodible.

Formerly abundant wildlife species were severely depleted or nearing extinction.

Now compare the unfortunate realities that the country faced at the turn of this century with a snapshot of how our forests look today as we prepare for a new millennium:

Following two centuries of decline, the area of forest land has stabilized. Today, the United States has about the same forest area as in 1920.

The area consumed by wildfire each year has fallen 90 percent. And this trend is continuing even with some severe fire seasons over the last couple of summers.

Nationally, the average volume of standing timber per acre in United States forests is about one-third greater today than in 1952. In the East, the average volume per acre has almost doubled.

Populations of whitetail deer, wild turkey, elk, pronghorns, and many other wildlife species have increased dramatically.

Tree planting on all forest lands rose significantly after World War II, reaching record levels in the 1980's. Many private forest lands are now actively managed for tree growing. 70,000 certified tree farms encompass 95 million acres of privately-owned land.

The tens of millions of acres of cut-over land that existed in 1900 have long since been reforested. Many of these areas today are mature forests. Others have been harvested a second time, and the cycle of regeneration to young forests has started again. Eastern forests have staged a major comeback. We are seeing an increase in forested acreage throughout the Eastern States.

Finally, forest growth nationally has exceeded harvests since the 1940's, with each subsequent decade generally showing increasing margins of growth over harvests. By the early part of this decade, growth exceeded harvest by 34 percent and the volume of forest growth was 360 percent greater than it had been in 1920.

Recreational use on national forests and other public and private forest lands has increased manifold.

The efficiency of wood utilization has improved substantially since 1900. Much less material is left in the woods.

Many sawmills produce more than double the usable lumber and other products per log than they did in 1900. Engineering standards and designs have reduced the volume of wood used per square foot of building space. Preservation treatments have substantially extended the service life of wood. These efficiencies have reduced by millions of acres, the area of annual harvest that otherwise would have occurred.

These comparisons demonstrate what huge strides have been made in forest management between the turn of the century and today. It is important that we recognize the Forest Service for its contributions to this progress. In my home State of Oregon, which has some of the most productive forest land in the world, the Forest Service has been a responsible partner in managing our Federal lands.

In fact, Forest Service employees in Oregon last year endured several physical attacks against their operations. Not only did arsonists burn the Oakridge Ranger Station to the ground, but they also destroyed a Forest Service truck at the Detroit Ranger Station. I want to thank those Forest Service employees in Oregon for enduring such deplorable acts of terrorism, and also recognize the agency's hard work all over the State.

Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to commend the U.S. Forest Service for helping improve the stewardship of our natural resources over the last 100 years. The agency's efforts to use sound science and its ability to look forward have become a worldwide model for balancing the growing needs of our land. While we may not agree on every issue, I look to the Forest Service for equally successful leadership in the next 100 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New York.

ALAN EMORY

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the work of someone who is rightly referred to as the dean of the New York press corps, Alan Emory, Washington bureau chief of the Watertown Daily Times. This Saturday Alan marks his 50th year with the Times, the last 46 have been spent here in Washington.

But more important than the length of Alan's service is the manner in which he has served his community. He has been a thoughtful, candid, and thoroughly professional reporter who has given the readers of the Watertown Times a clear view of the work of their elected officials in Washington.

Alan is tough but fair, and his influence extends far beyond Watertown. Never content to just follow the pack, Alan is constantly on the lookout for stories that may not make the network evening news, but which have a real impact on the lives of his readers.

Born in New York City, Alan was raised on Long Island and educated at

Phillips Exeter Academy, Harvard University, and the Columbia Graduate School of Journalism. A World War II veteran, he arrived in Watertown in July 1947 and was one of three Columbia graduates hired that summer by Harold B. Johnson, the editor and publisher of the Watertown Times.

Alan's first beats included the Boy Scouts and the local railroad station, but he was soon assigned to cover the city of Massena where he got his day-to-day newspaper training.

It was also during this time that Alan began covering politics and his impressive work led to his editor assigning him to the St. Lawrence County political beat.

In October 1948 he was appointed State editor and the following year he was named Albany correspondent. During his time in Albany he met his wife of 47 years, Nancy, and they have two sons, Marc and John, and a daughter, Katharine.

In 1951, Alan was asked to go to Washington. For 46 years and the administrations of 10 Presidents, Alan has kept his readers informed about what's going on down here and how it affects them.

Alan has always been an example of the best in professional journalism and he has proudly served as president and director of the Society of Professional Journalists and as president of the Gridiron Club.

Mr. President, I want to extend congratulations to Alan Emory on 50 years of providing journalistic excellence to the readers of the Watertown Times.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BINGAMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Mexico.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that David Schindel of my staff, a fellow in my office, be allowed the privilege of the floor for the duration of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. BINGAMAN pertaining to the introduction of S. 839 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. BINGAMAN. I yield the floor.

Mr. ALLARD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business with Senators permitted to speak up to 10 minutes.

A COMMONSENSE APPROACH IN THE COURTROOM

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I commend the work of Federal District

Court Judge Richard Matsch, the judge in the Oklahoma City bombing case tried in Denver, CO, as well as the prosecution team led by Special Assistant U.S. Attorney Joseph Hartzler.

I do not want to do anything that might prejudice the legal process and sentencing phase of this trial. However, on behalf of all of Colorado, I would like to recognize the outstanding work done thus far.

Prior to the trial, I took some time out and Judge Matsch took me through the Federal district court and explained to me the security measures that they had taken and explained to me how he wanted to proceed with the trial. I was very impressed with the forethought that had gone into making the proper setting for this very important trial in Denver, CO.

I realize that the success of something like this is not one man. I realize that a lot of very dedicated people had a role in the progress of this particular trial. But I believe that Judge Matsch has distinguished himself as a jurist and deserves our praise for overseeing the proceedings in this very high-profile case which brought justice for the victims and survivors of the worst act of terrorism ever to hit U.S. soil.

Confidence in our legal system has been renewed, thanks to the very tight ship run by Judge Matsch, who took a commonsense approach toward the courtroom. Judge Matsch appropriately protected the jurors in his courtroom from distraction and allowed the completely intact jury to reach a unanimous verdict in less than 6 weeks.

Judge Matsch did a good job because he focused on what was important and not television reaction, prime-time interviews, or book deals. Instead, Judge Matsch focused on justice—justice for the victims of the bombing, justice for their survivors, and justice to the defendant.

I hope that this commonsense approach is a model for future high-profile cases, and that Judge Matsch does an equally fine job during the sentencing portion of this trial.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRAHAM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Florida.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Evan Berman, Evie Gissendanner, and Hassan Tyler of my staff be granted privilege of the floor for the duration of my comments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. GRAHAM pertaining to the introduction of S. 840 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I have a request on behalf of the leader.

I ask unanimous consent that the previously scheduled vote on the supplemental appropriations conference report now occur at 6 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHIEF JUDGE KAZEN, U.S. DISTRICT COURT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, In the past few months my Democratic colleagues have attempted to paint the picture of a national emergency regarding unfilled vacancies in the Federal courts. We hear talk of a judicial crisis, of justice suffering at the hands of overworked and over-burdened judges, and of the Senate Judiciary Committee creating this situation out of political motivation. A recent example is an article in the Washington Post which interviewed only one Texas district judge who described how he was plowed under with work ever since Congress decided to get tough on drug smuggling and illegal immigration. And because his district has three open seats, he can't keep up with the caseload. Unfortunately this one judge has been used in an attempt to reflect some kind of a national crisis. Maybe some clarifying remarks regarding the central issues of this article will shed some light on this matter.

As the chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts, I sent a comprehensive questionnaire to article III judges last year. This extensive judicial survey addressed the very concerns raised by the May 15 article in the Washington Post. The judge in question was kind enough to respond to the questionnaire, as were most of his colleagues. As a matter of fact, 12 out of 17 active judges over 70 percent of the southern district of Texas furnished my subcommittee with detailed replies. Of those 12 judges, only 2 other judges complained of an unmanageable caseload and of a growing backlog. That means that 9 out of 12 judges found their caseloads to be manageable. As a matter of fact, one judge even stated that: "there is absolutely no backlog whatsoever."

Of the three judges who did complain of not being able to keep up with their workload, one had been on the bench less than 2 years, and the other two were the only two judges in the southern district involved in extensive outside work activities beyond occasional

speaking engagements. You would think that before judges complain about needing more help, they would be devoting 100 percent of their working time and energy to their caseloads. Unfortunately, it appears that is not the case here.

One must also keep in mind the organizational set-up of the district in question. The southern district has the highest number of judges in all of Texas, one of the highest in the Nation for that matter. Right now a total of over 30 active judges, senior judges, and magistrate judges are handling cases in that district. All but three of the active judges last year found their caseloads were manageable. Therefore, when one throws statistics and numbers around, we must be careful how to interpret those figures. For example, we must factor in the number of cases which are handled by staff attorneys. Prisoner petitions, for example, are rarely handled by a judge, but are routinely included in caseload statistics. As another Texas judge has told me, once prisoner petitions are factored out, the southern district's docket has actually decreased, not increased over the last 10 years. In addition, numerous judges have contacted me and praised the Prisoner Litigation Reform Act as having had a substantial and dramatic impact on the number of prisoner filings and as having caused that number to decrease enormously. I have asked the judge in question for more information on these issues.

We must also keep in mind that many senior judges are hearing cases. In the southern district of Texas there are at least three senior judges. In order to be certified, a senior judge must carry, at a minimum, a 25 percent caseload. And many senior judges maintain a full caseload. Yet, senior judges are not factored into the weighted caseload statistics when ascertaining whether new judges are needed. In other words, senior judges are not even counted, even though they make considerable contributions. Again, beware of the numbers you read in the paper.

As a matter of fact, nationally there are 48 seniors judges certified at 25 percent workload, with another 86 senior judges who are doing at a minimum at 25 percent workload. In addition, there are 206 senior judges certified at a 50 percent or more workload. Now lets add up the numbers: if you take 25 percent of the 48 senior judges, 25 percent of the additional 85 senior judges, and 50 percent of the 206 senior judges, you would have 136 full time judges, which more than makes up for the 100 or so vacancies nationwide. Now, while I would agree that there may be pockets of districts around the country that need some help, the overwhelming majority of the judges in the district named by the Washington Post, and across the Nation for that matter, are working diligently to serve justice and are doing so with a manageable caseload and without a backlog.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the Washington Post article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 15, 1997]

CASES PILE UP AS JUDGESHIP REMAINS VACANT

(By Sue Ann Pressley)

LAREDO, TEX.—The drug and illegal immigrant cases keep coming. No sooner does Chief U.S. District Judge George Kazen clear one case than a stack of new cases piles up. He takes work home at night, on weekends.

"It's like a tidal wave," Kazen said recently. "As soon as I finish 25 cases per month, the next 25 are on top of me and then you've got the sentence reports you did two months before. There is no stop, no break at all, year in and year out, here they come."

"We've already got more than we can say grace over down here," he said.

This is what happens to a federal judge on the southern border of the United States when Washington cracks down on illegal immigration and drug smuggling. It is a situation much aggravated by the fact that the Senate in Washington has left another federal judgeship in this district vacant for two years, one of 72 vacancies on federal district courts around the country.

As Border Patrol officers and other federal agents swarm this southernmost region of Texas along the Mexican border in ever-increasing numbers, Judge Kazen's docket has grown and grown. He has suggested, so far unsuccessfully, that a judgeship in Houston be reassigned to the Rio Grande Valley to help cope.

In Washington, where the laws and policies were adopted that has made Kazen's life so difficult, the Senate has made confirmation of federal judges a tedious process, often fraught with partisan politics. In addition to the 72 federal district court vacancies (the trial level), there are 25 circuit court vacancies (the appellate level) and two vacant international trade court judgeships across the country, leaving unfilled 99 positions, or 11 percent of the federal judiciary. Twenty-six nominations from President Clinton are pending, according to Jeanne Lopatto, spokeswoman for the Senate Judiciary Committee, which considers nominations for recommendation to the full Senate for confirmation.

Of those 99 vacancies, 24 qualify as judicial emergencies, meaning the positions have been vacant more than 18 months, according to David Sellers of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts. Two of the emergencies exist in Texas, including the one in Kazen's southern district.

Lopatto said the thorough investigation of each nominee is a time-consuming process. But political observers say Republicans, who run the Senate, are in no hurry to approve candidates submitted by a Democratic president. The pinch is particularly painful here in border towns. The nominee for Brownsville, in Kazen's district, has been awaiting approval since 1995. Here in Laredo, Kazen's criminal docket has increased more than 20 percent over last year.

"We have a docket," he said, "that can be tripled probably at the drop of a hat. . . . The Border Patrol people, the Customs people at the (international) bridges will tell you, they don't catch a tenth of who is going through. The more checkpoints you man, the more troops you have at the bridges, will necessarily mean more stops and more busts."

And many more arrests are expected, the result of an unprecedented focus on policing

the U.S.-Mexican border. Earlier this year, Clinton unveiled a \$367 million program for the Southwest for fiscal 1998, beginning Oct. 1, that includes hiring 500 new Border Patrol agents, 277 inspectors for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, 96 Drug Enforcement Administration agents and 70 FBI agents.

In Kazen's territory, the number of Border Patrol agents already has swollen dramatically, from 347 officers assigned to the Laredo area in fiscal 1993 to 411 officers in fiscal 1996. More tellingly, in 1993, agents in the Laredo sector arrested more than 82,000 people on cocaine, marijuana and illegal immigration charges. By 1996, arrests had soared to nearly 132,000, according to data supplied by the INS.

All of which is keeping Kazen and the other judges here hopping. "I don't know what the answer is," said U.S. District Judge John Rainey, who has been acting as "a circuit rider" as he tried to help Kazen out in Laredo from his post in Victoria, Tex. "I certainly don't see it easing up anytime soon. There still seems to be such a demand for drugs in this country, and that's what causes people to bring them in. Until society changes, we won't see any changes down here."

In a letter to Rep. Henry B. Gonzalez (D-Tex.) in February, Kazen outlined the need for a new judge in the Laredo or McAllen division, rather than in Houston, where a vacancy was recently created when then-Chief Judge Norman Black assumed senior status. "The 'border' divisions of our court—Brownsville, McAllen and Laredo—have long borne the burden of one of the heaviest criminal dockets in the country, and the processing of criminal cases involves special pressures, including those generated by the Speedy Trial Act," he wrote.

On a recent typical day, Kazen said, he sentenced six people on drug charges and listened to an immigration case. His cases tend to involve marijuana more often than cocaine, he said.

"The border is a transshipment area," he said. "The fact is, a huge amount of contraband somehow crosses the Texas-Mexican border, people walking through where the river is low, and there are hundreds and hundreds of miles of unpatrolled ranchland."

"In some cases," Kazen continued, "we're seeing a difference in the kind of defendant. We're almost never seeing the big shots—we're seeing the soldiers. Once in a while, we'll see a little bigger fish, but we're dealing with very, very smart people. We see some mom-and-pop stuff, too. There was a guy who came before me who had been in the Army umpteen years, and he needed the money, he was going bankrupt, so he did this 600-pound marijuana deal. He said he stood to pick up \$50,000, and now he's facing five to 40 years."

"We see kids 18 and 19 years old," Kazen said. "We see pregnant women. We see disabled people in wheelchairs. This is very, very tempting stuff."

In Washington, the argument over court vacancies continues. On April 30, Attorney General Janet Reno told the Judiciary Committee, "Chief judges are calling my staff to report the prospect of canceling court sittings and suspending civil calendars for lack of judges, and to ask when they can expect help. This committee must act now to send this desperately needed help."

In remarks yesterday to the Federal Judges Association meeting in Washington, Reno warned that "the number (of vacancies) is growing."

"As you are no doubt aware," Reno told the judges, "the level of contentiousness on the issue of filling judicial vacancies has unfortunately increased in recent times."

FATHER WILLIAM CUNNINGHAM

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today to pay my deepest respects to Father William Cunningham. Detroit lost one of its favorite sons on Monday, May 26, when Father Cunningham died following a 7-month battle with liver cancer.

His passing, and the loss we now face, brings us great sorrow. True heroes, after all, are never easily replaced. However, it also provides us a moment's pause to reflect upon and celebrate the extraordinary deeds of a man too humble to accept any congratulations while still in our midst.

Rarely do individuals, by the sheer force of the power of their vision, manage to alter the destiny of an entire city. Father Cunningham, without question, was one of these individuals. His commitment to Detroit, and to eradicating the problems that plagued it, was unwavering. Where others decried the insurmountable obstacles, Father Cunningham optimistically advocated solutions.

William Thomas Cunningham grew up in Detroit's Boston-Edison neighborhood. He attended Sacred Heart and St. John's Provincial Seminaries and was ordained into the priesthood in 1955.

Father Cunningham was teaching English at Sacred Heart Seminary when widespread rioting broke out in Detroit in the summer of 1967. Just a few short blocks from his classroom Detroit was being torn apart, both literally and figuratively.

In the aftermath of this deadly summer, Father Cunningham and Eleanor Josaitis, a Taylor, MI, housewife and mother, joined forces. Angered by what they felt was an inadequate response on the part of the religious, academic, industrial, and government establishments, Cunningham and Josaitis formed a civil rights organization, Focus:HOPE, to work to ensure the summer of 1968 was a peaceful one.

In an effort to promote racial harmony, Cunningham and Josaitis began gathering and distributing food and clothing to riot victims. In the process of doing so, Cunningham learned of Agriculture Department warehouses stocked with food supplies. With the missionary's zeal and powers of persuasion that made him such an effective public servant, Cunningham convinced the USDA to donate these large stockpiles for assistance to the inner city poor.

Today, Focus:HOPE feeds 51,000 people a month. However, Focus:HOPE has evolved and grown into so much more than just an organization that feeds the hungry.

Father Cunningham was driven by the belief that the only thing separating the poor and unemployed in downtown Detroit from their better off counterparts in the surrounding suburbs was a lack of job training and education. So Focus:HOPE set out to make people more employable.

Two decades later, on a forty acre industrial and educational complex on

Oakman Boulevard in Detroit, Focus:HOPE runs myriad highly successful enterprises. The Center for Advanced Technologies trains 85 people to graduate with bachelor's degrees accredited by Wayne State University. The Machinist Training Institute offers year-round classes and boasts of a 100-percent graduation and placement rate. Yet another program is Fast-Track, a training course to teach prospective job applicants the necessary math and communications skills to be competitive. Focus:HOPE also runs two for-profit auto parts manufacturing firms, High-Quality and Tec Express, not to mention a child care center, a communications center and a food distribution center.

Consider the following statistics as a measure of the success of Father Cunningham's work. At the time of its conception in 1968, Focus:HOPE had a budget of about \$12,000. In 1996, that budget had grown to \$76 million. Focus:HOPE currently employs over 800 people and has 45,000 volunteers.

Last October, Father Cunningham was diagnosed with cancer. He certainly wouldn't have been faulted had he chose to rest and enjoy his final days. Yet, as he had done his entire life, Father Cunningham chose to fight on. At the same time he battled his cancer, he continued to press forward with his latest project. In the days ahead, Focus:HOPE will open Tech Villas, an apartment complex of over 100 units, will be constructed within an empty former Michigan Yellow Pages building.

Father Cunningham was a man who had received the praise of presidents, heads of industry, and an entire city grateful for his vision. In the end, however, Father Cunningham still thought of himself as a simple parish priest, no more important than those he served.

It may be years before Detroit sees the likes of another leader as dynamic and committed as was Father Cunningham. No amount of tribute can ever begin to sufficiently repay our debt to Father Cunningham and Eleanor Josaitis, who will carry on their work.

Mr. President, on behalf of all my colleagues in the Senate and all those who live in my State of Michigan, I bid a fond farewell to Father William Cunningham. While he may no longer be with us, his legacy lives on in the institution he built, in the city he helped save, and in the countless lives he touched. We truly were blessed by his presence.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR STROM THURMOND—THE SENIOR SENATOR

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I rise today to add in a small way to the many tributes being offered on behalf of one of our colleagues.

There are persons lucky enough to witness history, and persons wise enough to study history. Then there

are those few who are dynamic enough to make history.

This week we honor someone who has made more history than most—our distinguished President pro tempore, STROM THURMOND.

STROM THURMOND was born during the Presidential term of Theodore Roosevelt—probably the only other person in the 20th century to have a comparable energy level.

And in the same way TR launched America on the great adventure of the 20th century, STROM THURMOND has been a real force in building up and guiding America during that century.

A few of our colleagues may have been friends with Jack Kennedy; but STROM THURMOND is the one who ran against Harry Truman—and came within a hair of denying him the White House.

He is the only sitting Senator today who actually was on a general election ballot as a Presidential candidate.

STROM THURMOND has always been a man of the people.

In 1954, when the 31-member committee that represented the political establishment of South Carolina froze him out of a special election, STROM THURMOND did what no one before or since has done—ran and won as a write-in candidate for the U.S. Senate.

STROM THURMOND has always been ahead of his time, with his finger on the pulse of history.

In the middle of the Johnson landslide in 1964, he moved against the tide, from the Democrat to the Republican party.

With the next election, he became only the second elected Republican Senator from the deep South since Reconstruction.

By the time the next two sitting Senators changed party affiliation—30 years later—a majority of the Senators and Representatives from across the Nation—and, for the first time since Reconstruction, a majority from the South—were now in STROM THURMOND's adopted party.

In fact, he is the only Senator to have served as a Democrat in the majority and the minority, and as Republican in the majority and the minority.

When we look at the New South today, we see the fruits of the "Thurmond Revolution," or the "Thurmond Realignment." He showed the way.

The issue on which I've probably worked most closely with STROM has been the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

When you work with him closely on an issue like that, you see how, and why, his colleagues revere him.

I cosponsored the first balanced budget amendment that made it to the floor of the U.S. House in 1982. I've been a part of writing every one since.

But STROM cosponsored an earlier version in the 1950's. Once again, he was ahead of his time.

When we finally pass that constitutional amendment, and permanently lock in that balanced budget we

achieve in 2002, it will be the "Thurmond Amendment."

When you ask STROM THURMOND what his secret is for stamina and energy, he may say something about diet, working out, swimming, or loving the work he does for the people of his State.

But his secret is, he thinks young—always.

He probably still considers himself the junior Senator from South Carolina—every time he stands with constituents for a picture in front of the portrait of John C. Calhoun just outside this Chamber.

One year, his campaign camper was the "Strom Trek." Another year it was the "Thurmon-ator."

And he loves to talk with young people.

He always has time to talk to the pages and visit with our staffers, treating them with respect and warmth, making them feel special.

He always remembers to ask about our families, and always imparts some of that joy of life to those around him.

STROM THURMOND has a joy of life, a love of people, and a sense of duty that give him purpose and energy.

In a world that we fear is becoming too coarse, he is gracious—and reminds us of the way back to civility.

He is devoted to God and country.

He is our most senior Senator and the highest-ranking constitutional officer of the Senate. Best of all for us, STROM THURMOND is our friend and teacher.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Wednesday, June 4, 1997, the Federal debt stood at \$5,358,712,178,993.49. (Five trillion, three hundred fifty-eight billion, seven hundred twelve million, one hundred seventy-eight thousand, nine hundred ninety-three dollars and forty-nine cents)

One year ago, June 4, 1996, the Federal debt stood at \$5,139,964,000,000. (Five trillion, one hundred thirty-nine billion, nine hundred sixty-four million)

Five years ago, June 4, 1992, the Federal debt stood at \$3,942,616,000,000. (Three trillion, nine hundred forty-two billion, six hundred sixteen million)

Ten years ago, June 4, 1987, the Federal debt stood at \$2,302,258,000,000. (Two trillion, three hundred two billion, two hundred fifty-eight million)

Fifteen years ago, June 4, 1982, the Federal debt stood at \$1,078,868,000,000 (One trillion, seventy-eight billion, eight hundred sixty-eight million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$4 trillion—\$4,279,844,178,993.49 (Four trillion, two hundred seventy-nine billion, eight hundred forty-four million, one hundred seventy-eight thousand, nine hundred ninety-three dollars and forty-nine cents) during the past 15 years.

U.S. FOREIGN OIL CONSUMPTION FOR WEEK ENDING MAY 30TH

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the American Petroleum Institute reports that for the week ending May 30, the United States imported 8,374,000 barrels of oil each day, 327,000 barrels less than the 8,701,000 imported each day during the same week 1 year ago.

While this is one of the few weeks that Americans imported less oil than the same period 1 year ago, Americans still relied on foreign oil for 56.5 percent of their needs last week, and there are no signs that the upward spiral will abate. Before the Persian Gulf war, the United States obtained approximately 45 percent of its oil supply from foreign countries. During the Arab oil embargo in the 1970's, foreign oil accounted for only 35 percent of America's oil supply.

Anybody else interested in restoring domestic production of oil? By U.S. producers using American workers?

Politicians had better ponder the economic calamity sure to occur in America if and when foreign producers shut off our supply—or double the already enormous cost of imported oil flowing into the United States—now 8,374,000 barrels a day.

JUNK GUN BAN IN CALIFORNIA

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I rise to mark a historic day in the nationwide movement to get junk guns, or Saturday night specials, off our streets. The California State Assembly and the California Senate passed legislation to prohibit the manufacture and sale of junk guns in California. The bills require that all guns made or sold in California meet the same quality and safety test currently required of imported firearms.

I applaud and thank each and every member of the California Legislature who voted for the bill for their courage in supporting this important legislation. I especially wish to acknowledge Assemblyman Louis Caldera and Senator Richard Polanco, whose leadership and tenacity contributed immeasurably to the passage of this legislation.

The bills passed by the California Legislature are nearly identical to a bill I introduced in the Senate last spring, the American Handgun Standards Act, which I have reintroduced this year. For the largest State in the Union to pass this legislation is extraordinary.

I trust that this important victory is just what we need here in Congress to move forward with junk gun legislation on the Federal level. Each year, nearly 40,000 Americans die from gunshots and more than 200,000 are injured. Gunshots are now the leading cause of death among children in California.

I have spoken on this floor many times before about the junk gun double standard that has flooded our streets with cheap, unsafe, easily concealable handguns. In 1968, Congress required

that all handguns imported to the United States meet a tough quality and safety test. This import restriction virtually cut off the flow of foreign junk guns. However Congress failed to require domestically produced handguns to meet the same test. This double standard led to the creation of a domestic junk gun industry that has flooded our streets with these unsafe, ultracheap handguns.

Study after study has shown that these junk guns are the criminal's weapon of choice.

California has taken the lead in a nationwide movement to get these guns off our streets. Thirty-two cities and counties have enacted local ordinances banning junk gun sales within their jurisdictions. Now that the California Legislature has taken this courageous step, I urge Governor Wilson to sign this historic legislation.

Today, Californians who want an end to gun violence had a major victory, and the U.S. Senate should take notice. I hope that soon we will be able to pass the American Handgun Standards Act, which will make our children, our families, and our communities safer.

There is no reason why American-made handguns should not have the same quality and safety standards as imported handguns. This dichotomy is killing our people.

NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, over the last few days, I have been reading in newspapers and hearing on radio and television about the Quadrennial Defense Review [QDR] and the so called National Defense Panel [NDP]. The QDR is supposed to be a comprehensive assessment of current military strategy and force structure, as well as outlining a vision for the future. However, experts have called this QDR "A Cold War Relic" and when it comes to the Army, I agree with them.

I truly believe the citizens of Kentucky and the American people deserve the best national defense strategy the Nation can afford. Yet the Active Army wants to cling to their 10 divisions, while simultaneously calling for a new Base Closure Commission. This is especially ironic when you consider that during the 1995 Base Closure Commission, the Active Duty Army leadership insisted the Army could not afford to close any more bases. This was just 2 years ago. The Base Closure Commission said not to have another Commission until the year 2001.

Mr. President, I would urge my colleagues to read page 3-2 of the 1995 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission's report to the President, which says " * * * The Defense Department will be implementing the closures and realignments of the 1995 and prior Commissions through the end of this decade. The requirement in the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act that all Closures be completed within 6 years means that the closures

from the 1995 round will not be completed until 2001. For that reason, the Commission recommends that the Congress authorize another Base Closure Commission for the year 2001 similar to the 1991, 1993, and 1995 Commissions." I understand this is still the view of our former colleague Alan J. Dixon, the Chairman of the 1995 Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

The Active Army argues that they are going to cut the Active Force by 15,000 men and women. But my colleagues shouldn't be fooled. When you look closely, you will see that the 15,000 troops the Army wants to cut are nothing more than ghosts. What you have are 15,000 positions in the Active Army that have been left empty the last few years.

So the question remains: where does the Army plan to put these ten divisions—with no real reductions—if they close bases? How do they meet their budget target, while simultaneously protecting their general officer slots and keeping their 10 active divisions? Their answer? Cut the Army National Guard by approximately 38,000 people. That is a 10 percent reduction of the entire Army National Guard Force Structure.

This is the very same Army National Guard, Mr. President, that currently provides more than 55 percent of the ground combat forces, 45 percent of the combat support forces and 25 percent of the Army's combat support units, while only using 2 percent of the Department of Defense budget.

Why, my colleagues might ask, would the Active Duty Army leadership do such a thing? Well let's look. First, the Army leadership argues that the Guard divisions have no war fighting missions. This is true. But the Guard divisions have no war fighting missions because the Active Duty Army leadership has failed to give them a war fighting mission. And the reason they don't give them a war fighting mission is because then they would have to explain why they still wanted to keep 10 active duty divisions.

Also the Active Army does not consider members of the Army National Guard as soldiers. Instead they treat the men and women of the Army National Guard with contempt. These Active Duty types seem to forget that the men and women of the Army National Guard have undergone the same training as the active duty forces. Fifty percent of the entire Army National Guard are men and women coming off active duty with the Army.

The generals in the Active Army should look at their own figures regarding retention of their active duty members. The annual attrition of the Active Army is 36 percent, the attrition in the Army Reserve is 34 percent, while the attrition in the Army Guard is only 18 percent.

Perhaps what is most frustrating to me is the fact that the Active Army refused to consult with the Army Guard during the QDR. When asked about this

oversight by the press, the Army spokesperson responded that "there is an Army Reserve colonel and a Guard colonel here in our offices. They get to weigh in on the issues." You don't need an extensive knowledge of military affairs to realize that a colonel doesn't pull much weight against a group of active duty Army generals protecting their turf.

Mr. President, there should be no reason for the poor working relationship between the Active Army and the Army National Guard. I look at the strong working relationship between the Active Air Force and Air National Guard and wonder why can't the Army have this kind of relationship. I look at the great relationship the Active Duty Marine Corps has with its reserve units and wonder why not the Army and the Guard?

Mr. President, Company A, 4th Tank Battalion, 4th Marine Division [REIN] which was deployed to Saudi Arabia in December 1990 is stationed at Fort Knox. This company of outstanding reservists was selected to lead the attack by the 6th Marine Regiment into the battle for Kuwait. This outstanding Marine Corps Reserve unit fought along side their active duty comrades and did a great job.

They were able to work side by side with their active duty counterparts because the Marine Corps Reserves play a vital role in the Marine Corps military strategy and because the Marine Corps integrates both reserve training and education with their active counterparts.

There are a number of plans I have been told about which could save more than \$2.5 billion a year for the Army. They envision elimination of two Active Divisions. Two divisions could come out of Europe, and the Army could fly brigades from the United States to Europe on a rotational basis to serve a 3-month tour. The Army could take the equipment from these divisions and modernize Guard Divisions and give the Guard Divisions the war fighting missions of the two eliminated active divisions.

Remember, Mr. President we have a Marine Corps that we can send anywhere in the world. We can do the same with the Army. Look at the 101st, the 82d, the 10th Mountain, and the 3d Infantry Division. These are tough Active Duty Forces that the 15 enhanced National Guard Brigades and the 8 National Guard Divisions can support.

Given these tight fiscal times, I hope all my colleagues remember that an Army Guardsman can be kept combat ready for an annual cost of \$17,000, while an active duty soldier costs more than \$80,000. The Army Guard, just like its Active Duty counterpart, is trained for combat.

Up to this point, I have tolerated the Active Army's all-too-obvious bias. Yet the QDR represents the final straw. Some of my colleagues want to wait for the National Defense Panel to do their review and report to Congress. I was a

cosponsor of the amendment that called for this panel. When Senator BOND and I agreed to cosponsor the amendment creating the Defense Panel, we did so only after we had received assurances that someone with a Guard background would be on the panel.

Mr. President, the National Defense Panel has been turned into a joke. It is nothing more than a warmed-over version of the failed Roles and Mission Commission—a Commission that spent more money in 2 years than the Base Closure Commissions spent in 5 years.

No one other than the outgoing Deputy Secretary of Defense has been interested in anything the Roles and Mission Commission reported and it should come as no surprise that this Commission also did not have a Guard representative. So what we have is a National Defense Panel appointed by the outgoing Deputy Secretary of Defense consisting of individuals from our cold war days who have no background in working day-to-day with the National Guard.

Even my friend Senator MCCAIN, an author of the amendment that created the National Defense Panel, expressed his disappointment with the lack of imagination in appointing the members of this Panel.

I think it's high time we put a stop to this childish bickering between the Army and the National Guard. The Active Duty Army needs to get its act together and accept the National Guard as an equal partner so they all can be the best Army they can be.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following articles, one from the National Guard magazine by Maj. Gen. Richard C. Alexander, be printed in the RECORD following my remarks, also that two articles from the Armed Forces Journal, May 1997, issue by former Congressman G.V. "Sonny" Montgomery and a second article by John G. Roos. I hope all my colleagues will read these articles.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Armed Forces Journal, May 1997]

AN APPLES-TO-APPLES COMPARISON

(By MG Richard C. Alexander, President, NGAUS)

The Pentagon announced this month that a Virginia Army National Guard rifle company has been notified to begin training for possible deployment to Europe in support of Operation Joint Guard, the Bosnia peace-keeping mission formerly known as Joint Endeavor.

Thousands of Guard members have deployed for this mission over the past several months, many of whom already have returned to home station. So, you may ask, what's the big deal? The big deal is that should the unit actually deploy, Virginia's C Company, 3d Battalion, 116th Infantry, would be the first National Guard infantry unit to be mobilized by the Department of Defense since the Vietnam War. It's fitting that this unit, which once fell under the command of Gen. Thomas "Stonewall" Jackson, might break the ice. I'm proud of C Company, just as I am of all our units.

At the same time, this newsworthy event adds poignancy to an ongoing debate about the Department of the Army's failure to include its National Guard combat troops in national military strategy. To this day, none of the Guard's eight combat divisions is in the nation's warfighting plans. The question is not only why it has taken so long for the Army to call up a Guard infantry unit, but also why Guard divisions are completely excluded from the war fight? Haven't our combat troops undergone the same training as our active-duty brethren? Isn't the Guard's training and readiness ultimately the responsibility of the active Army?

In fact, under the provisions of Title 11, the Army National Guard Combat Readiness Reform Act of 1992, the Army is supposed to provide 5,000 active-component advisors whose primary responsibility is to ensure National Guard and Reserve training standards are achieved. To date, the Army has not met this congressional mandate.

In this issue of National Guard Magazine, you will find strong evidence, despite what some Army leaders say, that Army Guard combat units can mobilize in time for war.

Let me point out a comparison that exposes the weakness in the active Army's straw man concerning the ability of Guard units to successfully mobilize for war. During the Gulf War mobilization, the 4th Tank Battalion, a United States Marine Corps Reserve unit in the 4th Marine Division, successfully transitioned from the M-60 to the M1-A1 Main Battle Tank in just 45 days. The battalion trained, shot and qualified, then deployed to the Gulf where it fought alongside its active Marine Corps counterparts. Indeed, one of its companies knocked out 35 of 36 Iraqi tanks in less than five minutes. This is just one example of the success the Marine Corps has had with putting all its units into the fight—by doctrine and by training.

The Army must be just as accountable for the relationship it has with Army Guard combat units.

In our Gulf War experience, the Tennessee Army Guard's 212th Engineer Company was the first American unit into Iraq after the ground war began, breaching the way for allied tanks. The 20th Special Forces Group, composed of National Guard units from Alabama, Florida, Maryland, Mississippi and Kentucky, completed their 90-day certification program in half the time. And, of course, our National Guard artillery units are legendary for their performance in the Gulf War, with such standouts as Oklahoma's 1st Battalion, 158th Field Artillery, (Multiple Launch Rocket System), which fired record numbers of missiles on target.

Those who pay close attention to national defense know the Guard and Reserve units are dependent upon how they are treated by their respective services. Army Guard members are ready, willing and motivated to take on real-world missions, if only given the chance. We've proven this in places like the Sinai, and we're proving it countrywide everyday.

The active Army leadership needs to be held accountable for the Army Guard's overall performance. The Army must foster a better working relationship among all of its officers and enlisted personnel, active, Guard and Reserve. Army leaders should not only be squelching myths about the Guard's combat units, but taking the lead in promoting our successes on and off the battlefield.

My hat is off to the Marine Corps leadership for fully integrating its reserve fighting units into its total combat force. The Marine Corps reserve forces play a vital role in the national military strategy. The Corps continues to integrate both reserve component training and professional military education with that of the active component.

Needless to say, news about the 4th Tank Battalion's feats during the Gulf War sparked a healthy competition within the Corps' ranks. Last October, five years after the war, the best tank crews from four Marine tank battalions—two active duty and two reserve—were pitted against each other in a showdown at Fort Knox's ultra-modern Yano Tank Range. Not surprisingly, the 4th Tank Battalion's crew came out on top.

To emphasize its policy of equal treatment between its components, the Corps dropped the term "reserve" in reference to its "part-time" soldiers. They train their soldiers for combat, and they send their soldiers to combat. They don't wallow in hypothetical arguments.

It's time the active Army leadership followed suit.

ENSURING THE STRENGTH OF OUR FUTURE—THE QDR AND THE FUTURE OF THE GUARD AND RESERVE

(By Hon. G.V. "Sonny" Montgomery)

Someone recently asked me, "Who's going to look out for the National Guard and Reserve now that you've retired from Congress?" I thought about the question, in light of the soon-to-be-released Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) and the reality of today's changing defense environment, and the answer was simple: The nation, led by my colleagues in Congress, will safeguard the Guard and Reserve because the Guard and Reserve so effectively help protect our nation.

A public treasure, the National Guard is actually older than the United States, first convening in the 13 original colonies. Now, more than 220 years later, its two-fold mission remains the same: to protect the state and to be a part of the federal militia. From thwarting drug smugglers on our southern and western borders to fighting on the front lines in the Gulf War, today's guardsmen and reservists play a vital role in protecting America's interests and citizens.

A roadmap for the future of our defense requirements, the QDR must assess threats to our nation and our military's capability to meet them. This QDR intends to evaluate the changing nature of conflict in the world today and whether it is feasible for our services to fight and win two regional Gulf War-sized conflicts nearly simultaneously.

My colleagues in Congress, however, will continue to base decisions to allocate funds less on the threat of regional conflicts and more on meeting anticipated global contingencies around the world. A keen eye will also be kept on such potential flash points as China, North Korea, Iran, Iraq, and possibly even Russia.

I have heard some concerns voiced that QDR's bottom-up review isn't appropriate given that many members of Congress who will evaluate the report lack military backgrounds. In my view, the process is still effective. Worldly in experience and highly educated, men and women in Congress, regardless of having served in wartime, possess the most important quality—the power to listen—to the QDR commission, to military experts, and most importantly, to the people they serve—their constituents, the American people.

When I was elected to Congress in 1967, more than 50 percent of the national budget went to the military. Now, less than 20 percent of our nation's budget funds the military. With the threat of further reductions of up to 40,000 active military personnel, the fate of our nation's security—and of the Guard and Reserve—is in question.

MORE CUTS AHEAD

The Guard and Reserve have shared the pain of the overall cutbacks, facing reduc-

tions in end strengths each year since 1980. With total active military personnel expected to shrink by 21 percent from FY96 to FY98, selected Reserves are expected to be reduced by 10 percent, and civilians (FTEs) will shrink by 27 percent.

These numbers seem staggering; we simply cannot set in motion the bleeding of the nation's National Guard and Reserve's fighting strength.

A few things to consider: The Guard and Reserve are perhaps one of the best values for the American taxpayer today. In times of conflict, the Guard and Reserve participate equally in the fighting force, side by side with their active-duty counterparts. But personnel costs for Guard and Reserve are only half as much as for the full-time military. And let's remember that these citizen-soldiers are an important link between the public and the professional military.

Some have questioned whether the Guard and Reserve, in their present forms, are still pertinent in today's changing environment. But their existence has become more appropriate than ever before, given the expanded domestic role they fulfill. For example, just in the past few years alone, the Guard and Reserve have been called to perform a wide range of missions here at home, from reacting to the Los Angeles riots, to supporting community rebuilding efforts in the current aftermath of the Midwest flooding, to protecting our borders in the drug interdiction program. These domestic activities should not, however, take the place of combat missions and combat support.

The Air National Guard and the Air Force Reserve, for example, with the highest number of full-time technicians, have done an excellent job of training and planning for missions, sometimes a year or more in advance. While other components have so far been prepared to move out despite shorter planning cycles, they are moving to adopt the Air Force's successful advance planning structure. Through proper training, Guard and Reserve units are ready to deploy in a reasonable time.

As with anything, the role of the Guard and Reserve is only as good as we make it. In the last 15 years, I worked with my colleagues in Congress toward the billion-dollar package of add-ons to fortify the Guard and Reserve. But today my colleagues in Congress must be more vigilant than ever before in protecting this extremely valuable national resource.

STEM THE DRAWDOWN

I urge Congress to restore defense budget spending levels to maintain our strength and capability to fight any conflict or mission we encounter. We must also stem the massive drawdown in the Total Force. We've gone about as far as we can or should go.

As a way of strengthening and preserving the Guard and Reserve, I offer the following recommendations:

The Department of Defense and all service branches must continue to accept the role of their National Guard and Reserve counterparts as part of the Total Force. This includes assigning them more combat and combat support missions.

DoD must offer equitable benefits and enticements to gain and retain the best men and women for our Guard and Reserve. This includes expanding health care and dental benefits, offering combat pay for overseas missions, and confirming legislation to provide health care coverage for victims of Gulf War Syndrome rather than waiting indefinitely for the results of lengthy medical research.

The active force must continue to play an important role in improving training for the Guard and Reserve.

Just as for active personnel, we must continue to provide the same state-of-the-art, properly maintained equipment and tools, and the proper personnel to sustain them. Further, we must make Operations and Maintenance funds readily available to keep that equipment in top fighting shape.

Whatever the outcome of the QDR process, the Total Force—Active, Guard, and Reserve—will continue to provide for the defense of this great nation and for the freedom of our people.

Enter Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs Deborah Lee. At her direction, early last year the Institute for Defense Analyses (IDA) was told to conduct a comprehensive inquiry to determine how long it would take to get the most complex type of division in the National Guard force structure ready to deploy for combat. The Texas National Guard's 49th Armored Division was selected as the test unit, and the actual readiness conditions prevailing in the 49th were used in establishing the study's baseline.

Drawing on the expertise of officers from HQDA and the Army's Training and Doctrine Command, Forces Command, and other appropriate organizations, a seven-month study began last July. Using relatively conservative planning assumptions for such things as the availability of training areas and the amount of training support that could be expected from active-duty army elements, the IDA-led inquiry determined that the 49th Division could achieve a validated readiness status in 94 days and could get to either a port of debarkation or an airhead in 132 days.

Not surprisingly, when these conclusions made their way to the Army staff early this year, they created more than a bit of heartburn. As things now stand, active-duty Army officials believe that the study results are probably flawed because—get this—the Active Army probably wouldn't be able to deliver the types of training and other support that the Active Army is supposed to provide to the National Guard during the mobilization process. They're not sure though, since there is no standard procedure for validating the readiness status of a National Guard division; in fact, there's no Army field manual that lays out the process by which a division is supposed to mobilize and prepare for deployment.

It's ironic that while most elements of America's military force structure would like nothing better than to find a place to hide during QDR deliberations, the Army National Guard is crying out for attention. But some National Guard officials clearly feel that years of benign neglect have put their divisions in a perilous position for QDR-prompted cuts. With the IDA-led study results in hand, these officials vow, they aren't about to disappear quietly.

UNEQUAL PARTNERS—NATIONAL GUARD'S COMBAT DIVISIONS REMAIN HIDDEN BENEATH MANTLE OF BENIGN NEGLECT

(By John G. Roos)

Today's "Total Army" includes eight National Guard combat divisions. This substantial slice of America's combat power is in addition to the National Guard's 15 "Enhanced Readiness Brigades" that presumably would be used to augment active-duty forces in the event of an all-out national emergency. But those eight divisions haven't attracted much attention during the nearly completed Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), since they're not even included in America's war plans.

Ever since the contentious issue of Georgia's 48th Infantry (Mechanized) Brigade's purported inability to achieve ready-for-deployment status during Desert Storm, Army

planners have shed away from relying on National Guard combat units to augment active-duty Army forces during the early stages of a conflict. In spite of the special attention the Army continues to devote to its Enhanced Brigades in order to keep them at relatively acceptable levels of combat readiness, they still remain far from the tip of the spear in the Service's deployment plans. But at least those Enhanced Brigades do come into play at some point during Army warfighting planning sessions. The same can't be said of the eight National Guard divisions.

In the wake of the "come-as-you-are" planning assumptions that flowed from the Bottom-Up Review's short-notice, two-MRC strategy, those eight divisions were deemed so unlikely to be ready to deploy in time to make a difference in the conflicts the Army would most likely face that they were quietly flushed from Army war plans. The plug was pulled more than five years ago, when former Army Chief of Staff General Gordon Sullivan told the House Armed Services Committee that it would take 365 days to prepare a National Guard division for deployment to a combat arena. After the howls of protests from National Guard leaders subsided, the Army revised its estimate downward to 270 days. But that three month chop by the Army headquarters staff did little to assuage the Guard's leadership: Even a nine-month mobilization, training, and deployment cycle, they argued, was blatantly pessimistic and would continue to exclude National Guard divisions from the Army's warfighting planning process.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I join with my friend and cochair of the National Guard Caucus when I call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial found in today's issue of the Washington Times by Mr. Philip Gold, entitled "The Army vs. The National Guard" which I ask unanimous consent to be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BOND. This editorial outlines succinctly the issues facing the National Guard in the debate surrounding its force structure and its very future. I have said before and reiterate now in the strongest of terms, that rather than bill payer, the Guard's role should be vibrant, viable, and adequately funded by the Department of Defense.

National Guard units from every State are, today, involved in operations domestically in their State roles, and globally in their national role. Recently, units from my home State have been involved in missions in accordance with United States directives in Bosnia, Hungary, the Persian Gulf, and continue to serve our interests there. Units from States which have experienced natural disasters have traditionally been the "Cavalry to the rescue." Even the U.S. Air Force was a recipient of the National Guard's professional response when an A-10 aircraft which had crashed in a remote area was initially discovered by a National Guard Team involved in the search.

With the fiscal constraints being imposed on our military force while simultaneously increasing their roles and missions, we need the Guard now,

more than ever. We need it to be trained, we need it to be well equipped, and we need it funded.

Mr. President I call upon all Senators to join with me and Senator FORD along with the other members of the National Guard Caucus in a pledge to insure the robust nature of the National Guard, a service from which we ask so much.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Times, June 5, 1997]

THE ARMY VS. THE NATIONAL GUARD

(By Philip Gold)

The fracas was inevitable. Several weeks ago, the National Guard's senior leadership concluded that they hadn't been given a fair chance to make their case before the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR). They also concluded that the Army was systematically lying to them about the extent of the Guard reductions they wanted. So they requested a meeting with Defense Secretary William Cohen and were told to "go through their chain of command."

So they did . . . through their other chain of command. They went to the governors, who started writing the president, cc: the Pentagon. That got Mr. Cohen's attention and Mr. Cohen's attention—to adapt a venerable adage—started flowing downhill. As of this writing, the secretary was ordered an Army/National Guard "off-site" at the Pentagon (great place for an "off-site") to work it out the first week in June. Also as of this writing, the Guard has received seven contradictory letters from Mr. Cohen, army secretary Togo West and senior army generals on structuring the meeting. About the only thing that hasn't been suggested is a United Nations peacekeeping force in the room.

Maybe not such a bad idea, given the acrimony on both sides.

Whatever the "off-site" producers, it won't last long. The Army and the National Guard have been at it for centuries. The Guard has survived through a combination of domestic political savvy and foreign threats that seemed to require a large reserve. But does this venerable (some would say archaic) institution have any relevance to today's world and tomorrow's missions?

The answer is that the Guard has a greater relevance today than during the Cold War—exactly the kind of relevance the Founding Fathers envisioned when they elected to place the preponderance of the nation's military strength in the state militias.

Three facts vindicate the Guard. First, the U.S. simply cannot afford to maintain a large standing army. The force that did Desert Storm is long-gone. Nor can the United States afford to maintain large portions of the present force at high readiness. Reserves are far cheaper, especially in a world where mass armies are vanishing, and where those that remain grow ever more obsolete and vulnerable to other forms of American power.

Second, the Guard and service reserves provide a de facto "people's veto" on major foreign involvements. If a president lacks the popular support to mobilize, he lacks the popular support to go to war—and has better not do it.

Third, the Guard is a classic "dual use" system, available for foreign and domestic tasks. The Guard's experience in domestic emergencies offers a capability of major military significance. For example, the Guard, not the standing Army, should be given the nuclear/biological/chemical weapons disaster relief mission. The standing Army doesn't need this capability in peacetime, so it should be in the part time forces.

Given the likelihood of future terrorist actions on American soil, the Guard, with thousands of sites around the country and local expertise, offers a far superior means of deploying this capability for domestic emergencies.

Further—and this is not easy to say—the standing Army, is an institution in profound disarray, trashed by scandal and, in many ways, looking for work that will generate hard cash and renewed respect. Almost inevitably, that points toward more domestic missions, especially counter-terrorism in its various aspects. One need not conjure up lurid thoughts of military coups or images of an alienated, embittered officer corps to understand that this is a bad idea. The less the standing military is involved in domestic affairs, the better. Not because they're evil people, but because their professional methods and loyalties may do more harm than good. The Founders knew it; the Army's domestic intelligence activities during Vietnam proved it. To the extent that military force may have to be used in this country in the decades ahead, it ought to be the Guard, with its complex set of responsibilities to and relationships with country, state, and community.

But the political and cultural justifications for the Guard don't address one practical question: Can they be ready to do the job? Obviously, the answer depends on what the job is and what you mean by ready. Still, one thing is clear. There is no inherent reason the Guard cannot perform adequately across the range of its missions. The Marine Corps and the Air Force have demonstrated what can be accomplished when reserves are treated as assets, not rivals. New tools and methods, from tank and cockpit simulators to computerized command post exercises, offer training possibilities unimaginable even 10 years ago. High-priority units can be filled with people willing to accept high levels of contractual obligation, including extended active duty and early call-up. In short, the Guard's proficiency is limited only by resources and creativity—and by a standing Army that, for reasons of its own, prefers not to acknowledge it.

Again, that standing Army isn't evil. It's simply fighting for its institutional life and soul. The current off-site, and the next one, and the one after that, will no doubt reflect the desperation of the struggle. But the Army should not be permitted to sacrifice the Guard to protect its own turf bowls. The current military situation, and the wisdom of centuries, should preclude it.

TRIBUTE TO LORD MICHAEL JOPLING

Mr. STEVENS. I come to the Senate floor today to tell the Senate that a very special and dear friend to many of us who serve in the Senate, the Right Honorable Michael Jopling, has now been honored in his country with a life peerage and will join the House of Lords.

Those of us who know Michael Jopling have known him as a Member of Parliament who has served more than three decades in Britain as a Member of Parliament. He served as a Minister of Agricultural, Fisheries, and Food in the British Government for two 4-year periods between 1979 and 1987. Those of us here in the Senate who know him, know him because of his active participation in the North Atlantic Assembly sessions and par-

ticularly in the British-American Interparliamentary Conference meetings which many of us have participated in from time to time.

He continues to serve, Mr. President, as the Secretary for the Interparliamentary Exchange. Senator BYRD and I will lead a Senate delegation in August to meet with our British counterparts, and for the 10th year in a row it will be Lord Jopling, now, who will meet us. He brings great energy and enthusiasm to the meetings we have held and, really, his participation has been unparalleled.

As a matter of fact, I am sad to report to the Senate that with his youthful exuberance he got the better of himself recently when he suffered an accident in a Go-Kart race. He broke some ribs and had some damage to his lungs, but he is on the mend now. I understand that he will have full recovery.

I further bring greetings to the Senate from our friend Senator Heflin. Senator Heflin has written to me about his real joy to see our friend, Michael Jopling, so honored. I am reminded of a speech that Sir Winston Churchill made in the House of Commons on August 20, 1940. He said:

The British Empire and the United States will have to be somewhat mixed together in some of their affairs for mutual and general advantage. For my own part, looking out upon the future, I do not view the process with any misgivings.

It is, in fact, the British-American interparliamentary process that has given great effect to those words, and Lord Jopling has been a leader of that effort. He has made a lasting contribution to the great relationship between our two countries. He and his wife Gail have always been gracious hosts, and they really are wonderful goodwill ambassadors for Britain.

I come to offer my congratulations to Lord Jopling. I think others who know him will want to congratulate him, also. We particularly thank him for years of dedication to his country and to the cause of world peace and understanding. He is a great personal friend. I am delighted to see a friend honored.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEVENS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HOLLINGS. As they say in England, hear, hear. We are delighted to hear of the elevation of our friend Michael to Lord Jopling. It shows, amongst other things in England, that you do not only have to be young, you can be old and still succeed.

I wish him well, too, in his recovery, and I appreciate the Senator from Alaska pointing out this wonderful happening.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for those remarks, and I know I reflect the sentiments of my great friend Howell Heflin in reporting to the Senate this great news.

Mr. DODD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEVENS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. DODD. I do not know Michael Jopling as well as our good friends from Alaska and South Carolina, but I have met him on numerous occasions, having attended a couple of the sessions of the North Atlantic Assembly with Judge Heflin, our former colleague.

I remember when I left the other body, Mr. President, and came to the U.S. Senate, our former colleague and delightful raconteur, Morris Udall, pulled me aside and said, "I want you to know I do not approve of your moving to the U.S. Senate. All I can say is by this move you have improved the intelligence of both bodies," and one might suggest I suppose here with our good friend Michael Jopling, being elevated to the status of Lord, that he is certainly going to improve the intelligence of that body.

He is a wonderful person, a great individual, and I wish him well.

Mr. STEVENS. I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR OF 1997—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 hours of debate on the subject of the conference report on H.R. 1469.

The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may use. I state to the Senate that I don't intend to use the whole hour, unless it is necessary to respond to some comments that may come up. It is my hope that we can finish debate on this bill and then turn to the budget resolution.

The conference report on the defense and emergency disaster supplemental bill will soon be before us. It is not before us yet. In the interest of time, we hope that we can get this matter resolved so that we may vote upon the bill as soon as it is received from the House.

Mr. President, the conferees completed their work yesterday afternoon and the conference report was filed in the House last night. The final bill keeps faith with the version that passed the Senate last month. It provides needed relief for the victims of disasters in 35 States. The bill also provides \$1.8 billion for military operations in Bosnia, Southwest Asia, and foreign deployments. Those amounts replace funds already spent by the administration. Without this funding for the Defense Department, we face a severe reduction in training, readiness,

and quality of life for our troops worldwide.

The bill continues to exceed the levels requested by the President for the Federal Emergency Management Agency [FEMA], the community development block grants, economic development, agriculture, and for the Corps of Engineers. I might say, however, Mr. President, while this bill involves increases of \$8 billion, we have offset \$8.4 billion. There is no net increase in this bill. We actually have a \$400 million net reduction in spending for fiscal year 1997 as a result of this bill.

Each of our subcommittees have carefully reviewed the amounts proposed by these agencies, and working with the Members from the impacted States, we have arrived at these funding levels. The new budget authority is offset by corresponding rescissions, as I have indicated. Those exceed the total spending.

Again, let me say, all defense spending is offset by reductions available to the Department of Defense in terms of prior appropriations. Again, consistent with the Senate version of the bill, additional amounts are provided for needed highway programs. Mr. President, there was a request from the administration for some highway money. We added to that. We have reached a compromise now by virtue of the work that was done by Senator SHELBY and Senator LAUTENBERG. That results in an increase for the so-called donor States, compared to the bill that passed the Senate. But I believe it keeps faith with the commitment that we have made to provide more funding to the donee States. We did not rewrite the highway formula. We reached an honest compromise with the House, where the House is dominated primarily by donor States and this Senate has more votes from the donee States. Now, this is a legitimate compromise on the money without rewriting the highway formula.

The conferees maintained the continuing resolution language; it is unchanged. It was the same version in both the House and Senate bills. It was not before the conference, actually. The levels of the continuing resolution version provide 100 percent of the fiscal year 1997 enacted rate of appropriations in the event a bill is not passed by the end of the fiscal year. This is more generous than most continuing resolutions that have been passed by the Congress in prior years. Typically, past resolutions provided that the money to be available during the period of a continuing resolution was the lower of the two amounts provided by the House or the Senate. This is not that case. This continuing resolution would be 100 percent of the amount that has been available in 1997.

I might say to the Senate that, after considerable debate, the conferees modified the language on the 2000 census; that is, we modified the provision adopted by the Senate. The conference agreement prohibits the use of sam-

pling and mandates a full enumeration of Americans for the apportionment of the House of Representatives. This is nothing more than maintaining current law, Mr. President, the constitutional requirement for a real census. It does not permit a political polling type of census.

I think we should state to the Senate that the Appropriations Committee in the House and the Senate each have recognized that this decision will increase the cost of the census for the year 2000. We are prepared to fund that additional cost within the total available under the bipartisan budget agreement, which we will vote on later today. I regret that no Member of the minority has chosen to sign the conference report, but I do understand and respect Senator BYRD's decision. I knew of his objection from the very beginning to the continuing resolution provision that is in the bill. But I want to assure Senators that, as far as the appropriations aspects of this bill, it is not a partisan bill. The agreements reached on the appropriations for disaster relief and for the recovery from the disasters were adopted with complete consultation with all Members of each body, regardless of party.

I hope the President will closely evaluate the total bill before he reaches the decision on a veto. We know that there is a threatened veto. We hope to work with the President to meet the needs of the victims of these disasters and to maintain our national defense, which is our constitutional duty. Vetoing this bill will simply delay further the aid and support that is needed by the citizens of more than 30 States.

I do want to state, Mr. President, that this is the first bill that I have been privileged to handle as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee. I offer my thanks to Chairman BOB LIVINGSTON for his courtesy and cooperation in working with Members of the Senate on this bill. It is a very complex bill, Mr. President. At times, this was a very contentious conference. But the House chairman, who was the chairman of the conference, presided over the conference with considerable grace, diligence, and good humor. I do believe that all Members will agree that anyone who wanted to participate in the debate concerning this conference was able to do so. I do urge the adoption of the bill by the Senate today so the bill can reach the President as soon as possible.

It will be a difficult vote, Mr. President, and I expect a very close vote on whether the bill goes to the President at all. Thank you.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following staff members of the Appropriations Committee and various subcommittees be granted floor access during the con-

sideration of the conference report on H.R. 1469:

Christine Ciccone, Becky Davies, Sid Ashworth, Alex Flint, Bruce Evans, Wally Burnett, Jon Kamareck, Jay Kimmitt, Michele Randolph, Jack Conway, Jim Morhard, Mary Beth Nethercutt, Robin Cleveland, Craig Higgins, Pat Raymond, Dona Pate, Susan Hogan, and Kevin Johnson.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I yield myself some of the time assigned to the minority side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Chair. Mr. President, this bill is critically important because it responds to the disasters in many States. Obviously, of greatest concern and interest to this Senator are the disasters that have occurred in North Dakota. Perhaps I could give a brief review for my colleagues and people who might be watching on the need for this disaster legislation. Before I do that, I want to thank those who helped write this legislation. I specifically want to thank the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senator STEVENS. I also want to thank his staff because they listened to our plea for help and they responded. We deeply appreciate that. There were some heated moments as we discussed this legislation, but much of what is here is very good and critically important to our recovery.

As I say that, I must also register disappointment for the unrelated matters that have been included in this legislation, which the President has indicated will compel him to veto the legislation. We asked for and pleaded for a clean disaster bill, one that did not contain extraneous matters. But that did not happen.

Mr. President, I want to go now to a review of the disasters that occurred and led to the necessity for this kind of legislation. North Dakota has been hit with the most extraordinary set of disasters in our State's history. First, we had, as this chart shows, "Snow Foolin', Fargo-Moorhead Sets Record." Mr. President, that is not an athletic record, it is a record for snowfall. At the time they wrote this article, we had received almost 95 inches of snow. Before we were done, we reached over 10 feet of snow that fell in North Dakota during the winter season.

Next, we were faced with an extraordinary ice and blizzard storm, which was the most powerful winter storm in the last 50 years in North Dakota. That occurred in the first week of April. This picture shows downed power lines. It just snapped power lines all across the northeastern part of the State, and 80,000 people were without power. Many were without power for over a week. Not only were power lines affected by this incredible storm, but, as this picture shows, we had thousands of cattle that were killed by this extraordinary blizzard. This shows a mother who is

licking one of her calves. This calf, by the way, did not survive. You can see another dead animal, another dead cow. We lost over 150,000 head in this incredible blizzard in early April.

This is a circumstance in which some cows froze to death and many died by suffocation because in the blizzard the winds were so powerful that it blew snow up into their nostrils, and it compacted. And then the cows actually suffocated, an especially gruesome death for these animals.

It didn't end there, unfortunately, because not only did we have record snowfall followed by the most powerful winter storm in 50 years but then we had on top of it a 500-year flood; a flood that in Grand Forks was 26 feet above flood stage. And the dikes could not hold. As this headline says, "Broken Dikes, Shattered Hopes," and a picture of just one part of Grand Forks.

Grand Forks is a city of 50,000 people. Ninety-five percent of the people were evacuated. Eighty percent of the homes were badly damaged. Tens of thousands of structures were just devastated. In fact, if you go to Grand Forks now—this is 6 weeks after the flood devastation—on every corner, on every boulevard are stacked the personal belongings and the personal effects of the people of the city of Grand Forks. It is like a giant junkyard because everything has been destroyed. This water was contaminated. All of these things are ruined. The carpets, the drapes, all of the furniture, all of their clothing and personal effects destroyed; all of it. It is amazing to go through town. You can see what everybody's refrigerator looked like; everybody's washer and dryer—because they are out on the curb. They are out on the boulevard waiting to be picked up because they are all destroyed. It is really an incredible experience.

This picture shows the extraordinary extent of the flooding that occurred once those dikes broke. I went on a helicopter and flew north of Grand Forks. This shows from horizon to horizon water. In fact, the water was 40 miles wide. Remember. This river is normally 75 to 100 yards wide. But after the dikes burst, the water spread and was 40 miles wide.

You will remember—I think the President has North Dakota roots—you may recall, Mr. President, that we used to have a lake thousands of years ago, Lake Agassiz, that covered much of eastern North Dakota. A lot of us said it looks like Lake Agassiz is reforming because to be up in a helicopter and as far as the eye can see was water; really a stunning sight.

The disaster didn't end there because in the middle of the 500 year flood we had an incredible fire break out. The headline in the paper was, "Red Overruns Heart of Forks." Of course, they are referring to Grand Forks. The picture shows amidst the flooded streets this fire that broke out. This fire devastated much of three blocks of downtown Grand Forks. Many buildings

were destroyed. This picture shows the headline, which says it well, "A City Scarred."

This shows the National Guard with the firemen fighting that incredible inferno. I mean it was an inferno. This fire was so intense and so powerful that giant support beams for office buildings actually went up and were forced by the convection, by the power of these air currents, they blew up into the air and went across the street to the next block. That is how this fire spread, block to block, and destroyed much of three city blocks.

You can see. This is one of the major commercial buildings in the city of Grand Forks. It looks like it went through the raids of Dresden. It is just a shell. It was block after block that looked just like this. Over 150 business structures were destroyed in the combined flood and fire; 156 business structures in Grand Forks alone, housing about two businesses per structure on average. So about 300 businesses had their property wiped out.

This headline came in the Grand Forks Herald, which says it all: "Come Hell and High Water". It shows the little street sign with the water right up to the top; 6 feet of water standing right in the middle of town. Here is again the burned-out shell of a three-block area where the people have been absolutely devastated.

Mr. President, we have another headline that comes from the Grand Forks Herald: "4 Days Since Congress Let Us Down."

This was after Congress failed to act after the Memorial Day recess, and they gave 11 reasons to pass the disaster bill now.

We have heard a lot of talk that, "There is money in the pipeline. Don't worry about anything. Nothing is being held up because there is money in the pipeline." We just had the mayors of the affected communities in town yesterday. The business leaders of Grand Forks were here. One of them said, "You know. I hear all of this talk about money in the pipeline. All I can say is there must be cement in the pipeline because the money is not getting through."

The fact is there is no money in the Housing Department's pipeline for the buyout and relocation of the thousands of homes that have been destroyed. There is no money in that pipeline. We met yesterday with Secretary Cuomo. We asked him, "Do you have any money anywhere that could be diverted to go to work immediately so these homes can be bought out and relocated so we can start to rebuild this community?"

His answer was, "No, I don't."

We met yesterday with Secretary Daley, the Secretary of Commerce. We asked him, "Do you have EDA funds that are in the pipeline that could be used to help rebuild the business community that has been devastated?"

He said, "No, I do not."

There is no money in the pipeline to reimburse the school districts who

took the kids from the disaster areas. Those school districts stepped forward and said, "Yes. We will take your children. We will put them in our schools. We will transport them. We will feed them. We will give them books. We will provide teaching"—because the schools in Grand Forks are devastated.

There is no money in the pipeline to reimburse the school districts that stepped forward. There is no money in the pipeline for the Department of Agriculture to help the ranchers who lost hundreds of thousands of heads of cattle in this remarkable winter that we have just been through.

So when people say there is money in the pipeline, that no project is being delayed, that is just not accurate. That is just not accurate. We had the direct testimony of the mayors of the affected cities, of the business leaders of these cities, and they are saying to us: "We are stopped cold until and unless this disaster bill passes."

So, Mr. President, I am here today with two messages. No. 1, a message of thanks to those who have supported a disaster package that is meaningful and critically important for recovery. But I am also here today to say that I am also disappointed that we don't have before us a clean disaster bill—one that does not have unrelated provisions so that the President can sign this legislation and we can move forward with the recovery and rebuilding. That is unfortunate, and one that I hope is not repeated any time in the future.

I have been in the U.S. Senate for 10 years. And when others had disasters, we never offered amendments that were controversial, that would hold up the legislation, or that would cause a Presidential veto. We never did that. We never even thought of doing such a thing. I wish others would have extended the same courtesy to us that we have extended to them.

Some said, "Well, you offered amendments." Yes. That is true. I have offered amendments to disaster legislation before—noncontroversial amendments that were supported on both sides of the aisle, that were supported by the administration, that didn't hold up anything. I certainly have done that. But I would never have even thought of offering an amendment that would compel a Presidential veto. I mean I really do not understand why that would be done.

I do not want to lose sight of the important provisions that are in this legislation—provisions that will help rebuild the homes and businesses that have been destroyed; provisions that will help farmers and ranchers in many cases who have lost their foundation herds; provisions that will help them recover; provisions that will allow the Corps of Engineers to rebuild and repair and reconstruct levees and dikes so that we don't go through this again next year.

Believe me. We are acutely aware that in North Dakota we could face another disaster next year if we do not

act and act quickly. Again, remember, we have a very short construction season. We need to go to work now to get these projects completed. The money that is here for the Federal Highway Administration to rebuild roads, highways and bridges—many of the bridges up and down the Red River have been destroyed by this series of disasters—the funds for the school districts that have been impacted, and the funding for Devil's Lake because we have another disaster that is occurring in North Dakota: Devil's Lake. This lake is raising inexorably. It has tripled in volume and doubled in size in the last 3 years. It is like a cancer eating more and more of the countryside, eating up homes, eating buildings, eating up roads and bridges. And we are grateful to the committee for having included \$5 million for the work that needs to be done this year on an outlet from that Devil's Lake; and, for the money to rebuild the rural sewer system; the money to provide floodplain easements for those whose land is flooded and who have now been denied any ability to earn an income necessary for their families.

Mr. President, I want to end on this note, as I started, by saying:

No. 1, we are deeply grateful for the response of so many in this Chamber who came to help out.

The occupant of the Chair wrote me a very gracious note reminding me of his North Dakota roots and offering to help out with this disaster. We appreciate that.

We appreciate again especially the assistance of the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee. We appreciate the help of his staff. We appreciate the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee and his staff for the great assistance they have provided in getting this legislation in shape.

Finally, Mr. President, we also have a disappointment. The disappointment is that we have these unrelated measures that are in this legislation. Hopefully, this will all be resolved as quickly as possible so that the relief can start to flow to those communities that have been so badly hurt.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. I had a chance to speak at some length about the need for disaster relief, and the need for emergency assistance for Minnesotans and the Dakotas. I want in less than 3 minutes to just say two things on the floor today.

I would like to thank my colleagues. This started out in the hope that eventually it will end up as a bipartisan effort, and a lot of cooperation to get help to people, our neighbors. This is help that doesn't make everybody whole again, but at least it gives peo-

ple a chance to rebuild their lives. I hope that next week that is where this ends up. It started out on a very positive note, and I hope it will end up there.

My second point is my colleague from North Dakota said he was disappointed. I am actually outraged. I think it is transparent. I think what is going on here is silly.

There are some extraneous amendments on what should be a straight disaster relief bill—the way we collect census data; having to do with a continuing resolution; having to do with a budget resolution; and, if there is any kind of crisis a Government shutdown next fall; having to do with parks; you name it. This shouldn't be on this bill.

I think what people know here—for some reason they think people in the country don't know it—that it is going to go to the President, the President is going to veto it, and it is going to be sent back. If it is an effort to embarrass the President, what is accomplished? Because when it gets sent back here, it is my fervent hope—and I believe this will happen—that these extraneous provisions will be taken off the bill. Then it will go back to the President, and then it will be signed.

What has been accomplished? Is the point to embarrass the President? Is it just a game?

I think we are going to be faced next week with one of two scenarios: Either it goes to the President, the President vetoes it—and everybody here knows it. But so do people back in our home States. They have intelligence. The President will veto it. Then it will come back here. And one of two things will happen: Either the bill will be stripped of these provisions that have nothing to do with the compelling need to get help to people, in which case, great. Thank you. Fine. But what was the point?

Or that will not happen. And if that does not happen, then I will use every measure I know how to use as a Senator to stop this process here. I will do everything I can next week if we do not get a clean bill. Everything I can do to fight for the people in Minnesota I will do. So my hope is that this ends up on the positive note that it started out on because this is really not about a kind of strategy or tactics. It is just about getting help to people, and it is time. It is time to do the right thing.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD). The Chair recognizes the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I believe the distinguished Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER], has been waiting. How much time does she wish?

Mrs. BOXER. Up to 10 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes from the time under my control to the distinguished Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Chair. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his leadership on all of this, and the chairman of the committee. This is his first time as chairman bringing a bill to the floor. I know that both sides have worked very, very hard.

Mr. President, this is a good news-bad news day for the people in North Dakota and for the people in the 21 other States who are waiting to see this Congress finally pass an emergency bill and send it to the President. It is a good news day because the bill is before us.

As has been said many times, and I repeat it again, for both sides, from the chairman, Senator STEVENS, to the ranking member, Senator BYRD, to their staffs, to all of the members of the Appropriations Committee, of which I am a new member, I cannot tell you how grateful we from California are for the patience and understanding and the work that went into this bill, for the things we have in this bill to help our people. We have had devastating floods, and we have many things to do to pick up the pieces for the people who were hit hard, for the people who have to replant orchards, for the people who depend on Yosemite National Park and the tourism that it brings to give them livelihood and sustenance.

Those funds are in this bill, and they do not come from FEMA. I say to my colleagues. And, as my friend, Senator CONRAD from North Dakota, said, they are not in the pipeline. These funds must come through the pipeline, and until this bill passes they will not be there because they are from agriculture, they are from the highway fund, they are from the Army Corps of Engineers, and they are from housing.

So the funds that are in the pipeline—and I think it is important we all understand this—are the FEMA funds. By the way, if we have another tragedy in our country—we never know when disaster strikes—even that could be jeopardized. I watched with horror the tornado that hit Texas, and I thought to myself here we are on a break and another natural disaster hits. I hope FEMA does have the wherewithal to meet that disaster.

So, my friends, we are playing with fire. We are playing with flooding. We are playing with earthquakes. We are playing with disaster here. We need to be sure that the funds in this bill which have been put together in such a careful way get to the people who need them the most.

I am glad my colleague from North Dakota showed the photographs again of the devastation because sometimes we have a short attention span and we forget, but when we see those buildings as they looked when they were in flames in the middle of a flood, it really did remind you of World War II pictures, of the worst kind of attack, and this was an attack from nature.

We need to do what we can to make these people whole, to work with their

private insurers, to work with communities, to work with local and State governments to do what we can do. It is a very basic question: What are we here for? Are we here to play political games? Are we here to win a political skirmish? Or are we here to help the people who so need that help? I hope that, after we get through today, because clearly we have these riders attached to this bill that have nothing to do whatsoever with the emergency, I hope when this bill comes back from the President, who has been forthright about the fact he will veto a bill with these riders, we will strip these controversial riders from the bill and move on.

Mr. President, my people in California are waiting. They do not understand it. I went home, and they said, "Well, why, Senator, is this all taking so long?" I explained that there were three controversial riders placed on this bill that have nothing to do with the emergency. And one of them, the most controversial, undermines the budget agreement that we were all so proud to say we support. It is almost as if the majority is protecting the Senate from the majority.

Why do I say that? Because there is no reason why we have to put this Government on automatic pilot. There is no reason why we cannot do our work and pass our appropriations bills. We do not need an automatic pilot budget process in place. If we had that in place, why do we need the Senate? We would not need it; we would just put everything on automatic pilot. The only people who can cause a shutdown are the people right here in this Senate. If we agree we are never going to shut down the Government, let us agree to do our work and pass our bills and compromise and move forward.

I do not blame the President for being outraged on this. Here he holds a press conference; everyone is hugging everyone, Democrats and Republicans; they passed the budget. Everyone gave a little and everyone got a little. Now we have this automatic CR placed on an emergency bill, which, if it passes, will totally undermine that agreement there. There are harsh cuts in education and the environment. This does not belong on this bill.

Here is the point. These riders should stand on their own two feet. They should come here as separate bills. We should debate them and vote them out. They should not be attached to legislation to help people who have been thrown off their feet by disasters. This is wrong. We do not have to do this.

So, yes, it is a good news-bad news day for people in 22 States—good news because we are moving the supplemental, bad news because it has these extraneous matters attached that undermine the budget agreement and do other things and do not belong on this bill. The bill will be vetoed, and we will be back to square one. And people in the country will scratch their heads and wonder what on Earth are we

doing. That is not a proud moment for this Senate.

Mr. President, on an unrelated matter, I want to mention that something historic happened in California yesterday that does deal with another type of emergency, and that is the passage of junk gun laws.

Let me tell my colleagues what happened in California yesterday.

The California State Assembly and the California State Senate passed legislation to prohibit the manufacture and sale of junk guns in California, Saturday night specials. Those guns that have not one quality of safety standard are now banned from manufacture in the State of California, assuming the Governor signs this bill.

Mr. President, we talk about emergencies; 40,000 people a year are killed by gunshots in this great Nation, almost 300,000 a year are wounded, and the criminal gun of choice is the Saturday night special, the junk gun, the only product in America today that has not one quality of safety standard. In 1968, those guns were outlawed from importation after Robert Kennedy was assassinated. I have to say there was a big loophole that allowed American companies to make these guns. I am proud that the State assembly and the senate passed this bill. It is modeled after my bill that I introduced last year and again this year.

I hope that as we deal with emergencies and we look at the emergency of gun violence, we will recognize we have guns on the market today that are banned from importation because they are so poorly made, and at the minimum people deserve to have safety standards and quality standards on guns that they purchase.

So, Mr. President, it is a great day for Californians. Even with the worst, heaviest type of heavyhanded lobbying, these bills passed, and I am very excited about it. I hope that we will have the courage to do the same in the Senate. I will give the Senate a chance to cast that courageous vote.

I close, Mr. President, by again thanking my colleagues from Alaska and West Virginia for their assistance to the good people of California and the 21 other States, particularly the heart-rending photos we saw today that just reminded us of what happened in North Dakota. I thank them for working in a bipartisan fashion to get a bill to us that is an excellent bill, and I pray and I hope that we can get these extraneous riders stripped off of this bill so that the people in North Dakota and the people in the 21 other States can say this Senate did something to really help the people of America.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has 28 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. How much time did the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER], use?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. She used 10 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. All right. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I will yield myself such time as I may consume from the time under my control.

Mr. President, I regret that I am unable to support the conference agreement on the emergency disaster assistance appropriations bill, H.R. 1469, now before the Senate. I am unable to do so despite my total support for the more than \$5 billion in disaster assistance payments which are included in this measure for the hundreds of thousands of people across the country who are the victims of the many natural disasters that have occurred in recent months.

I also support the nearly \$2 billion contained in the measure for aid to our men and women in uniform around the world, particularly in Bosnia, engaged in peacekeeping operations, as well as the nearly \$1 billion contained in the measure for payment of veterans' compensation and pensions.

These funds are all vitally needed for the purposes for which they are appropriated and should be made available at the earliest possible time. Indeed, it is my view Congress should not have recessed for the recent Memorial Day break without having enacted into law these funds that are contained in this bill.

Unfortunately, as did the bill when reported out of the Senate Appropriations Committee and after Senate action, this conference agreement contains a number of controversial, extraneous legislative provisions which have no business being included in an emergency disaster assistance bill. The President has never wavered in his statement that he will veto the measure despite the critical nature of funding it contains for hundreds of thousands of people. He has urged Congress to remove the extraneous provisions and send him a clean disaster assistance bill which he can sign. Regrettably, the leadership in Congress has chosen to use this bill as a vehicle for making political points on such things as keeping the Government operating on automatic pilot for the entirety of fiscal year 1998 at 1997 levels regardless of merit and ignoring the fact that a number of activities throughout the Federal Government should not continue and should be cut or eliminated altogether.

This so-called automatic CR and other extraneous provisions need not be on this bill. They can be raised at any time and debated in their own right as freestanding measures. They can be raised by the leadership at any time. What other reason can there be then to insist on including them in this disaster assistance measure than to make purely political points?

I am disturbed by this decision to proceed in this fashion. I note that no Democratic Member of the conference on H.R. 1469, no Democratic Member signed the conference report. In not signing a conference report, I find no

fault with and intend no disrespect toward the chairmen of the conference. I congratulate Chairman LIVINGSTON on conducting a very fair and evenhanded conference. I congratulate our own chairman of the conference, chairman of the Senate conferees, Senator STEVENS, who also, likewise, is very aware of and always considerate of the needs of the constituencies of the Members of this body. I have always found him, over the long years of friendship that I have enjoyed with him, to be most considerate, charitable and fair. In the conduct of this conference, these two chairmen were courteous to all members and showed great patience and eminent skill in completing the conference as expeditiously as possible. Unfortunately, they had no ability to remove these controversial matters that have caused me to oppose the measure and have caused me not to sign the conference report, and I speak for others on my side of the aisle who, likewise, did not sign this conference report. Only the leadership of the two Houses could have accomplished that result.

To those Senators who have chosen to delay the enactment of the measure in order to make political points which they hope to gain from forcing the President to veto it, I say consider this: Next time it may be your State, it may be your people, it may be your constituents.

For the reasons I have stated, I will not vote for the adoption of the conference report.

We must not continue to play cynical games with people who need help when a disaster has taken lives, taken homes, taken farms, taken livestock, taken livelihoods. I hope that this will be the last time such tactics are employed on an emergency disaster bill.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time. Does the Senator from North Dakota wish to have some time?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to yield for 5 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, [Mr. DORGAN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I spoke earlier today on the floor for about 30 minutes on this subject. I shall not extend much beyond that. But I did want to add my voice to the voice of Senator BYRD and express, as I indicated previously, two things. First, my gratitude for the resources that are in this bill that would be available and helpful to the victims of the flood in my State; and, second and also important, my concern about the unnecessary delay.

I was looking for a copy of the conference report. It is not yet available here in the Senate. The conference report is a conference report to provide emergency appropriations. The emergency appropriations are necessary to respond to natural disasters. But, of course, there are issues in this conference report that determine that it

will not become law. The conference report, if it were on my desk, I would hold it up and say, "This is not going to be law, and everyone in this Chamber knows it."

It is part of the process that is so frustrating from time to time in this Chamber. It is a process that goes on from time to time on a lot of legislation—and the Democrats do it, the Republicans do it: Put extraneous or unrelated amendments on a bill. That is not unusual. The rules of the Senate allow that. What is unusual is that a bill providing for disaster relief to thousands and thousands of people is now being used for that purpose. That's unusual. That's unprecedented. That didn't happen previously. A disaster bill, generally speaking, was a piece of legislation that most understood should not be used for the traditional kinds of political games that are played here in the U.S. Congress. That is what is different this time.

This aid will come. The resources in this bill will be available. Recovery will take place, but after, now, 2 weeks' delay. Two weeks ago today, the Congress left for the Memorial Day recess without having enacted a conference report. Now, today, the conference report is before us and it will be undoubtedly approved. It will not be signed into law, and everyone in this Chamber knows it.

Some say, and they make the case with great forcefulness, "It doesn't matter. Nothing that needs to be done is not now being done. There is money in the pipeline." I have heard it a hundred times this week from people who don't have the foggiest idea about what the facts are.

Will Rogers once said, "It's not what he knows that bothers me so much, it's what he says he knows for sure that just ain't so." There is some money in the FEMA pipeline to deal with emergency immediate relief—food today, housing tonight in a motel. But there is no money in the pipeline from HUD to rehabilitate the housing, to begin the construction that is necessary—in a State, by the way, that has a very short construction season. Losing 3 weeks in North Dakota, in a construction season where we have to replace probably 1,000 to 1,500 homes, is devastating. It is a delay that is devastating to the region.

That is the point that drives us and compels us to say, thanks for this aid. It will get there. We appreciate very much the cooperation of everyone. But we remain enormously disturbed by the fact that this conference report is not going to be law and everybody in this Chamber knows it, and the result will be another week of delay. There will be 1 more week with thousands of people who wake up in the morning not in their own beds, somewhere else—a shelter, a neighboring town, a hotel, a home of a stranger who took them in. There are thousands of them, thousands of them today without a home, waiting for the fundamental decisions

that will be unlocked by this bill. And the strategy today, by some, is to include in this bill something that will certainly gain a veto, because it has no relationship to this bill and the President has said it is something he cannot support. The result will be 1 more week, 7 more nights, 14 more nights, for people who don't have a home. That's the dilemma.

Mr. President, I have consumed my time. I thank the Chair and the ranking member of the committee. I hope, when all of this process is complete and the dust settles, that the quantity of resources involved in this bill finally, even if belatedly, will be there to provide some hope and help to those families who now feel hopeless and helpless. There is help on the way.

Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 15 minutes and 40 seconds.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair. I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. President, I very much agree with the Senator from North Dakota, the Senator from West Virginia, my colleague from California, and all who have really very sincerely expressed their dismay on the way this bill has been handled. I would like to just take a few minutes and remind my colleagues that this started with a flood in California in January, and it is now June. According to the California Office of Emergency Services, California sustained \$1.8 billion in damages during last winter's flooding. In California alone, 9 people died and 100,000 people lost their homes. They were forced to flee from their homes. This was the third 100-year flood in the last 10 years. It gives you the idea of the impact on part of the State.

Mr. President, 48 out of 58 counties in California were declared Federal disaster areas. Damage to levees, to roads, and other infrastructure was severe. There were over 60 levee breaks in the delta area of California. Many of those breaks have yet to be repaired. These levees do two things. Because the land behind the levee is below sea level, the levees protect homes and agricultural land from the rivers. Now, when the levees break, the land behind the levee is peat, and the peat comes out into the water. That water is the drinking water for two-thirds of the people of the State; that is 20 million people. And when you treat the water for drinking and it has been infested by peat soil, the chlorine throws off carcinogens. So the longer you leave these levees unattended and the longer you have the intrusion of the peat-infested

water into the drinking water, you increase problems in California.

So far, out of this more than \$1.8 billion, California has only received \$27 million for FEMA, for flood fighting, for debris removal, and for infrastructure repair. Fully repairing the damage to public facilities will take months, if not years.

I spent 3 days in these areas. I have flown over most of the levee breaks. I saw the extent of the damage. In places where I flew in a helicopter, let's say maybe 300, 400 feet above the ground, you could not see anything that was not flood-affected on either side. As far as your vision could go, flat land, from 300 to 500 feet above the ground, it was all water. You only saw rooftops.

I talked with people who lost as many as 14,000 trees in their orchard, who were wiped out of their dairy farms, wiped out of their homes. I went into the homes of people who were not farmers. I saw water halfway up the ceiling, everything ruined. Wiring, everything was ruined in the house. If only everyone could see this, I don't think they would want to play these games with this vital piece of legislation.

Let me remind my colleagues of the emergency relief provision and exactly what is in the bill: \$5.6 million, 22 States. According to OMB, the bill allocates \$3.3 billion out of new money and existing FEMA funds for disaster aid to California. Additionally, the bill provides another \$780 million for disaster-related work in California. This is \$200 million for Federal highway work, \$176 million for repairs at Yosemite, \$300 million for the Army Corps of Engineers, and \$47 million for the Department of Agriculture.

I want, just for a moment, to try to debunk the implication that no family has been denied assistance due to delays in the bill. This might be true for agencies like FEMA, which has the disaster trust fund to draw from. But other Federal agencies responding to the disasters are depending on this funding.

HUD currently has no CDBG funds to dedicate to disaster recovery efforts, and both the House and Senate bills contained a half a billion dollars for CDBG disaster recovery efforts. So without this bill, there is no money for these efforts.

Other Federal programs are also waiting for this funding: the Department of Agriculture's Emergency Conservation Program, which assists farmers in rehabilitating flooded farmland and clearing debris from the fields. Without this bill, farmers in the upper Midwest have to delay planting and will see their costs driven up.

The Watershed and Flood Prevention Program, the Tree Assistance Program—now, this is important. I mentioned losing 14,000 trees. Crops that are permanent, like vines and trees, are eligible for grants through the Tree Assistance Program for replanting. There are no moneys for that without

this bill. So it is necessary, if you are going to get the tree in the ground, to get it done as fast as possible.

Let me talk about one of our Nation's jewels—Yosemite National Park. Delaying this bill closes off parts of this park for millions of visitors, no question. The Park Service is proceeding with the most pressing needs, but funds in this bill are now going to arrive too late to affect this summer. That means that contracts to begin the permanent road widening and the permanent utility repairs need to be let as soon as possible to minimize the impact on the park. If it can't be done soon, we are into winter again and then it is not going to be for another year.

The President has made no secret about the fact that he will veto this bill when it hits his desk. We all know the problems with the automatic CR. I, for one, believe that this killer provision is really not necessary. We have shown that when we want to work together in a bipartisan way and make the necessary compromises that we can do it. All we have to do is pass appropriations bills on time. Two weeks ago we voted for a balanced budget. I think it is somewhat disingenuous to include the automatic CR in this legislation.

Let me spend a few moments on another killer issue, because I have spoken to a few Members on the other side about it, and that is the census sampling. I had hoped the conferees would have been able to accept the Senate compromise. The conference report prohibits the use of statistical sampling. This impacts every high-growth State in the United States. I know there is politics in it, let's face it, because lower-income people, minorities, are the most affected if you don't sample. So, if you don't sample, you cut down your numbers in that category. That might be one thing in elections, but let me tell you it is also another thing in funding formula. So by not accepting the sampling, the high-growth States are essentially deprived of vital formula.

Without sampling, the 2,000 census undercount would reach more than 18 million households, it would miss about 1 million people in California; it would miss 5 to 6 million in other States.

Let me give you one example. California's share of Federal vocational rehabilitation funds total about 8 to 9 percent of the Federal funds in the program. These funds would be 11 percent going to California if based on an accurate census. If we don't do the sampling, the cost to the State is \$70 to \$100 million in just this one program alone. You can multiply that all across the board in title I moneys for schools, for poor children, and so every State that has a growth in these numbers, if you don't use the sampling, for political reasons you are sacrificing formula dollars for your State. I might tell you, I find that very hard to do.

I intend to vote for this bill because the bulk of this bill is money for Cali-

fornia. I recognize that the President will veto it. I will also vote to sustain his veto when this comes back. I am hopeful that the rumors I hear about the House are correct, that there will be another bill and it will be a basic disaster relief emergency supplemental so we can get on with other things.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. I yield the Senator from Arizona such time as he may require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. McCain. Mr. President, I thank you, and I thank the distinguished chairman and ranking member of the Appropriations Committee. As always, they have done a very dedicated and very important job here.

As I always do on these bills, Mr. President, I am compelled to talk about some of the parts of this bill which were added which I find very objectionable and which I find unacceptable. I, again, lament that these really nonessential and sometimes wasteful appropriations are added to a bill that is labeled an "emergency supplemental appropriations bill."

Mr. President, in this bill, some that I have found—I am sure there are others—are that it makes an additional \$35 million available for new grants under the Commerce Department Advanced Technology Program. I am the chairman of the Commerce Committee. The Advanced Technology Program falls under the responsibility of the Commerce Committee. We have been investigating that program. We have had a lot of effort put in to making sure the best methods are used for selecting the recipients of these grants. And now in an emergency bill, we see \$35 million for new grants under the Advanced Technology Program.

It earmarks \$5 million for the study of water allocation issues in Alabama, Florida and Georgia; \$10 million for transportation planning and other purposes at Yosemite National Park; \$15 million for research on environmental factors affecting breast cancer; \$650,000 for the National Commission on the Cost of Higher Education. Someone has to help me out here. Where is the emergency? Where is the emergency that requires \$650,000 for the National Commission on the Cost of Higher Education?

It earmarks \$5 million for the development of a legislative information system in the Office of the Secretary of the Senate;

And \$16 million to continue development of an automated targeting system for the Customs Service; a set-aside, Mr. President—a set-aside—of \$12.3 million for discretionary authority to construct a parking garage at a VA medical center in Cleveland, OH. Do you want me to tell you that again? Mr. President, \$12.3 million for the construction of a parking garage at a VA

medical center in Cleveland, OH. I know this bill covers a lot of disaster areas. I don't believe Cleveland, OH, was an area that was afflicted, and certainly I do not suspect that a garage for a VA medical center would be an emergency.

There is an earmark of \$500,000 from previously appropriated funds for a parking garage—another parking garage—in Ashland, KY, to instead restore the Paramount Theater in that city; authorization to make grants under the Center for Ecology Research and Training for Bay City, MI.

There are others, Mr. President. This is really not fair to the American people, it is not fair to the taxpayers, and I wish we would stop these things. I, frankly, grow weary.

I want to talk about an important part of this bill, and that is the provision which has been put in the bill which prevents the President from shutting down the Government. That is what it is all about. It prevents the President from shutting down the Government.

As we know, in the last 2 years, one time he shut down the Government and another time the Congress was forced to add some \$8 to \$9 billion in additional spending which they otherwise wouldn't because of a threat to shut down the Government. Why would I care and why should we care, when we are talking about disasters, about the shutdown of the Government? Because the shutdown of the Government was a manmade disaster, Mr. President.

The shutdown of Government was a manmade disaster that afflicted the lives of millions of Americans and if it happens again because of our failure to do our work, we will, again, inflict pain and punishment on the American people.

I was interested in and I appreciate the comments just made by the Senator from California about Yosemite National Park. There is a report on the "Economic Importance of National Parks: The Effects of the 1995-96 Government Shutdown on Selected Park-Dependent Businesses and Communities." This is a report of the National Parks and Conservation Associations.

On page 8 it says:

Impacts were substantial in and around California's national parks, in spite of the fact that they were not in their peak seasons when the shutdowns occurred.

The report goes on to say:

At Yosemite National Park, an off season hardly exists. Impacts in and around the park, which normally receives more than 120,000 visitors in December, were the worst encountered in our investigation.

And then it goes on to quote Gilbert Ghyselinck, owner of Yosemite Gateway Inn, estimated loss, \$45,000; Jim Houtz, owner of the Cedar Lodge Inn and Parkline Restaurants in El Portal, CA, south of Yosemite, estimated loss, \$40,000 to \$50,000. "We put about 50 people on unemployment. It was pretty rough. The part that hurt us the worst was putting those people on unemploy-

ment when they were trying to put away for the winter."

Mr. President, I want to point out they were not Federal workers. They were people who were never repaid, never repaid for our shutdown of the Government.

A gentleman in Oakhurst, CA:

That Christmas and New Year's shutdown was the toughest on us. We're close to full that time of year—90 percent occupancy. I think we barely made 50 percent. It was only 10 days, but it was the 10 days you want. It's also had some lingering effect.

Cheryl Tyler, of Oasis of Eden Inn, Yucca Valley, CA, estimated loss, \$30,000. Cheryl Tyler said:

It really killed us. They were canceling as fast they could get on the phone. People booked for 5 days. They stayed one night and left. We lost half our business.

It goes on and on. Mr. President, this is what happens when you shut down the Government. I am totally and completely in sympathy with my colleagues who are seeking disaster relief. We, on this side of the aisle, are also seeking disaster relief. We are seeking relief from a disaster to ensure that it will never happen again.

I would like to quote from a study that was made by the Congressional Research Service, a CRS report for Congress entitled "Shutdown of the Federal Government: Effects on the Federal Workforce," James McGrath, analyst, National Government Division, updated June 17, 1996, conducted by the Congressional Research Service. Let me just tell you some things they talk about.

Examples of Federal services adversely affected by the shutdowns include those related to health, welfare, law enforcement, public safety, financial services, parks, museums, monuments, visas, passports, services to American Indians and services to veterans, among many others as listed below.

Health: New patients not accepted into clinical research. Toxic waste cleanup at 609 sites stopped; 2,400 Superfund workers sent home.

Welfare: 10,000 new Medicare applications, 212,000 Social Security card requests, 360,000 individual office visits, 13 million recipients of aid to families with dependent children, 273,000 foster care children, over 100,000 children receiving adoption assistance services, and over 100,000 Head Start children experienced delays.

There were 10,000 home purchase loans and refinancing applications totaling 800 million dollars worth of mortgage loans for moderate- and low-income working families nationwide that were delayed.

Law enforcement and public safety: Well, there is one good piece of news here, Mr. President, the suspension of investigative activities by the IRS. So I guess something good comes out of every disaster. But on a far more serious note, the Department of Justice suspended work on more than 3,500 bankruptcy cases. Delinquent child

support cases were suspended, the deadbeat dads program. Closure of 368 National Park Service sites. Loss of 7 million visitors. Grand Canyon National Park, closed for the first time in its 76-year history.

Local communities near national parks lost an estimated \$14.2 million per day in tourism revenues. I point out, again, Mr. President, the people who lost those tourism revenues never got them back. It was not like the Federal workers, where they were repaid when we started the Government up again.

Closure of national museums and monuments—the loss of some 2 million visitors; 20,000 to 30,000 applications by foreigners for visas to come to this country went unprocessed each day; 200,000 U.S. applications for passports went unprocessed; U.S. tourist industries and airlines sustained millions of dollars in losses because of visa and passport curtailment.

The American Indians. I will quote Deborah Maddox, the acting deputy commissioner for the Bureau of Indian Affairs:

We are getting close to an emergency situation. This week, we would be generating our general assistance payments for 53,000 individuals and families. These grants are for very basic needs and are for people who are not eligible for other services.

Mr. President, American veterans sustained a major curtailment in services as a result of the Federal shutdown, ranging from health and welfare to finance and travel. They include cancellation of vocational rehabilitation appointments; nonprocessing of payments for compensation, pension and education claims; delayed payments of GI bill education checks and insurance death claims; and canceled counseling services to avoid foreclosures. It goes on and on.

Mr. President, what we did when we shut down the Government was unconscionable and unacceptable, and it cannot be repeated. And for the life of me—for the life of me—I do not understand why. There is some connection being made between the extension of emergency disaster relief services and this provision in the bill. The only reason, Mr. President, there is a distinction being made is the President of the United States does not want to have to sign the bill with this in it because the President of the United States does not want to see legislation which would prevent his ability to shut down the Government.

Mr. President, in the Washington Post not long ago, a few days ago, there was a letter from Mr. ALBERT R. WYNN, who is a U.S. Representative to Congress representing a district in the State of Maryland, very close to here in the District of Columbia, it is a letter to the editor of the Washington Post.

While I recognize that The Post considers itself a national newspaper, as a U.S. Representative from the Washington region, I find portions of The Post's May 15 editorial

"Fooling Around in the House" very troubling.

I cosponsored the bipartisan "Government Shutdown Prevention Amendment" to the "Disaster Recovery Act of 1997." The amendment guarantees that the federal government will remain open and functioning at current funding levels if Congress and the administration cannot agree on the details of the Federal budget. Basically, this amendment provides a safety net for federal employees and the American taxpaying public, which expects its government to provide uninterrupted service. Given the devastating psychological and economic effect the last government shutdown had on our region, I am concerned that The Post considers such an amendment "fooling around."

The Post's assertion that this amendment "would change the balance of power between the elected branches" and that "the effect would be to lock in place a new norm in which an agency's appropriations would be frozen from year to year unless Congress acted to raise—or lower—it" is just plain wrong. The amendment clearly sunsets in 1998, and thus would affect only the appropriations bills now under consideration. . . .

Let me remind The Post of the effects of the last shutdown: The cost to the federal government was \$1.5 billion; 170,000 veterans did not receive December 1995 Montgomery GI Bill education benefits on time; more than 200,000 passport applications were not processed; pay for more than 750,000 federal employees was delayed; 7 million national parks visits were prevented; 2 million visits to historic museums were prevented; 5,200 small businesses did not receive guaranteed financing; 1,036 contract bid opportunities were lost for small businesses, and 30,000 FHA single-family home loans could not be insured.

For those who apparently think the Republicans are so humbled that they wouldn't shut the government down again, I would remind them that we never thought the government would shut down during the Christmas season 1995.

Thus, in the final analysis, I do not believe federal employees or taxpaying citizens think keeping the government open with a continuing resolution is "Fooling Around in the House."

Mr. President, I cannot say it any better. We have an obligation to provide for the needs of those who have suffered natural disasters. There is no one who sponsors this amendment who disagrees with that. And we want that money there as quickly as possible.

But I would allege, Mr. President, that when we ignore the possibility and fail to address the looming possibility of a manmade disaster which would be caused by the shutdown of the Federal Government, again, Mr. President, I cannot quite comprehend why we would not understand that we also have that obligation as well.

So I hope the President of the United States will change his mind. The Senator from Alaska, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, has said, and I have said, we would be willing to negotiate the details of this amendment. We would be more than happy to talk about satisfying some concerns as long as we preserve the basic principle of keeping the Government open.

So, Mr. President, I believe we are going to pass this bill. I believe it is going to the President with it included

in the bill. And I hope that the President of the United States will sign the bill, and then we would prevent again the disasters that we inflicted upon the American people during Christmas of 1995, for which not only did the American people suffer, but I have to tell you, in all candor, the reputation of the legislative branch of Government and the entire Federal Government, the governing body, suffered as well.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I reluctantly rise to oppose the supplemental appropriations bill currently before us.

But first, let me once gain take this opportunity to extend my deepest sympathies to those communities and families in the Upper Midwest who have had to deal with the loss and anguish caused by the terrible flooding several weeks ago.

I know all Marylanders join me in extending our thoughts and prayers to everyone in the Midwest.

Like many of my colleagues, I had hoped for a quick and speedy passage of this critically needed assistance to the disaster victims. I know they are counting on us to help them get back on their feet—to help them rebuild their homes and businesses.

I am therefore deeply troubled by the fact that what should have been a speedy, nonpartisan targeted relief bill has instead turned into yet another nasty partisan battle that is designed to divide us and provoke a veto from the President.

I have several major concerns with the supplemental, the first of which is the census sampling amendment that prohibits the Census Bureau from using funds to conduct statistical sampling in the year 2000 census. While to many this is a dry, academic topic, it impacts all Americans on a daily basis.

In addition to being the manner for determining representation in the Congress, the census has become the basis for which billions of dollars in Federal assistance are allocated. Programs such as low-energy assistance, community block development grants, and other vital programs to Maryland for transportation, housing, and education all rely on accurate census data.

This amendment does not follow the congressionally sought recommendation of this Nation's top statistical experts who advise using statistical sampling to get accurate data. Instead this provision would result in an undercount of many of the Nation's citizens. Especially hard hit would be those in rural areas and the inner city poor. That's wrong.

There is no reason to play games with the census, particularly when so many people's lives are at stake. Everybody counts in America, and everybody should be counted.

Mr. President, I am also very concerned by the continued inclusion in this disaster relief package of what has artfully been called the Shutdown Prevention Act.

Nobody knows the pain of a Government shutdown better than me and the Marylanders I represent. When the last shutdown occurred, numerous people from across my State felt the shock and dislocation of those events.

When I visited the Government agencies that had to remain open, I saw the frustration on the faces of the workers and the financial hardship it caused for all Federal employees.

Let there be no mistake, I do not want another shutdown and will do everything I can to prevent it. But this bill is not the answer.

Instead, this bill which provides for a permanent continuing resolution, is nothing more than a partisan exercise designed to hamstring Congress from exercising its constitutional role in the legislative process.

If we fail to enact our appropriations bills on time, the continuing resolution contained in this bill simply prevents Congress from increasing spending on such crucial items as cancer research, crime fighting, and education. It also hampers Congress in cutting unnecessary spending and eliminating waste.

Lastly, I am disappointed by the method we have chosen to pay for this bill. By taking over \$3 billion in unobligated funds from HUD's section 8 public housing program to pay for FEMA's disaster relief fund, we are simply robbing Peter to pay Paul.

We cannot keep on raiding this program to pay for disaster funding. We must find a new way to pay for emergency supplemental appropriations bills because these disasters are not going to end.

We could be facing even more expensive disasters in the near future. Are we going to continually rob one or two agencies to pay for these bills?

I believe we need a new system or a new arrangement to deal with these types of disasters—a new system that is off-budget.

Mr. President, because of the census sampling amendment, the continuing resolution, and the way in which we have chosen to pay for the bill, I am forced to oppose this bill.

It is my sincere hope that in the future we can avoid these partisan fights over disaster relief bills and find a more equitable way to pay for them.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I wanted to take a minute to express my deep satisfaction with the results produced by the conference on the emergency supplemental bill. The negotiations were complicated by how many issues were in play, but the chairman did a masterful job at methodically and successfully working through each and every item. Chairman STEVENS' patience and perseverance are why we are here today.

I want to take note of two sections of particular importance to me. First, the transportation chapter includes language which is essential to Kentucky. This legislation provides for a long overdue funding correction in Federal-aid highway funding. As a result of an

accounting error, Kentucky's highway funding in 1996 resulted in a loss of Federal funds. This bill will provide Kentucky with \$29.8 million to correct this funding shortfall. I am pleased to report that this level exceeds the \$12.6 million requested by the Governor to complete the William H. Natcher Bridge. I know the people of Daviess County and western Kentucky look to the completion of this bridge.

Second the foreign operations chapter in the House bill included language giving the President permission to waive earmarks for Ukraine which the Senate had included in last year's bill. This waiver authority was being offered in response to a deteriorating situation involving corruption and a slow down on crucial economic reforms. Congressman CALLAHAN and I have very different views on the need for earmarks, but we share a concern about the trends in Ukraine. We were able to craft a compromise which made clear we are not content with the pace or scope of reform by allowing the President to waive any earmark as it affects aid to the Government of Ukraine. The compromise exempted important projects such as nuclear safety and all activities carried out by the private sector and nongovernment organizations. Most importantly, we did not permit any reduction in the overall level of the aid we provided—the \$225 million stands intact. Should the administration choose to withhold or suspend funds for the government, they must reallocate the funds to other programs within Ukraine.

We have sent a clear and focused message to the government that reforms are essential if businesses are going to have the confidence to invest. But, we have narrowly crafted that message so that we do not damage our bilateral relationship or the support we provide to organizations committed to advancing both Ukrainian and American interests. Both Congressman CALLAHAN and I will review the progress made on this important issue when we take up the fiscal year 1998 bills in the coming weeks. I want to congratulate him on concentrating our attention on Ukraine's problem and working so effectively with me and my Senate colleagues to produce a compromise which we all hope will generate real results.

DIRECT OPERATING LOAN FUNDS FOR LOW-INCOME AND MINORITY FARMERS

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I want to mention another group of Americans who are suffering as Members of Congress continue to hold up the disaster relief supplemental appropriations bill and prevent us from passing a funding measure that the President can sign. That struggling group is our Nation's low-income farmers.

Back in April of this year, a group of farmers came to my office and described to me a crisis as real as the floods faced by Americans in the Upper Midwest. It is planting season and many States, including Virginia, have exhausted their total allocation of di-

rect operating loans. Direct operating loans are the funds made available by the U.S. Department of Agriculture to cover the costs of planting and repaid when crops are harvested. Without operating funds, the livelihoods of many farmers, mostly on small farms, are threatened.

The Operating Loan Program is especially important for minority farmers, many of whom have suffered from the well-documented discrimination within the Department of Agriculture. Discrimination has caused or contributed to the financial ruin of minority farmers nationwide and has resulted in bankruptcies and impoverished retirements. But as the number of black farmers in the United States has dwindled at three times the rate of other farmers nationwide—nearly to the point of extinction—a few farmers have managed to survive and keep their struggling farms afloat. USDA acknowledges that “having direct operating loan funds is critical for low-income minority farmers in their effort to become self-sustaining, successful, contributing members of rural communities.”

After speaking with Agriculture Secretary Dan Glickman and with the assistance of Senators COCHRAN, BUMPERS, STEVENS and BYRD, we were able to include an appropriation in the supplemental to provide \$100 million in direct operating loan funds to those low-income farmers who cannot obtain credit elsewhere. I believe these funds are as critical to serving the needs of small and limited-resource farmers as implementing the recommendations outlined in the Civil Rights Action Team report to remedy many of the long-standing problems plaguing the Department and eradicating, once and for all, the discrimination that has plagued the Department for decades.

Unfortunately for Virginia and the other Southern States, it is now June, and we have reached the tail end of the planting season. As we waste time disputing controversial provisions attached to a disaster relief funding bill, we've denied farmers access to loan assistance and prevented the farmers who have survived decades of discrimination the money needed to get their crops in the ground and to keep their farms afloat.

Mr. President, I find this situation frustrating, but my frustration must pale in comparison to the low-income and minority farmers who have struggled and, thus far, have managed to survive this manmade disaster. Again I want to thank my colleagues who are interested in helping our Nation's farmers and helped add my language to the supplemental. But, I ask my colleagues who are keeping this desperately needed money out of the field and out of the hands of our Nation's farmers to stop playing politics and let us pass a bill that the President is willing to sign.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, let me say, as I did when this legislation originally

came before the Senate a month ago, that I fully support the disaster relief that is being provided here. My heart goes not to the families that have lost their homes, their businesses, and their schools in the recent floods and snows. We have all seen the devastation on the evening news, in the newspapers. It is tragic, and we owe it to the people in the Midwest and elsewhere to put the full resources of the Federal Government behind the relief effort to help them get on their feet as soon as possible and restore some sense of normality to their lives.

Mr. President, the relief in this bill is urgently needed. So are the provisions that would prevent another shutdown of the Federal Government this fall. It seems to me that we are taking the very responsible step of acting now to prevent another shutdown of the Government—something President Clinton says he, too, wants to prevent. Yet the President is threatening to veto the disaster relief, of all things, on account of the antishutdown provisions.

Why would a President who says he opposes Government shutdowns threaten to veto a bill that would prevent Government shutdowns?

I will tell you why. Recognizing how anxious Members of Congress were about being perceived as responsible for another Government shutdown last fall—recognizing that Congress would do just about anything to avoid another shutdown—the President was able to demand and win an additional \$6.5 billion for his favorite programs. Majorities in the House and Senate went along. I did not. The threat of a shutdown proved to be a valuable part of the President's arsenal then, and it will be again unless we put a mechanism in place to keep the Government open while we continue to negotiate acceptable spending levels.

There are other good things in this bill as well, including provisions to extend the expiration date of the San Carlos Apache Tribe Water Rights Settlement Act of 1992, and to ratify the agreement between the tribe, Phelps Dodge Corp., and the Secretary of the Interior for long-term water use.

Yet, Mr. President, I find myself in the position of having to vote against this bill for the very same reason I did when it first came before this body last month: it is yet another in a long line of spending bills that merely add to the deficit. It is business as usual, and it comes at a time when we supposedly have reached agreement on a plan to eliminate deficits by the year 2002.

It would be one thing if there were no other way to get aid to the flood victims except to borrow. But it is quite another thing when we ignore other options in order to keep spending on other programs.

The Senator from Texas, Senator GRAMM, offered an amendment that would have reduced spending across the board by a grand total of 1.9 percent. One point nine percent. That is less than 2 cents on the dollar in other programs to pay for this disaster relief

and other spending. That is all it would have taken, yet there were only 38 of us in the Senate who voted for that amendment.

Later today, we will be asked to vote on the so-called balanced budget agreement that our leadership struck with the White House. The ink on the budget agreement is not even dry. Yet the supplemental appropriations bill we are about to vote on would add \$6.6 billion to the deficit over the next few years. It busts the budget agreement before the final vote is even taken.

What does that say about the budget agreement, which does not even begin to reduce the deficit until the year 2001? Consider the deficits that are projected under that plan. The deficit this year is expected to total \$67 billion. We are trying to get to a zero deficit—to balance—by the year 2002. But under the budget agreement, the deficit goes up, not down. It climbs 34 percent—to \$90 billion next year—and then remains in that range for 2 more years. Only in the final 2 years of the 5-year plan—in 2001 and 2002—would the deficit drop dramatically.

If anyone thinks that we are really going to be able to eliminate a \$90 billion deficit in those final 2 years—when we cannot even find a way to pay for less than \$7 billion in disaster relief in the bill before us today—they are mistaken.

Mr. President, we all know that disasters can and will occur on a regular basis. Unfortunately, they will happen—floods, hurricanes, earthquakes, and the like. We know it, and we should plan for it.

The Appropriations Committee acknowledged in its own report that the number of major disaster declarations in the 1992–1996 period has increased 54 percent. In other words, we had ample warning that something would occur somewhere.

Had we prepared for the need for disaster assistance last fall, instead of using every extra dollar to meet President Clinton's demands for new spending, we would already have been able to respond to the emergency in the Midwest and elsewhere around the country. But by ignoring the potential for disasters last fall, we merely paved the way for adding to the deficit now when the need for relief takes precedence over budget concerns.

Mr. President, this bill is more expensive than when it left the Senate a month ago. It is still not paid for. It busts the budget agreement that we will vote on this evening. We can and we must do better.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I want to voice my very strong objections to the 2000 census language in this bill. It bans the use of sampling—and any other statistical technique—to count the American population for purposes of apportionment. It's unfair—it will cost the American tax payers about a billion dollars—it's political—it just doesn't make sense.

Let's talk about fairness. Without sampling, the Census bureau tells us

that the 2000 census may be about as accurate as the 1990 census. That's the best case scenario. But in 1990, the census missed 10 million people. It counted 6 million people twice. And it counted another 10 or 20 million people in the wrong place—maybe even in the wrong congressional district. Is that our idea of fairness? Is that our idea of "one man, one vote?"

And many of the people undercounted in the last census are poor. Many of them belong to ethnic and racial minorities. We excluded some of America's most vulnerable people from the democratic process. Is that our idea of fairness? Of course not. But that's the kind of census we will have if this language passes into law.

Let's talk about cost. The Census Bureau tells us that a non-sampling census could cost almost a billion dollars more than a non-sampling census. Much of that additional cost will go toward various efforts that the Bureau knows will have only marginal pay-off. But if the Bureau can't sample, it will have to make every effort—even marginally effective efforts—to count people the traditional way. Without sampling, we're talking about a higher cost census to deliver a less accurate population count. Is that a responsible use of tax payer dollars? Does that make sense at the precise moment in time when both Congress and the American people are committed to the painful process of balancing the budget?

And let's talk about common sense. Statistical sampling is a rigorous, reliable, scientific tool. You can't find a statistician who disagrees with that. That view is supported by GAO, the Commerce inspector general, the National Academy of Sciences, and a host of professional organizations.

The Bureau has been using statistical sampling in the decennial census for decades. The census long form—which goes to only one in six households—is a perfect example of a kind of sampling that is widely accepted. Virtually every arm of Government—Federal, State, and local—uses long-form data for enforcement of laws like the Voting Rights Act and for tailoring programs to the cultural diversity of our population. And we are not plagued with law suits challenging the reliability of this data because it is based on sampling.

Ironically, the language in this bill would allow continued use of sampling for the long-form. In fact, it allows sampling for every purpose except that most important one—counting the American people for purposes of apportionment. On the one hand, it acknowledges that sampling is valid and valuable—a scientific tool. But on the other hand, it denies us the use of that tool just where it would be most valuable. That makes no sense at all.

Finally, despite what I read in the newspapers, I have seen no data whatsoever validating the apparent political assumption that an accurate census means fewer House seats for Repub-

licans. It is true—as I have already stated—that many of the undercounted people are poor or members of minority groups. But other groups are undercounted, too. We undercount people in rural areas—that's a third of the 1990 undercount—and many of those areas are Republican strongholds. We undercount people who are renters rather than homeowners, and statisticians tell us that disadvantages the Sun Belt States—where Republicans are also strong. Just last week the 2000 Census Advisory Committee discussed the politics of the undercount. That committee consists of census and population experts representing the statistical community, every level of Government, and every large minority group. The committee was unable to determine who would be the political winners and losers in an accurate census.

This isn't about Democrats versus Republicans. We undercount people of every race, gender, age, State, and political persuasion. The real winners and losers in the sampling debate are the American people. Our system of Government guarantees equal representation for all Americans—regardless of race, ethnicity or economic circumstances—whether they live in the country or the city—whether they own their homes or rent them. That should be our goal—our only goal—in planning the 2000 census.

In my home State of Ohio, we had a slight overcount in 1990. But I don't fear the political consequences of an accurate census. My commitment is to the fundamental principles of America's system of Government. And I'm confident that the citizens of Ohio feel the same way. Give us a fair, accurate census, and let the political chips fall where they may.

I know full well that the Census Bureau's plan to use sampling is highly controversial. I have some reservations about it myself. Some people say that sampling doesn't meet the constitutional requirement for an "actual enumeration." Some say that sampling is inherently subjective because it is based on statistical assumptions. These are questions that must be resolved.

On the constitutional issue, however, the Governmental Affairs Committee recently heard testimony from a panel of attorneys who are not friends of sampling. The panel included Wisconsin's Attorney General James Doyle. He led the charge against sampling in 1990 because statistical adjustment of that census would have given California an additional House seat at Wisconsin's expense. We also heard from Stuart Gerson, the Assistant Attorney General who advised the Bush administration not to adjust the 1990 census. Both testified that the constitutional requirement for an "actual enumeration" doesn't require a headcount. What it requires—what the Framers intended—is the most accurate census possible. That's what we should be aiming for. And those who tell us that

sampling is inherently unconstitutional are trying to scare us into a census process that doesn't meet the Framers' goal.

What's critical right now is for census to continue its planning process—continue to appear before congressional committees—as it is doing before the Governmental Affairs Committee—and continue to explain its plans. Most importantly, the Bureau must test the proposed census plan in the 1998 dress rehearsal. Only after this process is complete will we know whether sampling will yield a better census—a census that includes every American. The census language in this bill would make that impossible.

My heart goes out to all the Americans who are counting on us for the disaster relief this bill will provide. I want to give them that relief. It is extremely regrettable that in our legislative process this has also become a bill that jeopardizes the most fundamental principle of our Democratic society—every American's right to equal representation. If the census language in this bill passes Congress today, it will add to the other reasons that may persuade the President to veto the bill—and send it right back to us. Then perhaps we can get on with the job of providing relief to the thousands of people who are counting on us, and let the Census Bureau get on with planning the best decennial census in American history.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I reluctantly rise to oppose this conference report. Regrettably, the majority has decided to play politics with the lives of disaster victims. This is a tragedy.

Mr. President, I don't have a particular dog in this fight. My State has been fortunate to be free of disasters recently. But it pains me to look at television footage of homeless people in the Dakotas and Minnesota and know that they are not getting all needed assistance because of two unrelated political riders to this legislation.

Mr. President, I oppose this conference report because it includes the so-called automatic CR. I want to be clear with my colleagues—this provision violates the bipartisan budget agreement. Let me repeat this, the automatic CR violates the bipartisan budget agreement.

It violates the budget agreement for two reasons:

First, it would lower the total amount of discretionary spending available for fiscal year 1998. The budget agreement calls for \$527 billion in discretionary spending for fiscal year 1998, which is a \$17 billion increase over last year's level. If the automatic CR is enacted, the majority could refuse to pass the 13 appropriations bills and they would succeed in a \$17 billion cut in discretionary spending. This would violate one of the basic Democratic accomplishments in the budget agreement.

Second, the automatic CR would make deep cuts in programs that are

protected in the bipartisan budget agreement. The bipartisan negotiators agreed to provide large increases in 13 major discretionary programs.

Examples of these programs include: Elementary and secondary education improvement, Pell grants, child literacy, Head Start, national parks, job training, the Clean Water Act, Superfund, and the COPS Program.

Mr. President, the automatic CR would freeze these programs at last year's levels. Therefore, these programs would not get the increases promised in the bipartisan budget agreement if Congress did not pass certain appropriations bills.

Mr. President, as ranking member of the Budget Committee, I am concerned that the majority is violating the bipartisan budget agreement before the ink is dry.

First, they include this automatic CR that cuts overall discretionary spending and specific programs that were protected by the bipartisan budget agreement. Second, a House Ways and Means Subcommittee has approved welfare provisions that are in direct violation of the terms of the bipartisan budget agreement.

This is a disturbing trend. If we are to maintain bipartisan cooperation in the coming weeks, the majority will need to drop their efforts to move legislation that directly violates the bipartisan budget agreement, like the automatic CR.

Mr. President, I also oppose the census provision in the supplemental bill. This is not a provision based upon statistical science, it is a provision based upon politics. It is the latest attempt by the Republican National Committee to try to increase its political fortunes in the next century.

My Republican colleagues, at the request of the RNC, have proposed to throw hundreds of millions more at the 2000 census. This additional money, we have been told by the National Academy of Sciences, will not make the census any more accurate, just more expensive. The Census Bureau estimates that spending up to \$800 million more than planned would reduce the undercount only marginally.

This provision does not belong in a disaster relief bill and it should be stripped out and sent back to the Governmental Affairs Committee for further consideration.

Mr. President, I hope that the President will immediately veto this bill and that the majority will then pass a clean disaster relief bill so that people suffering all over this country will be able to begin the process of rebuilding their lives and communities.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I sincerely regret that the bill before us today is not the one which will get relief to the flood victims of the Upper Midwest. Why, because it is laden with extraneous, highly political provisions which the President has told us for months that he could not and would not sign.

What are those provisions? The first is an automatic continuing resolution

which, if enacted, would put the Government on automatic pilot if Congress is unable to complete its work on appropriations bills by the end of the fiscal year. While that may sound like a good idea, it is not. It would serve as a disincentive for Congress to complete their work in a timely fashion, and it would remove any leverage the President would have on appropriations bills not enacted by the end of the fiscal year.

The second extraneous provision prohibits the Bureau of the Census from using statistical sampling in preparing the 2000 census. Never mind that statistical sampling was proposed by the National Academy of Sciences after a lengthy study as the best way to ensure an accurate count. There is no question that this attempt to prohibit such sampling is politically motivated. While I oppose both provisions on their merits, neither, in any case, belongs on an emergency disaster appropriations bill.

The sole purpose of the bill before us today is to try to embarrass the President, not to help disaster victims. This is a sad day in the annals of congressional history. It is political one-upmanship at its worst. It is not about helping the people we were elected to serve. It is not about helping thousands of people in Grand Forks who are trying to rebuild their homes and their lives. It is about raw politics, pure and simple. Never, to my knowledge, has a disaster bill been held up for purely political, partisan advantage. That is what we are doing today, and that is just plain wrong.

A group of business and political leaders from Grand Forks were in Washington yesterday, including Mayor Pat Owens. They were here to meet with officials of the various agencies that will receive emergency funds in this bill. Our officials were discussing how the money contained in this measure could help their devastated community. A couple of them sat in on the appropriations conference. They were appalled at what they saw and heard. They heard about the census, the Ukraine, Uruguay, a continuing resolution, but they heard almost nothing about disaster funds. The people of Grand Forks are in dire straights. Their needs are urgent. Their lives are on hold, yet their problems were barely discussed in the conference.

We North Dakotans are a strong, proud, and resolute people. We will face the challenges ahead with courage and commitment. But with damages expected to be in the billions, we can not fully recover without the Federal help provided in this bill. As I stated earlier today, I am enormously grateful for all the resources provided in this bill to help our disaster stricken region. I am particularly grateful to Senators STEVENS and BYRD who were extremely helpful and supportive throughout

every step of the process. Without their personal intervention and continuous support, many items and millions of dollars would not be in the bill we have before us today.

I want to thank their staffs as well—Steve Cortese and Jim English—who gave me wise advice and counsel on my maiden voyage as a member of the Committee on Appropriations. On behalf of all the people of North Dakota, I want to thank them as well as all the members of the committee for their understanding and their generous assistance. I hope that by next week, we will be able to deliver the resources promised in this bill.

Let me just list a few of the items in the bill that will have a direct bearing on our ability to recover, and for which there is currently no money available in the pipeline:

\$500 million in community development block grants. This is the most flexible funding and the most crucial component to allow for buyouts. While all disaster States are eligible for this assistance, we anticipate that the majority will go to the Dakotas and Minnesota;

\$50 million for a new Livestock Indemnity Program which will help North Dakota farmers and ranchers who have lost close to 125,000 head of livestock;

\$15 million in Department of Agriculture funds to purchase floodplain easements to reduce hazards to life and property due to the floods;

\$5 million for the Interest Assistance Program to provide additional funding for guaranteed, low-interest loans to farmers;

\$20 million to reimburse school districts who have had to educate additional children who were dislocated by the floods;

\$5 million for all preconstruction and design work for an outlet from Devils Lake to the Sheyenne River;

\$27.9 million in Corps of Engineers funding for North Dakota from the Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies Program;

\$600,000 for Ramsey County to mitigate damages to the sewer system from flooding, if necessary;

Up to \$20 million for the Corps of Engineers to raise the levees at Devils Lake;

\$210,000 for North Dakota's National Parks;

\$3.9 million for the BIA in North Dakota;

\$265,000 for the Indian Health Service in North Dakota;

\$6.1 million for North Dakota to repair damaged freight rail lines;

\$9.3 million to the Fish and Wildlife Service in North Dakota;

\$840,000 for the U.S. Geological Survey in North Dakota;

Department of Education waiver authority language which will permit the Department to help students having difficulty meeting application and other statutory deadlines regarding Federal education funds; and

Language that allows disaster States greater flexibility in using child care and development block grant funds to help families in nonemployment-related activities relating to the cleanup and recovery.

My purpose in providing this list is to illustrate the urgent need to pass a bill the President can sign. Those who argue that there is plenty of money in the pipeline to respond to our needs are just plain wrong, as the list above so aptly demonstrates. None of funds listed above will be available until the President signs a disaster bill.

There are many people beyond the Congress to thank for their support in the wake of a series of historic and devastating disasters in North Dakota. Above all, I want to thank the people of North Dakota who, despite their losses, have refused to be overcome. They have displayed a remarkable sense of courage, caring, and conviction throughout the ordeal. Never have I been more proud to represent the State of North Dakota than I am now. They are wonderful people. They know the meaning of neighbor. Whenever and wherever they were able, they extended a hand to those less fortunate.

The great spirit of our people is embodied in the mayor of Grand Forks, Pat Owens. While small in stature, she has the heart of a giant. She gave us the courage not to lose courage. Her indomitable spirit held the citizens of Grand Forks together during the worst days of the tragedy, and now is guiding us patiently and compassionately through the recovery.

Finally, I want to thank all the Federal agencies for their long hours and hard work in bringing emergency assistance to relieve the immediate suffering of our citizens. They have done a magnificent job under extremely trying circumstances, and we are grateful for their superhuman efforts. James Lee Witt, the Director of FEMA, has been the guiding light in this endeavor. He came to North Dakota and personally witnessed the devastation, and then rushed personnel and resources into the State to assess damages and provide emergency assistance. He has also coordinated the activities of other Federal agencies in trying to get assistance to those in need as quickly as possible. That process is ongoing, and James Lee remains the stalwart in that endeavor. We thank him for all he has done and continues to do.

I intend to support this bill even though I know it is headed for a veto because of the extraneous provisions contained in it. I am voting for it to keep faith with my constituents, and to give them hope that a very similar bill, absent the political riders, will be passed next week. That bill will provide us with the helping hand we need to rebuild our communities, reunite our families and restore our economic base. We will face the challenge ahead with courage and commitment. With our prairie faith to guide us, we will rebuild, we will recover, and we will be a stronger community.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska has 36 minutes, and the Senator from West Virginia has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. FORD. And it be charged to the majority.

Mr. STEVENS. We will take it off our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I want to add my comments to those already expressed about how important it is that this legislation be passed, that it be acted upon rapidly, that people understand the extraordinary emergency that we are experiencing, that money is not adequately found in the pipeline today to meet all of the contingencies that are currently affecting communities all through the Midwest.

A delay by any other means will send exactly the wrong message to so many people who are waiting for us to act. We know that the legislation in its current form will be vetoed. It is a very dark day in the Senate, and, in my view, it is an extraordinarily unfortunate set of circumstances that today when we have an opportunity to send the right message to all the people who have contacted us, when we have an opportunity to say we do understand, we find many of our colleagues pushing a political agenda that has nothing to do with this legislation at all.

Mr. President, I would hope that the Senate would not adjourn until we find a bill signed by the President. I would hope that once this bill is vetoed, we will move a clean bill immediately, send it back to the President immediately, that we will not allow that veto to be any cause for delay in responding as comprehensively as we know how to respond to the needs we find across this country.

The balanced budget agreement we all voted on just 2 weeks ago makes a continuing resolution virtually unnecessary. We do not need to have a continuing resolution given the fact that we are working now in good faith on both sides of the aisle to resolve what remaining problems there may be with regard to budgetary policy. And I have every expectation we will be able to pass these appropriations bills and we will pass the reconciliation bill along the lines of the agreement that we have just voted on.

We know that there are contentious issues that have to be addressed outside the budget itself. The census sampling question is one that understandably is controversial. But I must say,

the National Academy of Sciences was charged with the responsibility of coming up with a way with which to improve upon the accuracy of the census.

We know that, because of methods used in 1990 by the Bureau of the Census, we were not even as accurate in 1990 as we were in 1980. And as we examine all the other possibilities for attaining a greater degree of accuracy, the one that is universally accepted is the one subscribed to and incorporated in the policy that is the subject of this controversy right now.

This is not something dreamed up by a Democratic or a Republican administration. This is something calculated to be the most accurate response by the National Academy of Sciences. But regardless of how one may view that particular issue, it ought not be in a bill to address the disasters that we face across this country.

There are many, many needs that are unmet. We received letters from communities across South Dakota, across North Dakota. Every one of them has made it very clear that the immediate passage of this supplemental is crucial to their economic viability. No contracts can be awarded to repair the sewer system in Watertown, SD, until this bill is passed.

I have a letter from the mayor of Watertown, who has asserted once more the extraordinary difficulties that she, as mayor, is facing. I will just read a couple of passages.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF WATERTOWN,
Watertown, SD, June 3, 1997.

Senator TOM DASCHLE,
Hart Senate Office Bldg.,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DASCHLE: I appreciate the opportunity to provide information which underscores the need for the immediate passage of the Supplemental Disaster Relief Appropriation bill.

On April 4th, the City of Watertown, a City of approximately 20,000 residents suffered a 500 year flood event which was fought by City, County and State resources in the midst of a 60 mph blizzard in subfreezing temperatures. Flood waters froze and remained for 4-5 weeks. Over 4,000 residents were evacuated during the flood and storm. Approximately seven hundred and fifty homes were left without sewer and water for over four weeks. The sanitary and storm sewer systems were inundated and our wastewater treatment facility which was designed to treat 3.5 million gallons of sewage per day was flooded by over 18 million gallons per day.

Substantial damage was done to the sewer and infrastructure system. Many homes were severely damaged by water and ice. A substantial number of residents remain displaced today.

Both FEMA and SBA, along with Red Cross and the Salvation Army were enormously helpful in meeting the emergency needs of the affected residents and continue to assist to this day; however, without the Supplemental Appropriations bill, it is impossible to begin to fully recover.

As a City, it now becomes our responsibility to prioritize needs, both short term and long term. As we proceed to do so, it is incredibly difficult to make firm plans without the commitment of Federal emergency dollars. Certain emergency projects, which have not been budgeted, must now be done to protect the community from experiencing further damage: the capping of storm sewer pipes from the river to prevent the re-flooding of an entire quadrant of the City; significant sections of sewer must be repaired to prevent the system from being flooded by extremely high groundwater levels, streets must be patched or repaired due to extensive water damage and shorelines along the lake area must be reinforced to stop the ongoing damage due to high water and wave action. No contracts can be awarded without confirmed sources of revenue for projects which the City cannot accommodate due to lack of dollars. In addition, South Dakota construction seasons are very short. Without immediate passage of the Supplemental bill, Watertown will be unable to make many necessary repairs during the current construction season.

Mitigation issues, both short term and long term are dependent on immediate Federal assistance: flood control projects cannot be accurately assessed without the consideration of the buy-out program which serves to relocate businesses and residences out of the flood plain. The degree to which buy-outs or flood prevention structures are necessary cannot be determined without the knowledge of available assistance levels. Residents whose homes would be excellent candidates for buy-outs are in limbo, unable to make decisions about reconstruction or completing the recovery process because the City is unable to negotiate unless firm funding commitments have been made. And, in fact, the result of delayed passage of the Supplemental bill may be that the City is forced to eventually pay more for homes which were repaired in the meantime.

CDBG funds are incredibly important to the States and Cities because they are flexible funds, allowing dollars to be delivered to priority projects in a timely manner. Leveraged with local and EDA funds, communities can get the most for the dollars being spent. No community or State is prepared for the immediate incredible costs of additional staffing needs, mitigation planning and project costs resulting from such devastating, unexpected occurrences. Immediate dollars for planning and technical assistance are critical to our recovery.

In the case of northeast South Dakota, communities such as Watertown continue to be threatened by record high water tables, aquifers and saturated watersheds which bleed into one another increasing the likelihood that flooding will continue to be a problem. Unless necessary measures can be undertaken to reduce our exposure to future floods now, future costs will continue to mount . . . Immediate and future mitigation needs require dollars for both local and State governments working as partners to solve problems as quickly as possible.

Watertown's economy will be enormously impacted by the devastating floods of 1997. Our very livelihood centers around the agricultural community for 100 miles in all directions. With many of the roads under water, travel to patronize our businesses is severely impacted. Without immediate assistance for animals killed during the disastrous winter and historic floods, herds will not be revitalized, profits will plunge and dollars for commerce will be few. Fields unable to be planted will equate into diminished dollars long term for businesses on main street. The very economy of Watertown and many affected rural towns like it, are

dependent upon the immediate response of Congress. We are so grateful for the generosity and assistance provided to us from throughout the United States. We are now in need of dollars to rebuild for the future. The very well-being and livelihood of thousands of affected disaster victims in the upper mid-west cries out for assistance in picking up the pieces of their lives and rebuilding the affected areas of their communities.

In closing, Senator Daschle, I would remind members of Congress that the bottom line in all of this is people. As I have stated before, Watertown is determined to recover and become stronger than ever. The incredible community spirit I have witnessed throughout these very difficult days has been nothing short of inspiring. We simply ask that the Supplemental Appropriations bill be passed as soon as possible to enable our community and others to recover and to heal.

Sincerely,

BRENDA S. BARGER,
Mayor.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, it is addressed to me. It says:

[I want to underscore] . . . the need for the immediate passage of the Supplemental Disaster Relief Appropriations Bill . . .

As a city, it now becomes our responsibility to prioritize needs, both short term and long term. As we proceed to do so, it is incredibly difficult to make firm plans without the commitment of Federal emergency dollars. No contracts can be awarded without confirmed sources of revenue for projects which the City cannot accommodate due to lack of dollars. . . .

Watertown's economy will be enormously impacted by the devastating floods of 1997. Our very livelihood centers around the agricultural community for 100 miles in all directions. . . . Without immediate assistance for animals killed during the disastrous winter and historic floods, herds will not be revitalized, profits will plunge and dollars for commerce will be few. Fields unable to be planted will equate into diminished dollars long term for businesses on main street. The very economy of Watertown and many affected rural towns like it, are dependent upon the immediate response of Congress.

Mr. President, I do not think you can say it any clearer than that. These people need help. They need it now. They do not understand all these complicated, misguided and extraordinarily problematic extraneous matters added to this legislation at the worst possible time. It is not just mayors, it is not just the people living in most of our communities in eastern South Dakota, North Dakota and Minnesota that are struggling. Farmers and ranchers have also expressed themselves in a myriad of ways.

Mr. President, 350,000 livestock in South Dakota alone were lost in the storms and flood—350,000. We have never had an experience of that magnitude in my lifetime. We have \$145 million in livestock losses alone. Not one dime has been provided or can be provided to indemnify producers for livestock losses until this bill passes. There is no possibility of providing any meaningful relief to livestock producers anywhere in the country until this legislation passes.

Mr. President, I have received so many remarkable letters from people all over South Dakota. I want to read

excerpts of one, and I ask unanimous consent the entire letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 14, 1997.

Senator TOM DASCHLE,
Hart Office Bldg.,
Washington, DC.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN: We live in the far North West corner of South Dakota. We have had a devastating winter to say the least. This last storm just added a finishing flair to the proverbial cake. When the winds finally died, we went to check our cattle. We had bedded heavily and created the best protection we could for them.

We found a horrifying sight; the cows looked as if they were walking snowballs. They had suffocated from ice covering their nostrils. As we went along we found dead calves scattered and tromped into the earth. Some stood like statues froze over with snow, blinded by the same. Our hearts ached, we spent the day dragging in cold calves that were trying their best to hold onto life. We saved what we could, others just gave up hope, as are we.

Our daughter who is eighteen, had never seen such a heinous sight. It is seven days past since the storm. We are still losing calves from the effects. Our greatest fear is not only financially, but that our daughter is tremendously stressed, as well as we. There is no greater pain than watching a child agonize.

As we heard of losses through the community our hearts were further pained. All have lost livestock, all are in pain. Some losses have been such as extreme ones we wonder how any human can live through it. Some are not or have chosen not to.

We implore you to please send some relief our way. A 70/30 deal is to no benefit if you can't afford the 70. We have lost 12 cows and approximately 30 calves. We know people that have lost 100 head to 150 head so we feel fortunate.

Ironically this loss could financially devastate us, so far this winter has costed us \$82,000 more than usual. Yet we feel fortunate it isn't more. We also feel fortunate to still have each other and God to hold us up.

PLEASE.....S.O.S.!!

Sincerely,

NOLAN L. SEIM,
Shadehill, SD.

Mr. DASCHLE. The letter is from Nolan Seim:

To whom it may concern,

We live in the far North West corner of South Dakota. We have had a devastating winter to say the least. This last storm just adding a finishing flair to the proverbial cake. When the winds finally died, we went to check our cattle. . . .

We found a horrifying sight; the cows looked as if they were walking snowballs. They had suffocated from ice covering their nostrils. As we went along we found dead calves scattered and tromped into the earth. Some stood like statues froze over with snow, blinded by the same. Our hearts ached, we spent the day dragging in cold calves that were trying their best to hold on to life. We saved what we could, others just gave up hope, as are we. . . .

We implore you to please send some relief our way.

Mr. STEVENS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DASCHLE. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. STEVENS. My question to the leader is I hope he realizes this is new

law. Never before in the history of the United States have we assisted people who lost cattle during a disaster. So we are making new law. It is not just an appropriation. It is an authorization bill, too.

I accept what the Senator says. It would be nice to get the bill passed, but I want the Senate to know that we took it upon ourselves to not only appropriate money but to change the law so that disaster aid would be available to people who lost cattle. I understand this is a bad disaster, but there have been many disasters where people have lost cattle before and they received no aid.

Mr. DASCHLE. If I could respond to the distinguished chairman. He has done an outstanding job, and I appreciate his responsiveness to this particular need. We have had other disasters where cattle were detrimentally affected, and ranchers have been compensated for livestock, but they have never been compensated, as he has indicated, for losses as a result of floods or winter snowstorms.

But we have clearly set precedent with regard to the reimbursement of ranchers, and, in fact, that happened in 1992. This legislation is modeled after that particular legislation, and I appreciate greatly his support and the effort he has made to respond to this circumstance as Congress has responded to situations in the past involving livestock.

Mr. President, it is not just livestock producers, it is not just communities. People in South Dakota and across the Midwest have been hit across the board in a number of different ways. It has been the coldest winter on record, we have had the most severe blizzards in our history, a 500-year flood, and there were only 2 days in 1997 when a Presidential disaster was not in effect for South Dakota. The winter storms produced winds chills of 90-degrees-below-zero and 70-mile-an-hour winds, 13,000 miles of road were impassable, and lives and livelihoods were threatened in ways we have never seen before.

My point in reminding all of my colleagues about this loss, Mr. President, is simply this: There is no patience left out there. They have endured the winter. They have endured the floods. They have endured this long, deliberative process about how we respond in the most effective way to all the problems we have across the country in emergencies and disasters where declarations have been made, but they do not understand this. They do not understand how anyone can take a bill this important and use it for vehicles that have nothing to do with the disaster, nothing to do with an emergency, nothing to do with responding as effectively as we possibly can, given the circumstances that they have had.

I do not understand it either, Mr. President, and I just hope that we can collectively respond as soon as the veto is made in a way that will give them more hope and less frustration, more

belief in what we as Republicans and Democrats can do to respond more effectively than we are this afternoon. We have to get rid of the extraordinary cynicism that comes so often when people in the country affected by these circumstances watch what we do. We cannot effectively deal with that cynicism so long as cynical uses are made of legislation this important.

So, again, let me thank the chairman for his best effort in trying to resolve any of these difficulties. Let me thank the ranking member. Senator BYRD has been extremely responsive and cooperative in all ways, as he is in so many instances. I thank the Members for their efforts.

I must say, this is a disaster in and of itself. For us not to be able to respond, for us not to resolve these matters, for us to know that this bill will be vetoed, and do it anyway, is inexcusable and inexplicable. I just hope we can find a way to resolve these matters this week and decide in a mutual fashion that we will get a new bill that will be signed by the President in the shortest possible time.

I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I appreciate the kind words that the Democratic leader has made here on the floor. My response to him would be that no President in the history of the United States has closed down the Government like President Clinton did. There are hundreds of thousands of people who were put in a position of being told to stay home, they could not go to work. When they did not go to work, facilities all over this country were closed. People were told they could not get their veterans checks, they could not get any assistance from the Social Security Administration. They were totally closed down.

Now, to use the first vehicle available to us in the appropriations process to try to prevent that, I do not think is a cynical act. I am sorry that he used that word with regard to this provision. It is a legitimate difference of opinion with the administration and with the minority, but I do not believe we are being cynical in trying to protect the people of the United States from another shutdown, which I foresee is going to happen unless we find some way to come to an agreement with this President about the misuse of the Presidential power to shut down the Government when we were not out of money, by the way. We were not out of money. There were funds that could have been used to keep the office open.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, let me respond very briefly, and I know there are Senators who are seeking recognition. We will differ as to who it was that shut the Government down. I think many of those in the Republican leadership have already admitted themselves that they hold the larger share of the responsibility.

The question is, do we need this vehicle, this bill, as the only means by

which we can resolve that problem in the future? That, in my view, is the cynical part of this. We know we can resolve it. We know we can find a way with which to deal with shutdowns in Government. We know that we can find other ways to resolve our differences. But to use this must-pass piece of legislation to do it, in my view, is wrong. A lot of our colleagues know it is wrong, and I just hope we can put those issues aside and deal with them at another time and get this legislation passed the way it should be passed.

I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. I yield the remaining time to the Senators from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator HUTCHISON.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. What is the remaining time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty minutes, twenty-one seconds.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I will speak for 5 minutes, and then I will yield the floor to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. President, I would like to speak on two issues that were brought up by the Senator, the distinguished minority leader, and also others on the floor, and that is, we keep hearing, "Send the President a bill he can sign." Mr. President, we are sending the President a bill that he can sign.

It is like we have a responsibility in Congress just to please the President. Mr. President, I think this is a two-way street. Pennsylvania Avenue runs two ways.

It is well settled in American law that there is a Congress that passes laws and a President who signs or vetoes those laws. So it is not, "Send the President a bill he can sign." We are sending the President a bill he can sign. We are sending the President a bill that he has asked for, to replenish the FEMA funding. The people of North Dakota and South Dakota and Minnesota are getting the help they need—and they should, and we want them to—and we are going to replenish those funds.

In addition, we are providing the notice and the process to not only the people who work for Government, the people who depend on it, about what is going to happen, what process are we going to use for appropriations bills so they can plan, so they will know that the veterans checks will be there, so they will know, if they plan their family vacation on October 2, that they will be able to get into the Grand Canyon, so that if they have a problem with a passport, they will know that there is not an artificial disruption of Government on October 1 because the President and Congress have not agreed. What better time to provide that process than right now in the first appropriations bill of this year?

Mr. President, we are sending the President of the United States a bill that he can sign to replenish the FEMA funding, and we are acting in a most responsible way so that the veterans of this country will never again have to

worry if their check is going to be there on time, so that the very disaster victims that we are trying to assure have coverage will never have to worry that the check is going to get there on time because they will never have to worry that Government might shut down if Congress and the President have not agreed to one or two appropriations bills by the September 30 deadline. We want Congress and the President to have a level playing field, to negotiate in good faith, as Congresses and Presidents have done for years in this country.

The second issue I want to talk about is why we have to do these things in this bill, why we can't do it in a separate bill, as the distinguished minority leader has asked that we do? It is because there is urgency. There is urgency in determining how we are going to do the processes of Government, whether it is census, whether it is just the functions of Government. There is an urgency that we set that process right now. So, Mr. President, when we hear all of the talk about sending the President a clean bill, we are sending the President a clean bill. We are sending the President a bill that provides for the funding for our armed services, to replenish their accounts; we are sending the President the replenishing of the Federal Emergency Management Account; we are providing for the people who are in need as we speak, and we are making sure that there is not a disruption today, nor on October 1 or 2 of this year, because we are providing for the orderly transition of Government from fiscal year to fiscal year.

Mr. President, when you hear all of the horror stories about this bill not being clean, having political overtones, we need to set the record straight. The President can sign the bill that we are sending him, or he can tell us what he doesn't like about it and negotiate in good faith. But to tell the American people that any victim of a disaster is not getting funding, especially when he has not even made a decision yet to declare the victims of a tornado in Texas last week a disaster so that they will know the funding is coming, I think is a specious argument.

I ask the President and the minority leader to cease and desist from telling the American people something that is not true, and that is that we are not providing for the disaster victims and the armed services of our country. We are doing it, and we are providing responsible Government for the people who depend on Government checks, whether it is the worker or a citizen of our country, so they will be able to plan on October 1 of this year that there will not be a disruption for any reason in the normal processes of Government.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GRAMM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, let me make a very brief comment on this

issue that the minority leader has raised. Then I want to turn to the real purpose that I have come to the floor to speak on today.

What we have done in this bill, recognizing what happened last year when the Government shut down, is simply say to the President that if we have an impasse in deciding on how much money we are going to spend in any given area, while we are working out those differences, the Government, in that area, will have the same level of funding that it had this year, and so the Government will not be shut down and services won't be disrupted.

There is only one reason the President would refuse to go along with this imminently reasonable proposal, and that reason is that the President believes that by having the leverage of shutting down the Government, he can extract additional spending from the Congress. That is what happened in the last week of the session last year. We increased spending by about \$7 billion in that year, and about \$20 billion over the next 4 years, basically because of the power of the President to intimidate a Congress that was frightened because the Government might shut down.

So I hope nobody is confused. This issue is about spending money. The President wants to spend more of it. We would like to begin by saying that while we negotiate on that subject, we will not shut the Government down; we fund it at the existing year's level.

I am sorry to have to come over to be, apparently, the last speaker of the day on a bill that everybody will rejoice in and pound on their chest and say, "Look what we have done for our fellow citizens who had the misfortune of having terrible floods." We have all seen the pictures, and those of us who represent States that weren't flooded have all been thankful that it didn't happen to us. Our hearts have gone out to those who have been victims.

I want to end this debate today by pointing out why this bill represents a failure. It represents a failure for the Congress and the American people, not because we are helping people who suffered from a disaster, but because we are not paying for it. We want to get all this credit for being compassionate. We want to fulfill the obligation that the Government has taken on itself to help people who suffer from natural disasters. But when it comes right down to it, we don't want to do what families have to do in America, or what businesses have to do when they undertake similar activities—that is, we don't want to spend less money on other things. In fact, when we considered this disaster funding bill on the floor of the Senate, I offered an amendment to reduce spending across the board in other areas by .7 percent—hardly massive cuts—so that we could help those who suffered from natural disasters, but do it in such a way as to pay for it. I am sorry to say that my

amendment got only 38 votes. I personally believe that if the American people had the right to vote on paying for the disaster assistance by cutting other programs, they would have voted for that amendment and it would have passed. So I somewhat feel here in the Senate as if my views on this subject are kind of hopelessly out of fashion. But I do believe that when families sit around kitchen tables every night and write their budgets and make tough decisions when they have emergencies, they have to take money away from things they want to do, and I believe they would have been on the side that I took on this issue.

This bill, as now written, with all the good things it will do, will raise the deficit this year by \$760 million. It will raise the deficit, over the next 5 years, by \$6.6 billion. We are going to adopt a budget resolution. We have already adopted it in both Houses of Congress—we are going to work out the differences and adopt it shortly—that is going to set out the claim of balancing the budget. I am not going to drag that dead cat back across the table by pointing out again in great detail that 97 cents out of every dollar of deficit reduction in that budget is simply assumed. It doesn't represent any policy change. But I have to lament, in passing, that before that budget is adopted, we are already busting that budget by \$6.6 billion. The deficit spending in the Senate and the deficit spending in Washington never comes to an end.

I wish we were having a different battle today rather than fighting over continually funding the Government—which I think we should—instead of allowing it to be shut down. But I wish we were having a fight about the fact that this bill doubles the level of funding that was originally requested. I wish we were having a battle about the fact that this bill spends \$8.6 billion—twice as much as originally requested—for flood damage and for replenishment of money for Bosnia. I wish there were greater concerns about the fact that this bill will raise the deficit by \$6.6 billion. But that concern today, while it exists in the Senate, is certainly a minority view. I think it is important on these occasions to simply point out that we have done the right thing in helping our fellow Americans who have had terrible things happen to them that were beyond their control. But we have done the wrong thing by not paying for it, because in helping people that have suffered from a natural disaster, we are contributing once again to not only a man-made, but a Government-made disaster called the deficit. I simply want to predict that this problem is not going to go away and that we are going to be back here some day worrying about the deficit again, and that we might wish that we had not raised it by \$6.6 billion today.

I thank our distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee for giving me this time.

I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixteen minutes forty two seconds.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this has been cleared with the Democratic leadership and our leadership. I ask unanimous consent that the vote on passage of the conference report accompanying H.R. 1469 occur at 6 p.m., as ordered, notwithstanding the fact that the Senate may not have received the official papers from the House by that time, and that when and if the Senate does receive those papers, the vote at 6 p.m. be considered as a vote on final passage of the conference report, provided that the papers received from the House are identical to the conference report filed in the House last evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I note that the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma is here. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifteen minutes forty eight seconds.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oklahoma may speak within the balance of our time on a subject other than the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. INHOFE pertaining to the introduction of S. 842 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, is there any time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 3 minutes and 17 seconds.

Mr. STEVENS. I yield that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded.

The vote, pursuant to the previous order, will take place at 6 o'clock.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order

to ask for the yeas and nays on the vote at 6 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized to speak as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OUR TROOPS IN BOSNIA

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I just wanted to share a few thoughts with you on something that came up this last week.

I was quite distressed when I heard that the President of the United States—the administration—suggesting that maybe our troops in Bosnia are going to be there for a longer period of time than the deadline having been established of June 30, 1998. This bothers me a great deal, for one reason in particular, and that is, I am chairman of the Readiness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee. Back when the decision was made in 1995 to send troops to Bosnia, many of us felt this was not a good idea—not that we are not compassionate, but that we were using our very rare, precious resources, after this administration has decimated virtually our defense budget to send troops over to areas and endanger their lives where we have no national security interest at stake.

This is something that bothers quite a few of us. So we introduced back in November 1995 a resolution of disapproval to stop the President from sending troops over to Bosnia. This only lost by four votes, or we could have perhaps kept our troops from being sent over to Bosnia.

I was concerned about this because I went to Bosnia to see what our interests might be over there. When I went up to the northeast sector, the northeastern part of Bosnia, where it would be under the jurisdiction of the support of the United States for our station troops to be stationed, I got up there, and when I told the people up there that it was going to be 12 months, as the President promised, that our troops would be over there—this is November 1995, keep in mind—General Hoagland, in charge of the northeast

sector for the United Nations, made this statement. He started laughing. He said, "You mean 12 years, don't you?" I said, "No, 12 months. The President has promised that this is a 12-month operation, that if we deploy the troops to Bosnia, they would be back in 12 months."

So nobody really believed rationally that would happen. However, because of the President's promise that the troops would be back in 12 months, they were able to get enough votes to defeat our resolution of disapproval. And they sent the troops over to Bosnia.

Now we are in a position where we will do everything in our power to support the troops over in Bosnia. But at the time when he said they would all be back by December 1996, all of a sudden, as soon as the election was over, we find that the troops are going to be extended over there another 18 months, or until June 30 of 1998.

This is kind of a creeping thing that we go through, such as we experienced many years ago with our Marines in Guatemala. We have many other examples where we have gone in for a limited period of time. I can remember when we sent troops over to Somalia and they were going to be over there for a short period of time. And they stayed. It wasn't until 19 of our Rangers were murdered and their bodies dragged through the streets of Mogadishu that finally there was enough pressure to bring our troops back home.

I am very concerned now because, as I suspected would be the case, the President, who, again, has promised the second time that all the troops would be back home now by June 30, 1998, has started to renege on that. We can't let this happen.

The cost they talked about for the Bosnian operation initially was \$2 billion. It has now turned out to be closer to \$8 billion, as I predicted over 18 months ago it would be, and we are at least creeping up to \$6.5 billion.

Where does that money come from? We are going to be asked to vote for an emergency supplemental. That is to pay for the additional cost over there, along with other problems, other flood problems and emergencies that existed, and a few cats and dogs thrown into the bill. However, in this case, we have to spend the money.

Where does it come out of? It comes out of our defense budget, which is already strained to the point where we can't carry out the minimum expectations of the American people, and that is to defend America on two regional fronts.

So we have a second reason. Not only are we endangering the lives of our troops over there, but we are also spending money that should be going into building and rebuilding our Nation's defense system.

So, Mr. President, I want to get on record, as I did in Brussels when I gave the speech to NATO, that I would do

everything, with every fiber in my being, to make sure that the troops come back.

I would suggest this, however. I think the President is in the bully pulpit on this. I think he keeps continuing to want to leave them over there knowing full well that once the troops leave, it will go back to just like it was before. The Croats, Muslims, the Serbs, the Mujaheddin, the Arkan Tigers, the Black Swans—all of the other rogue forces—will be over there fighting as they were before. And then he can say, well, if we had left them their longer, that would not have happened. Recognizing that is going to happen regardless, I still say, Mr. President, we should all resolve to ourselves that our troops should come on the second deadline that we have standing. That is June 30, 1998.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee on conference on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 84), establishing the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal year 1998 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 84) having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by all of the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of June 4, 1997.)

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the attention of the Senate a typographical error contained in the statement of managers to accompany the conference report on the fiscal year 1998 budget resolution. During the course of the conference some language was worked out to include in the statement of managers with respect to the section 8 housing allowance—which is set out in section

203 of the conference report. This language was mistakenly included in the description of section 203 of the Senate amendment rather than in the description of section 203 of the conference agreement. The language at issue reads as follows:

The agreement creates an allowance of \$9.2 billion in budget authority with an associated, but unspecified, amount of outlays to be released by the Budget committees when the Appropriations committees report bills that provide for renewal of Section 8 housing assistance contracts that expire in 1998. The conference agreement assumes that the amount of the allowance to be released (estimated to be \$3.436 billion for outlays) will not be reduced to the extent that the appropriations and authorizing committees produce Section 8 savings that were proposed in the President's 1998 budget.

Mr. President, the conference report on the concurrent budget resolution of the budget for fiscal year 1998 now before the Senate, represents the first major legislative step—in what will be a number of steps—to implement the bipartisan budget agreement announced by President Clinton and the bipartisan congressional leadership almost exactly 1 month ago today.

As those in this Chamber will understand, but maybe not as obvious to those watching this debate, this conference agreement is the blueprint that will guide the building and enforce the adjustments to legislation throughout the summer. When the legislation is finished following this blueprint, and when it is sent to the President and signed, we will have built a house that is fiscally strong for the future.

So today's vote on this conference agreement should be identical to the 78 to 22 vote taken in this Chamber just before the Memorial Day recess. And that is as it should be, because the conference agreement is based on the Senate-passed budget resolution and the House-passed budget resolution which both followed the agreed on budget levels of the announced bipartisan budget agreement. In other words the aggregate numbers in the two Chambers' resolutions were almost identical, resulting in hardly any need for a conference.

In fact, it was initially felt that since both resolutions followed the agreement, there was not even a need or a conference. It was held by our joint leadership that merging the two resolutions—because of the normal differences in House and Senate committees of jurisdiction under the reconciliation instructions—that this could have been done by simply adopting a House amendment to the Senate amendment, a procedure clearly authorized under the Budget Act. However, this procedure would have put us in the posture of possibly having amendments to that House amendment, the leadership concluded we should expedite the process by simply having a conference meeting and avoiding possible amendments.

So on Tuesday afternoon when the House returned from the Memorial Day

recess, they appointed conferees and Tuesday evening the conference met. As I indicated, since the two resolutions were almost identical in the numbers, the only issues to conference were related to some procedural reserve fund mechanisms, and nonbinding sense-of-the-Senate, sense-of-the-House, and sense-of-the-Congress resolutions.

Yesterday these minor issue were resolved and last evening the conference agreement and accompanying statement of managers was filed. The House of Representatives just acted on the budget resolution conference agreement by a vote of 327 to 97, almost identical to the vote when it first passed the House on May 20. The House-passed budget resolution passed on a vote of 333 to 99. Today, nearly 90 percent of the House Republicans voted for his conference agreement, and almost two thirds of the House Democrats voted for it. Clearly this is a bipartisan budget agreement as reaffirmed in this vote today in the House.

And now the Senate is about to follow suit. If you voted for the Senate-passed budget resolution on May 23, then you have no reason not to vote for this conference agreement on June 5.

For the record, through it is probably unnecessary, I might remind the Senators and those watching what this blueprint for a balanced budget means. It means that when our fiscal house is finished following this blueprint, the Federal deficit, which would have topped \$150 billion in 2002 if nothing was done, will be balanced. And if the policies that get us to balance in 2002 are continued unchanged beyond 2002, we will reduce spending over the next 10 years almost \$1.1 trillion.

The blueprint for the balanced budget agreement before us this afternoon means that spending which would have grown at 4.4 percent annually over the next 5 years will now grow at slightly over 3 percent, about the rate of growth in the overall economy.

The blueprint for the balanced budget agreement means that the size of the Federal Government will decline. Federal spending which today represents 20.8 percent of the economy today, will decline to 18.9 percent in 2002.

The blueprint for the balanced budget agreement means that the Medicare part A program will remain solvent for nearly a decade and that the spending on all of Medicare that is now projected to grow at nearly 9 percent annually over the next five years, will be reduced to a more manageable growth rate of about 7.5 percent annually.

The blueprint for the balanced budget agreement means that Federal taxes will be reduced on hard working American families with children and on small business and farms. Taxes will be reduced by \$85 billion over the next 5 years, and if these tax cuts are extended over a 10-year period, total tax reductions not exceeding \$250 billion will be given to the American public.

We are going to let them keep their money. It is their money.

Finally, the blueprint does assume that some additional resources are needed for high priority Federal programs in education, environment, justice, transportation, children's health, work welfare reform, and some safety

net programs. But I would remind the blueprint critics that the some \$33.6 billion in additional resources spent on these priority programs represent less than 0.37 percent of the total \$9.0 trillion in total Federal spending we expect over the next 5 years.

This is a good blueprint. Like all blueprints, as the building actually begins in the committees of jurisdiction these next few weeks, it will require some adjustments in the actual building phase and from time to time, as has already begun, there will be disputes as to how to read the blueprint. In those cases, I am long with my ranking member and the bipartisan leadership will work with the committee chairman to insure that we are making a good faith effort to stick to the agreement. But today the design is clear and the builders can go to work.

In closing let me say that the passions of the Federal budget debate lie at the very essence of our free, democratic governmental system. The questions of the role of the Federal Government, how much of our national wealth should be spent on the public good and who should pay for it, are questions that date back to the beginning of this great republic.

In recent years, however, the obstacles to the Federal budget have been primarily a question of finding a working consensus between the executive and the Congress. Today we have a consensus on this issue. Of course, each of us alone might have designed the plan differently, but then we might not have had a consensus. Yes, I personally think we should have done more in entitlement spending programs that still threaten the foundation of this house we build today, but for today we must do what we can. And I ask you to vote as you did on May 23 and adopt this conference agreement. Then we will be one step further on the road to the future of restoring the American dream for the young people of our country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I am pleased to join the manager of the Budget Committee in supporting the conference report on the budget resolution. Perhaps it is unnecessary to recall what constitutes this agreement, a consensus agreement. Consensus is a fairly simple word with very dramatic meaning. It is the majority view—not the unanimous view but the majority view—of the participants in an agreement in a debate.

And I want to just take a moment to remind everybody about the fact that this is a consensus agreement. Those who are looking for total victory are not going to find it here and those who are looking for total defeat are not going to find it here. A consensus view, the majority view is what we strove for. I am unhappy with some things, and I am sure my colleague on the other side of the aisle is also unhappy with some of these things. But we struck an agreement in good faith. We worked very hard. We worked hard to get it through the conference and we thought that we had a continuation of the understanding that was arrived at when we shook hands a few weeks ago

and presented the Senate side of the budget understanding, the budget resolution.

As I said in my first remarks, I fully support this agreement. That doesn't mean I support it enthusiastically, but it means that it has my commitment because we worked so hard and we got so many good things in this budget resolution. What I am concerned about—if there seems to be evident a note of reluctance or wariness in my comments, it is true. It is true because what I have heard already, and I have read in the papers, as it is said, is that there are those who want to reinterpret what it is that we agreed upon when we concluded this Senate budget resolution, what we agreed upon when we had the conference concluded; those who are saying, well, not this many immigrants are going to be taken care of; or not this proposal on containing the tax cut, \$250 billion over the 10-year period; or not making certain that the investments in the principal passenger railroad in this country are going to be made, as it was understood by me and others sitting there.

So I want to throw out that word of caution. This is, as I think everyone knows, nonamendable. It is a budget conference report. There is no room for amendment. There is no opportunity for amendment. The conference report before us is very similar to the budget resolution that the Senate approved on May 23, by a vote of 78 to 22. It provides a framework to get our fiscal house in order while protecting critical national priorities. Last fall, the American people spoke at polling booths. They elected a Democratic President and a majority of the Republicans in both Houses. Yet, despite this divided Government, they have been clear about what they want. They want the gridlock to end. They want the bickering to end. They want us to get to work. They want us to do the best we possibly can to get this house in fiscal order and get on with the business of our country.

At the same time, Americans asked that Washington focus on the issues that matter most to us: Education, Medicare, children's health, environment, fighting crime, and other Government responsibilities that make a difference in the way people live. I believe the conference report before us keeps our trust with the people. It is not, as I earlier said, a perfect agreement. It is not exactly as I would have written it. But I consider it an enormous step forward. It will, as we see it now, relieve future generations of having to continue to pay for borrowing that we have done or that we are doing now. But it is going to stop in 2002—that's my belief and that's the belief of those who negotiated in good faith to get this agreement done. It calls for the largest investment in education and training since the Johnson administration. It is phenomenal. It says we are going to put money into our children. We are going to prepare for the future. We are agreed on that. And with that, it combines tough fiscal discipline with a strong commitment to Medicare, environment, transportation, and other national priorities.

Throughout this process, President Clinton has insisted and I have agreed that an agreement that imposes real

fiscal discipline, that builds on President Clinton's tremendous successes in reducing the deficit, and balances the budget in a real, credible way, is the way we have to go. The President has insisted and I have insisted that we make education the priority that it is.

I strongly supported some amendments that were dropped in the process of discussion, like the Dodd amendment. I commend the distinguished Senator from Connecticut for his leadership. His was the amendment that said that we would not go beyond \$250 billion worth of tax cuts over the 10 years. A point of order could have been raised against any of the tax cuts in the bill and that point of order could have been waived only with the votes of 60 Senators. But it was dropped in the conference.

Instead, there is a commitment that says that \$250 billion over the next 10 years, \$85 billion in the first 5 years and \$165 billion in the second 5, is the most that can be had by way of tax cuts. There are letters supporting it. There are letters from the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee in the House, there is a letter from the chairman of the Finance Committee in the Senate, there are letters from the Speaker of the House, and there is a letter from the distinguished majority leader here, that confirms the position that we took. So, while there is some disappointment that the language that we originally anticipated would be in there is not part of the record, but it is indirectly recognized. It is there.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of letters from the Speaker and Senate majority leader and the letter from Senator ROTH and Congressman ARCHER be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, May 15, 1997.

Hon. WILLIAM J. CLINTON,
President of the United States,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We would like to take this opportunity to confirm important aspects of the Balanced Budget Agreement. It was agreed that the net tax cut shall be \$85 billion through 2002 and not more than \$250 billion through 2007. We believe these levels provide enough room for important reforms, including broad-based permanent capital gains tax reductions, significant death tax relief, \$500 per child tax credit, and expansion of IRAs.

In the course of drafting the legislation to implement the balanced budget plan, there are some additional areas that we want to be sure the committees of jurisdiction consider. Specifically, it was agreed that the package must include tax relief of roughly \$35 billion over five years for post-secondary education, including a deduction and a tax credit. We believe this package should be consistent with the objectives put forward in the HOPE scholarship and tuition tax proposals contained in the Administration's FY 1998 budget to assist middle-class parents.

Additionally, the House and Senate Leadership will seek to include various proposals in the Administration's FY 1998 budget (e.g., the welfare-to-work tax credit, capital gains

tax relief for home sales, the Administration's EZ/EC proposals, brownfields legislation, FSC software, and tax incentives designed to spur economic growth in the District of Columbia), as well as various pending congressional tax proposals.

In this context, it should be noted that the tax-writing committees will be required to balance the interests and desires of many parties in crafting tax legislation within the context of the net tax reduction goals which have been adopted, while at the same time protecting the interests of taxpayers generally.

We stand to work with you toward these ends. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker.

TRENT LOTT,
Senate Majority Leader.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, May 15, 1997.

MR. ERSKINE BOWLES,
Chief of Staff to the President,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: We are writing to express our desire for continued cooperation between Congressional staff and the staff of the various Administration agencies during the development of the current budget agreement.

Much of the most difficult work in connection with the budget agreement will involve the development of the revenue provisions that will satisfy the parameters of the agreement. Historically, the staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation has provided technical legal and quantitative support to the House and Senate. The Budget Act requires the use of Joint Committee on Taxation revenue estimates. Ken Kies and his staff are committed to facilitating our work on the tax provisions of this budget agreement. You can be assured that they will cooperate with Administration counterparts in receiving Administration input as they carry out their statutory responsibilities.

The revenue estimating staffs of the Joint Committee on Taxation and the Office of Tax Analysis at Treasury have a long history of cooperation and communication among analysts. It is our understanding that steps have already been taken to insure that the cooperative efforts of these two staffs will be intensified during the current budget process. It is also our understanding that the professional staffs at the Office of Tax Analysis at Treasury and the Joint Committee on Taxation will consult and share information necessary to understand fully the basis of their revenue estimates and to minimize revenue estimating differences. The proposal shall not cause costs to explode in the out-years.

Now that we have agreed upon the overall parameters of this significant agreement, an inordinate number of details concerning specific provisions must be drafted and analyzed by the JCT and the committee of jurisdiction. We look forward to working with the Administration.

Sincerely,

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker.

TRENT LOTT,
Senate Majority Leader.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, June 4, 1997.

Hon. PETE V. DOMENICI,
Chairman, Senate Budget Committee,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN R. KASICH,
Chairman, House Budget Committee,
Washington, DC.

DEAR PETE AND JOHN: Our Committee will soon begin marking up tax legislation to meet the reconciliation directives of the 1998 Budget Resolution. We will meet the Resolution's instructions of reducing revenues by \$85 billion over the five year period 1998-2002 and by no more than \$20.5 billion in 2002.

Furthermore, we can assure you that, consistent with the May 15, 1997 letter from the Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate to the President which stated, "It was agreed that the net tax cut shall be \$85 billion through 2002 and not more than \$250 billion through 2007," the ten year net revenue loss in the tax reconciliation bill will not exceed \$250 billion.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM V. ROTH,
Chairman, Finance
Committee.

BILL ARCHER,
Chairman, Ways and
Means Committee.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I note also that this resolution does include the sense of the Congress resolution that again reaffirms that \$250 billion 10-year tax limit on tax cuts is clarified, in a way. I just want to remind everybody what it says here:

The 10-year cost of the tax reconciliation bill resulting from this resolution shall not exceed \$250 billion and any revenue loss shall be certified by the Joint Committee on Taxation in consultation and cooperation with the Office of the Tax Analysis of the Department of the Treasury.

To make the point by continuing to emphasize it, I don't think anyone should have any doubts that the tax cuts in the reconciliation will be limited. We are not going to suffer a repeat of exploding deficits that flowed from the disastrous policies of the Reagan era. We will not go down that road again.

So as we wrap up our work on this budget resolution, I congratulate the President for his leadership in this effort. We are here today on a bipartisan basis, only because the President decided to lead the effort to make it happen. He deserves enormous credit for it. When we look back at the results of the legislation that the President wanted to put forward some years ago, in 1993, and we see the incredible results, we see reports by a publication like Fortune magazine saying this is one of the greatest economies that this country has ever had, you can sense the strength of the economy, you can sense the confidence that the people have in their ability to take care of their families and to provide, hopefully, with the programs that we are outlining here today, education for their children in the future, security for the aged, to make sure that these investments will produce job opportunities and a better quality of life for all our people. That is what we want to see.

So, I yield the floor and I say to my colleagues, even if there is some disagreement, even if there is some question, I hope we will get the fullest support that we can obtain for this agreement. It does, once again, put the fiscal house in order. It maintains the important priorities that we all, I think it is fair to say, would like to see.

I am sure if I talk to my colleague to my right here, if we talk about education for our children, he will say we want to invest in education for our children.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I will.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. We want to have Medicare more secure. Our approaches might be slightly different, but the fact is we want the same objective.

So, I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COLLINS). The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I would like to have my fellow manager enter into a unanimous-consent agreement, if we could, so every Member can plan on when we would be able to speak; that we would do what we traditionally do, to have one Republican and one Democrat, then back to the Republican, back to the Democrat, to yield for speeches in that way?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Will the Senator yield for a question? In the unanimous-consent agreement, which I think makes all the sense in the world, will the Senator be kind enough in the rotation, since we have Senator FAIRCLOTH here and Senator HOLLINGS, and I am pleased to follow Senator HOLLINGS, could we be listed in order right now, since we are here?

Mr. GRASSLEY. And then, beyond that, it will be one Republican and one Democrat—I would agree to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. OK. I think it was understood we would yield now to Senator FAIRCLOTH. I yield to Senator FAIRCLOTH such time as he might use.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Madam President, I take the floor to rise to discuss a serious issue, and my concern is this. The ink isn't even dry on this budget agreement and I have heard nothing, yesterday and today, but rumors that there are plans to change radically and have a major tax increase put into this agreement. Specifically, there is much talk, and it is far beyond rumor, of increasing the tobacco tax from 21 cents to 50 cents per pack, which would raise \$15 to \$30 billion a year.

The problem is, of course, the tax cut in the budget plan is too small. But that is not news to anybody; it was always too small. The Republicans wanted to cut taxes by \$188 billion. We now have a net tax cut of \$50 billion, and that is to cover several initiatives such as capital gains, estate tax, and child

credit. As I view choices, we should live by the budget agreement we passed in the Senate, and the one we want to pass. Now, if we can't do that, if there is some reason we cannot do that—and we want to cut taxes further, which I agree to—then there is a simple choice that it would be a wonderful thing if this body could learn—to cut spending, to spend less money. That is a wonderful alternative that we need to know about. Not every time we are short of money, raise taxes.

If there is intent on the part of some of those who are having this discussion to change the budget agreement, I wonder why we are even having a budget resolution. What else are we going to change? Are we going to expand the deficit? Are we going to expand spending? Apparently we are. Is a deal not a deal? We either agree not to raise taxes any farther or we do not agree, and it looks like we do not agree. But I think it is an outrage that it is even under consideration at this point in the negotiations.

When I came to the Senate I said I would never vote for a tax increase. I never have and I never will. We have plenty of money. We are spending it in too many places.

We do not need a tax increase. Taxes are already too high. The average American works until mid-May to pay his or her taxes now. One-third of the money the average citizen earns goes to pay taxes. A tax increase of any kind is the last thing the working men and women of this country need now. What they truly need is a tax cut.

But we say we are going after the tobacco industry, which really doesn't count, but when we drive the tobacco industry into bankruptcy, what product do we want to attack next? To each Senator, what product from your State will we decide to drive into bankruptcy? This is a Government that has an insatiable appetite for tax money—money of any kind, borrowed, taxes, there is never enough.

The net tax cut in the budget resolution is only 1 percent of revenues over the next 5 years, a pretty minuscule amount. It is hardly a windfall. Yet, here we are before we even get the resolution passed and we are considering raising taxes.

Again, I have to ask, what is the budget agreement for? Why do we even call it an agreement, if we fully intend to come back and rewrite it in the Finance Committee? Why debate it and argue over it on this floor when the real decision is going to be made in the Finance Committee? It is a waste of our time.

The agreement is not worth the paper it is written on if we are going to haul it over into the Finance Committee and they are going to make the decision.

Madam President, I can give every assurance that if the Finance Committee intends to raise taxes beyond what is called for in the budget resolution, passing this bill is going to be ex-

tremely difficult. I will say now, we are heading into dangerous territory in raising taxes. There is not support for it, even if it is on tobacco. This isn't a case of reading anybody's lips. We don't have to read lips. We can read the budget resolution. We don't need new taxes. I will forcefully oppose any kind of effort to increase them. Frankly, given that this is going on and has been for 2 days, I think the Senate is wasting its time on a budget resolution that will be rendered meaningless within a week.

I thank you, Madam President, and I yield back any time I might have remaining.

Mr. HOLLINGS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, let me talk to a very, very important point other than taxes and the increase thereof.

What we have is the jargon of "I'm against taxes, I'm against taxes, I'm against taxes," but now we have reached the point where we are increasing spending, because we are not paying our bills. We are increasing spending by \$1 billion a day. That is the interest cost on the national debt.

When Reaganomics commenced in 1981, the interest costs on the national debt were \$74.8 billion. We had less than \$1 trillion debt, and the interest cost was only \$74.8 billion. So looking at it in a historical sense, for 200 years of our history, with the cost of all the wars, we had never reached a \$1 trillion debt. We had paid for the Revolution, right on up through World War I, World War II, Korea, Vietnam, and yet, in the last 16 years, without the cost of a war, we have jumped to a \$5.4 trillion debt. And it is all because you wouldn't pay the bill. You were against taxes, and you were against paying the bill. It is wonderful to go home with that sing-song and continue.

I have a chart right here to show exactly what I am talking about. There is the \$74.8 billion in interest costs at the time of President Reagan. This has all the Presidents since Truman, the actual deficits, the actual debt and thereby the forced interest costs, which I call interest taxes. You know, they say death and taxes can't be avoided; neither can interest costs on the national debt. So beware of the colleague who comes and says, "I am against taxes, and I'm never going to vote for taxes," like this is a luxury we all can afford. I would love that. I can just come here and join in the spending. We would never have any taxes and we would all get reelected, but the country would go broke because you have to pay, as this debt goes through the ceiling, the interest cost.

It is now, as shown here by the CBO figures, at 359 billion, and this chart is somewhat outdated by several weeks. Its actually higher now. Still, there is no question it is \$1 billion a day we are spending for nothing. I know my distinguished colleague from North Carolina is interested in highways. So is the

Senator from South Carolina. This \$1 billion doesn't pay for a single road or a single bridge. It doesn't engage us in any research. It helps us not with health research at the National Institutes of Health. It doesn't pay for defense. It doesn't give foreign aid. It doesn't do anything but represent waste, and we are determined to continue this waste.

Let me get right to the point about this particular budget resolution because, Madam President, I say advisedly, if there ever was a fraud, this particular budget resolution is a fraud. I say that advisedly to my colleagues in the Senate. The distinguished Senator from Iowa gets up and says, "This is bipartisan, this is bipartisan, and it just passed the House with 350 votes." Then our distinguished ranking member on this side of the aisle on the Budget Committee said, "This is consensus, we had to get together, we got a consensus," and thereby is the sizzle that is supposed to sell this steak when the truth of the matter is it is one piece of meat that is an outrageous fraud.

Let's go to the partisan resolution that we passed in 1993. If you want to see frauds, it is when they get together. When they don't get together, you are getting nearer the truth in budgeting. Back in 1993, Madam President, we cut some 250,000 Federal employees off the payroll. We came in and we created savings, spending cuts of \$500 billion, and, yes, we increased taxes. We taxed beer, we taxed gasoline and, yes, we taxed Social Security.

I can see my colleague on the other side of the aisle talking about that Social Security tax increase that the Senator from South Carolina voted for and, pointing over to this side, the distinguished Senator said, "Ah, they will be hunting you down like dogs in the street and shooting you." The chairman of the Finance Committee was willing to bet everything on it. He said he would bet his home and everything else. Of course, the poor gentleman is not here anymore, but he was going to bet it all.

Another distinguished Senator said, "Wait a minute, these tax increases, they'll take the money and spend it, it won't be allocated to the deficit." And they went down the list deriding, if you please, the partisan budget of 1993, that budget plan.

What has it given us, without a single Republican vote? The partisan budget is what I want to talk about. This morning, I was listening to early morning TV. I turned on CNN at 6 o'clock, a little before 6, and they had the chief economist for Bear Stearns, and he said this economy is the strongest that he had ever experienced in 24 years. We have the lowest unemployment in those 24 years. We've got inflation down to its lowest point in 35 years. We have created 12.1 million jobs. Business investment is up to the highest point since World War II. The stock market has doubled and, ah, deficits, Madam President, deficits, the deficits for the first time are really starting to increase. I was with Presi-

dent Johnson here in the Senate when we balanced the budget back in 1968 and 1969. Since that time, deficits have been going up, up, and away; the national debt is up, up, up, and away; interest cost spending for nothing is up, up, up and away. But, Madam President, under President Clinton's plan of 1993, deficits have been declining each year, every year, for 5 years.

Heavens above, what does this instrument do? I hold in my hand the conference report. On page 4, I looked for the word balance. Instead, you see the word deficit. If you want to know what the actual deficit is, all you need do is go to the public debt. For fiscal year 2001, it is \$6,307,300,000,000. For fiscal year 2002, instead of balance, it goes up to \$6,481,200,000,000. So the actual deficit is \$173,900,000,000. Here is the figure, here is the document, here is the truth. And while the Senator from South Carolina cries fraud, we have this so-called bipartisan consensus, where we say "I'll take your tax cuts if you take my spending increases and we'll all run around on the floor of the Congress hollering balance, balance, balance." Everywhere man cries balance, but as for me, give me balance or give me staying the course. I wanted staying the course, but here is what they did instead.

I hope they get ashes in their mouths, that media crowd, when they say "balance," "the balanced budget plan," "the balanced budget resolution that passed," "the balanced budget." It is time we stop lying to the American people and tell the truth and show the page. I dare them to refute it. I have the document right here right now.

So what has happened? Instead of staying the course, Madam President, we have gone off the wagon.

President Clinton put us on the wagon. We stopped drinking that old deficit whiskey, but now we are taking the bottle back up and we are going to start drinking again. And we are going to get drunk on the wonderful balance—balance, 200-proof—excuse me, \$173,900,000,000-proof. That is what we have to drink here this afternoon.

And how do they do it? It is similar to another time, back in 1990, when I was on the Budget Committee trying to hold the line on Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, with the automatic spending triggers across the board. They abolished them at 1:45 a.m., October 21, early in the morning. And I raised a point of order. They voted me down. That is when I asked for a divorce from Gramm-Rudman-Hollings. It was supposed to be a solid boost toward fiscal responsibility, not a shield they started hiding behind.

But, again, what they do is take unrealistic savings or spending cuts. We have it over in the Commerce Committee. I talked to the distinguished chairman this morning. You are not going to find \$26 billion in spectrum auctions.

What we did back in 1990 was to revise the economics. We did the same thing again this year. What we did here is, we found \$225 billion the day before

they made the agreement. That was convenient, wasn't it? They found \$225 billion.

And they came again with backloading, just as they did in 1990. I looked at this particular instrument here, the 1997 conference report, and saw that 72 percent of the spending cuts occur in the last 2 years. They backload it. Unrealistic—not going to happen.

But worst of all, they go again and start looting the trust funds of America—looting the trust funds, the pension funds, to the extent where we now owe, in 1997, \$1.484 trillion. Under this particular resolution, by the year 2002, we will owe just under \$2 trillion—\$1.992 trillion.

Now, here is how they do it. They use Social Security moneys. They use the military retirees' money, civilian retirees' pension funds, the unemployment compensation moneys, the highway trust funds—and we are not building highways—and the airport moneys. That is scandalous.

Right to the point, Madam President, they are going to continue the tax increases that the Senator from North Carolina talks about. They will continue the airport and airways tax on passenger taxes that we pay as airline travelers. But that is not going to airlines. That is going to give you an inheritance tax cut or capital gains tax cut. That is outrageous, scandalous. That is a breach of trust.

If you want to talk about a breach of trust, I was reading Bob Reich's book. Former Secretary of Labor, Secretary Reich, said, "I'm proud of two things: One, during my 4-year tenure I got a minimum wage; and the second thing, I passed the Pension Reform Act of 1994."

And what did that provide? All of us in the Congress said, "Corporate America, you have got to fully fund your pensions so the employees can count on it. You can't use it, you can't raid those trust funds, those pension funds."

Madam President, guess what? Just 3 weeks ago, Denny McLain, the all-star championship pitcher for the Detroit Tigers, was sentenced to 8 years in prison because, as head of a corporation, he used the pension funds to pay a corporate debt.

Here we are using trust funds to pay the Government debt. In private, outside-the-beltway America, you get a prison sentence for this. Here in the wonderful Congress, heavens above, you get the "Good Government Award," you get consensus, you get bipartisanship, you get one grand fraud. It is time we stopped lying to the American people.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGEL). The Senator from Minnesota is recognized under the previous agreement.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I see my colleague from Alaska. I say, I will try to stay under 10 so he will have time to speak. We had an agreement, those of us here earlier, if that would be OK. I will try to be quite brief, because we have been through a tremendous amount of this debate.

Mr. President, first of all, let me just say that I appreciate the work of my colleagues. I know that my friend from New Jersey is committed to many of the same issues that I am. Whatever he does, he does in good faith. I think this budget agreement is a profound mistake. I have said I think it is a budget without a soul. I believe that very honestly and truthfully.

I worry about so much of these cuts in capital gains and estate taxes going to the very top of the population, those that really do not need any assistance. Mr. President, really, I hate the tradeoff. I think it is a budget without a soul. And I think it is a profound mistake as a blueprint for our country for the following reasons.

First, let me just start with the justice, just by raising the question of simple justice. In the last Congress, all in the name of deficit reduction, in the welfare bill we made huge cuts. Almost all of the cuts we made were targeted to low-income people. We made cuts totalling about \$26 billion in food nutrition programs, food stamp programs. We do not restore any of that by way of a blueprint in this budget agreement. Then we made cuts in benefits for legal immigrants.

Now, my colleague from New Jersey expressed some of his dismay about what is going on in the House side, in the House Ways and Means Committee. And I am quite in agreement with him. But I also just want to say I guess it is how you look at what is progress.

The fact we restored some benefits for legal immigrants who are elderly and disabled, that is a good thing. And the fact that we restored some benefits for children, that is a good thing. But the fact of the matter is, if you are elderly, if you are 80 years old and you are not disabled, you are just old and poor, you are elderly and poor, your benefits were not restored in the budget agreement. I do not think that is enough.

The fact of the matter is, for children who need food nutrition help or for elderly people, there was no restoration of funding for food nutrition programs. I do not think that is enough. Just as a matter of elementary fairness, we should have done much better.

Mr. President, my colleagues have talked about our priorities. I guess I will be honest. I really understand that everybody votes in good conscience—and I know this budget agreement is going to get a good vote—but to have tax cuts, and I think my colleague from South Carolina is on the mark, to backload it, and with enormous revenue loss, the vast majority of the benefits going to those people who least need it, and what is the tradeoff? The

tradeoff is what is unacceptable. This is a budget without a soul.

Mr. President, we had an amendment that would have at least restored the \$5 billion in investment in dilapidated school infrastructure. It was voted down. Why are we doing tax cuts for wealthy people and we are unwilling to invest in rebuilding our schools?

Mr. President, I had an opportunity to go to Delta, MS. I visited a school. There is going to be some renovation now, but the ceiling was just practically caving in. The toilets were so decrepit, no child should ever have to go into a bathroom like this. You could not wash your hands after going to the bathroom because there was no running water in the sink.

Now, that is not just in the South. These schools exist in the North and the Midwest and the West. These are the schools that too many of our children go to every day. And we did not invest one penny in rebuilding these schools for America's children, for some of the poorest children in America. I just think that this is unacceptable. And I think that this budget is a budget without a soul.

Mr. President, we have talked so much about early childhood development, and we have been reading all these reports, all the neuroscience evidence. It is so compelling. The evidence is irreducible and irrefutable that if we do not invest in the nutrition—and I could talk about each one of these areas at great length—if we do not invest in the health care, if we do not invest in really good child care, really good child care, if we do not get it right for these children, that by age 3 they are not going to be ready for school and they will never be ready for life.

Mr. President, with all due respect, what are we doing with cuts in capital gains and estate taxes, disproportionately going to the very top of the population, not even targeting that, and at the same time we make a pittance—I am sorry—a pittance of investment when it comes to the most critical years that affect whether children are going to do well in education, and those are in the very early years?

We have White House conferences that talk about the development of the brain. We have speeches that are given. And yet, when it comes to where the rubber meets the road, when it comes to what are our priorities, we have a budget agreement here that does not make the investment in these children, does not make the investment in early childhood development, barely scratches the surface. It is not even a baby step.

How much longer are these children going to have to wait? Everybody keeps talking about how we have to balance the budget for the sake of our children, our children's future. How about these children right now? And let us go ahead and balance the budget. But, first of all, why do we have these tax cuts that go to some of our

wealthiest citizens? Why are we backloading it? Why are we eroding our revenue base? Why are we building here a straitjacket which will prevent us from making any of these investments in rebuilding rotting schools, in health and nutrition and child care for children at a very early age?

This is a budget without a soul. I think this budget as a blueprint for our country is a profound mistake. It is a profound mistake for America.

Mr. President, one final point because I promised to be brief. I could go on and on, but I have spoken on these issues before.

There was a cut in this budget—and really, it was not very well publicized—in veterans health care, \$2.3 or \$2.7 billion. I just want to make it very clear to my colleagues that when we got briefings from the White House—and everywhere else nobody talked about this. We had a flat-line budget we were worried about, but \$2.3 or \$2.7 billion—a couple different figures are out there—over the next 5 years in veterans health care.

Dr. Ken Kizer, who runs those health care programs, was out in Minnesota. He did not know about it. I do not think Secretary Jesse Brown knows about it. And I will tell you something, the veterans organizations, all of the organizations I know that I have had the honor of working with, are really indignant about this. They are angry not only about the substance of it, but also the manner in which it was done. So I will have an amendment and I certainly hope my colleagues will join me to restore that funding for veterans health care. I think it is critically important.

Mr. President, let me conclude. I do not understand why we have accepted this tradeoff of tax cuts disproportionately benefiting the people on the top, not even targeting them to middle income or small businesses, and at the same time not investing in rebuilding our schools, not investing in early childhood development, not investing in making sure that every child has a head start, not investing adequately in veterans health care.

I just think that this tradeoff is unacceptable. Yes, let us have an agreement. But what is the price? The price of this agreement is that we have, as a Senate, I think—I know some colleagues disagree with me, I know many do, I know most do—I think we have abandoned a principle that has been so important to our country. I think it has been a principle which, in many ways, has led to our resilience as a nation.

It is a principle that has to do with the very meaning of our Nation, it is the principle of justice, it is the principle of expanding opportunities for our citizens, and it is that American dream that every child—no matter color of skin, no matter income, no matter boy or girl, no matter urban or rural,—that every child will have the same chance to reach his or her full potential. We have not met that standard in

this budget agreement. We are nowhere near that standard. That is why, again, I will vote no.

Mr. DODD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. I want to begin by commending our colleagues from New Mexico and from New Jersey, Senator DOMENICI and Senator LAUTENBERG, for their herculean efforts on this budget process. This is a very difficult task.

I had—I say guardedly—the privilege of serving on the Budget Committee for a number of years, and it is more of a sentence than a duty in many ways, considering the laborious task day in and day out of going through the number-crunching process. I feel a special sense of appreciation for the work of those who serve on the committee, and for those who lead the committee in the case of the chairman and the ranking Democratic member.

I would like to take a few moments if I could to discuss just one aspect of this budget resolution, one that has already been addressed by Senator LAUTENBERG, the ranking Democratic member of the committee. It is a provision that started out as a rather innocuous suggestion that was adopted unanimously by this body as part of the budget resolution and then became the source, Mr. President, of some controversy over the last several days. But the issue has been resolved, due to the efforts of Senator LAUTENBERG, Senator DOMENICI and others, to the satisfaction of everyone, including the author of the original provision, and that is myself.

The budget agreement, as we all know, was reached by the President and the Congress and includes a number of provisions designed to protect the priorities that Americans care about while ensuring that the budget would reach balance in the year 2002 and thereafter.

One of the stipulations of the budget agreement specified that the cost of the tax cuts would be a net \$85 billion over 5 years and a net \$250 billion, one-quarter of a trillion dollars, over 10 years. There was a letter, in fact, signed by the majority leader of the Senate, Mr. LOTT, and the Speaker of the House, Speaker GINGRICH, and sent to the President. I quote it here: "It was agreed that the net tax cut shall be \$85 billion through the year 2002 and not more than \$250 billion through the year 2007."

As I say, this letter was signed by both leaders. I was surprised, however, Mr. President, when the budget resolution came to the floor more than 2 weeks ago with no mention whatever of the cost of the tax cuts over 10 years. The resolution fulfilled the first part of the agreement by instructing the tax-writing committees to craft legislation that would cost no more than \$85 billion over the first five years. But when it came to the understanding on the \$250 billion, that had been left out of the resolution, entirely. That is a large

amount indeed, a quarter of a trillion dollars.

Mr. President, in my view, again, I think this budget resolution is a good resolution. I offered amendments to shift some of the priorities here. I lost in that effort. I wish we had done more in the area of early childhood development, Healthy Start, Head Start, child care. I will still make those arguments from time to time. But there are improvements clearly in many important areas of this budget.

Even though I disagreed in part with it, I think it is a good resolution. But the provisions on tax cuts left me with a great deal of concern because you could write the tax cut part of this budget resolution, much of which I agree with, in such a way that for the first 5 years the revenue losses would be limited to \$85 billion. But we all know how to write these in such a way that the second 5 years they could blow totally out of proportion and we end up where we were in the mid-1980s, again looking at a huge deficit. I might add that even with my language, there is no guarantee that that will not happen after 10 years. But at least over the first 10 years with the agreement we have reached here, we are left with an assurance that that is not going to happen in the short term, and future Congresses will have an opportunity to examine how these tax cuts are working.

So this new language that will be included in the agreement, I think, will be a major step forward.

I should tell my colleagues what happened procedurally. My amendment to put in place a cap of \$250 billion over 10 years was accepted on a voice vote. The distinguished Senator from New Mexico and my colleague from New Jersey agreed with the amendment. It was adopted. In fact, Senator LAUTENBERG enthusiastically supported the amendment. It ended up in conference, but there was no similar language in the House version. But then JOHN SPRATT, the distinguished Congressman from South Carolina, went to the floor on the House side and instructed the House conferees that my amendment should be adopted. To the credit of many of the Republican Members of the House, as well as Democrats, they agreed with JOHN SPRATT. So he carried overwhelmingly in a House vote to accept my amendment.

So we were left with a situation where the House instructed conferees to take the amendment that had been accepted on a voice vote here, but for reasons that I will allow them to explain, the majority decided on our side that they could not continue to hold this amendment. Instead, they offered a compromise. That was a sense-of-the-Congress resolution that would limit the tax cut to \$250 billion over 10 years, and require that the Joint Tax Committee and others would certify that we had not broken that ceiling of \$250 billion over 10 years. In addition, a letter has been signed by our colleagues

Senator ROTH, the chair of the Finance Committee, and Congressman ARCHER, chairman of the Ways and Means committee. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Roth and Archer letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, DC, June 4, 1997.

Hon. PETE V. DOMENICI,

Chairman, Senate Budget Committee, Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN R. KASICH,

Chairman, House Budget Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR PETE AND JOHN: Our Committees will soon begin marking up tax legislation to meet the reconciliation directives of the 1998 Budget Resolution. We will meet the Resolution's instructions of reducing revenues by \$85 billion over the five year period 1998-2002 and by no more than \$20.5 billion in 2002.

Furthermore, we can assure you that, consistent with the May 15, 1997 letter from the Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate to the President which stated, "It was agreed that the net tax cut shall be \$85 billion through 2002 and not more than \$250 billion through 2007," the ten year net revenue loss in the tax reconciliation bill will not exceed \$250 billion.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM V. ROTH,
Chairman, Finance
Committee.

BILL ARCHER,
Chairman, Ways and
Means Committee.

Mr. DODD. Let me read from that letter:

Furthermore, we can assure you that, consistent with the May 15, 1997 letter from the Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate to the President which stated, "It was agreed that the net tax cut shall be \$85 billion through 2002 and not more than \$250 billion through 2007," the 10-year net revenue loss will not exceed \$250 billion.

This language confirms the agreement made by the President, the Senate, and the Congress, as well as the sense-of-the-Congress resolution and the certification.

Some may argue you have given up, it is not exactly law. I do not see it that way. I am satisfied people have made their commitments, and those commitments have been confirmed. This letter has been signed by the two chairs of the committee, and that ought to be satisfactory enough for people that we mean what we say in these resolutions. What good is it going to be to have a budget in balance by the year 2002 that goes immediately out of balance in 2003 because we did not keep an eye on the tax expenditure side of this equation?

So, with this new language that Senator LAUTENBERG and Senator DOMENICI worked on here, I am very satisfied this is a good resolution. I believe that those of us who have been concerned that this resolution, while balanced in the initial stages, could end up out of balance very quickly, have seen our concerns eased by this progress.

So I want to thank once again the leadership of Senator LAUTENBERG,

Senator DOMENICI, Senator ROTH and Congressman ARCHER, as well as Congressman SPRATT, for their work in this regard, and lastly just point out, Mr. President, I know that there are legitimate issues that have been raised by those who say, "Well, what happens in the second 10 years? You can craft the tax expenditure provisions so they could end up pushing us out of balance in the second 10 years." I cannot argue with that. That could happen. We will have to look at it very closely. Obviously, the economy could change dramatically in 10 years. We may have to come back and revisit parts of this.

So there are no reassurances for the second 10 and there are those who will lay out for you scenarios that show there is significant ballooning, if you will, of those tax cuts in the second 10 years. We may have to come back and revisit that. But by putting in the net cap of \$250 billion over the next 10 years, I think we have done a great deal to avoid the kind of problem that occurred in the early 1980's when no such caps were put in place and we saw as a result of the 1981 tax program a major deficit created in this country.

I voted against that 16 years ago. I am glad I did. I think I was proven correct by what happened. I think we have avoided any likelihood of that occurring, certainly in the short run, here, and we will have plenty of opportunities in the Congress to respond if for whatever reason that begins to happen later on.

I thank the leadership and my colleague from New Mexico and the Senator from New Jersey for this agreement and look forward to supporting the resolution.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, the Budget Resolution assumes reductions in spending of \$290 billion over the next 5 years. To accomplish this goal we, of course, must adopt changes in federal programs.

The Governmental Affairs Committee has received reconciliation instructions requiring \$4.8 billion in savings over a 5-year period be obtained from programs under our committee's jurisdiction. Most of this committee's programs involve Federal employees and retirees.

In March, the President sent his budget proposal to Congress in which he recommended \$6.5 billion in savings from Federal employee and retiree benefit programs. Included in the President's proposal was \$1.7 billion to be saved by delaying annual cost-of-living adjustments for Federal retirees. As chairman of the Subcommittee with jurisdiction over this subject I opposed that proposal, and so did the chairman of the full Committee, Senator FRED THOMPSON.

The President's Federal employee-related proposal had four basic components:

First, the President proposed delaying the receipt of civilian Federal retiree cost-of-living adjustments from January until April through the year

2002, which would have cost the typical Federal retiree \$726 over the next 5 years.

I thought the proposal was unfair since it singled out Federal civilian retirees for this change. No other group of retirees was treated this way.

Most Federal retirees are not wealthy people. Most are like other Americans who have retired from private sector jobs and are just barely making ends meet. The average yearly income for a Federal retiree—after taxes and out-of-pocket costs of health care and life insurance premiums—is \$14,864. This hardly allows for a comfortable lifestyle, considering the average Federal retiree faces annual living costs of \$22,098.

Our subcommittee opposed the singling out of Federal civilian retirees for a COLA delay, and this position was adopted by Governmental Affairs Committee Chairman THOMPSON in his Annual Views and Estimates report submitted to the Senate Budget Committee. I was very pleased that Budget Chairman DOMENICI agreed with us and not the President.

Second, the President's budget also assumed a savings starting in January 1999 be achieved by requiring employees to pay a greater share of their health care premiums.

Under current law, the Government pays, on average, 71 percent of the premiums of the health insurance plans in which Federal employees and retirees enroll. That calculation is based on 60 percent of the average premium of the Federal Employee Health Benefit Program's Big Six health insurance plans.

In 1990, Aetna—one of the Big Six high-option plans—dropped out of the Federal Employee Health Benefit Program. In order to prevent enrollees' share of the premium from rising, Congress enacted legislation establishing a proxy plan. The President's budget proposal allowed for the expiration of the proxy plan, thereby shifting approximately \$4 billion of health care premium costs from the Government to the employee over 5 years.

The Federal Employee Health Benefit Program, unlike Medicare, is not facing a fiscal crisis. In fact, it works so well, I believe we should use it as a model for future health care reform. However, I do not think the President's willingness to simply accept conversion to a Big Five-based formula by default, thereby lowering the government's share of the premium to about 67 percent, is equitable. Doing so would not only shift substantial costs to enrollees but it would allow for the continued use of an outdated formula. As subcommittee chairman, I intend to propose a new formula—possibly based on a weighted average of all plans—which will maintain the current rate of contributions to the FEHB plans by the government and its employees.

Regardless of any change in the FEHBP formula, it is possible health insurance premiums will increase over the next year due to medical inflation

and federally mandated increases in basic coverage. Congress should not aggravate the situation by shifting an additional \$4 billion in costs onto enrollees.

Third, the President's budget plan also increased Federal agency contributions to the retirement fund for civil service retirement system employees by 1.51 percent beginning October 1, 1997 and ending September 30, 2002. Currently, agencies match employee contributions of approximately 7 percent.

Fourth, the President recommended an increase in Federal employee retirement contributions—0.25 percent of base pay in 1999, another 0.15 percent in 2000, and a final 0.10 percent in 2001—adding up to a total of 0.50 percent increase. The higher contribution rate would expire on December 31, 2002.

I believe the President's proposed Federal employee budget package goes far beyond fairness. President Clinton has advocated a disproportionate contribution by those who have been asked to give again and again over the past several years. Federal employees and retirees across the country know there is no justification for the President's proposed package of changes—and it does not serve the interest of fairness to the Federal workforce.

The Federal Government may be the largest employer in the Nation, but it is far from being a model employer. You might ask, what is the Federal Government offering its workforce in order to attract and retain qualified personnel who can respond to the challenges of providing efficient, effective service to the American people? Federal employees have witnessed the slow erosion of their pay and benefit package over the last several years.

Because of the requirements of the budget resolution some changes must be adopted. As we work toward the goal of achieving the \$4.8 billion in savings required of our committee, Federal employees will have to share the burden of deficit reduction, but they will not be singled out to accept burdens not imposed upon other Americans.

Without question, public employees play an important role in our society. The hope is that by offering a balanced and fair compensation package, we can continue to attract and retain a talented and skilled workforce to deliver federal services. The reconciliation package which I will work to develop will have that as a goal as well as deficit reduction.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the conference report on the budget resolution and to say that I am pleased that this year is shaping up to be a historic year in the fight to balance the budget. Democrats and Republicans have worked together to fashion a bipartisan agreement that is projected to balance the unified budget in 5 years, in the year 2002.

I will support this budget plan because it will help maintain the superb

economy we are now enjoying. The budget plan will build on the 1993 deficit reduction bill, which has cut the unified budget deficit by 77 percent. The budget plan also makes room for priorities that are important to the American people, such as middle-class tax relief, greater funding for education, more attention to our environment, and health care for the young and the elderly.

We have been able to agree on a balanced, commonsense package—one that avoids extreme cuts to programs that Americans depend on and includes some tax cuts. This agreement is balanced because it builds on the economic gains that America has made since 1992.

THE BEST ECONOMY IN 30 YEARS

We need to remember how far we have come since 1992, when this country was in the depths of a recession. In the past 5 years, we have had so much economic growth and so little inflation that the experts are describing today's economy as the best in 30 years. Let me briefly describe some of these gains—gains that have made a budget agreement possible today.

Unemployment has fallen from 7.5 percent in 1992 to an annual rate of 4.9 percent. The last time unemployment was at 4.9 percent or less, it was 1973.

For the first 3 months of this year, inflation ran at an annual rate of 1.8 percent. The last time inflation was this low, it was 1965.

The economy has created 12.5 million jobs since President Clinton was first inaugurated.

There were nearly 1.5 million housing starts in 1996, the most since 1988.

The economy grew at an annualized rate of 5.6 percent in the first quarter of this year. This is truly a stunning rate of growth at this point in our economic recovery.

The economy has responded beautifully to the economic plan that Senate Democrats passed in 1993—without one Republican vote. The measure of our achievement is that today's economy is the best economy America has had in 30 years.

BUILDING ON DEMOCRATIC DEFICIT REDUCTION

However, the 1993 bill didn't just spark our economy into recovery. It also cut the unified deficit by 77 percent.

Let's recall when the real heavy lifting occurred with respect to deficit reduction. It was only Democrats who voted for President Clinton's deficit reduction bill in 1993. And what has that bill done to the deficit since? The unified deficit has fallen dramatically, from \$290 billion in 1992, to \$255 billion in 1993, to \$203 billion in 1994, to \$164 billion in 1995, and \$107 billion last year.

Most importantly, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that the deficit for 1997 will be only \$67 billion.

That's a cut of 77 percent in the unified deficit. Under President Clinton, for the first time since the Civil War, we will slash the deficit 5 years in a row.

Let's put it another way. The budget plan we are voting on today will provide \$204 billion in deficit reduction over the next 5 fiscal years. In contrast, the 1993 bill provided 5 times that amount of deficit reduction. If you compare the actual deficits for fiscal years 1994 to 1998 to what CBO in 1993 expected those deficits to be, you realize that the 1993 bill achieved \$922 billion in deficit reduction for the years 1994 to 1998.

Let's put it yet another way. If you calculate the improvements in the deficit from 1994 through 2002, you realize that the 1993 bill cut future deficits by \$2.4 trillion. Again, if we do get to a balanced budget in 2002, Democrats will have done the heavy lifting.

So there's some justice, Mr. President, in the fact that this balanced budget deal contains Democratic priorities and protects Democratic programs that Americans depend on. We today are standing on the shoulders of the Democratic Members of Congress who voted to cut the deficit in 1993.

BUDGET PLAN PROTECTS AMERICA'S PRIORITIES

Besides the economic record of the past 5 years and the dramatic deficit reduction that Democrats have achieved, the third thing that makes this agreement possible is that it allocates resources to the priorities that the American people care about: education, the environment, health care, and middle-class tax relief.

On education, this budget plan includes the President's budget proposal for Head Start, which puts us on the road to enrolling 1 million children in Head Start in 2002. Only 714,000 kids were enrolled in 1993. In addition, the budget would fund a child literacy initiative. The more we learn about education and child development, the more we realize that early intervention is vital to enabling a child to gain the skills and knowledge that are vital in today's economy. That's why Head Start and the literacy initiative are so important to our Nation's future.

At the higher education end, this budget would fund the largest Pell Grant increase in two decades. Four million students could receive grants of \$3,000 a year, which is \$300 higher than the current annual grant. The plan also includes \$35 billion worth of higher education tax cuts, including a credit and a deduction. In total, this will be the largest increase in higher education funding since the G.I. Bill in 1945. These resources are sorely needed today. As every American knows, college costs have been spiraling upwards, putting college out of reach for too many families. I am pleased that this budget plan will address this issue.

The budget plan will also devote resources to preserving our environment. This agreement would provide \$3.4 billion in 1998 for the Environmental Protection Agency, which is a 9 percent increase over last year's level, for its research and enforcement work to protect the public from environmental threats. The agreement would enable

the expansion of the Brownfields Redevelopment Initiative to help communities clean up and redevelop contaminated areas. And it could double the pace of Superfund cleanups, leading to 500 additional sites being cleaned up by the year 2000.

With respect to health care, this budget plan is a marked departure from the extreme budget plans we saw here in the Senate back in 1995. In 1995 the majority tried to slash \$270 billion from Medicare in order to provide \$240 billion in tax cuts for the rich. Fortunately that plan never became law. This bipartisan agreement would cut projected Medicare spending by \$100 billion over the next 5 years, but those cuts will largely come from health care providers. And these savings will extend the life of the Medicare trust fund for at least a decade. The agreement would also provide 4 major new preventive Medicare benefits: mammography, colorectal screening, diabetes self-management and vaccinations. What a far cry this plan is from the plan 2 years ago.

I would also like to mention that the budget plan contains a major new initiative to provide health care for kids. It would provide \$16 billion over the next 5 years to cover 5 million children. This coverage will take the form of either improvements to Medicaid or a new mandatory grant program to the States in order to supplement their efforts to cover uninsured children in working families.

Lastly, I remain hopeful that this budget agreement will cut taxes for America's hard-working families. We do not know the details of the proposed tax legislation yet, but the Republican leadership has assured us that the tax bill will include a \$500-per-child tax credit to make it easier for families to raise their kids. It will contain \$35 billion in higher education tax credits to make college more affordable. It will expand the tax advantages of individual retirement accounts.

I have some concerns about the eventual shape of the tax bill, but this budget plan does not specify the distribution of the tax cuts. It does not specify the details of the estate tax or capital gains tax cuts. Those details may well be controversial. But I will wait to see the tax bill before I make that judgment.

FURTHER DEFICIT REDUCTION NEEDED

Besides the eventual shape of the tax cuts, I want to raise one other concern about this budget plan. Many of my colleagues are describing this budget as a balanced-budget agreement, and indeed it does balance the unified budget, as I have said. However, as I made clear during the debate on the balanced budget amendment, I do not think the unified budget accurately portrays our fiscal situation. This budget plan is projected to balance the unified budget, but the unified budget counts the Social Security surplus, which is estimated to be \$104 billion in 2002, in order to reduce the deficit.

Congress has recognized that it is not appropriate for us to count the Social Security surplus in this way. And we have said so in the law. Section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 forbids us from doing it. So if you look at the text of this conference report, which is about the only place where we actually observe section 13301, you will find a revealing statistic. The conference report lists the projected budget deficits in each fiscal year. And guess what? In 2002, if you take out the Social Security trust fund surplus, we will have a deficit of \$108 billion.

So, Mr. President, in my view the Congress still has some deficit reduction left to do if we are to truly balance the budget. And I am pleased that the final version of the budget plan contains my amendment, which the Senate approved when I offered it here 2 weeks ago. My amendment simply says that we should continue to work to reduce the true deficit, so that we can balance the budget without relying on the Social Security trust fund.

A BALANCED AGREEMENT

However, Mr. President, I do not intend to make the perfect enemy of the good in our budgeting. In general, I believe this budget agreement meets America's expectations and addresses America's priorities. That is why I will vote for it, and why I will work to see the budget deal implemented this summer in a way that carries out the bipartisan agreement that we have achieved this spring.

• Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, as we are now within 1,000 days of the new millennium, we need to begin to think about what our Nation should look like in the next 1,000 years. For in the last 1,000 years we have discovered new continents and new planets, we have conquered deadly diseases and created new technology. As we stand at the threshold of the next century we need to take the steps to prepare the Federal Government and all Americans for the path that lies ahead.

This budget resolution is based on principles which are reasonable, credible, solution-oriented, and are based on common sense. It is because of those principles, Mr. President, that I rise today to support this bipartisan balanced budget resolution. For today we begin the process to bring fiscal security and greater economic opportunity to our children.

For over 25 years, the Federal Government has been unable to balance the budget. We now owe more than \$5.3 trillion. Therefore, we spend over \$900 million on interest every day. We send more to our bondholders in 3 days than we do to every man, woman, and child in Vermont over the course of an entire year.

The interest payment on our national debt is five and half times more than we spend on all education, job training, and employment programs combined. If one was to ask the question what should be the Federal priorities of this Nation? Should we spend

more money on education for the future of this Nation, or more money on interest? Well, it is clear what our choice would be—education. Yet, we have precisely reversed our priorities because we have been imprudent with our fiscal policy.

Balancing the budget is what we need to do to ensure a brighter future for America. Lower interest rates will allow American families to purchase their first home, send a child to college, and buy a new automobile. The real benefits of a balanced budget will be realized in the increased standard of living for each American family.

Mr. President I would now like to take a moment to speak about some of the provisions in this agreement.

Medicare serves a 37.5 million elderly and disabled individuals in this country. For several years the trustees of the Medicare program have continued to send notice to Capitol Hill that steps needed to be taken or this program will go bankrupt. This budget resolution keeps this program solvent for the next 10 years. We now can take the steps to make fundamental changes to preserve and strengthen Medicare for the current recipients and future generations.

Through the effort of several of my colleagues, children's health was put in the forefront during these first few months of the 105th Congress. Senators came up with different proposals due to one fundamental thing—the need to provide health insurance to the estimated 10 million low income children. I commend both the administration and the leadership for realizing the importance of this issue and to providing the needed resources for these children.

In many families today, both parents need to work in order to get by. They work in order to give their children a chance at a better future. Dinner tables in the past were filled with lively conversation. Conversation centering on discussions of values and goals and the other important issues which bring a family together. These tables are now silent. Empty tables due to the fact parents come home from work just too tired.

It is time for we in Congress to take some steps to provide relief for the American family. The tax reduction package is not going to solve all the problems that each family faces in this country. But what it will do is leave some additional dollars in the pockets of our hard-working Americans in order for them to spend those funds on their family needs. As a member of the Finance Committee, I look forward to working with Chairman ROTH on the specific provisions dealing with tax relief.

One of the reasons I first got involved in public service was to make a difference in the educational system of our Nation. As chairman of the Labor and Human Resources Committee I feel that it is important that we continue to improve our school system. We have all read stories about children who go

to class but just don't learn. Each day is a lost opportunity to shape and prepare these children for the future. A generation is leaving high school unable to meet the challenges that lay ahead.

When a high school graduate is unable to read, what we find is that we sent an individual into the world who will live a life of missed opportunities. Every year America becomes a more technological country. Distances which used to be measured in the time it took for a plane travel across this country are now measured in the time it takes for a signal to be bounced off a satellite. Children need to graduate from high school not just able to read but to understand the changing nature of the workplace.

Over my many years in Congress, I have championed educational opportunities for our children. This budget provides additional funding for programs that will help students throughout this Nation prepare for the future. Even though, for every dollar of increased spending for certain specific programs, this budget has made a \$15 reduction in spending. Today we begin to prepare our students with greater educational opportunities and our Federal Government will lower deficit spending, both which will help meet the demands of a global economy.

Mr. President, in closing, the American people in 1996 sent a message to our Nation's Capital. They wanted an administration and Congress of different political parties to work together to solve common problems. Though this agreement is not perfect, and there are some in this Chamber that feel that we have gone too far and some who feel we have not gone far enough, it is an important step forward. This is not a budget based on party, or one that was written exclusively in the Halls of Congress or in the Oval Office, this is a budget of compromise. This is a first step toward a new millennium. A time where America is going to need the ability to meet the challenges that lie ahead.

I want to commend Budget Committee Chairman PETE DOMENICI and Majority Leader LOTT for their determination, their hard work, and their vision in putting together this historic budget resolution. This is the first step to ensure a brighter tomorrow for our nation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. •

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the conference report on the fiscal year 1998 budget resolution, which puts us on a path to a balanced budget by the year 2002. As a member of the Budget Committee, I am proud to have been a part of the process that created this agreement. While I recognize that it is not perfect and that the real work is still ahead of us, I still believe that it represents a legitimate and fair plan to ensure that we achieve a balanced budget.

This agreement builds on the historic and successful deficit reduction package enacted in 1993, which resulted in a

real reduction in the Federal deficit. This 1993 package not only brought the deficit down from a high of \$290 billion in 1992 to an estimated \$70 billion for 1997, but it has achieved real economic growth and expansion.

The agreement before us today is another step in making sure that our fiscal house is in order. Developing this agreement was not an easy task, and required some tough choices, but the bipartisan approach succeeded.

Throughout the process, significant improvements were made to the original agreement. I believe that some of these improvements are essential to protecting the integrity of the agreement. I am pleased that most of these improvements remained in agreement throughout the conference process.

One of these improvements is an amendment that I offered to ensure that in meeting the deficit reduction target for Medicaid, the authorizing committees will not look to a per-capita cap as a mechanism for savings or for controlling future spending. I believe that this was an important message to send; a per-capita cap is not an acceptable mechanism for controlling Medicaid costs and could seriously jeopardize the quality of care for millions of children, senior citizens, and the disabled.

Along these same lines, I was pleased to join with my colleague from Missouri, Senator BOND, in support of an amendment that expresses the sense of the Senate, that any changes in the Medicaid disproportionate share hospital payments not jeopardize the ability of hospitals, especially children's hospitals to serve the most neediest and the most vulnerable. We have to be absolutely sure that the numbers do not drive the policy. If savings can be achieved through reforming DSH without jeopardizing access to quality health care for the most needy than these policy changes should be considered. But, if the motive is simply a number and develop the policy around the cut, than this is unacceptable.

Working with my good friend from Minnesota, Senator WELLSTONE, we were successful in including the family violence option amendment to the Senate resolution. This amendment simply recognizes the need to properly clarify the ability of the States to include a family violence option as part of their welfare reform plans without facing any penalty. During Senate debate on welfare reform in the 104th Congress, Senator WELLSTONE and I included this option as guidance to the States. Unfortunately, there is now some dispute as to congressional intent. The family violence option amendment that Mr. WELLSTONE and I offered to the budget resolution is intended to address this confusion. The amendment is simple: It allows the States to waive work or training requirements for victims of domestic violence and abuse without being forced to count these individuals as part of the 20 percent hardship exemption. Proper implementation of a family violence option guarantees that women who have been victims of do-

mestic violence or abuse do not become victims of welfare reform. Placing barriers to welfare simply means that these women and their children are trapped in a violent and in some cases, life threatening environment. For many, welfare is the only way to escape the violence.

While I believe that this agreement is a major step forward, I am deeply concerned that efforts already underway would ignore the agreement. In developing the reconciliation bills, we must adhere to the goals and principles of this agreement. I am hopeful that there will be no effort to ignore the policy assumptions in this agreement. We must also be absolutely sure that any tax cut proposal is fiscally sound and does not explode the deficit. Not only would this be unethical, but it would be economically foolish.

I want to thank both Chairman DOMENICI and Senator LAUTENBERG for their efforts in bringing this conference report together and for working with me to improve the final agreement.

CHILDREN'S HEALTH INITIATIVE

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I would like to clarify for the record, a procedural point in the budget resolution. The budget resolution conference report currently before the Senate includes language which would permit the chairman of the Budget Committee, with the concurrence of the ranking member, to revise the reconciliation instructions to the Finance Committee and to adjust other budget resolution levels in amounts which are intended to reflect the children's health initiative. In this regard, I would direct the attention of our colleagues to the children's health section of the bipartisan budget agreement, which provides that the \$16 billion in funding "could be used for one or both of Medicaid (provisions) * * * and a program of capped mandatory grants to States." The agreement further provides that other possibilities for implementation of the child health initiative may be considered if mutually agreeable. Would the chairman of the committee agree that the budget agreement therefore requires the concurrence of all parties to the agreement—the majority and minority in Congress and the President—before other policy options may be considered?

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes, I concur with the Senator from New Jersey that agreement of the President and the majority and minority leadership in Congress are necessary to consider children's health options beyond the specified Medicaid and capped mandatory alternatives.

HIGHWAY RESERVE FUND

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee regarding the highway reserve fund in the conference agreement on H. Con. Res. 84.

Mr. President, as my colleagues know, I strongly support increased Federal infrastructure spending. This budget resolution, while providing for

increased transportation spending, does not provide as much infrastructure spending as I would have liked. During floor consideration of this budget resolution, I offered an amendment to provide for a reserve fund for highways that would allow for increased spending on highways above the amounts called for in the budget resolution so long as appropriate offsets are found. I believe that, once the Senate begins debate on the reauthorization of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act or ISTEA, there will be strong interest on the part of many Members on both sides of the aisle to find additional resources to produce a highway bill that is balanced and meets the transportation needs of all regions of the country. As such, I am very pleased that the conference agreement on this budget resolution includes a highway reserve fund that is effectively identical to the one provided for in my amendment.

I wish to thank the distinguished Chairman of the Budget Committee for his cooperation on this matter and ask if I am correct that the main purpose of this reserve fund is to accommodate higher contract authority and outlays for highway programs if this additional spending is offset by direct spending reductions or revenue increases?

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes, the Senator is correct. We have provided \$8.5 billion in outlays above the President's budget request for transportation. Even more critical, the bipartisan budget agreement and this budget resolution has as one of its primary discretionary assumptions that Congress will spend all of the highway trust fund receipts over the next 5 years. This will allow for increased highway obligations by the Appropriations Committee of \$9.3 billion over the President's budget request for highways between 1998 and 2002.

Mr. BYRD. Would the Chairman also take a moment to describe how the reserve fund would be used to create this additional deficit-neutral spending for highways?

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for raising this issue and would be happy to explain the operation of the reserve fund. As the Senator knows, the authority to fund highway programs is split between the Environment and Public Works Committee, which provides budget authority through contract authority, and the Appropriations Committee, which controls outlays of the highway program through annual obligation limitations.

The bifurcated funding nature of these programs made it difficult to design a reserve fund to allow for additional funding. I appreciate the Senator from West Virginia's assistance in crafting the highway reserve fund.

The highway reserve fund in this resolution has separate components to allocate funding from additional savings to the Environment and Public Works

Committee for additional contract authority and to the Appropriations Committee for additional outlays for highway programs.

The first provides a mechanism to increase budget authority levels in the budget resolution to accommodate additional highway contract authority. If legislation is reported to the Senate, or an amendment is offered on the Senate floor, that reduces nonhighway direct spending or increases revenues above the levels contained in the budget resolution, these savings will be made available for highway spending.

The savings would be captured by adjusting the budget resolution's levels to ensure these savings are not spent for other programs. Next, the budget authority levels in the resolution would be adjusted upwards to accommodate higher contract authority for highways. In order for the Budget Committee to determine how to adjust budget authority levels, the provision of the bill or the amendment must either provide the contract authority for highway programs or dedicate the savings in some fashion for highway programs.

These savings must be either direct spending savings—a reduction in mandatory spending—or an increase in revenues. Other changes, such as a reduction in an authorization of appropriations or the diversion of revenues from the general fund to the highway trust fund, will not qualify. In addition, the savings will qualify only if the committee of jurisdiction from which the savings are found is already within its section 602 ceiling. Savings cannot be used for additional highway spending if the Senate committee of jurisdiction has already used such savings to meet its reconciliation targets.

The second component of this reserve fund allows for these savings, once they have been enacted, to be reserved for future appropriations bills to accommodate additional outlays that would result from an increase in the obligational ceilings for highway programs.

When the legislation that generates the direct spending savings or revenue increases is enacted, I, as Budget Committee chairman, will submit to the Senate a document that will reflect the revisions to the budget resolution levels to ensure these savings are not spent on other programs. This document also would provide the amount on a year-by-year basis of the outlay adjustment that could be made to the discretionary caps for additional highway spending.

As with the adjustment for budget authority I have just discussed, these additional savings must be in addition to the budget resolution savings. It is my belief this reserve fund will allow for a deficit-neutral way of providing additional infrastructure resources.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chairman. Am I correct then, that an amendment on the ISTEA reauthorization bill or other legislation that makes the nec-

essary savings and provides additional funding for highways in the manner you have described will not be subject to a Budget Act point of order in the Senate?

Mr. DOMENICI. That is correct. The reserve fund ensures that budget levels are adjusted to accommodate such legislation and avoid Budget Act points of order for exceeding committee allocations or budget aggregates.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the distinguished Chairman for taking the time to clarify this very important issue and I look forward to working closely with him to provide additional highway resources for our Nation during the reauthorization of the ISTEA or other legislation.

Mr. KENNEDY. I would inquire of the Senator from New Jersey and the ranking Democratic Senator for the Budget Committee, as he knows, on a vote of 51-49, the Senate passed the Coverdell amendment to the budget resolution, increasing aggregate budget authority in the year 2000 by \$2.539 billion and function 500 budget authority in the year 2000 by the same amount. The stated purpose of the amendment was to permit States and local education agencies to create voucher programs that would take Federal dollars away from public schools and divert those Federal dollars to support private schools and religious schools. It is my understanding that the entire Coverdell amendment has now been dropped. Is that correct?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is there anything in the budget agreement or this budget resolution or the report, that reflects any language similar to the purpose of the Coverdell amendment?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. No, there is not.

Mr. KENNEDY. Does the final budget resolution include any of the numbers that were included in the Coverdell amendment?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. No, it does not.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator for his response. Obviously, any such voucher program would be highly objectionable because of its serious harmful effects on the Nation's public schools. It's the wrong education priority, and I hope it will continue to be rejected by Congress and the President.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, before we pass the final version of the budget resolution, on behalf of myself and the ranking member, Senator LAUTENBERG, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished chairman and ranking member of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. President, the final budget resolution contains an unusual reconciliation instruction to the Agriculture Committee. Unlike the other committee reconciliation instructions, it calls for an increase in direct spending of \$1.5 billion over 5 years. This instruction is designed to fulfill the bipartisan budget agreement between the President, the Speaker of the House,

the Senate majority leader and the Senate minority leader. These parties agreed to add \$1.5 billion in new spending for the Food Stamp Program for increased work slots and expanded waiver authority in the jurisdiction of the Agriculture Committee. The specific details of the bipartisan budget agreement can be found on page 89 of the committee print that accompanies Senate Concurrent Resolution 27.

Mr. President, I would therefore ask the chairman and ranking member of the Agriculture Committee about their intentions regarding the bipartisan budget agreement's provisions of \$1.5 billion in new food stamp spending consistent with the details that can be found on page 89 of the committee print that accompanies Senate Concurrent Resolution 27?

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I would respond to the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee by saying that I intend to work with the ranking member of the Agriculture Committee, Senator HARKIN, to craft a bill that will comply with the bipartisan budget agreement's food stamp provisions.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks of the chairman of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chairman and ranking member for these responses.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I am very pleased to hear the distinguished chairman and ranking member of the Agriculture Committee commit to fulfill the bipartisan agreement's food stamp provision.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, section 6005 of the conference agreement on H.R. 1469 contains a substitute for the original Senate prohibition on the expenditure of funds to advocate certain policies with respect to the recognition, validity, or management of rights of way established pursuant to section 2477 of the Revised Statutes (43 U.S.C. 932), more commonly referred to as R.S. 2477.

Section 6005 establishes a commission to recommend a long-term solution to the administration and Congress. The commission is bipartisan—6 Republicans and 6 Democrats—plus a retired Federal judge selected by the other 12 to chair the commission. The commission has representatives from the administration, Congress, and the States.

The commission is cost effective—the only new cost is the salary of the retired judge. All other members are Federal, State, or congressional employees who would serve on the commission within the scope of their existing duties. The Secretary of the Interior is responsible for payment of the chairman's salary and expenses, and for providing, and paying for any necessary staff, office space, and expenses out of existing funds provided for the Department of the Interior.

Based on concerns raised by the administration, the provision waives the

Federal Advisory Committee Act to avoid lengthy procedural delays. However the commission's hearings are open to the public, and a public record is required to be kept of those hearings. In addition, the commission must keep a record of its deliberations.

The commission is tasked with recommending changes in law to expeditiously resolve outstanding right of way claims under R.S. 2477. Those recommendations are to be made in consultation with the governors of affected States. It is my hope that working together this commission can reach consensus on this difficult issue.

This commission must make its recommendations by March 1, 1998, and must include with their submission any comments they receive from governors. The Secretary of the Interior must approve or disapprove the recommendations in their entirety by March 31, 1998. If the Secretary approves the commission's recommendations, then a fast track procedure is provided in Congress to ensure those recommendations are considered. If the Secretary does not approve the commission's recommendations, then the fast track procedure is not available. Under the fast track procedure only relevant amendments are allowed in the Senate during floor consideration of the bill, and any message from the House on such a bill.

The conference agreement leaves intact the permanent prohibition on the issuance of final rules or regulations on R.S. 2477 without express authorization of such rules or regulations by a subsequent act of Congress, and specifically states in section 6005(b)(5)(A) that this provision does not constitute such express authorization. Section 6005 does not repeal or modify any existing law, and takes no position regarding the legitimacy of the R.S. 2477 policy announced by the Secretary of the Interior on January 22, 1997.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, as we finish our work on the conference report. I want to express my appreciation to Jodi Grant, who has provided invaluable assistance to me and my staff. Jodi served as counsel to the Democratic staff before leaving us recently to work on the leadership staff of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, Senator KERRY. However, she has taken time from her busy schedule to give us the benefit of her special expertise on budget matters. I very much appreciate her assistance, and thank her for her willingness to help.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1997—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 6 o'clock has arrived. The question is on agreeing to the conference report on the supplemental appropriations bill, H.R. 1469.

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that if present and voting the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS] would vote "yea."

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 31, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 95 Leg.]

YEAS—67

Abraham	Domenici	Moynihan
Allard	Dorgan	Murkowski
Ashcroft	Enzi	Murray
Baucus	Feinstein	Reed
Bennett	Frist	Reid
Bond	Glenn	Robb
Boxer	Gorton	Roberts
Breaux	Grams	Rockefeller
Brownback	Grassley	Roth
Bryan	Hatch	Shelby
Bumpers	Hutchinson	Smith (OR)
Burns	Hutchison	Snowe
Campbell	Inhofe	Specter
Chafee	Johnson	Stevens
Coats	Kempthorne	Thomas
Cochran	Kerrey	Thompson
Collins	Kerry	Thurmond
Conrad	Landrieu	Torricelli
Coverdell	Lott	Warner
Craig	Lugar	Wellstone
D'Amato	Mack	Wyden
Daschle	McCain	
DeWine	McConnell	

NAYS—31

Akaka	Gramm	Leahy
Biden	Gregg	Levin
Bingaman	Hagel	Mikulski
Byrd	Harkin	Moseley-Braun
Cleland	Helms	Nickles
Dodd	Hollings	Santorum
Durbin	Inouye	Sarbanes
Faircloth	Kennedy	Sessions
Feingold	Kohl	Smith (NH)
Ford	Kyl	
Graham	Lautenberg	

NOT VOTING—2

Jeffords	Lieberman
----------	-----------

The conference report was agreed to. Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, we are going to vote on the budget resolution in just a moment.

I want to announce that the House passed the Senate budget resolution 333 to 99. We passed it 78 to 22.

I believe the reason we have not gotten a balanced budget in the past is we have not had a President and a Congress in accord. And I think we are going to get a balanced budget.

In recent years, however, the obstacles to the Federal budget have been primarily a question of finding a working consensus between the Executive and the Congress. Today we have a consensus on this issue. Of course, each of us along might have designed the plan differently, but then we might have had a consensus. Yes I personally think we should have done more in entitlement spending programs that still threaten the foundation of this house we build today, but for today we must do what we can to. And I ask you to vote as you did on May 23 and adopt this conference agreement.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. We yield all the time we had.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEVENS). Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS] would vote "yea."

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 76, nays 22, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 96 Leg.]

YEAS—76

Abraham	Dorgan	Lugar
Akaka	Durbin	Mack
Baucus	Feingold	McCain
Bennett	Feinstein	McConnell
Biden	Ford	Mikulski
Bingaman	Frist	Moseley-Braun
Bond	Glenn	Murkowski
Boxer	Gorton	Murray
Breaux	Graham	Nickles
Brownback	Grassley	Reid
Bryan	Gregg	Robb
Burns	Hagel	Roberts
Byrd	Harkin	Rockefeller
Campbell	Hatch	Roth
Chafee	Hutchinson	Santorum
Cleland	Hutchison	Sessions
Cochran	Inouye	Shelby
Collins	Johnson	Smith (OR)
Conrad	Kempthorne	Snowe
Coverdell	Kerrey	Stevens
Craig	Kohl	Thurmond
D'Amato	Landrieu	Torricelli
Daschle	Lautenberg	Warner
DeWine	Leahy	Wyden
Dodd	Levin	
Domenici	Lott	

NAYS—22

Allard	Helms	Sarbanes
Ashcroft	Hollings	Smith (NH)
Bumpers	Inhofe	Specter
Coats	Kennedy	Thomas
Enzi	Kerry	Thompson
Faircloth	Kyl	Wellstone
Gramm	Moynihan	
Grams	Reed	

NOT VOTING—2

Jeffords	Lieberman
----------	-----------

The conference report was agreed to. Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BENNETT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the Senate will shortly adjourn over until Monday at noon, 12 o'clock. I announce to all Senators that no votes will occur on Monday prior to the hour of 5 p.m. I expect a lengthy period of morning business on Monday to accommodate a number of requests, and I will update the Democratic leader at a later time with respect to potential legislation the Senate may consider on Monday. We have already had one conversation about that, and we will have some more here in a few minutes.

Before I consider two housekeeping items, I would like to thank all Senators for their cooperation this week. The Senate has now passed a budget resolution outlining a long overdue balanced budget for our Nation, and I congratulate all those Senators who have participated in the negotiations. Again, I thank Senator DOMENICI, the chairman of Budget Committee, and Senator LAUTENBERG, who also has worked with us getting through some problems we ran into. They both did an excellent job. The Senate also adopted the supplemental appropriations conference report. Consequently, I think this has been a good week, and I hope we can continue that next week.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

REPORT CONCERNING THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY TO THE THREAT POSED BY WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 45

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 204 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1703(c)) and section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1641(c)), I transmit herewith a 6-month report on the national emergency declared by Executive Order 12938 of November 14, 1994, in response to the threat posed by the proliferation of nuclear, biological, and chemical

weapons ("weapons of mass destruction") and of the means of delivering such weapons.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 5, 1997.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:50 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agrees to the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 84) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1998 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002.

At 7:04 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agrees to the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1469) making emergency supplemental appropriations for recovery from natural disasters, and for overseas peacekeeping efforts, including those in Bosnia, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-2058. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Selected Acquisition Reports for the period October 1 through December 31, 1996; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2059. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Surface Mining, Reclamation and Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a rule entitled "State Program" (CO-034-FOR) received on May 23, 1997; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2060. A communication from the Board Members of the U.S. Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation entitled "The Railroad Retirement Financial Improvement Act of 1997"; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-2061. A communication from the Board Members of the U.S. Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation entitled "The Railroad Retirement and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Amendments Act of 1997"; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-2062. A communication from the Board Members of the U.S. Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation entitled "The Railroad Retirement and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Penalty Amendments Act of 1997"; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-2063. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Employment Standards, transmitting, pursuant to law, a rule entitled "Nondisplacement of Qualified Workers Under Certain Contracts" (RIN1215-

AA95) received on May 22, 1997; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-2064. A communication from the Chairperson of the U.S. National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report for fiscal year 1996; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-2065. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, drafts of legislative proposals relative to public health for fiscal year 1998; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-2066. A communication from the Director of Regulations Policy, Management Staff, Office of Policy, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, two rules including a rule entitled "Food Labeling"; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-2067. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, two rules entitled "The William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program" (RIN1840-AC42) received on June 2, 1997; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-2068. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator of the Marketing and Regulatory Programs, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a rule entitled "Gypsy Moth Generally Infested Areas" received on June 2, 1997; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2069. A communication from the Acting Administrator of the Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a rule entitled "1997 Marketing Quota" received on June 2, 1997; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2070. A communication from the Chief of the Natural Resources Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a rule entitled "The Environmental Quality Incentives Program" (RIN0578-AA19) received on June 2, 1997; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2071. A communication from the Administrator of the Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, two rules including a rule entitled "U.S. Standards for Grades of Apple"; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2072. A communication from the Administrator of the Rural Utilities Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, two rules including a rule entitled "Exemptions of RUS Operational Controls" received on June 2, 1997; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2073. A communication from the Acting President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a transaction involving U.S. exports to Indonesia; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2074. A communication from the Acting President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a transaction involving U.S. exports to Argentina; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2075. A communication from the Managing Director of the Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of two rules including a rule entitled "Community Support Requirements,"

received on June 2, 1997; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2076. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report for calendar year 1996; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2077. A communication from the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1996; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2078. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report concerning direct spending or receipts legislation within five days of enactment; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC-2079. A communication from the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule relative to Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants, (RIN1018-AE10) received on June 4, 1997; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2080. A communication from the Deputy Administrator of the General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a building project survey for the Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2081. A communication from the Administrator of the General Services Administration, transmitting, a prospectus for construction of a building for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2082. A communication from the Director of the Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, two rules including a rule relative to Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans, (RIN2070-AB78, FRL-5829-9) received on June 4, 1997; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2083. A communication from the Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, the report on the Toxic Release Inventory (TRI); to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2084. A communication from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on Environmental Monitoring of Organotin; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-123. A resolution adopted by the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Ship Bottom, County of Ocean, New Jersey relative to the Mud Dump Site; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

POM-124. A resolution adopted by the Borough Council of the Borough of Tinton Falls, New Jersey relative to the Mud Dump Site; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

POM-125. A resolution adopted by the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Fair Haven, New Jersey relative to the Mud Dump Site; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

POM-126. A resolution adopted by the Romanian Community of Sacramento, Cali-

fornia relative to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

POM-127. A resolution adopted by the Board of Commissioners of the Metropolitan Knoxville (Tennessee) Airport Authority relative to the National Spallation Neutron Source; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

POM-128. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Finance.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 20

Whereas, The federal unified gift and estate tax generates a minimal amount of federal revenue, especially considering the high cost of collection and compliance, and in fact has been shown to decrease these federal revenues from what they might otherwise have been; and

Whereas, This "Death Tax" has been identified as destructive to job opportunity and expansion, especially to minority entrepreneurs and family farmers; and

Whereas, The "Death Tax" causes severe hardship to growing family businesses and family farming operations, often to the point of partial or complete forced liquidation. This deprives state and local governments of an important, ongoing source of revenue; and

Whereas, Critical state and local leadership assets are unnecessarily destroyed and forever lost to the future detriment of the community through the relocation and liquidation associated with the tax; and

Whereas, Local and state schools, churches, and numerous other charitable activities would greatly benefit from the increased employment and continued family business leadership resulting from the repeal of the tax; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That we memorialize the Congress of the United States to repeal the federal unified gift and estate tax; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President of the United States Senate, the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM-129. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 25

Whereas, Since its establishment following World War II, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has played a key role in helping to bring stability to the world. In addition to its strategic significance, NATO has fostered economic and social benefits through increased communications and various programs. This success is built on the commitment of its member nations to ideals of democracy and opposition to oppression; and

Whereas, The role that NATO plays in encouraging peace and progress is especially apparent to the Baltic nations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. The Baltic states, through their individual histories, especially their common experiences in this century, are well aware of the need for unity among people devoted to self-determination. The irreversible commitment to democracy in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania is among the many conditions that are the foundation of NATO; and

Whereas, While much has changed in Europe over the past decade, there remain many reminders of threats to security in the region. Situations in several areas illustrate the role for NATO and the need for it to include the nations of the Baltic states; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That we memorialize the President and the Congress of the United States to work for the admission of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM-130. A resolution adopted by the House of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

HOUSE RESOLUTION

Whereas, the noble people of Ethiopia have developed and nourished a proud and distinguished culture that has endured for three millennia; and

Whereas, Ethiopia has had a long and productive friendship with the United States of America; and

Whereas, the people of the United States have responded generously and magnificently to the plight of Ethiopian famine victims through the provision of humanitarian aid; and

Whereas, the winds of democratic change have blown dramatically and ferociously across the former Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, Latin America, many parts of Africa, and now to Ethiopia; and

Whereas, Ethiopia is poised at a crucial juncture in its history because it is making a regression toward non-democratic one-party rule of Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF); and

Whereas, the ascendance of the Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front and its policy of promoting ethnic federalism have engendered animosity among nationalities of Ethiopia; and

Whereas, such governmental policies and practices have contributed to the severity of strained relations in Ethiopia by misdirected bureaucratic cleansing, arbitrary arrest, and detention of the prominent physician professor Asrat Woldeyes and many other prisoners of conscience, recognized as such by Amnesty International and the indigenous Ethiopian Human Rights Council (EHRC); and

Whereas, the people of Ethiopia are aspiring to resolve their complicated problems through the formation and utilization of democratic institutions and maximum citizen input; and

Whereas, the basic underpinning of democratic institutions in the new Ethiopia should be the supremacy of the will of the people and the guarantee of the rule of the people; and

Whereas, the Ethiopian government should adhere to the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which encourages freedom of speech, assembly, religion, and press, guarantees all basic rights, and discourages ethnocentric politics and ethnic reservations; and

Whereas, it is crucial that the diverse voices, opinions, and philosophies of the people be expressed in promoting political, economic, and social progress and justices in Ethiopia; and

Whereas, a multiparty government may be the most egalitarian, feasible, and productive political arrangement in providing suffrage and in overcoming monumental obstacles; and

Whereas, the President Bill Clinton and the Congress of the United States will play a crucial role in promoting the peaceful resolution of the immense problems of war ravaged Ethiopia; and

Whereas, the implementation of a democratic, multiparty government in Ethiopia should be a long-range foreign policy goal of the United States Government;

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

SECTION 1. That the Honorable House of Representatives continue to encourage the formation of democratic institutions, multiparty participation, progressive social change, and respect for fundamental human rights in Ethiopia, including freedom of association and expression.

SECTION 2. The President and the Congress of the United States should be encouraged to use every possible means at their command to examine the policy, that recognizes and evaluates the political conditions that exist in Ethiopia with a view to ensure the prevention of the shocking brutality of ethnic warfare elsewhere in Africa from spreading to Ethiopia.

SECTION 3. The Clerk of the House of Representatives is hereby directed to transmit a copy of this Resolution to the Honorable Bill Clinton, President, 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20500; the Honorable Albert Gore, Vice President, Old Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510; the Honorable Madeleine K. Albright, 2201 "C" Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20520; His Excellency Berhane Gebre-Chrispof, Embassy of Ethiopia, 2134 Kalorama Road, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20008; the Honorable Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, 2428 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515-1006; the Honorable Wendell H. Ford, 173A Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510; the Honorable Mitch McConnell, 361A Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510; the Honorable Ed Whitfield, 236 Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515; the Honorable Ron Lewis, 412 Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515; the Honorable Anne Northup, 1004 Longworth Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515; the Honorable Jim Bunning, 2437 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515; the Honorable Harold Rogers, 2468 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515; and the Honorable Scotty Baesler, 113 Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CHAFEE, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, without amendment:

S. 289. A bill to designate the United States courthouse to be constructed at the corner of Superior Road and Huron Road in Cleveland, Ohio, as the "Carl B. Stokes United States Courthouse."

S. 347. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 100 Alabama Street NW, in Atlanta, Georgia, as the "Sam Nunn Federal Center."

S. 478. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 475 Mulberry Street in Macon, Georgia, as the "William Augustus Bootle Federal Building and United States Courthouse."

S. 628. A bill to designate the United States courthouse to be constructed at the corner of 7th Street and East Jackson Street in Brownsville, Texas, as the "Reynaldo G. Garza United States Courthouse."

S. 681. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 300 Northeast First Avenue in

Miami, Florida, as the "David W. Dyer Federal Courthouse."

S. 715. A bill to redesignate the Dublin Federal Courthouse building located in Dublin, Georgia, as the "J. Roy Rowland Federal Courthouse."

S. 819. A bill to designate the United States courthouse at 200 South Washington Street in Alexandria, Virginia, as the "Martin V.B. Bostetter, Jr. United States Courthouse."

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CHAFEE, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works:

Michael J. Armstrong, of Colorado, to be an Associate Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

(The above nomination was reported with the recommendation that he be confirmed, subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

Brigadier General Robert Bernard Flowers, United States Army, to be a Member and President of the Mississippi River Commission, under the provisions of Section 2 of an Act of Congress, approved June 1879 (21 Stat. 37) (33 USC 642).

(The above nomination was reported with the recommendation that he be confirmed.)

By Mr. D'AMATO, from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

Jackie M. Clegg, of Utah, to be First Vice President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States for a term expiring January 20, 2001.

James A. Harmon, of New York, to be President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States for a term expiring January 20, 2001.

(The above nominations were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed, subject to the nominees' commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. JEFFORDS:

S. 830. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the Public Health Service Act to improve the regulation of food, drugs, devices, and biological products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. SHELBY (for himself, Mr. BOND, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mr. COVERDELL):

S. 831. A bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for congressional review of any rule promulgated by the Internal Revenue Service that increases Federal revenue, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. KOHL (for himself, Mr. KERREY, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HAGEL, and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 832. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deductibility of business meal expenses for individuals who are subject to Federal limitations on hours of service; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. GLENN, and Mr. HATCH):

S. 833. A bill to designate the Federal building courthouse at Public Square and Superior Avenue in Cleveland, Ohio, as the "Howard M. Metzenbaum United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself and Mr. REED):

S. 834. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to ensure adequate research and education regarding the drug DES; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. ABRAHAM (for himself and Mr. LEVIN):

S. 835. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the treatment of effectively connected investment income of insurance companies; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ABRAHAM (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. ASHCROFT):

S. 836. A bill to offer small businesses certain protections from litigation excesses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. CRAIG):

S. 837. A bill to exempt qualified current and former law enforcement officers from State laws prohibiting the carrying of concealed firearms and to allow States to enter into compacts to recognize other States' concealed weapons permits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRYAN (for himself, Mr. BOND, and Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN):

S. 838. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to eliminate legal impediments to quotation in decimals for securities transactions in order to protect investors and to promote efficiency, competition, and capital formation; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 839. A bill to improve teacher mastery and use of educational technology; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

S. 840. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exemption from tax gain on sale of a principal residence; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BURNS (for himself and Mr. BAUCUS):

S. 841. A bill to authorize construction of the Fort Peck Reservation Rural Water System in the State of Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. CRAIG, and Mr. HUTCHINSON):

S. 842. A bill to provide for the immediate application of certain orders relating to the amendment, modification, suspension, or revocation of certificates under chapter 447 of title 49, United States Code; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, and Mr. MACK):

S. 843. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify certain rules relating to the taxation of United States business operating abroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SPECTER:

S. 844. A bill to amend the President John F. Kennedy Assassination Records Collection Act of 1992 to extend the authorization of the Assassination Records Review Board until September 30, 1998; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. LUGAR (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. KERREY, Mr. BAUCUS, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. CONRAD):

S. 845. A bill to transfer to the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to conduct the census of agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. AKAKA:

S. 846. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to remove the jurisdiction of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to license projects on fresh waters in the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. COATS (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. ASHCROFT, Mr. COVERDELL, and Mr. GREGG):

S. 847. A bill to provide scholarship assistance for District of Columbia elementary and secondary school students; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MURKOWSKI (for himself and Mr. BAUCUS):

S. 848. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services, through the Health Care Financing Administration, to expand and strengthen the demonstration project known as the Medicare telemedicine demonstration program; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CRAIG:

S. Res. 96. A resolution proclaiming the week of March 15 through March 21, 1998, as "National Safe Place Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. ROBB):

S. Res. 97. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the President should designate the month of June 1997, the fiftieth anniversary of the Marshall Plan, as George C. Marshall month, and for other purposes; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. D'AMATO (for himself, Mr. BOND, Mr. MACK, and Mr. SPECTER):

S. Con. Res. 31. A concurrent resolution concerning the Palestinian Authority and the sale of land to Israelis; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. JEFFORDS:

S. 830. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the Public Health Service Act to improve the regulation of food, drugs, devices, and biological products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION MODERNIZATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1997

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to modernize the Food and Drug Administra-

tion [FDA] and reauthorize the Prescription Drug User Fee Act for 5 years. This legislation comes as result of over 3 years of consideration by the Congress on steps that could be taken by the agency that would contribute to its mandate to protect the American public while ensuring that life-saving products could be made more readily available.

FDA acknowledges that its mandate also requires it to regulate over one-third of our Nation's products. Within its purview the FDA regulates virtually all of the food and all of the cosmetics, medical devices, and drugs made available to our citizens. I believe, and several members of the Labor Committee share my belief, that in an organization the size of FDA there is always room for improvement and modernization. Our objective, which this legislation achieves, was identify areas where improvements could be made that will strengthen the agency's ability to approve safe and effective products more expeditiously.

Last year, both the House and the Senate held numerous and extensive hearings on countless proposals for modernizing and reforming the FDA. The Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee successfully reported a bipartisan bill that sought to accomplish many of those reforms. But last year, acrimonious issues remained, time ran out and the bill did not receive floor consideration. This year I have resolved to move forward. I have been committed to addressing last year's most controversial issues. I believe that the legislation I am introducing today addresses virtually all of objections raised last year both in process and in content. This is a better bill and I believe that upon examination, my colleagues will agree that it accomplishes its goal.

I want to comment a moment on the open, consensus-building process we followed in developing this legislation. The Labor Committee held two hearings. During the first the committee received testimony from the principal FDA Deputy Commissioner, Dr. Michael Friedman, and all of the FDA Center Directors. The second hearing included representatives from patient and consumer coalitions and from the food, drug, and medical device sectors regulated by the FDA. Committee members learned from the agency of the administrative reforms and the progress it has already undertaken, areas that remain a challenge, and those areas that require legislative authority to change. The committee listened to consumers' concerns with provisions that were considered last year that they felt would weaken the FDA's ability to protect the public health. Finally, the committee learned of the ongoing and needless delays and frustrations facing health care and consumer product sectors of our economy in working with the FDA. The committee learned of the frustrated attempts to work through the bureaucratic lab-

yrinth of needless regulatory delays. Delays that prohibited people from getting access to vitally needed, life saving medical treatments, drugs, and devices.

Since the finish of the committee's hearings we have engaged in an open, collaborative process that has given voice to each party wishing to be heard. For many of these meetings it is worth noting that the agency was a full, cooperating participant and we would not have been able to make the progress made without FDA's collaboration. Several meetings, essentially roundtable discussions, have occurred with bipartisan committee staff, the FDA, and each of the several sectors regulated by the agency. These meetings have given all the participants an opportunity to discuss problems and potential solutions and have been the basis for the consensus bill I am introducing today. Finally, committee staff have had numerous meetings to discuss key provisions in the bill with a wide range of consumer groups including, among others, the Patient Coalition, Public Citizen, the Centers for Science in the Public Interest, the Pediatric AIDS Foundation, and the National Organization for Rare Diseases. It should be clear that no person or group was excluded from this deliberative process.

Let me turn to the content of this measure and the steps we have taken to respond to the controversies raised last year. Five key objections were raised against the FDA reform bill that had been reported on a strong bipartisan vote from the Labor and Human Resources Committee during the last Congress. In that vein, we have sought to and have accomplished addressing each of the substantive concerns raised by the minority.

Last year's measure was criticized by some for the number of mandatory, but shortened, product review time frames that critics said would overburden the FDA and for the hammers that would have required FDA to contract out some product reviews or to give priority to products approved abroad. Today's legislation eliminates most of the mandatory time frames and retains only those necessary to ensure collaborative, more efficient reviews or to facilitate quick reviews of low risk products. The contracting out and European review hammers that would have forced FDA actions have been eliminated.

Last year's provision allowing for third party, outside expert review were criticized for turning central regulatory authority decisions over to private industry, creating conflicts of interest, and depriving FDA of resources and expertise. Today's legislation adopts FDA's current system for accrediting and selecting third-party review organizations. The bill expands FDA's current pilot third-party review program beyond just the lowest risk devices and FDA retains final approval for all devices. Devices that are life-

supporting, life-sustaining, or implantable are excluded from third-party review. FDA may allow third-party review for higher risk devices at its sole discretion. This approval will allow FDA to retain, augment, and focus its expertise, at its discretion, on critical areas of its expanding workload.

Last year's bill would have required FDA to contract out review of food additive petitions, medical devices, and drugs. Critics argued these changes would weaken consumer protections. We have modified these provisions to give FDA express authority to contract out when deemed by FDA to be more efficient or to add needed expertise.

This year the collaborative effort has continued. During our meetings FDA identified a number of enforcement powers that the agency believes will enhance its ability to protect the public health. We have included a number of FDA's specific requests. Many patient and consumer groups raised concerns about insufficient safeguards related to the fast-track drug approval process and the provision improving accelerated access to investigational products and we have adopted several of their key concerns.

I would close by saying that this measure embodies a reasonable, moderate approach to balancing the agency's mandate to regulate over one-third of our Nation's economy and provide for the public health and safety with the compelling need to provide new, improved, safe, and effective products to the American public. It is a good bill and I look forward to working with my colleagues to improve it even further.

By Mr. SHELBY (for himself, Mr. BOND, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mr. COVERDELL):

S. 831. A bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for congressional review of any rule promulgated by the Internal Revenue Service that increases Federal revenue, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

THE STEALTH TAX PREVENTION ACT

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Stealth Tax Prevention Act. Perhaps the most important power given to the Congress in the Constitution of the United States is bestowed in article I, section 8—the power to tax. This authority is vested in Congress because, as elected representatives, Congress remains accountable to the public when they lay and collect taxes.

Last year, Mr. President, Congress passed the Congressional Review Act of 1996, which provides that when a major agency rule takes effect, Congress has 60 days to review it. During this time period, Congress has the option to pass a disapproval resolution. If no such resolution is passed, the rule then goes into effect.

The Internal Revenue Service, as the President here knows, has enormous

power to affect the lives and the livelihoods of American taxpayers through their authority to interpret the Tax Code. The Stealth Tax Prevention Act that I am introducing today, along with Senator BOND and Senator HAGEL, will expand the definition of a major rule to include, Mr. President, any IRS regulation which increases Federal revenue. Why? Because we desperately need this today.

For example, if the Office of Management and Budget finds that the implementation and enforcement of a rule has resulted in an increase of Federal revenues over current practices or revenues anticipated from the rule on the date of the enactment of the statute under which the rule is promulgated. Therefore, the Stealth Tax Prevention Act will allow Congress to review the regulation and take appropriate measures to avoid raising taxes on hard-working Americans, in most cases, small businesses.

Mr. President, the Founding Fathers' intent, as you know, was to put the power to lay and collect taxes in the hands of elected Members of Congress, not in the hands of bureaucrats who are shielded from public accountability. It is appropriate, I believe, that the IRS's breach of authority is addressed, in light of the fact that we are celebrating this week Small Business Week.

The discretionary authority of the Internal Revenue Service exposes small businesses, farmers, and others to the arbitrary whims of bureaucrats, thus creating an uncertain and, under certain cases, hostile environment in which to conduct day-to-day activities. Most of these people do not have lobbyists that work for them, other than their elected Representatives, the way it should be. The Stealth Tax Prevention Act will be particularly helpful in lowering the tax burden on small business which suffers disproportionately. Mr. President, from IRS regulations. This burden discourages the startup of new firms and ultimately the creation of new jobs in the economy, which has really made America great today.

Americans pay Federal income taxes. They, Mr. President, as you well know, pay State income taxes. They pay property taxes. On the way to work in the morning they pay a gasoline tax when they fill up their car, and a sales tax when they buy a cup of coffee.

Mr. President, average Americans in small businesses are saddled with the highest tax burden in our country's history.

Allowing bureaucrats to increase taxes even further, at their own discretion through interpretation of the Tax Code is intolerable. The Stealth Tax Prevention Act will leave tax policy where it belongs, to elected Members of the Congress, not unelected and unaccountable IRS bureaucrats.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 831

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE RULES THAT INCREASE REVENUE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Stealth Tax Prevention Act".

(b) IN GENERAL.—Section 804(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(2) The term ‘major rule’—

“(A) means any rule that—

“(i) the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget finds has resulted in or is likely to result in—

“(I) an annual effect on the economy of \$100,000,000 or more;

“(II) a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, or local government agencies, or geographic regions; or

“(III) significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets; or

“(ii)(I) is promulgated by the Internal Revenue Service; and

“(II) the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget finds that the implementation and enforcement of the rule has resulted in or is likely to result in any net increase in Federal revenues over current practices in tax collection or revenues anticipated from the rule on the date of the enactment of the statute under which the rule is promulgated; and

“(B) does not include any rule promulgated under the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and the amendments made by that Act.”.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today to join my distinguished colleague from Alabama, Senator SHELBY, in introducing legislation to ensure that the Treasury Department's Internal Revenue Service does not usurp the power to tax—a power solely vested in Congress by the U.S. Constitution. The Stealth Tax Prevention Act will ensure that the duly elected representatives of the people, who are accountable to the electorate for our actions, will have discretion to exercise the power to tax. This legislation is intended to curb the ability of the Treasury Department to bypass Congress by proposing a tax increase without the authorization or consent of Congress.

The Stealth Tax Prevention Act builds on legislation passed unanimously by the Senate just over 1 year ago. As chairman of the Committee on Small Business, I authored the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act—better known as the Red Tape Reduction Act—to ensure that small businesses are treated fairly in agency rulemaking and enforcement activities. Subtitle E of the Red Tape Reduction Act provides that a final rule issued by a Federal agency and deemed a major rule by the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget

cannot go into effect for at least 60 days. This delay is to provide Congress with a window during which it can review the rule and its impact, allowing time for Congress to consider whether a resolution of disapproval should be enacted to strike down the regulation. To become effective, the resolution must pass both the House and Senate and be signed into law by the President or enacted as the result of a veto override.

The bill Senator SHELBY and I introduce today amends this law to provide that any rule issued by the Treasury Department's Internal Revenue Service that will result in a tax increase—any increase—will be deemed a major rule by OIRA and, consequently, not go into effect for at least 60 days. This procedural safeguard will ensure that the Department of the Treasury and its Internal Revenue Service cannot make an end-run around Congress, as it is currently attempting with the stealth tax it proposed on January 13.

As my colleagues are aware, the IRS has issued a proposal that is tantamount to a tax increase on businesses structured as limited liability companies. The IRS proposal disqualifies a taxpayer from being considered as a limited partner if he or she "participates in the partnership's trade or business for more than 500 hours during a taxable year" or is involved in a "service" partnership, such as lawyers, accountants, engineers, architects, and health-care providers.

The IRS alleges that its proposal merely interprets section 1402(a)(13) of the Tax Code, providing clarification, when in actuality it is a tax increase by regulatory fiat. Under the IRS proposal, disqualification as a limited partner will result in a tax increase on income from both capital investments as well as earnings of the partnership. The effect will be to add the self-employment tax—12.4 percent for social security and 2.9 percent for Medicare—to income from investments as well as earnings for limited partners that under current rules can exclude such income from the self-employment tax.

Under the bill introduced today, the tax increase proposed by the Internal Revenue Service of the Treasury Department, if later issued as a final rule, could not go into effect for at least 60 days following its publication in the Federal Register. This window, which coincides with issuance of a report by the Comptroller General, would allow Congress the opportunity to review the rule and vote on a resolution to disapprove the tax increase before it is applied to a single taxpayer.

The Stealth Tax Prevention Act strengthens the Red Tape Reduction Act and the vital procedural safeguards it provides to ensure that small businesses are not burdened unnecessarily by new Federal regulations. Congress enacted the 1966 provisions to strengthen the effectiveness of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, a law which had been ignored too often by Government agen-

cies, especially the Internal Revenue Service. Three of the top recommendations of the 1995 White House Conference on Small Business sought reforms to the way Government regulations are developed and enforced, and the Red Tape Reduction Act passed the Senate without a single dissenting vote on its way to being signed into law last year. Despite the inclusion of language in the 1996 amendments that expressly addresses coverage of IRS interpretative rules, we find ourselves faced again with an IRS proposal that was not issued in compliance with the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

As 18 of my Senate colleagues and I advised Secretary Rubin in an April letter, the proposed IRS regulation on limited partner taxation is precisely the type of rule for which a regulatory flexibility analysis should be done. Although, on its face, the rulemaking seeks merely to define a limited partner or to eliminate uncertainty in determining net earnings from self-employment, the real effect of the rule would be to raise taxes by executive fiat and expand substantially the spirit and letter of the underlying statute. The rule also seeks to impose on small businesses a burdensome new record-keeping and collection of information requirement that would affect millions of limited partners and members of limited liability companies. The Treasury's IRS proposes this stealth tax increase with the knowledge that Congress declined to adopt a similar tax increase in the Health Security Act proposed in 1994—a provision that the Congressional Joint Committee on Taxation estimated in 1994 would have resulted in a tax increase of approximately \$500 million per year.

The Stealth Tax Prevention Act would remove any incentive for the Treasury Department to underestimate the cost imposed by an IRS proposed or final rule in an effort to skirt the administration's regulatory review process or its obligations under the Regulatory Flexibility Act. By amending the definition of major rule under the Congressional Review Act, which is subtitle E of the Red Tape Reduction Act, we ensure that an IRS rule that imposes a tax increase will be a major rule, whether or not it has an estimated annual effect on the economy of \$100,000,000. Our amendment does not change the trigger for a regulatory flexibility analysis, which still will be required if a proposed rule would have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. We believe the heightened scrutiny of IRS regulations called for by this legislation will provide an additional incentive for the Treasury Department's Internal Revenue Service to meet all of its procedural obligations under the Regulatory Flexibility Act and the Red Tape Reduction Act.

I urge my colleagues to join Senator SHELBY and me in supporting this important legislation to ensure that the IRS not usurp the proper role of Con-

gress—nor skirt its obligations to identify the impact of its proposed and final rules. Rules such as that currently proposed by the IRS should be carefully scrutinized by Congress. When the Department of the Treasury issues a final IRS rule that increases taxes, Congress should have the ability to exercise its discretion to enact a resolution of disapproval before the rule is applicable to a single taxpayer. The Stealth Tax Prevention Act Senator SHELBY and I introduce today provides that opportunity.

By Mr. KOHL (for himself, Mr. KERREY, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HAGEL, and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 832. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deductibility of business meal expenses for individuals who are subject to Federal limitations on hours of service; to the Committee on Finance.

THE BUSINESS MEAL DEDUCTION FAIRNESS ACT
OF 1997

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, as my colleagues know, I am one of this body's strongest advocates for deficit reduction. I attribute much of my deep commitment to this goal to my days in business. As a businessman, I learned that you must balance your books and live within your means. I also learned that you must treat people fairly and admit when you have made a mistake. I have come to the floor to acknowledge that a mistake has been made, and must be corrected.

In August 1993 we passed the omnibus budget reconciliation bill. I am proud to say that this legislation has helped to produce falling deficits and sustained economic growth. However, in our efforts to get our fiscal house in order we unfairly penalized a group of hard working, middle-class Americans: transportation workers. It is for this reason that I rise today, to reintroduce the business meal deduction fairness bill. This measure would increase the deductibility of business meals, from 50 to 80 percent, for individuals who are required to eat away from home due to the nature of their work.

In the 1993 reconciliation bill was a provision which lowered the deductible portion of business meals and entertainment expenses from 80 to 50 percent. The change was aimed at the so-called three martini lunches and extravagant entertainment expenses of Wall Street financiers and Hollywood movie moguls. Unfortunately, the change also hit the average truck driver who eats chicken fried steak, hot roast beef sandwiches, and meatloaf in truck stops. And while those who entertain for business purposes can change their practices based on the tax law change, long-haul transportation workers often have no choice but to eat on the road.

For these workers, the 1993 decrease in the meal deduction has translated into an undeserved decrease in take home pay. For example, when the allowable deduction was dropped in 1993,

it increased taxes on an average truck driver \$700 to \$2,000 per year. This is a huge increase for a truck driver who normally earns \$27,000 to \$35,000 per year.

Our legislation would increase the take-home pay of hard working, middle-class Americans who were inadvertently hurt by changes in the tax law in 1993. Workers who, due to regulations limiting travel hours, must eat out. They have no control over the length of their trips, the amount of time they must rest during a delivery, or, in many cases, the places they can stop and eat. This legislation is straight forward. It would simply restore the business meal expense deduction to 80 percent for individuals subject to the Department of Transportation's hours-of-service limitations.

I will be the first to admit that the budget deficit is the No. 1 economic problem facing this country. Since being elected to the Senate, I have fought to eliminate this destructive drain on our ability to grow and compete in the world economy, but I have fought to do so in a fair manner. The 1993 reconciliation bill closed a loophole and unintentionally trapped some very hard working Americans. We need to acknowledge that a mistake was made and take the opportunity of a tax bill moving this year to fix that mistake. Therefore my colleagues, Senators KERREY, HARKIN, HATCH, HAGEL, GRASSLEY and I are requesting the support and assistance of this entire body to ensure that the business meal deduction fairness bill becomes law. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my legislation be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 832

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. INCREASED DEDUCTIBILITY OF BUSINESS MEAL EXPENSES FOR INDIVIDUALS SUBJECT TO FEDERAL LIMITATIONS ON HOURS OF SERVICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 274(n) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to only 50 percent of meal and entertainment expenses allowed as deduction) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) SPECIAL RULE FOR INDIVIDUALS SUBJECT TO FEDERAL LIMITATIONS ON HOURS OF SERVICE.—In the case of any expenses for food or beverages consumed by an individual during, or incident to, any period of duty which is subject to the hours of service limitations of the Department of Transportation, paragraph (1) shall be applied by substituting ‘80 percent’ for ‘50 percent’.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1997.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. GLENN, and Mr. HATCH):

S. 833. A bill to designate the Federal building courthouse at Public Square and Superior Avenue in Cleveland, Ohio, as the “Howard M. Metzenbaum

United States Courthouse”; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

THE HOWARD M. METZENBAUM UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE DESIGNATION ACT OF 1997

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate my dear friend and former colleague, Howard Metzenbaum, on the occasion of his 80th birthday. In his honor, I am introducing a bill that would designate the Federal Building Courthouse in Cleveland, OH, as the “Howard M. Metzenbaum United States Courthouse.” I am joined by Ohio's two Senators, Senator GLENN and Senator DEWINE.

Mr. President, I propose naming a courthouse after Howard because a courthouse is a symbol of justice where all people can come and be treated equally under the law. Howard Metzenbaum deserves this honor because he was a dedicated public servant, who served his home State of Ohio for 18 years in the U.S. Senate. Howard's sense of fairness and equality for all Americans led one of his former colleagues to suggest that Howard would have made an exceptional U.S. Supreme Court Justice when he retired from the Senate in 1994.

Mr. President, naming a courthouse after Howard is only a small gesture in attempting to remember a man so committed to justice and fairness. Howard's contributions to the Senate are extraordinary, so we should commemorate his unique contribution by celebrating his 80th year, his 18 years in the United States Senate, and also the special character he brought to our body.

I pay tribute today to a man who always stood up for what he believed was right, fighting hard to preserve opportunity for those yet to come. As a Senator, Howard had a broad range of interests and he pursued them with dogged perseverance, sincerity, and clarity.

Howard and I worked on many issues together during our time in the Senate. Individual rights and environmental preservation were major concerns. He poured his energy into clean air protection, nuclear regulation, cleaning up superfund sites, and recycling. Howard provided strong leadership on antitrust issues as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Antitrust, Monopolies and Business Rights on the Judiciary Committee.

He was a persistent gun control advocate, taking the lead on many antigun initiatives in the Senate. He was one of the lead sponsors of the Brady bill handgun purchase waiting period, as well as the bans on assault weapons and plastic explosives.

But Howard's true passions lay with America's underprivileged and needy communities, which never had a bolder champion. His work on behalf of the poor, the disabled, and the elderly reflect his remarkable compassion for those members of society who face challenges that many of us cannot fully appreciate. He tirelessly defended

their interests and fought for their protection. He was dedicated to eradicating discrimination, ensuring adequate health care to those in need, and boosting public education. It has been said many times, but for good reason, that Howard brought not only his conscience to the Senate, but also the courage to act on his convictions.

Howard remains a good friend to me, but he was also a mentor and a teacher during his years in the Senate. He gave me good advice and plenty of it. And, I might add, he continues to do so today, which I welcome. But more than that, his dedication to the office of United States Senator is an example by which to live. He stood tall for the little people.

Some will affectionately remember Howard as determined, argumentative, and even “irascible.” I cannot deny that those words come to my mind every now and then, when describing Howard. He was always at his best then, and for good reason. I heard it said by one Senator, and not a good friend: “If there wasn't a Metzenbaum here, we'd have to invent one to keep us alert.”

I have missed working with Howard Metzenbaum in this great institution, a place that has been truly enhanced by his presence. I salute him on celebrating his 80th year.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 833

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF HOWARD M. METZENBAUM UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE.

The Federal building courthouse at Public Square and Superior Avenue in Cleveland, Ohio, shall be known and designated as the “Howard M. Metzenbaum United States Courthouse”.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Howard M. Metzenbaum United States Courthouse”.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself and Mr. REED):

S. 834. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to ensure adequate research and education regarding the drug DES; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

THE DES RESEARCH AND EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1997

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, today I am pleased to be joined by my distinguished colleague from Rhode Island, Senator REED, in introducing an important women's health initiative. The DES Research and Education Amendments of 1997 would extend and expand our effort to assist the over 5 million Americans who have been exposed to

the drug, DES. Representative LOUISE SLAUGHTER, a long-time leader on this issue, is introducing companion legislation today in the other body.

Between 1938 and 1971, some 5 million American women were given the synthetic drug, diethylstilbestrol, commonly known as DES. Women were given the drug during pregnancy in the mistaken belief it would help prevent miscarriage. The drug was pulled from the market based on studies that found that it was ineffective and might result in damage to children born to the women who had been given it.

Since the 1970's, studies have shown that DES does damage the reproductive systems of those exposed in utero and increases these individuals' risk for cancer, infertility, and a wide range of other serious reproductive tract disorders. The women exposed in utero to DES are five times more likely to have an ectopic pregnancy and three times more likely to miscarry when they in turn try to have children. Studies also show that one of every thousand women exposed to DES in utero will develop clear cell cancer. Women who took DES have also been found to face a higher risk for breast cancer.

In 1992, while there had been a number of research studies on DES exposure and its effects, much more research was necessary. That year, President Bush signed legislation introduced by myself and Representative SLAUGHTER, that mandated a significant increase in DES research supported by the National Institutes of Health [NIH]. Our legislation also required NIH to support long-term studies of Americans impacted by this drug. Those studies are now underway and must be continued. The legislation we are introducing today will ensure that this critical medical research continues. In addition, there is now preliminary evidence that the grandkids of women who took DES may also be at higher risk for certain health problems, and this legislation would help ensure that further research into this is supported.

Another major problem in this area is that millions of Americans don't know the risks they face because of their exposure to DES. Many health professionals who see these people also lack sufficient information about DES exposure and the appropriate steps that should be taken to identify and assist their patients. As a result, many people do not seek or get the appropriate preventive care or take appropriate preventive measures to reduce their risks of adverse affects. For example, women exposed to DES in utero and therefore at higher risk of miscarriage may be able to reduce their risks with appropriate precautionary steps.

In an initial attempt to address this need for better information, our 1992 legislation required NIH to test ways to educate the public and health professionals about how to deal with DES exposure. The legislation we are intro-

ducing today would give people across the Nation access to the information developed through these pilot programs by requiring a national consumer and health professional education effort.

Mr. President, we took a very important step in 1992 to begin to address the significant problem presented by DES exposure. And we did it with strong bipartisan cooperation between a Democratic Congress and a Republican President. That legislation expires this year. We need to make sure that the progress we've made is continued. The 5 million Americans whose health is at risk are depending on us to work together to make sure that happens. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of that effort. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the legislation be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 834

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "DES Research and Education Amendments of 1997".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

With respect to diethylstilbestrol (a drug commonly known as DES), the Congress finds as follows:

(1) DES was widely prescribed to American women from 1938 to 1971 in the mistaken belief it would prevent miscarriage. Approximately 5,000,000 pregnant women took the drug, resulting in DES exposure for approximately 5,000,000 daughters and sons.

(2) Studies conducted since the 1970s have shown that DES damages the reproductive systems of those exposed in utero and increases the risk for cancer, infertility, and a wide range of other serious reproductive tract disorders. These disorders include a five-fold increased risk for ectopic pregnancy for DES daughters and a three-fold increase in risk for miscarriage and preterm labor. Studies have indicated that exposure to DES may increase the risk for autoimmune disorders and diseases.

(3) An estimated 1 in 1,000 women exposed to DES in utero will develop clear cell cancer of the vagina or cervix. While survival rates for clear cell cancer are over 80 percent when it is detected early, there is still no effective treatment for recurrences of this cancer.

(4) Studies also indicate a higher incidence of breast cancer among mothers who took DES during pregnancy.

(5) While research on DES and its effects has produced important advances to date, much more remains to be learned.

(6) Preliminary research results indicate that DES exposure may have a genetic impact on the third generation—the children of parents exposed to DES in utero—and that estrogen replacement therapy may not be advisable for DES-exposed women.

(7) All DES-exposed individuals have special screening and health care needs, especially during gynecological exams and pregnancy for DES daughters, who should receive high risk care.

(8) Many Americans remain unaware of their DES exposure or ignorant about proper health care and screening. There remains a great need for a national education effort to inform both the public and health care providers about the health effects and proper health care practices for DES-exposed individuals.

SEC. 3. REVISION AND EXTENSION OF PROGRAM FOR RESEARCH AND AUTHORIZATION OF NEW NATIONAL PROGRAM OF EDUCATION REGARDING DRUG DES.

(a) PERMANENT EXTENSION OF GENERAL PROGRAM.—Section 403A(e) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 283a(e)) is amended by striking "for each of the fiscal years 1993 through 1996" and inserting "for fiscal year 1997 and each subsequent fiscal year".

(b) NATIONAL PROGRAM FOR EDUCATION OF HEALTH PROFESSIONALS AND PUBLIC.—From amounts appropriated for carrying out section 403A of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 283a), the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the heads of the appropriate agencies of the Public Health Service, shall carry out a national program for the education of health professionals and the public with respect to the drug diethylstilbestrol (commonly known as DES). To the extent appropriate, such national program shall use methodologies developed through the education demonstration program carried out under such section 403A. In developing and carrying out the national program, the Secretary shall consult closely with representatives of nonprofit private entities that represent individuals who have been exposed to DES and that have expertise in community-based information campaigns for the public and for health care providers. The implementation of the national program shall begin during fiscal year 1998.

By Mr. ABRAHAM (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. MCCAIN and Mr. ASHCROFT):

S. 836. A bill to offer small businesses certain protections from litigation excesses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE SMALL BUSINESS LAWSUIT ABUSE PROTECTION ACT OF 1997

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Small Business Lawsuit Abuse Protection Act of 1997. This bill will provide targeted relief from litigation excesses to small businesses.

Small businesses in Michigan and across the Nation have faced increasingly burdensome litigation and desperately need relief from unwarranted and costly lawsuits. While other sectors of our society and our economy also need relief from litigation excesses, small businesses by their very nature are particularly vulnerable to lawsuit abuses and especially unable to bear the high costs of unjustified and unfair litigation against them.

As this week is Small Business Week, it provides a fine opportunity for us to focus on relieving the burdens faced by small businesses. Small businesses represent the engine of our growing economy and provide countless benefits to communities across America. The Research Institute for Small and Emerging Business, for example, has estimated that there are over 20 million small businesses in America and that small businesses generate 50 percent of the country's private sector output.

When I was in Michigan last week over the Memorial Day recess, I heard story after story from small businesses about the constraints, limitations, and

fear imposed on them by the threat of abusive and unwarranted litigation. I also heard about the high costs that they must pay for liability insurance. Those represent costs that could be going to expand small businesses, to provide more jobs, or to offer more benefits. According to a recent Gallup survey, one out of every five small businesses decides not to hire more employees, expand its business, introduce a new product, or improve an existing one out of fear of lawsuits.

Before the Memorial Day recess, Congress passed the Volunteer Protection Act, which—if signed by the President—will provide specific protections from abusive litigation to volunteers. The Senate passed that legislation by an overwhelming margin of 99 to 1. That legislation provides a model for further targeted reforms for sectors that are particularly hard hit and in need of immediate relief.

Small businesses have carried an often unbearable load from unwarranted and unjustified lawsuits. Data from San Diego's superior court published by the Washington Legal Foundation revealed that punitive damages were requested in 41 percent of suits against small businesses. It is unfathomable that such a large proportion of our small businesses are engaging in the sort of egregious misconduct that would warrant a claim of punitive damages. Unfortunately, those sort of findings are not unusual. The National Federation of Independent Business has reported that 34 percent of Texas small business owners have been sued or threatened with court action seeking punitive damages. Those figures are outrageously high and simply cannot have anything to do with actual wrongdoing.

We know of far too many examples of expensive and ridiculous legal threats faced by our small businesses that they must defend every day. In a case reported by the American Consulting Engineers Council, a drunk driver had an accident after speeding and bypassing detour signs. Eight hours after the crash, the driver had a blood alcohol level of 0.09. The driver sued the engineering firm that designed the road, the contractor, the subcontractor, and the State highway department. Five years later, and after expending exorbitant amounts on legal fees, the defendants settled the case for \$35,000. The engineering firm—a small 15 person firm—was swamped with over \$200,000 in legal costs. That represents an intolerable amount for a small business to have to pay in defending a questionable and unwarranted lawsuit.

There are more examples. In an Ann Landers column from October 1995, a case was reported that involved a minister and his wife who sued a guide dog school for \$160,000 after a blind man who was learning to use a seeing-eye dog stepped on the woman's toes in a shopping mall. The guide dog school, Southeastern Guide Dogs, Inc., which provided the instructor supervising the

man, was the only school of its kind in the Southeast. It trains seeing-eye dogs at no cost to the visually impaired. The couple filed their lawsuit 13 months after the so-called accident, in which witnesses reported that the woman did not move out of the blind man's way because she wanted to see if the dog would walk around her.

The experiences of a small business in Michigan, the Michigan Furnace Co., is likewise alarming. The lawsuit in the history of her company has been a nuisance lawsuit. She indicates that if the money the company spends on liability insurance and legal fees was distributed among the employees, it would amount to a \$10,000 annual raise per employee.

These costs are stifling our small businesses and the people who work there. The straightforward provisions of the Small Business Lawsuit Abuse Protection Act will provide small businesses with relief by discouraging abusive litigation. The bill contains essentially two principal reforms.

First, the bill limits punitive damages that may be awarded against a small business. In most civil lawsuits against small businesses, punitive damages would be available against the small business only if the claimant proves by clear and convincing evidence that the harm was caused by the small business through at least a conscious, flagrant indifference to the rights and safety of the claimant. Punitive damages would also be limited in amount. Punitive damages would be limited to the lesser of \$250,000 or two times the compensatory damages awarded for the harm. That formulation is exactly the same formulation that appears in the small business protection provision that was included in the product liability conference report that passed in the 104th Congress.

Second, joint and several liability reforms for small businesses are included under the exact same formulation that was used both in the Volunteer Protection Act passed this Congress and in the product liability conference report passed last Congress. Joint and several liability would be limited so that a small business would be liable for noneconomic damages only in proportion to the small business's responsibility for causing the harm. If a small business is responsible for 100% of an accident, then it will be liable for 100% of noneconomic damages. But if it is only 70%, 25%, 10%, or any other amount responsible, then the small business will be liable only for that same percent of noneconomic damages.

Of course, small businesses would still be jointly and severally liable for economic damages, and any other defendants in the action that were not small businesses could be held jointly and severally liable for all damages. This should provide some protection to small businesses so that they will not be sought out as "deep pocket" defendants by trial lawyers who would otherwise try to get them on the hook for

harms that they have not caused. The fact is that many small businesses simply do not have deep pockets, and they frequently need all of their resources just to stay in business, take care of their employees, and make ends meet.

The other provisions in the bill specify the situations in which those reforms apply. The bill defines small business as any business having fewer than 25 employees. That is the same definition of small business that was included in the Product Liability Conference Report. Like the Volunteer Protection Act, this bill covers all civil lawsuits with the exception of suits involving certain types of egregious conduct. The limitations on liability included in the bill would not apply to any misconduct that constitutes a crime of violence, act of international terrorism, hate crime, sexual offense, or civil rights law violation, or which occurred while the defendant was under the influence of intoxicating alcohol or any drug.

Also like the Volunteer Protection Act, the bill includes a State opt-out. A State would be able to opt out of the provisions of the bill provided the State enacts a law indicating its election to do so and containing no other provisions. I do not expect that any State will opt-out of these provisions, but I feel it is important to include one out of respect for principles of federalism.

I am pleased to have Senators MCCONNELL, COVERDELL, SANTORUM and MCCAIN as original cosponsors of the legislation and very much appreciate their support for our small businesses and for meaningful litigation reforms. The bill is also supported by the National Federation of Independent Business and by the National Restaurant Association. I ask unanimous consent that letters from those two organizations be inserted in the RECORD.

Finally, I ask unanimous consent that a section-by-section analysis of the bill be printed in the RECORD, as well as the full text of the bill, and I encourage my colleagues to support this simple and much-needed legislation.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 836

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Small Business Lawsuit Abuse Protection Act of 1997".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

- (1) the United States civil justice system is inefficient, unpredictable, unfair, costly, and impedes competitiveness in the marketplace for goods, services, business, and employees;
- (2) the defects in the civil justice system have a direct and undesirable effect on interstate commerce by decreasing the availability of goods and services in commerce;
- (3) there is a need to restore rationality, certainty, and fairness to the legal system;
- (4) the spiralling costs of litigation and the magnitude and unpredictability of punitive

damage awards and noneconomic damage awards have continued unabated for at least the past 30 years;

(5) the Supreme Court of the United States has recognized that a punitive damage award can be unconstitutional if the award is grossly excessive in relation to the legitimate interest of the government in the punishment and deterrence of unlawful conduct;

(6) just as punitive damage awards can be grossly excessive, so can it be grossly excessive in some circumstances for a party to be held responsible under the doctrine of joint and several liability for damages that party did not cause;

(7) as a result of joint and several liability, entities including small businesses are often brought into litigation despite the fact that their conduct may have little or nothing to do with the accident or transaction giving rise to the lawsuit, and may therefore face increased and unjust costs due to the possibility or result of unfair and disproportionate damage awards;

(8) the costs imposed by the civil justice system on small businesses are particularly acute, since small businesses often lack the resources to bear those costs and to challenge unwarranted lawsuits;

(9) due to high liability costs and unwarranted litigation costs, small businesses face higher costs in purchasing insurance through interstate insurance markets to cover their activities;

(10) liability reform for small businesses will promote the free flow of goods and services, lessen burdens on interstate commerce, and decrease litigiousness; and

(11) legislation to address these concerns is an appropriate exercise of Congress powers under Article I, section 8, clauses 3, 9, and 18 of the Constitution, and the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **ACT OF INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM.**—The term “act of international terrorism” has the same meaning as in section 2331 of title 18, United States Code.

(2) **CRIME OF VIOLENCE.**—The term “crime of violence” has the same meaning as in section 16 of title 18, United States Code.

(3) **DRUG.**—The term “drug” means any controlled substance (as that term is defined in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802(b)) that was not legally prescribed for use by the defendant or that was taken by the defendant other than in accordance with the terms of a lawfully issued prescription.

(4) **ECONOMIC LOSS.**—The term “economic loss” means any pecuniary loss resulting from harm (including the loss of earnings or other benefits related to employment, medical expense loss, replacement services loss, loss due to death, burial costs, and loss of business or employment opportunities) to the extent recovery for such loss is allowed under applicable State law.

(5) **HARM.**—The term “harm” includes physical, nonphysical, economic, and noneconomic losses.

(6) **HATE CRIME.**—The term “hate crime” means a crime described in section 1(b) of the Hate Crime Statistics Act (28 U.S.C. 534 note).

(7) **NONECONOMIC LOSSES.**—The term “noneconomic losses” means losses for physical and emotional pain, suffering, inconvenience, physical impairment, mental anguish, disfigurement, loss of enjoyment of life, loss of society and companionship, loss of consortium (other than loss of domestic service), injury to reputation, and all other nonpecuniary losses of any kind or nature.

(8) **SMALL BUSINESS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “small business” means any unincorporated business, or

any partnership, corporation, association, unit of local government, or organization that has less than 25 full-time employees.

(B) **CALCULATION OF NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES.**—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the number of employees of a subsidiary of a wholly-owned corporation includes the employees of—

(i) a parent corporation; and

(ii) any other subsidiary corporation of that parent corporation.

(10) **STATE.**—The term “State” means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Northern Mariana Islands, any other territory or possession of the United States, or any political subdivision of any such State, territory, or possession.

SEC. 4. LIMITATION ON PUNITIVE DAMAGES FOR SMALL BUSINESSES.

(a) **GENERAL RULE.**—Except as provided in section 6, in any civil action against a small business, punitive damages may, to the extent permitted by applicable State law, be awarded against the small business only if the claimant establishes by clear and convincing evidence that conduct carried out by that defendant through willful misconduct or with a conscious, flagrant indifference to the rights or safety of others was the proximate cause of the harm that is the subject of the action.

(b) **LIMITATION ON AMOUNT.**—In any civil action against a small business, punitive damages shall not exceed the lesser of—

(1) two times the total amount awarded to the claimant for economic and noneconomic losses; or

(2) \$250,000.

(c) **APPLICATION BY COURT.**—This section shall be applied by the court and shall not be disclosed to the jury.

SEC. 5. LIMITATION ON SEVERAL LIABILITY FOR NONECONOMIC LOSS FOR SMALL BUSINESSES.

(a) **GENERAL RULE.**—Except as provided in section 6, in any civil action against a small business, the liability of each defendant that is a small business, or the agent of a small business, for noneconomic loss shall be determined in accordance with subsection (b).

(b) **AMOUNT OF LIABILITY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In any civil action described in subsection (a)—

(A) each defendant described in that subsection shall be liable only for the amount of noneconomic loss allocated to that defendant in direct proportion to the percentage of responsibility of that defendant (determined in accordance with paragraph (2)) for the harm to the claimant with respect to which the defendant is liable; and

(B) the court shall render a separate judgment against each defendant described in that subsection in an amount determined pursuant to subparagraph (A).

(2) **PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSIBILITY.**—For purposes of determining the amount of noneconomic loss allocated to a defendant under this section, the trier of fact shall determine the percentage of responsibility of each person responsible for the harm to the claimant, regardless of whether or not the person is a party to the action.

SEC. 6. EXCEPTIONS TO LIMITATIONS ON LIABILITY.

The limitations on liability under sections 4 and 5 do not apply to any misconduct of a defendant—

(1) that constitutes—

(A) a crime of violence;

(B) an act of international terrorism; or

(C) a hate crime;

(2) that involves—

(A) a sexual offense, as defined by applicable State law; or

(B) a violation of a Federal or State civil rights law; or

(3) if the defendant was under the influence (as determined pursuant to applicable State law) of intoxicating alcohol or a drug at the time of the misconduct, and the fact that the defendant was under the influence was the cause of any harm alleged by the plaintiff in the subject action.

SEC. 7. PREEMPTION AND ELECTION OF STATE NONAPPLICABILITY.

(a) **PREEMPTION.**—Subject to subsection (b), this Act preempts the laws of any State to the extent that State laws are inconsistent with this Act, except that this Act shall not preempt any State law that provides additional protections from liability for small businesses.

(b) **ELECTION OF STATE REGARDING NON-APPLICABILITY.**—This Act does not apply to any action in a State court against a small business in which all parties are citizens of the State, if the State enacts a statute—

(1) citing the authority of this subsection;

(2) declaring the election of such State that this Act does not apply as of a date certain to such actions in the State; and

(3) containing no other provision.

SEC. 8. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—This Act shall take effect 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) **APPLICATION.**—This Act applies to any claim for harm caused by an act or omission of a small business, if the claim is filed on or after the effective date of this Act, without regard to whether the harm that is the subject of the claim or the conduct that caused the harm occurred before such effective date.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS—THE SMALL BUSINESS LAWSUIT ABUSE PROTECTION ACT OF 1997

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE

This section provides that the act may be cited as the “Small Business Lawsuit Abuse Protection Act of 1997.”

SECTION 2. FINDINGS

This section sets out congressional findings concerning the litigation excesses facing small businesses, and the need for litigation reforms to provide certain protections to small businesses from abusive litigation.

SECTION 3. DEFINITIONS

Various terms used in the bill are defined in the section. Significantly, for purposes of the legislation, a small business is defined as any business or organization with fewer than 25 full time employees.

SECTION 4. LIMITATION ON PUNITIVE DAMAGES FOR SMALL BUSINESSES

The bill provides that punitive damages may, to the extent permitted by applicable State law, be awarded against a defendant that is a small business only if the claimant establishes by clear and convincing evidence that conduct carried out by that defendant with a conscious, flagrant indifference to the rights or safety of others was the proximate cause of the harm that is the subject of the action.

The bill also limits the amount of punitive damages that may be awarded against a small business. In any civil action against a small business, punitive damages may not exceed the lesser of two times the amount awarded to the claimant for economic and noneconomic losses, or \$250,000.

SECTION 5. LIMITATION ON SEVERAL LIABILITY FOR NONECONOMIC LOSS FOR SMALL BUSINESSES

This section provides that, in any civil action against a small business, for each defendant that is a small business, the liability of that defendant for noneconomic loss will be in proportion to that defendant's responsibility for causing the harm. Those defendants would continue, however, to be held

jointly and severally liable for economic loss. In addition, any other defendants in the action that are not small businesses would continue to be held jointly and severally liable for both economic and noneconomic loss.

SECTION 6. PREEMPTION AND ELECTION OF STATE NONAPPLICABILITY

The bill preempts State laws to the extent that any such laws are inconsistent with it, but it does not preempt any State law that provides additional protections from liability to small businesses. The bill also includes an opt-out provision for the States. A State may opt out of the provisions of the bill for any action in State court against a small business in which all parties are citizens of the State. In order to opt out, the State would have to enact a statute citing the authority in this section, declaring the election of the State to opt out, and containing no other provisions.

SECTION 7. EXCEPTIONS TO LIMITATIONS ON LIABILITY

The limitations on liability included in the bill would not apply to any misconduct that constitutes a crime of violence, act of international terrorism, hate crime, sexual offense, or civil rights law violation, or which occurred while the defendant was under the influence of intoxicating alcohol or any drug.

SECTION 8. EFFECTIVE DATE

The bill would take effect 90 days after the date of enactment, and would apply to claims filed on or after the effective date.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS, Washington, DC, June 4, 1997.

Hon. SPENCER ABRAHAM,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC

DEAR SENATOR ABRAHAM: On behalf of the 600,000 small business owners of the National Federation of Independent Business (NFIB), I am writing to commend you for your efforts to put an end to abusive litigation and restore common sense to our civil justice system.

Legal reform is a small business issue and was listed as a top priority at the 1995 White House Conference on Small Business. The frequency and cost of litigation have been exploding at an alarming rate. Our civil justice system is becoming increasingly inaccessible, unaffordable and intimidating, not to mention unfair. It is now so strained that it threatens not only the fair judicial process but also has become a huge disincentive to business start-ups. The cost and availability of liability insurance was listed as a top concern to small business owners in a survey conducted recently by the NFIB Education Foundation.

Small business owners now see the legal system as a "no win" situation. If sued—even if completely innocent—it means either a costly, protracted trial or being forced into an expensive settlement to avoid a trial. Thousands of small business owners across the country are having their business, their employees, and their future put at risk by a legal system that is out of control.

Small business owners support any measures that inject more fairness into our civil justice system and allow for the affordable pursuit—or defense—of legitimate cases. Your legislation, the Small Business Lawsuit Abuse Protection Act of 1997, is an important vehicle for those goals. With our courts facing an extraordinary backlog with delays up to several years in some jurisdictions, your bill will discourage frivolous or malicious cases, and help streamline and balance the system.

Thank you for your continued support of small business.

Sincerely,

DAN DANNER,
Vice President, Federal
Governmental Relations.

NATIONAL RESTAURANT ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, June 4, 1997.

Hon. SPENCE ABRAHAM,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR ABRAHAM: The National Restaurant Association—the leading representative for the nation's restaurant industry which employs more than nine million Americans—strongly applauds your effort to protect small businesses from litigation excesses.

Many small businesses, particularly restaurants, have become vulnerable to excessive litigation in recent years. Indeed, our members are all too familiar with the rising costs of liability insurance and with the reality that a single frivolous lawsuit can be enough to drive a restaurant out of business. We strongly support the Small Business Lawsuit Abuse Protection Act of 1997 and believe it will go a long way toward curbing lawsuit abuse.

Because of the fear of unlimited punitive damages when faced with a claim, many small business owners settle out of court for significant award amounts, even if the plaintiff's claim is frivolous and unwarranted. Plaintiffs' attorneys take advantage of a small business owner's fear, pursuing claims against businesses that they know will have "settlement value." The Small Business Lawsuit Abuse Protection Act limits the amount of punitive damages that may be awarded against a small business. In any civil action against a small business, punitive damages may not exceed the lesser of two times the amount awarded to the claimant for economic and noneconomic losses, or \$250,000. Putting a cap on the amount of punitive damages would help to reduce frivolous suits and would enable businesses to obtain more equitable settlements and avoid costly and unnecessary legal fees.

In addition to limiting punitive damages, we are pleased that your legislation includes a provision to limit several liability for noneconomic damages. Under joint and several liability, small business owners are often dragged into lawsuits with which they had little, or nothing, to do. The Abraham Small Business Lawsuit Abuse Protection Act takes an important first step by limiting the liability for noneconomic loss to the proportion of the small business' responsibility. The limitation on several liability would apply in any civil action against a small business.

Senator Abraham, we appreciate your continued commitment to small business and to legal reform. We look forward to working with you to pass the Small Business Lawsuit Abuse Protection Act.

Sincerely,

ELAINE Z. GRAHAM,
Senior Vice President,
Government Relations and Membership.

CHRISTINA M. HOWARD,
Senior Legislative Representative.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to join my esteemed colleague from Michigan in the introduction of the Small Business Lawsuit Abuse Protection Act of 1997.

Over the past 30 years, the American civil justice system has become inefficient, unpredictable, and costly. Con-

sequently, I have spent a great deal of my time in the U.S. Senate working to reform the legal system. I was particularly pleased to help lead in the efforts to pass the Volunteer Protection Act, which offers much-needed litigation protection for our country's battalion of volunteers. America's litigation crisis, however, goes well beyond our volunteers.

Lawsuits and the mere threat of lawsuits impede our country's invention, innovation, and the competitive position our Nation has enjoyed in the world marketplace. The litigation craze has several perverse effects. For example, it discourages the production of more and better products, while encouraging the production of more and more attorneys. In the 1950's, there was one lawyer for every 695 Americans. Today, in contrast, there is one lawyer for every 290 people. In fact, we have more lawyers per capita than any other western democracy.

Mr. President, don't get me wrong—there is nothing inherently wrong with being a lawyer. I am proud to be a graduate of the University of Kentucky College of Law. My point, however, is simple: government and society should promote a world where it is more desirable to create goods and services than it is to create lawsuits.

The chilling effects of our country's litigation epidemic are felt throughout our national economy—especially by our small businesses. We must act to remove the litigation harness from the backs of our small businesses.

The Small Business Lawsuit Abuse Protection Act is a narrowly crafted bill which seeks to restore some rationality, certainty, and civility to the legal system. Specifically, this bill would offer limited relief to businesses or organizations that have fewer than 25 full-time employees.

First, the bill seeks to provide some reasonable limits on punitive damages, which typically serve as a windfall to plaintiffs. The bill provides that punitive damages may be awarded against a small business only if the claimant establishes by clear and convincing evidence that the business engaged in wanton or willful conduct. The bill would also limit the amount of punitive damages that may be awarded against a small business to, the lesser of: First, \$250,000, or second, two times the amount awarded to the claimant for economic and noneconomic losses. Third, the bill provides that a business' responsibility for noneconomic losses would be in proportion to the business' responsibility for causing the harm. Any other defendants in the action who are not small businesses would continue to be held jointly and severally liable.

Now, let me explain what this bill does not do. It does not close the courthouse door to plaintiffs who sue small businesses. For example, this bill does not limit a plaintiff's ability to sue a small business for an act of negligence, or any other act, for that matter. The

bill also does not abolish joint and several liability for economic losses.

Mr. President, this is a sensible, narrowly tailored piece of legislation that is greatly needed to free up the enterprising spirit of our small businesses. I look forward to Senate's consideration of this important legislation.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I rise today to join my good friend, Senator ABRAHAM, in introducing the Small Business Lawsuit Abuse Protection Act. As a member of the Senate's Small Business Committee, I have focused on helping small businesses succeed in an increasingly competitive environment.

Small businesses are vulnerable to abusive lawsuits. Take for example the case of Dixie Flag Manufacturing, a small business in Texas that manufactures American flags. The company was named in an injury lawsuit claiming it manufactured an unreasonably dangerous product—a flag—that failed to carry proper instructions or warning labels. Ironically, Dixie Flag Manufacturing did not even make the flag involved in the injury prompting the lawsuit. In fact, its only connection to the incident was that it happened to be in the business of manufacturing American flags. Nevertheless, this small family-owned business was forced to settle out of court in order to avoid large legal fees.

The cost of obtaining product liability insurance has skyrocketed over the last 20 years, and small businesses have been disproportionately affected. A recent Gallup survey found that the fear of lawsuits drove 20 percent of small businesses not to hire more employees, expand the business, introduce a new product, or improve an existing one.

I recently authored the Volunteer Protection Act to shield volunteers from unreasonable and costly lawsuits, and it received overwhelming support in Congress because it takes real action to promote voluntarism. Frivolous and absurd lawsuits are having a chilling effect on the volunteer community. Consequently, the Volunteer Protection Act deserves the President's unqualified support.

The Gallup study demonstrates that the threat of frivolous lawsuits is having a similar chilling effect on small business. Simply put, the Small Business Lawsuit Abuse Protection Act, which has been modeled after the Volunteer Protection Act, would provide needed protections for small businesses from abusive and frivolous lawsuits.

Let me take this opportunity to briefly describe how the Small Business Lawsuit Abuse Protection Act would protect small businesses, specifically those with fewer than 25 full-time employees.

First, it would require that clear and convincing evidence of gross negligence must be present before punitive damages could be awarded against a small business. Second, it would place sensible limits on punitive damages, which could potentially bankrupt a

small business. Third, it would provide for proportionate liability for small business.

It is important to note that this legislation would give States the flexibility to impose conditions and to make exceptions to the granting of liability protection. In addition, it would allow States to opt for cases where all parties are citizens of that State.

Finally, it is important to note that the bill clearly states which actions would not entitle a small business to protection. Any misconduct constituting a crime of violence, an act of international terrorism, a hate crime, a sexual offense, or a civil rights violation or misconduct occurring while under the influence of alcohol or drugs would not be covered.

Mr. President, this is Small Business Week. Accordingly, all citizens should take a moment during this year's Small Business Week to recognize our economy's dependence on small business and realize the importance of nurturing their development. For Georgia, as is the case for the whole Nation, small businesses are the jobs provider and the backbone of our economy. The Small Business Administration reports that nearly 98 percent of the firms in Georgia that provide employment are small businesses. Moreover, it is estimated there are an additional 213,000 self-employed entrepreneurs in my State.

What better time to highlight the importance of providing small business much-needed relief from abusive lawsuits than during Small Business Week? I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting the Small Businesses Lawsuit Abuse Protection Act and in protecting small businesses from abusive litigation.

By Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. CRAIG):

S. 837. A bill to exempt qualified current and former law enforcement officers from State laws prohibiting the carrying of concealed firearms and to allow States to enter into compacts to recognize other States' concealed weapons permits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCEALED WEAPONS PERMITS LEGISLATION

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, today I am pleased to be joined by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Senator HATCH and Senator CRAIG as original cosponsors of this legislation.

This bill would both authorize States to recognize each other's concealed weapons laws and would exempt qualified current and former law enforcement officers from State laws prohibiting the carrying of concealed firearms. This legislation is designed to support the rights of States and to facilitate the right of law-abiding citizens as well as law enforcement officers to protect themselves, their families, and their property.

The language of this bill is similar to a provision in S. 3, the Omnibus Crime Control Act of 1997, introduced earlier

this year by the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Senator HATCH. In light of the importance of this provision to law-abiding gunowners and law enforcement officers, I am introducing this free-standing bill today for the Senate's consideration and prompt action.

This bill allows States to enter into agreements known as compacts to recognize the concealed weapons laws of those States included in the compacts. This is not a Federal mandate; it is strictly voluntary for those States interested in this approach. States would also be allowed to include provisions which best meet their needs, such as special provisions for law enforcement personnel.

This legislation would allow anyone possessing a valid permit to carry a concealed firearm in their respective State to also carry one in another State, provided that the States have entered into a compact agreement which recognizes the host State's right-to-carry laws. This is needed if you want to protect the security individuals enjoy in their own State when they travel or simply cross State lines to avoid a crazy quilt of differing laws.

I use my own experience in Colorado as a former deputy sheriff and as a person who just lives 9 miles from the New Mexico border and within an hour's drive of both Arizona and Utah as a person who is caught in this kind of crazy quilt. I have always been a law-abiding citizen. I have a permit to carry a gun in Colorado, but if I go south just 5 minutes into New Mexico, I have to comply with a different standard, and this bill would correct this different standard.

Currently, a Federal standard governs the conduct of nonresidents in those States that do not have a right-to-carry statute. Many of us in this body have always strived to protect the interests of States and communities by allowing them to make important decisions on how their affairs should be conducted. We are taking to the floor almost every day to talk about mandating certain things to the States. This bill would allow States to decide for themselves.

Specifically, it allows that the law of each State govern conduct within that State where the State has a right-to-carry statute, and States determine through a compact agreement which out-of-State right-to-carry statute will be recognized.

To date, 31 States have passed legislation making it legal to carry concealed weapons. These State laws enable citizens of those States to exercise their right to protect themselves, their families, and their property.

Applicants, of course, must be law-abiding citizens and pass their State's firearm training requirements. In my State of Colorado, the State legislature has passed a bill which puts into place statewide uniform standards for concealed weapons permits.

The second major provision of this bill would allow qualified current and

former law enforcement officers who are carrying appropriate written identification of that status to be exempt from State laws that prohibit the carrying of concealed weapons. This provision sets forth a checklist of stringent criteria that law enforcement officers must meet in order to qualify for this exemption status. Exempting qualified current and former law enforcement officers from State laws prohibiting the carrying of concealed weapons, I believe, would add additional forces to our law enforcement community in our unwavering fight against crime.

I share the view of the Judiciary Committee chairman, Senator HATCH, as reflected in his legislation, that the need to establish greater national uniformity concerning the entitlement of active and retired law enforcement officers to carry weapons across State lines is paramount. That is why I have included this provision in this bill. To our friends who do not believe in the right to bear arms, I recommend reading this morning's Washington Post. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 5, 1997]

SEVEN SLAIN IN DISTRICT IN 36 HOURS OF VIOLENCE

(By Brian Moar and Avis Thomas-Lester)

Two men were fatally shot yesterday in separate incidents in Southeast Washington in a deadly 36-hour period in which seven people were killed in the city, police said.

At least four other people were wounded by gunfire.

the unusual flurry of violence stretched the resources of the D.C. police homicide branch, sending investigators from one end of Washington to the other as reports came in about shootings.

"Everybody has their hands full, running here and running there," Sgt. Marvin Lyons, a homicide squad supervisor, said last night.

"My detectives have been working around the clock and on the multitude of different cases, and then this latest group of homicides happens," said Capt. Alan Dreher, head of the homicide unit for the last two years. "I don't know if it's a record, but it is certainly the highest number of homicides I've seen in a 24- or 36-hour period since I've been commander of homicide."

The latest shooting occurred about 11 p.m. in the Washington Highlands neighborhood in far Southeast Washington. Police said that a woman and two men were shot and wounded by gunfire in the 4200 block of Sixth Street SE.

That scene was not far from a shooting about eight hours earlier that left one man dead near Sixth and Chesapeake Streets SE.

Another man was killed about 1:30 p.m. yesterday near the Kentucky Courts apartment complex in the 200 block of Kentucky Avenue SE.

The names of those shot, including a man wounded on 50th Street NE about 9 p.m., had not been released last night.

While keeping up with the two fatal shootings yesterday, homicide detectives were investigating Tuesday's fatal shootings of three young men in Northeast Washington and the discovery of two bodies in Northwest.

Officers on patrol in the 5800 block of Blaine Street NE about 4 p.m. Tuesday saw

what appeared to be two men sitting in a car in an alley. But when the officers checked on them, officials said, they discovered that both men had been shot several times.

They were identified as Norman Isaac, 18, of the 100 block of 59th Street NE, and William Alonzo Powell III, 23, of the 100 block of 58th Place NE, police said.

Later Tuesday, Bernard Campbell Allen, 17, was shot multiple times about 11 p.m. at 16th and E streets NE. Allen, of the 9300 block of Edmonston Road in Greenbelt, was taken to D.C. General Hospital, where he was pronounced dead a few hours later, police said.

About 9 a.m. Tuesday, police found the body of an unidentified woman who had been stabbed to death and left in an alley in Columbia Heights. Later in the day, the body of an unidentified man was found in the trunk of a car in the 1400 block of Chapin Street NW.

Mr. CAMPBELL. This appeared this morning, and is a story about seven people slain in violence in the last 36 hours in Washington, DC, four or more wounded in just that same 36-hour period. And I would point out that this is a city that has the tightest gun control laws in the Nation, so tight in fact that not a Senator or Congressman, not a Supreme Court Justice, for that matter, can carry a concealed weapon. It seems like only the bad guys can carry them in this town.

I do ask unanimous consent that Senator HATCH be added as an original cosponsor to this bill and it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 837

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Law Enforcement Protection Act of 1997".

SEC. 2. EXEMPTION OF QUALIFIED CURRENT AND FORMER LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS FROM STATE LAWS PROHIBITING THE CARRYING OF CONCEALED FIREARMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 926A the following:

"§ 926B. Carrying of concealed firearms by qualified current and former law enforcement officers

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any provision of the law of any State or any political subdivision of a State, an individual may carry a concealed firearm if that individual is—

"(1) a qualified law enforcement officer or a qualified former law enforcement officer; and

"(2) carrying appropriate written identification.

"(b) EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.—

"(1) COMMON CARRIERS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to exempt from section 46505(B)(1) of title 49—

"(A) a qualified law enforcement officer who does not meet the requirements of section 46505(D) of title 49; or

"(B) a qualified former law enforcement officer.

"(2) FEDERAL LAWS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to supersede or limit any Federal law or regulation prohibiting or restricting the possession of a firearm on any Federal property, installation, building, base, or park.

"(3) STATE LAWS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to supersede or limit the laws of any State that—

"(A) grant rights to carry a concealed firearm that are broader than the rights granted under this section;

"(B) permit private persons or entities to prohibit or restrict the possession of concealed firearms on their property; or

"(C) prohibit or restrict the possession of firearms on any State or local government property, installation, building, base, or park.

"(4) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(A) APPROPRIATE WRITTEN IDENTIFICATION.—The term 'appropriate written identification' means, with respect to an individual, a document that—

"(i) was issued to the individual by the public agency with which the individual serves or served as a qualified law enforcement officer; and

"(ii) identifies the holder of the document as a current or former officer, agent, or employee of the agency.

"(B) QUALIFIED LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.—The term 'qualified law enforcement officer' means an individual who—

"(i) is presently authorized by law to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, or investigation of any violation of criminal law;

"(ii) is authorized by the agency to carry a firearm in the course of duty;

"(iii) meets any requirements established by the agency with respect to firearms; and

"(iv) is not the subject of a disciplinary action by the agency that prevents the carrying of a firearm.

"(C) QUALIFIED FORMER LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.—The term 'qualified former law enforcement officer' means, an individual who is—

"(i) retired from service with a public agency, other than for reasons of mental disability;

"(ii) immediately before such retirement, was a qualified law enforcement officer with that public agency;

"(iii) has a nonforfeitable right to benefits under the retirement plan of the agency;

"(iv) was not separated from service with a public agency due to a disciplinary action by the agency that prevented the carrying of a firearm;

"(v) meets the requirements established by the State in which the individual resides with respect to—

"(I) training in the use of firearms; and

"(II) carrying a concealed weapon; and

"(vi) is not prohibited by Federal law from receiving a firearm.

"(D) FIREARM.—The term 'firearm' means, any firearm that has, or of which any component has, traveled in interstate or foreign commerce."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The chapter analysis for chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 926A the following:

"926B. Carrying of concealed firearms by qualified current and former law enforcement officers."

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION TO ENTER INTO INTER-STATE COMPACTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The consent of Congress is given to any 2 or more States—

(1) to enter into compacts or agreements for cooperative effort in enabling individuals to carry concealed weapons as dictated by laws of the State within which the owner of the weapon resides and is authorized to carry a concealed weapon; and

(2) to establish agencies or guidelines as they may determine to be appropriate for making effective such agreements and compacts.

(b) RESERVATION OF RIGHTS.—The right to alter, amend, or repeal this section is hereby expressly reserved by Congress.

By Mr. BRYAN (for himself, Mr. BOND, and Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN):

S. 838. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to eliminate legal impediments to quotation in decimals for securities transactions in order to protect investors and to promote efficiency, competition, and capital formation; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

THE COMMON CENTS STOCK PRICING ACT OF 1997

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, today Senator BOND, Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN, and I are introducing legislation to require stocks to be traded in a much more consumer-friendly fashion with the added benefit of saving investors billions of dollars.

Mr. President, I send that legislation to the desk for its introduction.

Let me just say parenthetically this is not the first time that I have had the privilege of working with the senior Senator from Missouri on legislation that affects vital consumer interests. He and I had the opportunity to work over several previous Congresses and secured in the last Congress significant changes to Federal law that protect consumers in terms of correcting information on their consumer histories, the largest single complaint before the Federal Trade Commission, and through his leadership and support and sustained efforts we were able to accomplish that. So I look forward to working with him on the piece of legislation that we introduce today, with the only caveat that I hope my distinguished colleague and I might be more helpful in getting this passed in a sooner period of time than we did on our previous enterprise which took three successive Congresses to work through.

This legislation would bring to an end an antiquated pricing system currently used by Wall Street to buy and sell stocks that dates back to colonial times when the New York Stock Exchange was founded in the 18th century and the dollar was denominated in pieces of eight. While every other pricing system in our country has moved to dollars and cents, Wall Street continues to use this outdated eighths pricing system.

As one article pointed out, and I quote, "Imagine going to the grocery store and seeing bacon selling for \$3³/₈ and chicken potpies for \$1¹/₈." Mr. President, not only has every other pricing system in America moved to dollars and cents, but all other major stock exchanges in the world—all have abandoned the antiquated eighths system and now trade in decimals.

The bill that we are introducing today is a companion piece of legislation to H.R. 1053 sponsored in the House of Representatives by Congressmen OXLEY, MARKEY and BLILEY. This legislation would direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to, within 1

year after the enactment of the legislation, adopt a rule to transition the stock and option markets away from their current trading practice in eighths to trading in dollars and cents.

Currently, the New York Stock Exchange has a rule which mandates a minimum quote of an eighth for a share of stock trading in excess of \$1. This rule is sanctioned by the Securities and Exchange Commission. Otherwise, it would be a blatant example of price-fixing. This legislation would require the SEC to revise this sanction to better represent the interests of consumers and investors throughout the country.

I must say, Mr. President, I have been encouraged by recent newspaper reports which suggest that the New York Stock Exchange plans to move to one-sixteenth of a dollar and in 2 years to switch to decimals. If those reports are in fact confirmed—and I am informed that there is a meeting today in which formal action will be taken to that effect—then the members of the New York Stock Exchange are to be commended for moving in the right direction. I would note, however, that there are other stock exchanges in the United States which have not yet indicated that is their course of action, and so this legislation will be necessary to ensure that all take that step.

There are currently 60 million Americans who participate directly in the stock markets who would benefit from change. Large pension funds and small investors alike would benefit. According to SEC Commissioner Steven Wallman, investors would end up saving between \$5 billion to \$10 billion each year if stocks were traded in increments of dollars and cents rather than in the current practice of trading in eighths. It is not uncommon for a 500-million share day to occur on a given day, so a small change in the spread would mean enormous savings for investors.

Many of us are reluctant to have Government intervene in the marketplace. Private sector determinations ought to be the rule, not the exception, here in America. In point of fact, we do not have a free market at work here. In fact, we have a classic example of price collusion. Wall Street dictates that this antiquated system be used and that all dealers must adhere to it. In essence, we are not interfering with the free market system; we are stepping in to help the stock market act more like a free market.

We are not trying to dictate the spreads that could be charged in the buying and selling of stocks or the profits that Wall Street can make. In my judgment, that would be appropriate. If this legislation is enacted, however, stocks would be traded in dollars and cents and then the free market can more accurately determine what the prices and spreads should be. This is the essence of a free market. This is the essence of free enterprise. It seems appropriate as we move into the 21st

century. It is time the United States joined the rest of the world in using a more rational, understandable system of stock transactions.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator BRYAN in introducing the Common Cents Stock Pricing Act of 1997. I thank Senator BRYAN for his leadership in this measure. As he indicated in his comments, we worked together through three sessions of Congress to pass the Fair Credit Reporting Act. Numerous members of staff came and went while we were trying to get this commonsense consumer measure passed, and I only hope, as he indicated, that we will not have a similar 6-year battle on this one, because I think the bill is very simple, very straightforward, and reflects common sense. It calls for the markets to get on in the business of trading in plain numbers, dollars and cents, instead of fractions.

The Common Cents Stock Pricing Act will make stock prices easier to understand for the average small investor. It will also force stock dealers to compete in pennies, which should result in lower transaction costs and investor savings.

Our Nation's stock markets use pricing methodologies which date back to the 18th century, when colonies used Spanish dollars as their currency. Traders would chisel these ancient coins into "pieces of eight" or "bits" and use them to purchase commodities. When organized stock trading began in New York in 1792, stock prices were quoted in bits, or eighths.

Mr. President, 200 years later, the time has come to move beyond this pricing system. We don't use Spanish coins today, we don't use bits, and we don't need confusing price systems.

The pricing system based on ancient coins is not only out of date, but it is difficult for the average investor to understand. At least one newspaper has recognized this fact. The San Francisco Chronicle recently began printing its tables in dollars and cents, instead of fractions. Others, including the Boston Globe and USA Today have called on the stock exchanges to move to a penny pricing system.

Small investors also stand to benefit financially from the move to pricing by the penny rather than by the bit. SEC Commissioner Steve Wallman estimates investors lose a minimum of \$1.5 billion a year under the current system. Other experts put the figure in the \$4 to \$9 billion range.

Let me just explain why small investors lose in the current environment. Stock exchange rules effectively limit the minimum spread between a stock's buy-and-sell price to one-eighth of a dollar, or 12.5 cents. This means that floor traders earn at least 12.5 cents from investors on every trade. Large investor institutions can get better deals on their trades by negotiating prices on block trades, but the average small investor has to pay the full fare.

Penny stock pricing is also in step with the rest of the world. The U.S. is

the only major market that trades in eighths; every other country uses decimal pricing. If we are going to maintain our role as the dominant player in world markets, the U.S. must keep pace and move to a system of decimal pricing.

The bill we are introducing today is straightforward. It simply calls on the Securities and Exchange Commission to promulgate a rule, within 1 year after the enactment date of the legislation, to transition the stock and option markets away from fractionalized trading, bits trading, into dollars and cents pricing.

I think the bill is an appropriate way for the Government to regulate financial markets. The Common Cents Stock Pricing Act does not micromanage the markets by dictating what the spread will be. The competition and the markets will determine the spread. The implementation of the SEC will allow competitive forces to decide what the spread will be.

Let me close by saying I also noted the New York Stock Exchange announcement has been made that it will begin trading in sixteenths and eventually in decimals. I commend Senator BRYAN and the sponsors of the companion House legislation, because their bill was cited as one of the reasons that the New York Stock Exchange was moving forward. I plan to review the language to ensure that their efforts clearly commit them to move to decimals, and that other exchanges will move to decimals. We need to do so in a reasonable timeframe and not wait until the forecasted computer crisis of the year 2000, when all of the computers go back to 1900.

Big investors get good deals every day in negotiating stock trade prices. I think it is time for the average investor to get a good deal too. I encourage my colleagues to join me in making sure average investors are treated equitably. I thank my colleague from Nevada for his work on this issue, and I encourage and invite other Members of the Senate to join us in supporting this bill.

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 839. A bill to improve teacher mastery and use of educational technology; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

THE TECHNOLOGY FOR TEACHERS ACT

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today, with the support of Senator MURRAY from the State of Washington, to introduce legislation that will increase the effectiveness of our efforts to improve education in the country. I send to the desk the legislation and ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, the bill is entitled the Technology for Teachers Act. Its purpose is to increase

the ability of millions of new and current teachers to use technology in the classroom.

Every school day in my home State of New Mexico and across the country, computers are being purchased, are being unpacked and are being delivered to classrooms in the hope that the teachers there will do wonderful things with those computers to assist the educational process. Sometimes that happens, but most of the time, the computer that is delivered and unpacked is just one more challenge to that teacher, one more demand on that teacher's time and one more drain on the energy of that teacher, because no one has given the teacher the training necessary to be able to do wonderful things with the computer.

Most of the teachers in our public schools today started teaching before the era of personal computers really began and was established.

The problem begins with low standards for the preparation of teachers to use this new technology and for the licensing of new teachers. This is reflected in a chart I have, Mr. President, that I would like to call attention to. This chart demonstrates the following. On the left-hand side, we have the States that now require one course in education technology. You can see that the red area indicates that 32 States now require a course in education technology. Eighteen of our States require no instruction in education technology today.

But the more problematic part of this chart is the right-hand side, where we try to depict the new teachers who feel prepared to use technology in the classroom.

You can see that the green area indicates that 90 percent of our new teachers do not feel prepared to use technology in the classroom. That means 90 percent have not had adequate training, including the 90 percent who have had that one course that is required in those 32 States. So there is a serious problem.

We also have a disturbing imbalance between the high investment we are making in equipment on the one hand and our inadequate investment in teachers on the other. Let me show a couple of other charts to make that point.

This chart tries to make the distinction between the high availability of computers in our schools versus the low amount of teacher training to use them. Ninety-eight percent of our schools today are equipped with some computers. So, clearly, that is a major step forward from where we were, for example, 5 or 10 years ago. But if you look at the teachers who took more than 1 day of training in a single school year on how to use those computers, it is 15 percent of our teachers. Clearly, that imbalance exists.

We are investing in the hardware; we are not investing in training the teachers to use that hardware effectively.

Let me show one other chart to make the same point. This is connections to

the Internet. This shows a 1997 estimate of the percent of schools that are connected to the Internet. About 65 percent of our schools have at least some connection to the Internet. When you look, though, down at the classroom level, you see that only 14 percent of our classrooms actually have a connection to the Internet.

Only 13 percent of schools require some kind of advanced training for teachers so that they would know how to take advantage of that hookup to the Internet. And teachers who are actually using the Internet to help with their instruction is only 20 percent. So, again, we have a major imbalance between the investment in the equipment on the one hand, and the inadequate investment in training our teachers on the other. The experts say that 30 percent of the total investment we make in education technology should be used to train teachers, but right now we spend only 9 percent on teacher training. In my own State of New Mexico, only 4 percent of the \$33 million spent on education technology goes for training teachers. That's less than half the national average and less than one seventh what we should be spending on teacher training.

I am not saying that the Federal Government has not invested in teacher training as a part of school reform. There is a lot of money which is available for this, but also for a great many other needs. Clearly, this chart shows that. When we talk about general reform of education, there are four large programs that the Federal Government has. Of course, Title I is by far the largest, Title VI, Goals 2000, the Eisenhower Professional Development Program—all of those programs have funds that arguably can be used for training of teachers in this respect but, in fact, there are other great demands on those funds.

When you look at technology for education, we now have the Technology Literacy Program that is funded at \$257 million. The request from the President and the agreement in this year's Budget Resolution is to substantially increase that in the coming years. But when you look at technology training for teachers, there is absolutely nothing planned for that or required to be spent on that. This legislation tries to correct that deficiency.

There are no Federal programs today devoted exclusively to technology training for teachers—either technology training for new teachers that are being trained, or technology training for current teachers in the work force.

Let me briefly describe what our bill would do, Mr. President. This bill has two parts. One would improve the technology training that 2 million new teachers will get while they are in college during the next decade to try to ensure that as they begin their teaching careers, they have had this instruction.

The other part involves the technology training that millions of our

current teachers will need throughout their teaching careers.

For both parts, our legislation provides that the Department of Education would make competitive grants to the States, to the States' departments of education that are responsible for the licensing of teachers and for maintaining high teaching standards. Those States' departments would then set up competitive grant programs, one to go to colleges of education for innovative programs to train new teachers to use technology; the other set of grants would go to local school districts for innovative professional development of current teachers.

The bill would require that the States' departments of education, the colleges of education, the local school districts, and the education technology private sector all work together to create these innovative teacher training programs. This bill would be a major step forward in providing the necessary training to our teachers so that they can benefit from new technologies and integrate those new technologies into their instruction.

There are some very good examples, happening in a few places, of what should be happening all over the country. For example, the University of Missouri has a program that issues a laptop computer to incoming freshmen in their College of Education. It has built telecommunications links to K-through-12 schools throughout the State of Missouri.

This bill would also support some innovative programs similar to the program we have in New Mexico called the Regional Education Technology Assistance Program; it trains five teachers from each of the school districts in my State. In fact, we have only reached out now and gotten the involvement of 52 of our 89 school districts. But the idea here is to get a cadre of teachers who are comfortable with the use of technology who can then work in their school district to train other teachers so that they, too, can be comfortable with the use of that technology and not have the technology just be a frill which is put over in the corner of their classroom for people to use when they don't have other more important activities to pursue.

Mr. President, I think this legislation is particularly important because it tries to deal with the very real resource constraints that some of our school districts face. In my home State, we have a school district in Cuba, NM, where they have had to give up their music instruction, they have had to give up their home economics program, in order to acquire technology to try to enrich their curriculum. This would provide some additional sources of funds for them so that they could get that technology, they could get the training for the use of that technology. That is the great need that we have at this particular time.

I hope very much that we can get a hearing on this bill this summer, move

ahead with it, and enact this legislation before the conclusion of this session of the Congress. I think this is a step forward.

We have seen significant progress over the last few years in Federal support for technology and the use of technology in education. The one great deficiency today is that we do not put enough into training teachers so that that technology can be used effectively. This legislation will help to correct that problem.

I thank Senator MURRAY for cosponsoring the legislation. I hope other colleagues will do so as well.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

S. 840. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exemption from tax gain on sale of a principal residence; to the Committee on Finance.

THE PRINCIPAL RESIDENCE TAX EXCLUSION ACT
OF 1997

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, today I introduce the Principal Residence Tax Exclusion Act of 1997. Earlier this year, Representatives ROB PORTMAN and BEN CARDIN introduced similar legislation, styled H.R. 1391, in the House of Representatives. In addition, both President Clinton and former Senator Dole have expressed strong support for a capital gains exclusion for our Nation's homeowners.

This is a proposal that enjoys widespread bipartisan support. Now is the time to make good on our promises to help our Nation's families.

As everyone knows, moving is a stressful and complicated process. Besides worrying about whether to take advantage of a job opportunity in another State or to move closer to family members or to accept some other reason for relocation, such as a change of residence at retirement, people should not have added to all of those complex decisions the worry about paying taxes on the sale of their permanent residence.

This act will get the tax code out of the family's decisionmaking process. It will allow the family to make decisions based on the family's specific circumstances, not based on constraints imposed by the tax law.

What is the current law? Under the current law, capital gains from the sale of principal residences are subject to taxation. However, two provisions exclude many homeowners from the effect of that taxation.

First, under the so-called rollover provision, taxpayers can roll over gains from the sale of a principal residence into a new residence and defer any capital gains tax under certain conditions. One of those is that the purchase price of the new residence must exceed the adjusted sales price of the previous principal residence. The new residence must be purchased within 2 years of the date of sale of the first home.

There is a second provision which results in many homeowners not paying a capital gains tax on a principal resi-

dence. And that is the age 55 exclusion, a taxpayer is eligible for a one-time permanent exclusion of up to \$125,000 on any accumulated gain from the sale of their principal residence. In addition to meeting the age 55 requirement to qualify for this exclusion, the taxpayer must have owned the residence and used it as their principal residence for at least 3 years during the 5 years prior to the sale.

A taxpayer is eligible for the exclusion only if neither the taxpayer nor the taxpayer's spouse has previously benefited from this exclusion. Consequently, Mr. President, to avoid the tax, most people wait until they are eligible for the one-time exclusion or they make what may be uneconomic decisions regarding the sale of their home.

Mr. President, this is not right. People should be able to move when they want to, not when the tax code makes it financially possible. They should be able to buy a smaller home, if that is what they desire, without having to pay a tax on the difference between their profit on the sale of the first home and the price of the new home.

Mr. President, this is an issue of removing governmental intrusion from family matters. This is an issue of allowing Americans to be free from unnecessarily burdensome requirements. This is an issue of permitting people to make decisions that will ultimately have a positive impact on the American economy.

The Principal Residence Tax Exclusion Act would go a long way toward resolving each of these issues. I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting this proposal.

Under this act, the Principal Residence Tax Exclusion Act, taxpayers of any age—I underscore "any age"—could exclude the gain on the sale of a principal residence of up to \$500,000 for a married couple filing a joint return, and up to \$250,000 for a single taxpayer.

To be eligible, the taxpayer must have owned and used the home as the principal residence for at least 2 of the last 5 years prior to the sale. The exclusion will generally be available once every 2 years.

This legislation would have a far-reaching impact on the families of our Nation. Under the current law, approximately 150,000 families annually have taxable gain on the sale of their homes. This number would be even higher. However, concern about the tax causes most people to wait until they are eligible for the one-time exclusion or to buy increasingly more expensive homes over time regardless of whether such purchases are economically wise or otherwise meet the family's needs.

Under the new proposal, the Department of the Treasury estimates that only about 10,000 transactions annually would be subject to taxation. So nearly all families would be relieved of the burdensome recordkeeping requirements and constraints on decision-making which are part of the current law.

Mr. President, I would like to bring to your attention one such family, a family who I believe represents the concerns of many American families. Rudy and Lynn Saumell of Valrico, FL, retired and moved to Florida several years ago after working for a combined total of 60 years in the Connecticut school system. Lynn taught remedial math in the elementary school for 25 years. Rudy taught for 15 years before serving as an assistant principal for 20 more years. The Saumells lived in their Connecticut home with their two daughters for 23 years. When the Saumells retired 5 years ago, their girls had long since left home; the family's needs had changed.

Lynn and Rudy decided to move to Florida to be near some of their relatives and to enjoy the warm climate and a hospitable neighborhood. They no longer needed such a large home. They were moving to a lower cost area. But the Saumells were concerned about being taxed on the sale of their Connecticut home. So, upon their accountant's advice, they bought a more expensive home than they needed and used both the one-time exclusion and the rollover provision to avoid paying tax on their previous residence's sale.

In order to qualify under current law, the Saumells had to keep extensive records of all of the improvements they made to their previous residence. For over two decades, they complied with the law to the best of their abilities despite the difficulties they encountered in doing so.

I commend the Saumells for their diligence. I agree with them that these requirements seem unnecessarily burdensome and nearly impossible to fulfill without error, omission, or honest misunderstanding.

The act I propose would eliminate the need to keep these detailed records for 99 percent-plus of all Americans. After spending 5 years in their new home, the Saumells still want to move to a smaller home in a retirement community. They are paying more than they would like in property taxes. Their heat, water, and electric bills would be greatly reduced. Instead, Rudy and Lynn would rather spend the money they have saved for traveling and helping their daughters buy homes for their new families. Lynn and Rudy do not need such a big home for just the two of them.

But the Saumells are stuck between a rock and a hard place. Under the current law, if they keep their house they will not be able to spend their savings as they would like. But if they sell their home and buy a less expensive one, they cannot use the over-55 exemption again since it is only available once in a lifetime and the rollover provision would not apply since they are not moving to a more expensive home.

Thus their savings would be eaten up by a large capital gains tax, defeating the purpose of selling their current residence. So they are locked in the dilemma: Do we stay in a home that is

larger than we need, more expensive than we can afford, or do we sell the home and suffer a substantial capital gains tax?

Mr. President, why should the Saumells have to base their housing decisions on the Tax Code rather than their family requirements? Why should they be prevented from spending their savings on what they deem to be important?

Like many Americans who are affected by the capital gains tax on home sales, Rudy and Lynn have spent their entire lives working and saving for their retirement and to assist their daughters in starting their new families' lives. It is unfair to deny them the freedom to spend these savings as they wish. So I offer this legislation to allow the Saumells and all of our Nation's families more freedom in their decisionmaking, to be able to decide where to live based on their families' circumstances, not on the Tax Code.

Rudy now volunteers with a local television station to help people recover money that has been wrongfully withheld from them. Isn't it time that we remove the Tax Code restraints on Rudy and help him get back the free use of his own money?

Mr. President, we have the means, the opportunity, and the support to help our Nation's families in a very significant way. Passing this legislation is more than providing relief to our Nation's homeowners. It is the right thing to do.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the ERC, the Employee Relocation Council, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EMPLOYEE RELOCATION
COUNCIL,
Washington, DC, June 4, 1997.

Hon. BOB GRAHAM,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR GRAHAM: The Employee Relocation Council ("ERC") strongly supports your efforts to introduce legislation that would provide a \$500,000 exclusion of gain on the sale of a principal residence and we urge that this proposal be included as part of the tax package to be assembled by Congress in the coming weeks. Reducing the tax cost of relocations and improving the economics of home purchase decisions would be beneficial not only to individual taxpayers, but to companies and the economy as well.

Currently, taxpayers can rollover gains from their principal residence into a new residence and defer any capital gains tax to the extent that the purchase price is equal to or greater than the adjusted sales price of the old residence. Additionally, a one time \$125,000 exclusion (\$62,500 for separated individuals) is provided at age 55. These tax rules are extremely complex; encourage relocating employees to purchase increasingly expensive homes regardless of their economic situation and can prevent companies from relocating those employees because of increased relocation costs (attached is an analysis of the benefits to employers and employees that would result from enactment of this proposal).

ERC is an association whose members are concerned with employee transfers, the sale

and purchase of real estate related to the movement of household goods and other aspects of relocation. ERC's members include some sixty percent (60%) of Fortune 1000 corporations as well as real estate brokers, appraisers, van lines, relocation management companies and other industry professionals. ERC supports initiatives that ease the constraints and reduce the costs of moving employees and that allow companies and individuals to relocate based on sound economic decisions. ERC believes that one of the keys to success in today's international marketplace is workforce mobility, which enhances the ability of companies to compete internationally and is reflected in improved national productivity and efficiency. The complexity and costs imposed by the current tax rules act as a detriment and forces employers and employees to make decisions based on tax law and not economic soundness. Accordingly, ERC endorses your efforts to enact legislation that would provide for a \$500,000 exclusion of gain on the sale of a principal residence.

Sincerely,

H. CRIS COLLIE,
Executive Vice President.

By Mr. BURNS (for himself and Mr. BAUCUS):

S. 841. A bill to authorize construction of the Fort Peck Reservation Rural Water System in the State of Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

THE FORT PECK RESERVATION RURAL WATER
SYSTEM ACT OF 1997

Mr. BURNS. Madam President, today I introduce a bill that will ensure the Assiniboine and Sioux people of the Fort Peck Reservation in Montana a safe and reliable water supply system. The Fort Peck Reservation is located in northeastern Montana. It is one of the largest reservations in the United States, and has a population of more than 10,000. The Fort Peck Reservation faces problems similar to all reservations in the country, that of remote rural areas. This reservation also suffers from a very high unemployment rate, 75 percent. Added to all this, the populations on the reservation suffer from high incidents of heart disease, high blood pressure, and diabetes. A safe and reliable source of water is needed to both improve the health status of the residents and to encourage economic development and thereby self-sufficiency for this area.

This legislation would authorize a reservation-wide municipal, rural, and industrial water system for the Fort Peck Reservation. It would provide a much needed boost to the future of the region and for economic development, and ultimately economic self-sufficiency for the entire area. My bill has the support of the residents of the reservation and the endorsement of the tribal council of the Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes.

The residents of the Fort Peck Reservation are now plagued with major drinking water problems. In one of the communities, the sulfate levels in the water are four times the standard for safe drinking water. In four of the communities the iron levels are five times

the standard. Sadly, some families were forced to abandon their homes as a result of substandard water quality. Basically, the present water supply system is inadequate and unreliable to supply a safe water supply to those people that live on the reservation.

Several of the local water systems have had occurrences of biological contamination in recent years. As a result, the Indian Health Service has been forced to issue several health alerts for drinking water. In many cases, residents of reservation communities are forced to purchase bottled water. Not a big deal to those who can afford it, but difficult to a population that has the unemployment rate found on the Reservation. All this, despite the fact that within spitting distance is one of the largest man-made reservoirs in the United States, built on the Missouri River.

Agriculture continues to maintain the No. 1 position in terms of economic impact in Montana. In a rural area like the Fort Peck Reservation agriculture plays the key role in the economy, more so than in many areas of the State. The water system authorized by the legislation will not only provide a good source of drinking water, but also a water supply necessary to protect and preserve the livestock operations on the reservation. A major constraint on the growth of the livestock industry around Fort Peck has been the lack of an adequate watering site for cattle. This water supply system would provide the necessary water taps to fill watering tanks for livestock, which in normal times would boost the local economy of the region and the State. An additional benefit of this system would be more effective use of water for both water and soil conservation and rangeland management.

The future water needs of the reservation are expanding. Data shows that the reservation population is growing, as many tribal members are returning to the reservation. It is clear that the people that live on the reservation, both tribal and nontribal members, are in desperate need of a safe and reliable source of drinking water.

The solutions to this need for an adequate and safe water supply is a reservation wide water pipeline that will deliver a safe and reliable source of water to the residents. In addition this water project will be constructed in size to allow communities off the reservation the future ability to tap into the system. A similar system for water distribution is currently in use on a reservation in South Dakota.

The surrounding communities have also agreed with the importance of this system. Last year when I introduced this bill, there were no additional communities signed on to the system. Today, the surrounding communities have signed on and look at this system as a means of supplying clean, safe drinking water to their residents.

The people of the Fort Peck Reservation, and the State of Montana are

only asking for one basic life necessity. Good, clean, safe drinking water. This is something that the more developed regions of the Nation take for granted, but in rural America we still seek to develop.

I realize the importance of getting this bill introduced and placed before the proper committee. This action will allow us to move forward and provide a basic necessity to the people of this region in Montana. Good, clean, safe drinking water.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator BURNS today in introducing legislation that authorizes the construction of a municipal, rural, and industrial water system for the Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes of the Fort Peck Reservation.

The reservation has long been plagued by major drinking water problems including both inadequate supplies and unacceptable water quality. Ground water, the primary source of drinking water for many reservation residents, often exceeds the standards for total dissolved solids, iron, sulfates, nitrates, and in some cases for selenium, manganese and fluorine.

Bacterial contamination of domestic water supplies has also been a recurring problem. On several occasions the Indian Health Service and Tribal Health Office have had to issue public health alerts regarding drinking water. In short, the very health of residents of the Fort Peck Reservation depends on construction of this pipeline.

A safe and adequate supply of water is a necessity if the Fort Peck Nation is to realize its dream of economic development and full employment. The reservation economy is based on ranching and farming but expansion of agricultural operations is severely limited by the lack of adequate stockwater supplies. Additionally more effective distribution of water would result in more effective soil conservation and improvement of the native rangeland.

The Bureau of Reclamation has determined that a regional MR&I water supply system using water from the Missouri River is a feasible alternative for addressing the serious water problems facing Fort Peck. This legislation will make that alternative a reality for the people of the Fort Peck Reservation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting authorization of this critical project.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. BREAU, Mr. CRAIG, and Mr. HUTCHINSON):

S. 842. A bill to provide for the immediate application of certain orders relating to the amendment, modification, suspension, or revocation of certificates under chapter 447 of title 49, United States Code; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REVOCATION OF CERTIFICATIONS LEGISLATION

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I have been working with representatives of

the aviation industry on legislation that will address a problem with the Federal Aviation Administration. Let me, first of all, say that back in real life I have been a professional pilot for some 40 years. I am a little bothered, too, at some of the things taking place in the aviation industry. I have seen great injustice done many, many times, having to do with the emergency revocation powers of the FAA. In a revocation action, brought on an emergency basis, the certificate holder loses use of his certificate immediately, without an intermediary review by an impartial third party. The result is that the certificate holder is grounded and, in most cases, is out of work until the issue is adjudicated. I believe the FAA unfairly uses this necessary power to prematurely revoke certificates when the circumstances do not support such drastic action. A more reasonable approach, Mr. President, when safety is not an issue, would be to adjudicate the revocation on a nonemergency basis, allowing the certificate holder to continue use of his certificate.

Please don't misunderstand me. In no way do I want to suggest that the FAA should not have emergency revocation powers. I believe it is critical to safety that the FAA can ground unsafe airmen and other certificate holders. However, I also believe that the FAA must be judicious in its use of this extraordinary power. A review of recent emergency cases clearly demonstrates a pattern by which the FAA uses their emergency powers as standard procedure rather than an extraordinary measure.

Perhaps the most visible case is that of Bob Hoover, who happens to probably be the best pilot in America today. He is up in age. I have watched him and have been in a plane with him. He can set a glass of water on the panel of an airplane and do a barrel roll without spilling any of the water. He is highly regarded as an aerobatic pilot. In 1992, his medical certificate was revoked based on alleged questions regarding his cognitive abilities. After getting a clean bill of health from four separate sets of doctors—just one of the many tests cost Bob \$1,700—and over the continuing objections of the Federal air surgeon, who never even examined Bob Hoover personally, his medical certificate was reinstated only after then-Administrator David Henson intervened. And I want to take this opportunity to tell David Henson what a great job he did for aviation, and for one person.

Unfortunately, Bob Hoover is not out of the woods yet.

His current medical certificate expires on September 30, 1997. Unlike most airmen who can renew their medical certificate with a routine application and exam, Bob has to furnish the FAA with a report of a neurological evaluation every 12 months.

It is a very expensive and unnecessary process.

Mr. President, Bob Hoover's experience is just one of many. In a way, his wasn't as bad, because some of them do this—like professional airline pilots—for a living.

I have several other examples of pilots who have had their licenses revoked on an emergency basis. Pilots such as Ted Stewart who has been an American Airlines pilot for more than 12 years and is presently a Boeing 767 captain. Until January 1995, Mr. Stewart had no complaints registered against him or his flying. In January 1995 the FAA suspended Mr. Stewart's examining authority as part of a larger FAA effort to respond to a problem of falsified ratings. The full NTSB board exonerated Mr. Stewart in July 1995. In June 1996, he received a second revocation. One of the charges in this second revocation involved falsification of records for a flight instructor certificate with multiengine rating and his air transport pilot [ATP] certificate dating back to 1979.

Like most, I have questioned how an alleged 17½-year-old violation could constitute an emergency; especially, since he has not been cited for any cause in the intervening years. Nonetheless, the FAA vigorously pursued this action. On August 30, 1996, the NTSB issued its decision in this second revocation and found for Mr. Stewart. A couple of comments in the Stewart decision bear closer examination. First, the board notes that:

The administrator's loss in the earlier case appears to have prompted further investigation of respondent . . .

I find this rather troubling that an impartial third party appears to be suggesting that the FAA has a vendetta against Ted Stewart. This is further emphasized with a footnote in which the Board notes:

[We,] of course, [are] not authorized to review the Administrator's exercise of his power to take emergency certificate action . . . We are constrained to register in this matter, however, our opinion that where, as here, no legitimate reason is cited or appears for not consolidating all alleged violations into one proceeding, subjecting an airman in the space of a year to two emergency revocations, and thus to the financial and other burdens associated with an additional 60-day grounding without prior notice and hearing, constitutes an abusive and unprincipled discharge of an extraordinary power.

Joining with me today is JOHN BREAUX of Louisiana. JOHN has a constituent, Frank Anders who has taken the lead gathering other examples of FAA abuses with regard to their emergency revocation authority. One in particular is Raymond A. Williamson who was a pilot for Coca-Cola Bottling Co. Like Ted Stewart, he was accused of being part of a ring of pilots who falsified type records for vintage aircraft.

As in all of the cases received by my office, Mr. Williamson's biggest concern is that the FAA investigation and subsequent revocation came out of the blue. In November 1994, he was notified by his employer—Coca-Cola—that FAA inspectors had accused him of giving il-

legal check rides in company owned aircraft. He was fired. In June 1995, he received an emergency order of revocation. In over 30 years as an active pilot, he had never had an accident, incident, or violation. Nor had he ever been counseled by the FAA for any action or irregularities as a pilot, flight instructor or FAA designated pilot examiner.

In May 1996, FAA proposed to return all his certificates and ratings, except his flight instructor certificate. As in the Ted Stewart case, it would appear that FAA found no real reason pursue an emergency revocation.

Mr. President, I obviously cannot read the collective minds of the NTSB board, but I believe a reasonable person would conclude that in the Ted Stewart case the Board, believes as I do, that there is an abuse of emergency revocation powers by the FAA.

This is borne out further by the fact that since 1989, emergency cases as a total of all enforcement actions heard by the NTSB has more than doubled. In 1989 the NTSB heard 1,107 enforcement cases. Of those, 66 were emergency revocation cases or 5.96 percent. In 1995, the NTSB heard 509 total enforcement cases, of those 160 were emergency revocation cases or 31.43 percent. I believe it is clear that the FAA has begun to use an exceptional power as a standard practice.

In response, I and Senators CRAIG, HUTCHINSON, and BREAUX are introducing legislation that would establish a procedure by which the FAA must show just cause for bringing an emergency revocation action against a certificate holder. Many within the aviation community have referred to this needed legislation as the Hoover bill.

Not surprisingly, Mr. President, the FAA opposes this language. They also opposed changes to the civil penalties program where they served as the judge, jury, and executioner in civil penalty actions against airmen. Fortunately, we were able to change that so that airmen can now appeal a civil penalty case to the NTSB. This has worked very well because the NTSB has a clear understanding of the issues.

Our proposal allows an airman within 48 hours of receiving an emergency revocation order to request a hearing before the NTSB on the emergency nature of the revocation. NTSB then has 48 hours to hear the arguments. Within 5 days of the initial request, NTSB must decide if a true emergency exists. During this time, the emergency revocation remains in effect.

That means that the pilot does not have his certificate and cannot fly an airplane. In many cases, this is a means of a living. But that is for 7 days.

In other words, the certificate holder loses use of his certificate for a maximum of 7 days. However, should the NTSB decide an emergency does not exist, then the certificate would be returned and the certificate holder could continue to use it while the FAA pursued their revocation case against him

in an expedited appeal process as provided for by the bill. If the NTSB decides that an emergency does exist, then the emergency revocation remains in effect and the certificate holder cannot use his certificate while the case is adjudicated.

This bill is supported by: the Air Line Pilots Association, International; the Air Transport Association; the Allied Pilots Association; Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association; the Experimental Aircraft Association; National Air Carrier Association; National Air Transportation Association; National Business Aircraft Association; the NTSB Bar Association; and the Regional Airline Association.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter dated March 11, 1997, to me from the above mentioned organizations be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 11, 1997.

Hon. JAMES M. INHOFE,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR INHOFE: The undersigned associations and organizations endorse and support your proposed legislation, the FAA Emergency Revocation Act of 1997, to reform the Federal Aviation Administration enforcement process in an important respect.

It has become apparent to us in recent years that the FAA has significantly increased its use of its emergency authority to immediately suspend or revoke airmen, air carrier, and air agency certificates, thereby avoiding the automatic stay of such action provided by law pending appeal to the National Transportation Safety Board. This legislation will accord due process to certificate holders by providing a more adequate forum for promptly adjudicating the appropriateness of the FAA's use of this authority. The forum, the same one which will adjudicate the merits of the FAA action, will also adjudicate, on a more timely basis, whether aviation safety requires the immediate effectiveness of a certificate action. The effect will be that in an appropriate case, a certificate holder will be able to exercise the privileges of its certificate while an FAA certificate action is on appeal, all without compromise of aviation safety.

We thank you for introducing this legislation, and we look forward to working with you toward its passage.

Sincerely,

Air Line Pilots Association, International; Allied Pilots Association; Experimental Aircraft Association; National Air Transportation Association; NTSB Bar Association; Air Transport Association; AOPA Legislative Action; National Air Carrier Association; National Business Aircraft Association; Regional Airline Association.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, in closing, this bill will provide due process to certificate holders where now none exists, without compromising aviation safety. This is a reasonable and prudent response to an increasing problem for certificate holders. I hope our colleagues will support our efforts in this regard.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, and Mr. MACK):

S. 843. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify certain rules relating to the taxation of United States business operating abroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

INTERNATIONAL TAX SIMPLIFICATION FOR
AMERICAN COMPETITIVENESS LEGISLATION

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill that would provide much-needed tax relief for American-owned companies that are attempting to compete in the world marketplace. I am joined by Senator BAUCUS in introducing the International Tax Simplification for American Competitiveness Act.

Mr. President, our country's economy has entered into an environment like no other in our history. The success of the American economy is becoming more and more intertwined with the success of our businesses in the global marketplace. As the economic boundaries from country to country merge closer together, and competition begins to arise from previously lesser-developed nations, it is imperative that American owned businesses be able to compete from the most advantageous position possible.

There are already barriers the U.S. economy must overcome to remain competitive that Congress cannot hurdle by itself. I know that we have international trade negotiators working hard to eliminate those obstacles, such as barriers to foreign markets, but we can do more than just open barriers. We can reform our Tax Code in such a way that would ensure continued success by American-owned companies in today's highly competitive international market. There is no need to further impede the economy by saddling it with an outdated and extremely complex Tax Code.

If we pass on this opportunity, Mr. President, we run the risk of jeopardizing the international competitiveness of the U.S. economy, as American companies are lured to other countries with simple, more favorable tax treatment.

The business world is changing at a more rapid pace than any other time in history. Tax laws, unfortunately, have failed to keep pace with the rapid changes in the world economy. The last time the international provisions of the Internal Revenue Code were substantially debated and revised was in 1986. Since that time, existing economies have changed, and new economies have been created, all while our tax policy regarding this changing market has remained the same. And in several cases, our foreign competitors operate under simpler, fairer, and more logical tax regimes. The continued use of a confusing, archaic tax code results in a mismatch with commercial reality and creates a structural bias against the international activities of U.S. companies. We cannot, and should not, continue to impede the progress of our economy.

Mr. President, the bill that I am introducing today seeks to simplify and

correct various areas in the Internal Revenue Code that are unnecessarily restraining American businesses competing in today's global market. Some of these provisions are similar to those contained in the President's recently released simplification package. Some changes come in areas that are in dire need of repair, and others are changes that take into consideration international business operations that exist today, but were either nonexistent, or limited to domestic soil in 1986, when the tax reform laws were put into place.

An important correction to current rules relates to Foreign Sales Corporation [FSC] treatment for software. When the current FSC rules were implemented 11 years ago, the level of software exports was nowhere near the level it is today. Because the Tax Code was not modified with the evolution of the high-technology business world, American software exports are currently discriminated against. This proposal would clarify that computer software qualifies as export property eligible for FSC benefits. These benefits are currently available for films, records, and tapes, but not software.

The United States is currently the global leader in software production and development and employs nearly 400,000 people in high-paying software development and servicing jobs. The industry has experienced a great deal of growth in the past decade, primarily due to increased exports. If the FSC benefits to software continue to be denied, we are creating another obstacle to the competitiveness of American manufactured software, ultimately harming the U.S. economy, and putting American jobs at risk.

Another important change included in the bill would repeal the 10/50 tax credit rules. Currently, the code requires U.S. companies to calculate separate foreign tax credit limitations for each of its foreign joint venture businesses in which the U.S. owner owns at least 10 percent but no more than 50 percent. In addition to creating administrative headaches for American owned companies that may have hundreds of such foreign joint venture operations, these rules impede the ability of U.S. companies to compete in foreign markets.

It is necessary for businesses in the United States to operate in joint ventures worldwide, particularly in emerging, previously closed markets such as the former Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China. Many times, the joint ventures are needed to assist the United States investor to overcome significant local country and political obstacles involved with taking a controlling interest in foreign companies. This applies particularly to regulated businesses, such as telecommunications companies. While this type of joint venture is necessary for companies to enter and compete in foreign markets, the current tax law in our country discourages such operations.

The bill would permit U.S. owners to compute foreign tax credits with respect to dividends from such entities based on the underlying character of the income of these entities, or the so-called look-through treatment, provided that the necessary information is available. Moreover, the bill includes a provision that would eliminate the overlap in the rules between passive foreign investment companies [PFIC] and controlled foreign companies [CFC]. PFIC rules were never intended to apply to CFC's. In the Tax Act of 1993, changes were made that created unnecessary duplication in PFIC and CFC rules. Currently, there are several CFC's that are caught under both sets of rules. This proposal would eliminate these duplications. If a PFIC is also a CFC, the proposal generally would treat the foreign corporation as a non-PFIC with respect to certain 10-percent U.S. shareholders of the CFC.

Mr. President, I ask that my colleagues take a close look at this bill. This is not partisan legislation. It is an attempt to give fair tax treatment to American companies who operate abroad, and that, I think, is an objective we all support. The bill is truly a technical correction and simplification, designed to correct the inequities in our Tax Code, and to help place U.S. companies on a level playing field with their competitors in the foreign market. If we do not step up and make these corrections, American companies will lose ground to their foreign counterparts, eventually losing their power to operate successfully at home and harm our Nation's economic potential. American workers are the most creative, competitive, and hard-working in the world. It is our duty, Mr. President, to release them from any unnecessary constraints at home. Their hard work and perseverance will enable us to maintain and strengthen our lead in the global marketplace, resulting in more quality, high-paying jobs on American soil, and an even stronger national economy.

I ask unanimous consent that a section-by-section summary be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INTERNATIONAL TAX SIMPLIFICATION FOR
AMERICAN COMPETITIVENESS ACT—SUM-
MARY OF PROVISIONS

TITLE I—TREATMENT OF PASSIVE FOREIGN
INVESTMENT COMPANIES

Section 101. PFIC/CFC overlap: The overlap between the PFIC and CFC rules would be eliminated. In the case of a PFIC that is also a CFC, the proposal generally would treat the foreign corporation as a non-PFIC with respect to certain 10-percent U.S. shareholders of the CFC. The change generally would be effective for taxable years of U.S. persons beginning after December 31, 1997, and to taxable years of foreign corporations ending with or within such taxable years of U.S. persons, subject to certain holding period requirements.

Section 102. PFIC mark-to-market election: A shareholder of a PFIC would be allowed to make a mark-to-market election for PFIC

stock that is regularly traded on a qualifying national securities exchange or is otherwise treated as marketable. A similar election generally would be available for regulated investment companies. The provision would be effective for taxable years of U.S. persons beginning after December 31, 1997, and to taxable years of foreign corporations ending with or within such taxable years of U.S. persons.

Section 103. Clarification of passive income definition: The definition of passive income would be amended for purposes of PFIC provisions by clarifying that the exceptions from the definition of foreign personal holding company income under section 954(c)(3) (regarding certain income received from related persons) do not apply in determining passive income for purposes of the PFIC definition. The change would be effective for taxable years of U.S. persons beginning after December 31, 1997, and to taxable years of foreign corporations ending with or within such taxable years of U.S. persons.

Section 104. Effective date of new PFIC provisions: The changes made by the new PFIC provisions (sections 101–103, above) would apply to taxable years of U.S. persons beginning after December 31, 1997, and to taxable years of foreign corporations ending with or within such taxable years of U.S. persons.

TITLE II—TREATMENT OF CONTROLLED FOREIGN CORPORATIONS

Section 201. Extension of dividend treatment to dispositions of lower-tier CFCs: Section 1248 dividend treatment would be extended to the sale of a CFC by a CFC where such dividend treatment is provided under current law upon the sale of a CFC by a U.S. shareholder. In addition, a provision added to section 904(d)(2)(E) by the 1988 Act (TAMRA) would be repealed. That provision requires the recipient of a CFC distribution to have been a U.S. shareholder in the CFC when the related earnings were generated to avoid subjecting the distributions to the separate foreign tax credit basket applicable to section 902 corporations. The changes would be effective for gains recognized on transactions or distributions occurring after the date of enactment.

Section 202. Miscellaneous modifications to subpart F: The following changes would be made to subpart F:

Subpart F inclusions in year of acquisition: The subpart F inclusions of an acquirer of CFC stock would be reduced in the year of acquisition by a portion of the dividend deemed recognized by the transferor under section 1248. The provision would apply to dispositions after the date of enactment.

Adjustments to basis of stock: The income inclusion to a U.S. shareholder resulting from an upper-tier CFC's sale of stock in a lower-tier CFC that earns subpart F income would be adjusted, under regulations, to account for previous inclusions by adjusting the basis of the stock. The provision would apply for purposes of determining inclusions for taxable years of U.S. shareholders beginning after December 31, 1997.

Certain distributions of previously taxed income: The IRS would be authorized to issue regulations to prevent multiple inclusions in income or to provide appropriate basis adjustments in the case of cross-chain section 304 dividends out of the earnings of CFCs that were previously included in the income of a U.S. shareholder under subpart F, or in other circumstances in which there would otherwise be a multiple inclusion or a failure to adjust basis. The provision would be effective on the date of enactment.

U.S. income earned by a CFC: A treaty exemption or reduction of the branch profits tax that would be imposed under section 884 with respect to a CFC would not affect the general statutory exemption from subpart F

income that is granted for U.S. source effectively connected income. The provision would apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1986.

Section 203. Indirect foreign tax credit allowed for lower tiers: The availability of indirect foreign tax credits would be extended to certain taxes paid or accrued by certain fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-tier foreign corporations. The provision generally would be effective for taxes of a CFC with respect to its taxable years beginning after December 31, 1997.

Section 204. Exemption for active financing income: Income earned in the active conduct of a banking, financing, or similar business by a CFC would not be treated as foreign personal holding company income if (1) a significant portion of the CFC's income for that business is derived from transactions with unrelated customers in the jurisdiction in which the CFC is organized and the CFC is predominantly engaged in the active conduct of such business, or (2) the CFC's income is derived in the active conduct of a securities or banking business within the meaning of the PFIC rules. In addition, the bill would exclude from subpart F income a qualifying insurance CFC's income from the investment of its assets, subject to certain limitations. The provision would apply to taxable years of foreign corporations beginning after December 31, 1997, and to taxable years of U.S. shareholders with or within which such taxable years of foreign corporations end.

Section 205. Provide look-through treatment for 10/50 companies: Current law requires U.S. companies operating joint ventures in foreign countries to calculate separate foreign tax credit basket limitations for income earned from each joint venture in which the U.S. owner owns at least 10 percent but no more than 50 percent. The proposal would permit U.S. owners to compute foreign tax credits with respect to dividends from such entities based on the underlying character of the income of these entities (i.e., "look-through" treatment), provided that the necessary information is available. Dividends from entities for which the necessary information is unavailable would be aggregated in a single foreign tax credit basket. The provision would apply to dividends paid out of earnings and profits accumulated during taxable years of foreign corporations beginning after December 31, 1997.

Section 206. Study of treating European Union as a single country: The Treasury Department would be directed to conduct a study on the feasibility of treating all members of the European Union as a single country for purposes of applying the same country exceptions under subpart F. This study would include consideration of methods of ensuring that taxpayers are subject to a substantial effective rate of foreign tax if such treatment is adopted. A report would be required within six months.

Section 207. Expand subpart F de minimis rule: The subpart F de minimis rule under current law excludes all gross income from foreign base company income or insurance income if the sum of the gross foreign base company income and the gross insurance income of the CFC for the taxable year is less than the lesser of five percent of gross income or \$1 million. The proposal would expand this rule to the lesser of 10 percent of gross income or \$2 million. The provision would apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1997.

Section 208. Use U.S. GAAP for determining subpart F earnings and profits: Taxpayers would be allowed to use U.S. generally accepted accounting principles to determine subpart F earnings and profits. The provision would apply to distributions during, and the determination of the inclusion under section 951 with respect to, taxable years of foreign

corporations beginning after December 31, 1997.

Section 209. Clarify treatment of pipeline transportation income: The proposal would exclude income from the pipeline transportation of oil or gas within a foreign country from the statutory definition of "foreign base company oil related income." The provision would apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1997.

Section 210. Expand deduction for dividends from foreign corporations with U.S. income: Under the proposal, the constructive ownership rules of section 318 would apply in determining whether the 80-percent ownership threshold of section 245(a)(5) is satisfied, and the term "dividend" would include subpart F inclusions. The provision would apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1997.

TITLE III—OTHER PROVISIONS

Section 301. Translation, redetermination of foreign taxes: Current law requires U.S. taxpayers making foreign tax payments to translate each payment made during the year into U.S. dollars at the exchange rate on the day of payment. The proposal would simplify this rule by generally permitting accrual-basis taxpayers to translate foreign taxes at the average exchange rate for the taxable year to which such taxes relate. In addition, it generally would provide for any subsequent adjustments to or refunds of accrued foreign taxes to be taken into account for the taxable year to which they relate. The provision would apply to taxes paid or accrued in taxable years beginning after December 31, 1997, and to taxes that relate to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1997.

Section 302. Election to use simplified foreign tax credit calculation under AMT: Taxpayers would be permitted to elect (with certain limitations) to use, as their alternative minimum tax (AMT) foreign tax credit limitation fraction, the ratio of foreign source regular taxable income to entire AMT income. This would eliminate the need to calculate a separate AMT foreign tax credit limitation. The election would apply to all subsequent taxable years and could be revoked only with IRS consent. The provision would apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1997.

Section 303. Outbound transfers: The excise tax under section 1491 on certain outbound transfers would be repealed and, in its place, full recognition of gain would be required on a covered transfer of property by a U.S. person to a foreign corporation, foreign partnership, or foreign estate or trust. The provision would apply to transfers after December 31, 1997.

Section 304. Inbound transfers: Regulatory authority generally would be provided to require income recognition, to the extent necessary to prevent U.S. federal income tax avoidance, in the case of certain otherwise tax-free corporate organizations, reorganizations, and liquidations in which the status of a foreign corporation as a corporation is a condition for nonrecognition by a party to the transaction. The provision would apply to transfers after December 31, 1997.

Section 305. Increase in reporting threshold: The ownership threshold triggering the requirement to file information returns regarding the organization or reorganization of foreign corporations and the acquisition of their stock would be increased from 5 percent to 10 percent, effective January 1, 1998.

Section 306. Exempt foreign corporations from uniform capitalization rules: Under the proposal, the uniform capitalization rules would apply to foreign taxpayers only for the purposes of subpart F or the taxation of income effectively connected with the conduct of a U.S. trade or business. The provision would

apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1996. Section 481 would not apply to any change in a method of accounting by reason of the provision.

Section 307. Extend FTC carryforward: The proposal would extend the carryforward period for excess foreign income taxes and extraction taxes from five years to 10 years. The provision would apply to excess foreign taxes for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1997.

Section 308. Domestic loss recapture: The proposal would make symmetrical the overall foreign loss provisions by recharacterizing overall domestic losses recaptured in subsequent years as foreign source income. The provision would apply to losses for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1997.

Section 309. FSC rules for computer software and military property: The proposal would clarify that computer software, whether or not patented, qualifies as export property eligible for FSC benefits. The provision would apply to sales, exchanges, or other dispositions after the date of enactment. Also, the proposal would remove the 50-percent limitation on foreign trading gross receipts attributable to military property. This amendment would apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1997.

Section 310. Special rules for financial services income: The foreign tax credit limitation provisions generally would be amended to exclude from high withholding tax interest any interest on a security held by a dealer in connection with its activities as such. The foreign tax credit limitation for financial services income would be amended to include the entire gross income of any person for which financial services income exceeds 80 percent of gross income. In addition, the section 904(g) source rules for U.S.-owned foreign property would be amended to exclude income derived by a securities dealer on securities. The proposals generally would apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1997. In the case of deemed paid credits, the proposal would apply to taxable years of foreign corporations beginning after December 31, 1997 and to taxable years of U.S. shareholders in such corporations with or within which such taxable years of foreign corporations end.

Section 311. Exclusion of certain dealers' assets from section 956 definition of U.S. property: The provision would exclude from the definition of "United States property" under section 956 certain assets acquired by a dealer in securities or commodities in the ordinary course of its trade or business. Excluded assets would include certain assets posted as collateral or margin, certain obligations of U.S. persons acquired in connection with a sale and repurchase agreement, and certain securities acquired and held by a CFC primarily for sale to customers. The provision would be effective for taxable years of foreign corporations beginning after December 31, 1997, and to taxable years of U.S. shareholders with or within which such taxable years of foreign corporations end.

Section 312. Foreign investment in mutual funds: The proposal generally would exempt from U.S. taxation certain dividends received by nonresident aliens or foreign corporations from regulated investment companies (RICs) to the extent the dividends are attributable to interest or short-term capital gains. Also, for U.S. estate tax purposes, the proposal would treat stock in certain RICs as property without the United States. Finally, the proposal would expand the special rules for REITs under section 897(h) to cover domestically controlled RICs as well. The first provision would apply to dividends with respect to taxable years of RICs beginning after the date of enactment; the other provisions generally would take effect on the date of enactment.

Section 313. Exclude preliminary agreements from definition of intangible property: The proposal would exclude from the section 936(h)(3)(B) definition of intangible property any "preliminary agreement" that is not legally enforceable. This provision would apply to agreements entered into after the date of enactment.

Section 314. Study of affiliated group interest allocation: The Treasury Department would be directed to conduct a study of the rules under section 864(e) for allocating interest expense of members of an affiliated group. This study would include an analysis of the effect of such rules, including the effects such rules have on different industries. A report would be required within six months.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I am very pleased today to join my colleague, Senator HATCH, to introduce a bill to help American-owned companies compete in the world marketplace by simplifying our overly complicated international tax rules.

America's economic success depends more than ever before on our ability to succeed in the international economy. When I came to the Senate, imports and exports together made up about 12 percent of our economy. Today it is 30 percent and growing every day. So more jobs than ever depend on exports and overseas operations.

I have worked through the Trade Subcommittee to lower foreign trade barriers and encourage agreements to keep trade free and fair. I have sought to open foreign markets for Montana products like beef to wheat. And this work pays off.

According to a report prepared by the accounting firm Price Waterhouse last month, exports of goods alone in the United States in 1996 supported almost 7 million direct and indirect jobs and account for over 11 percent of our Gross Domestic Product. In Montana, these exports totaled almost one-half billion dollars and supported 58,000 jobs in 1996.

But while our trade policies have been successful in many areas, our Tax Code has failed to keep up. Its international provisions are outdated, unclear, complex, and duplicative. And the result is fewer jobs and less prosperity here at home.

So Senator HATCH and I have joined in an effort to simplify our Code, remove duplicative or outmoded provisions, and provide incentives for trade whenever possible.

This bill does not by any means cure all of the problems in the international tax arena. But it is a good starting point which simplifies existing law, reduces the cost of compliance, and begins to make rules more rational and more mindful of the competitiveness of U.S. businesses. The major provisions include:

Putting U.S. companies entering into joint ventures in foreign markets on an equal footing with their foreign competitors by eliminating the so-called 10-50 foreign tax credit basket rules.

Rationalizing the anti-deferral rules by eliminating provisions that duplicate other clauses of the Internal Revenue Code. This is essential if U.S. financial services companies

are to keep their leading edge in foreign markets.

Guaranteeing that the export tax incentive provided by the foreign sales corporation rules would apply to U.S. software sold overseas, and to approved sales of U.S.-made military goods overseas.

Putting mutual funds on the same footing as individual companies in their ability to attract foreign investors, increasing their investment capital.

And making it easier for utilities to bid for construction projects overseas.

These things will make us more efficient and more competitive. It will allow companies to put less effort into accounting and filling out tax forms, and more into producing, competing, and creating jobs. And that is what we need, today, and even more so tomorrow.

We live in a global economy, Mr. President, and we must help American companies compete in this economy if we hope to continue an expansion in which a quarter of our growth already comes from exports. The International Tax Simplification for American Competitiveness Act is a major step in that direction.

I look forward to working with Senator HATCH and my other colleagues on the Finance Committee to have its provisions incorporated into the reconciliation bill we will soon be considering.

By Mr. LUGAR (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. McCONNELL, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. KERREY, Mr. BAUCUS, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. CONRAD):

S. 845. A bill to transfer to the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to conduct the census of agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

THE CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1997

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce legislation that will transfer the census of agriculture from the Department of Commerce to the Department of Agriculture [USDA]. I am pleased that the distinguished ranking member of the Agriculture Committee, Senator HARKIN, as well as Senators McCONNELL, SANTORUM, DASCHLE, ROBERTS, LEAHY, KERREY, BAUCUS, LANDRIEU, COCHRAN, CONRAD, JOHNSON, CRAIG, and GRASSLEY have joined me as cosponsors of this bill.

In recent years the census of agriculture has been conducted every 5 years. Agricultural producers nationwide are asked questions regarding their production and sales. The census of agriculture is the only source of consistent, county level statistics on agricultural operations throughout the United States. It also provides national and State data. The census of agriculture is useful in monitoring the current status of, as well as documenting changes in, the agricultural industry. The number of farms, a major piece of data resulting from the census, is taken into account in the allocation of funding for several USDA programs.

Last year Congress provided funds to USDA to allow USDA, in cooperation with the Department of Commerce, to conduct the next census without any substantive changes in scope, coverage, or timing. This transfer of funding necessitates the transfer of the authority.

Transferring the authority for the census of agriculture to the USDA makes common sense. This move would integrate the agricultural statistics programs of the two Departments and eliminate duplication. USDA states that cost savings will result with one agency given primary authority over the content of the census as well as dissemination of its results.

The issue of moving the census surfaced during final conference committee deliberations on the 1996 Federal Agricultural Improvement and Reform Act. Given the time constraints of that conference, a provision to transfer the census of agriculture to USDA was not included in the bill. Subsequent legislation was passed by the House, but did not receive approval from the Senate before the end of the session.

Last year, the Department of Commerce expressed some interest in changing the definition of a farm, which is now defined as sales of \$1,000 or more per year. While USDA has stated there will be no substantive changes with how the upcoming census is carried out, it is more logical to provide the authority to set the definition to the Department whose programs would be most affected by a change.

Many agricultural associations and organizations, including the American Farm Bureau Federation, support the transfer of the census of agriculture to USDA. Last month, USDA proposed legislation which is virtually identical to this bill.

I ask my colleagues for their support of this legislation. I ask unanimous consent that the bill and a section-by-section analysis of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 845

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Census of Agriculture Act of 1997".

SEC. 2. TRANSFER TO THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE OF THE AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT THE CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 526 of the Revised Statutes (7 U.S.C. 2204) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(c) CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In 1998 and every 5th year thereafter, the Secretary of Agriculture shall take a census of agriculture.

"(2) METHODS.—In connection with the census, the Secretary may conduct any survey or other data collection, and employ any sampling or other statistical method, that the Secretary determines is appropriate.

"(3) YEAR OF DATA.—The data collected in each census taken under this subsection

shall relate to the year immediately preceding the year in which the census is taken.

"(4) ENFORCEMENT.—

"(A) FRAUD.—A person over 18 years of age who willfully gives an answer that is false to a question submitted to the person in connection with a census under this subsection shall be fined not more than \$500.

"(B) REFUSAL OR NEGLECT TO ANSWER QUESTIONS.—A person over 18 years of age who refuses or neglects to answer a question submitted to the person in connection with a census under this subsection shall be fined not more than \$100.

"(C) SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER.—The failure or refusal of a person to disclose the person's social security number in response to a request made in connection with any census or other activity under this subsection shall not be a violation under this paragraph.

"(D) RELIGIOUS INFORMATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, no person shall be compelled to disclose information relative to the religious beliefs of the person or to membership of the person in a religious body.

"(5) GEOGRAPHIC COVERAGE.—A census under this subsection shall include—

"(A) each of the several States of the United States;

"(B) as determined by the Secretary, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the United States Virgin Islands, and Guam; and

"(C) with the concurrence of the Secretary and the Secretary of State, any other possession or area over which the United States exercises jurisdiction, control, or sovereignty.

"(6) COOPERATION WITH THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.—

"(A) INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.—The Secretary of Commerce may, on a written request by the Secretary of Agriculture, provide to the Secretary of Agriculture any information collected under title 13, United States Code, that the Secretary of Agriculture considers necessary for the taking of a census or survey under this subsection.

"(B) INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.—The Secretary of Agriculture may, on a written request by the Secretary of Commerce, provide to the Secretary of Commerce any information collected in a census taken under this subsection that the Secretary of Commerce considers necessary for the taking of a census or survey under title 13, United States Code.

"(C) CONFIDENTIALITY.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—Information obtained under this paragraph may not be used for any purpose other than the statistical purposes for which the information is supplied.

"(ii) CENSUS INFORMATION.—For purposes of sections 9 and 214 of title 13, United States Code, any information provided under subparagraph (B) shall be considered information furnished under the provisions of title 13, United States Code.

"(7) REGULATIONS.—A regulation necessary to carry out this subsection may be promulgated by—

"(A) the Secretary of Agriculture, to the extent that a matter under the jurisdiction of the Secretary is involved; and

"(B) the Secretary of Commerce, to the extent that a matter under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce is involved."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1)(A) Subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 13, United States Code, is amended by striking the subchapter heading and inserting the following:

"SUBCHAPTER II—POPULATION, HOUSING, AND UNEMPLOYMENT".

(B) Section 142 of title 13, United States Code, is repealed.

(C) The analysis of chapter 5 of title 13, United States Code, is amended—

(i) by striking the item relating to the heading for subchapter II and inserting the following:

"SUBCHAPTER II—POPULATION, HOUSING, AND UNEMPLOYMENT";

(ii) by striking the item relating to section 142; and

(iii) by inserting after the item relating to section 161 the following:

"163. Authority of other agencies."

(2) Section 343(a)(11)(F) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1991(a)(11)(F)) is amended by striking "taken under section 142 of title 13, United States Code".

SEC. 3. CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION.

(a) INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.—

(1) AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE INFORMATION.—Section 9(a) of title 13, United States Code, is amended by inserting after "chapter 10 of this title" the following: "or section 526(c)(6) of the Revised Statutes (7 U.S.C. 2204(c)(6))".

(2) CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION.—Section 1770(d) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 2276(d)) is amended by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following:

"(5) subsections (a) and (c) of section 526 of the Revised Statutes (7 U.S.C. 2204);".

(b) INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.—Section 1770 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 2276) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(e) INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.—This section shall not prohibit the release of information under section 526(c)(6) of the Revised Statutes (7 U.S.C. 2204(c)(6))."

AG CENSUS BILL—SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1. Short Title. Section 1 would provide that the act may be cited as the "Census of Agriculture Act of 1997."

Section 2. Transfer to the Secretary of Agriculture of the Authority To Conduct the Census of Agriculture. Section 2(a) would amend section 526 of the Revised Statutes (7 U.S.C. 2204) to require the Secretary of Agriculture to take a census of agriculture in 1998 and every 5th year thereafter. The data collected in each census would relate to the year preceding the year that the census was taken. Any person who refuses to answer or provides false answers to questions in connection with the census would be subject to penalties, except if the refusal is to disclose the person's social security number.

Section 2(a) also would authorize the Secretaries of Agriculture and Commerce to share information necessary for taking a census. Upon written request by the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce would be authorized to furnish certain information to be used for statistical purposes. Upon written request by the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to furnish census information to be used for statistical purposes.

Section 2(b) would repeal section 142 of title 13, United States Code. Section 142 of title 13, United States Code, requires the Secretary of Commerce to take the census of agriculture. This repeal is a confirming amendment necessary to effectuate the transfer of the authority to conduct the census of agriculture from the Secretary of Commerce to the Secretary of Agriculture. Section 2(b) also would make a conforming amendment to the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to refer to the census of agriculture as under section 526(c) of the Revised Statutes.

Section 3. Confidentiality of Information. Section 3 would make amendments to ensure

the confidentiality of information furnished for the census of agriculture.

By Mr. AKAKA:

S. 846. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to remove the jurisdiction of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to license projects on fresh waters in the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

THE FEDERAL POWER ACT AMENDMENT ACT OF
1997

Mr. AKAKA. Madam President, the State of Hawaii, its delegation in Congress, and conservation organizations throughout the State are deeply concerned about Federal efforts to regulate hydroelectric projects on State waters. Across the United States, the question of who should have authority for hydropower regulation—the State or the Federal Government—is very contentious. But in the case of the fresh water streams of Hawaii, the answer is clear. The State of Hawaii, not the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, should have the authority for hydropower regulation in Hawaii, if the Commission finds it has no mandatory jurisdiction under the Federal Power Act.

Those who care for Hawaii's rivers and streams recognize that unnecessary Federal intervention may have serious repercussions for our fresh water resources and the ecosystems that depend upon them.

The State of Hawaii has demonstrated its commitment to protect stream resources by instituting a new water code, adopting instream flow standards, launching a comprehensive Hawaii stream assessment, and organizing a stream protection and management task force.

The Federal interest in protecting the vast interconnected river system of North America is misplaced in our isolated mid-Pacific locale. The issues of interstate commerce, protecting military ports, or long interstate rivers are not applicable.

Therefore, I am introducing legislation to terminate FERC's voluntary jurisdiction over hydropower projects on the fresh waters of the State of Hawaii. This legislation is nearly identical to one passed by the Senate during the 103d Congress. In 104th Congress, the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee again approved the bill. I will continue to fight for the passage of this legislation in the 105th Congress.

By Mr. COATS (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. BROWNBAC, Mr. ASHCROFT, Mr. COVERDELL, and Mr. GREGG):

S. 847. A bill to provide scholarship assistance for District of Columbia elementary and secondary school students; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STUDENT
OPPORTUNITY SCHOLARSHIP ACT OF 1997

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, today is a very important day for students in the

District of Columbia. Today, I join Senator LIEBERMAN, Senator BROWNBAC, Senator ASHCROFT, and Senator GREGG in introducing the District of Columbia Student Opportunity Scholarship Act of 1997, also known as the DC SOS Act. The DC SOS Act provides immediate relief to thousands of the District's neediest students who are consigned to failing, violent public schools. This bill is a direct response to the needs of thousands of families in our Capital City who have, for too long, been expected to accept underperforming and often violent schools for their children. The DC SOS Act provides real educational opportunities to almost 4,000 District students.

Many of you may remember that a very similar initiative was introduced by former Representative Gunderson, and included in the 1996 D.C. appropriations bill. At that time, a majority of the Senate, 56 Senators in all, were supportive of the idea to provide scholarships to poor students in the District of Columbia. Tragically, that program, which would have benefited 5,000 of our Nation's most needy students, was blocked by the threat of a filibuster.

During the 1996 D.C. Appropriations debate, many of those who opposed providing scholarships for poor District students argued that the initiative was opposed by the residents of the District. That argument cannot be used this time. A recent bipartisan survey conducted in the District of Columbia found that fully 64 percent of Washingtonians would send their children to private school if they had the option and if money were not an issue; 61 percent of single parents think that creating a school choice program for the District is an excellent or good use of taxpayer dollars. And those most likely to opt out of the public system are residents of the wards 7 and 8, the areas with the most troubled public schools. Clearly, the residents of the District are ready for a change.

But these surveys should not surprise us. The D.C. schools have not improved since the defeat of the D.C. scholarship program in 1996. Rather, the schools got so bad that the D.C. Control Board fired Superintendent Franklin Smith, stripped control of the school from the D.C. Board of Education, and installed a new Chief Executive and Superintendent, retired Army Gen. Julius W. Becton, Jr. Perhaps General Becton can turn the D.C. school system around. But I am not willing to tell a family who fears for the safety of their child that they should wait and given General Becton 5 or 10 years to test his approaches, especially because changes have been promised by five new superintendents in the last 15 years.

In February of this year, the Washington Post ran a five-part series on the D.C. school system, chronicling its complete breakdown. A school system where jobs for bureaucrats are more important than providing textbooks. A school system that employs almost nine times more central office adminis-

trators than the national average, despite a decreasing student population, and a shortage of qualified teachers and principals.

Many of the district's 152 schools are in a state of terrible disrepair. Students and teachers contend with leaking roofs, bitterly cold classrooms, and thousands of fire code violations. Yet, in 1996, the D.C. Board of Education allocated \$1.4 million for its own use, an amount far greater than that spent by neighboring counties, and \$200,000 more than is spent by the Chicago school system, which is five times larger.

Unfortunately, these problems of infrastructure are minor concerns compared to violence and basic educational failure. Violence in the schools is at an alltime high—both student on student, and student on teacher—even as the violent crime rate in the country as a whole drops. And stories of academic mediocrity have become so common that they have lost their power to shock. Why is there no public outcry that the D.C. school district, which spends the most per pupil of any district in the country, has the Nation's lowest reported scores on the NAEP exams? Where is the outrage that only 35 percent of students are reading at grade level?

Students are routinely promoted regardless of whether they have progressed in their studies and graduate from the school system with little to show for their 12 years of schooling. Eighty-five percent of D.C. public school graduates who enter the University of the District of Columbia need 2 years of remedial education before beginning their course work toward degrees. And more than half of all graduates who took the U.S. Armed Forces Qualification Test in 1994 failed. This last statistic is particularly troubling, because it blocks a traditional escape route from disadvantage.

We are asking poor, inner-city children and their parents to tolerate circumstances that most middle-class and affluent Americans would not tolerate for one moment. Why should these families have to suffer violence and the lack of educational opportunities for another week, let alone the years that General Becton himself admits it will be before reform has any effect?

But those of us concerned about this issue face an obstacle. No one seems outraged enough about the betrayal of these children by indifferent adults to make major changes. Not suburban whites, who are often satisfied with their schools. Not politicians, some of whom are either blindly obedient to teachers unions or may simply have different political constituencies than these kids and their parents.

The DC SOS Act is an attempt to end this conspiracy of complacency. In introducing this bill today, I join with a coalition of members in both House of Congress who seek to provide scholarships for low-income students in the District of Columbia to enable them to attend the public or private school of

their choice or to receive tutoring assistance. This bill is the single most practical, immediate, effective way to help actual children, with flesh and blood and futures, rather than continuing to ignore this very serious situation.

I find it inconceivable that anyone, in good conscience, could condemn the District's low income children to attend schools that not only fail to educate them, but cannot even assure their personal safety. Some of the public schools in this city have become wastelands of violence and despair. We cannot begin to imagine the fears of a mother who is forced, required, compelled to send her child through barbed wire and metal detectors into a combat zone, masquerading as an educational institution.

The introduction, and ultimate passage of this bill, will signal a fundamental shift in priorities. It would indicate to parents in the District of Columbia and all across America that we care about their children more than we care about maintaining the status quo; that we understand the depth of the problem in our Nation's public schools and that we are finally willing to address it.

Opponents of this bill should carefully consider what they would do if they had a child assigned to a school where physical attacks, robberies, and drug sales were rampant. Low-income parents, who face this circumstance every day, deserve a voice and a choice.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the D.C. Student Opportunity Scholarship Act of 1997. With this bill we signal our intention to provide a safe and effective school for every child in the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this act, the District of Columbia Student Opportunity Scholarship Act of 1997, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 847

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; FINDINGS; PRECEDENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Student Opportunity Scholarship Act of 1997".

(b) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Public education in the District of Columbia is in a crisis, as evidenced by the following:

(A) The District of Columbia schools have the lowest average of any school system in the Nation on the National Assessment of Education Progress.

(B) 72 percent of fourth graders in the District of Columbia tested below basic proficiency on the National Assessment of Education Progress in 1994.

(C) Since 1991, there has been a net decline in the reading skills of District of Columbia students as measured in scores on the standardized Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills.

(D) At least 40 percent of District of Columbia students drop out of or leave the school system before graduation.

(E) The National Education Goals Panel reported in 1996 that both students and teachers in District of Columbia schools are subjected to levels of violence that are twice the national average.

(F) Nearly two-thirds of District of Columbia teachers reported that violent student behavior is a serious impediment to teaching.

(G) Many of the District of Columbia's 152 schools are in a state of terrible disrepair, including leaking roofs, bitterly cold classrooms, and numerous fire code violations.

(2) Significant improvements in the education of educationally deprived children in the District of Columbia can be accomplished by—

(A) increasing educational opportunities for the children by expanding the range of educational choices that best meet the needs of the children;

(B) fostering diversity and competition among school programs for the children;

(C) providing the families of the children more of the educational choices already available to affluent families; and

(D) enhancing the overall quality of education in the District of Columbia by increasing parental involvement in the direction of the education of the children.

(3) The 350 private schools in the District of Columbia and the surrounding area offer a more safe and stable learning environment than many of the public schools.

(4) Costs are often much lower in private schools than corresponding costs in public schools.

(5) Not all children are alike and therefore there is no one school or program that fits the needs of all children.

(6) The formation of sound values and moral character is crucial to helping young people escape from lives of poverty, family break-up, drug abuse, crime, and school failure.

(7) In addition to offering knowledge and skills, education should contribute positively to the formation of the internal norms and values which are vital to a child's success in life and to the well-being of society.

(8) Schools should help to provide young people with a sound moral foundation which is consistent with the values of their parents. To find such a school, parents need a full range of choice to determine where their children can best be educated.

(c) **PRECEDENTS.**—The United States Supreme Court has determined that programs giving parents choice and increased input in their children's education, including the choice of a religious education, do not violate the Constitution. The Supreme Court has held that as long as the beneficiary decides where education funds will be spent on such individual's behalf, public funds can be used for education in a religious institution because the public entity has neither advanced nor hindered a particular religion and therefore has not violated the establishment clause of the first amendment to the Constitution. Supreme Court precedents include—

(1) *Wisconsin v. Yoder*, 406 U.S. 205 (1972); *Pierce v. Society of Sisters*, 268 U.S. 510 (1925); and *Meyer v. Nebraska*, 262 U.S. 390 (1923) which held that parents have the primary role in and are the primary decision makers in all areas regarding the education and upbringing of their children;

(2) *Mueller v. Allen*, 463 U.S. 388 (1983) which declared a Minnesota tax deduction program that provided State income tax benefits for educational expenditures by parents, including tuition in religiously affiliated schools, does not violate the Constitution;

(3) *Witters v. Department of Services for the Blind*, 474 U.S. 481 (1986) in which the Su-

preme Court ruled unanimously that public funds for the vocational training of the blind could be used at a Bible college for ministry training; and

(4) *Zobrest v. Catalina Foothills School District*, 509 U.S. 1 (1993) which held that a deaf child could receive an interpreter, paid for by the public, in a private religiously affiliated school under the Individual with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.). The case held that providing an interpreter in a religiously affiliated school did not violate the establishment clause of the first amendment of the Constitution.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act—

(1) the term "Board" means the Board of Directors of the Corporation established under section 3(b)(1);

(2) the term "Corporation" means the District of Columbia Scholarship Corporation established under section 3(a);

(3) the term "eligible institution"—

(A) in the case of an eligible institution serving a student who receives a tuition scholarship under section 4(d)(1), means a public, private, or independent elementary or secondary school; and

(B) in the case of an eligible institution serving a student who receives an enhanced achievement scholarship under section 4(d)(2), means an elementary or secondary school, or an entity that provides services to a student enrolled in an elementary or secondary school to enhance such student's achievement through activities described in section 4(d)(2); and

(4) the term "poverty line" means the income official poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget, and revised annually in accordance with section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2))) applicable to a family of the size involved.

SEC. 3. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SCHOLARSHIP CORPORATION.

(a) **GENERAL REQUIREMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There is authorized to be established a private, nonprofit corporation, to be known as the "District of Columbia Scholarship Corporation", which is neither an agency nor establishment of the United States Government or the District of Columbia Government.

(2) **DUTIES.**—The Corporation shall have the responsibility and authority to administer, publicize, and evaluate the scholarship program in accordance with this Act, and to determine student and school eligibility for participation in such program.

(3) **CONSULTATION.**—The Corporation shall exercise its authority—

(A) in a manner consistent with maximizing educational opportunities for the maximum number of interested families; and

(B) in consultation with the District of Columbia Board of Education or entity exercising administrative jurisdiction over the District of Columbia Public Schools, the Superintendent of the District of Columbia Public Schools, and other school scholarship programs in the District of Columbia.

(4) **APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS.**—The Corporation shall be subject to the provisions of this Act, and, to the extent consistent with this Act, to the District of Columbia Non-profit Corporation Act (D.C. Code, sec. 29-501 et seq.).

(5) **RESIDENCE.**—The Corporation shall have its place of business in the District of Columbia and shall be considered, for purposes of venue in civil actions, to be a resident of the District of Columbia.

(6) **FUND.**—There is established in the Treasury a fund that shall be known as the District of Columbia Scholarship Fund, to be administered by the Secretary of the Treasury.

(7) **DISBURSEMENT.**—The Secretary of the Treasury shall make available and disburse to the Corporation, before October 15 of each fiscal year or not later than 15 days after the date of enactment of an Act making appropriations for the District of Columbia for such year, whichever occurs later, such funds as have been appropriated to the District of Columbia Scholarship Fund for the fiscal year in which such disbursement is made.

(8) **AVAILABILITY.**—Funds authorized to be appropriated under this Act shall remain available until expended.

(9) **USES.**—Funds authorized to be appropriated under this Act shall be used by the Corporation in a prudent and financially responsible manner, solely for scholarships, contracts, and administrative costs.

(10) **AUTHORIZATION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—There are authorized to be appropriated under this Act to the District of Columbia Scholarship Fund—

(i) \$7,000,000 for fiscal year 1998;

(ii) \$8,000,000 for fiscal year 1999; and

(iii) \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2002.

(B) **LIMITATION.**—Not more than \$500,000 of the amount appropriated to carry out this Act for any fiscal year may be used by the Corporation for any purpose other than assistance to students.

(b) **ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT; BOARD OF DIRECTORS.**—

(1) **BOARD OF DIRECTORS; MEMBERSHIP.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Corporation shall have a Board of Directors (referred to in this Act as the “Board”), comprised of 7 members with 6 members of the Board appointed by the President not later than 30 days after receipt of nominations from the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the majority leader of the Senate.

(B) **HOUSE NOMINATIONS.**—The President shall appoint 3 of the members from a list of 9 individuals nominated by the Speaker of the House of Representatives in consultation with the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(C) **SENATE NOMINATIONS.**—The President shall appoint 3 members from a list of 9 individuals nominated by the majority leader of the Senate in consultation with the minority leader of the Senate.

(D) **DEADLINE.**—The Speaker of the House of Representatives and majority leader of the Senate shall submit their nominations to the President not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(E) **APPOINTEE OF MAYOR.**—The Mayor shall appoint 1 member of the Board not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(F) **POSSIBLE INTERIM MEMBERS.**—If the President does not appoint the 6 members of the Board in the 30-day period described in subparagraph (A), then the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Majority Leader of the Senate shall each appoint 2 members of the Board, and the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives and the Minority Leader of the Senate shall each appoint 1 of the Board, from among the individuals nominated pursuant to subparagraphs (A) and (B), as the case may be. The appointees under the preceding sentence together with the appointee of the Mayor, shall serve as an interim Board with all the powers and other duties of the Board described in this Act, until the President makes the appointments as described in this subsection.

(2) **POWERS.**—All powers of the Corporation shall vest in and be exercised under the authority of the Board.

(3) **ELECTIONS.**—Members of the Board annually shall elect 1 of the members of the Board to be chairperson of the Board.

(4) **RESIDENCY.**—All members appointed to the Board shall be residents of the District of Columbia at the time of appointment and while serving on the Board.

(5) **NONEMPLOYEE.**—No member of the Board may be an employee of the United States Government or the District of Columbia Government when appointed to or during tenure on the Board, unless the individual is on a leave of absence from such a position while serving on the Board.

(6) **INCORPORATION.**—The members of the initial Board shall serve as incorporators and shall take whatever steps are necessary to establish the Corporation under the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act (D.C. Code, sec. 29–501 et seq.).

(7) **GENERAL TERM.**—The term of office of each member of the Board shall be 5 years, except that any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which the predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.

(8) **CONSECUTIVE TERM.**—No member of the Board shall be eligible to serve in excess of 2 consecutive terms of 5 years each. A partial term shall be considered as 1 full term. Any vacancy on the Board shall not affect the Board's power, but shall be filled in a manner consistent with this Act.

(9) **NO BENEFIT.**—No part of the income or assets of the Corporation shall inure to the benefit of any Director, officer, or employee of the Corporation, except as salary or reasonable compensation for services.

(10) **POLITICAL ACTIVITY.**—The Corporation may not contribute to or otherwise support any political party or candidate for elective public office.

(11) **NO OFFICERS OR EMPLOYEES.**—The members of the Board shall not, by reason of such membership, be considered to be officers or employees of the United States Government or of the District of Columbia Government.

(12) **STIPENDS.**—The members of the Board, while attending meetings of the Board or while engaged in duties related to such meetings or other activities of the Board pursuant to this Act, shall be provided a stipend. Such stipend shall be at the rate of \$150 per day for which the member of the Board is officially recorded as having worked, except that no member may be paid a total stipend amount in any calendar year in excess of \$5,000.

(c) **OFFICERS AND STAFF.**—

(1) **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.**—The Corporation shall have an Executive Director, and such other staff, as may be appointed by the Board for terms and at rates of compensation, not to exceed level EG–16 of the Educational Service of the District of Columbia, to be fixed by the Board.

(2) **STAFF.**—With the approval of the Board, the Executive Director may appoint and fix the salary of such additional personnel as the Executive Director considers appropriate.

(3) **ANNUAL RATE.**—No staff of the Corporation may be compensated by the Corporation at an annual rate of pay greater than the annual rate of pay of the Executive Director.

(4) **SERVICE.**—All officers and employees of the Corporation shall serve at the pleasure of the Board.

(5) **QUALIFICATION.**—No political test or qualification may be used in selecting, appointing, promoting, or taking other personnel actions with respect to officers, agents, or employees of the Corporation.

(d) **POWERS OF THE CORPORATION.**—

(1) **GENERALLY.**—The Corporation is authorized to obtain grants from, and make contracts with, individuals and with private, State, and Federal agencies, organizations, and institutions.

(2) **HIRING AUTHORITY.**—The Corporation may hire, or accept the voluntary services of, consultants, experts, advisory boards, and panels to aid the Corporation in carrying out this Act.

(e) **FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND RECORDS.**—

(1) **AUDITS.**—The financial statements of the Corporation shall be—

(A) maintained in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles for nonprofit corporations; and

(B) audited annually by independent certified public accountants.

(2) **REPORT.**—The report for each such audit shall be included in the annual report to Congress required by section 13(c).

SEC. 4. SCHOLARSHIPS AUTHORIZED.

(a) **ELIGIBLE STUDENTS.**—The Corporation is authorized to award tuition scholarships under subsection (d)(1) and enhanced achievement scholarships under subsection (d)(2) to students in kindergarten through grade 12—

(1) who are residents of the District of Columbia; and

(2) whose family income does not exceed 185 percent of the poverty line.

(b) **SCHOLARSHIP PRIORITY.**—

(1) **FIRST.**—The Corporation shall first award scholarships to students described in subsection (a) who—

(A) are enrolled in a District of Columbia public school or preparing to enter a District of Columbia kindergarten, except that this subparagraph shall apply only for academic years 1997, 1998, and 1999; or

(B) have received a scholarship from the Corporation in the year preceding the year for which the scholarship is awarded.

(2) **SECOND.**—If funds remain for a fiscal year for awarding scholarships after awarding scholarships under paragraph (1), the Corporation shall award scholarships to students described in subsection (a) who are not described in paragraph (1).

(c) **SPECIAL RULE.**—The Corporation shall attempt to ensure an equitable distribution of scholarship funds to students at diverse academic achievement levels.

(d) **USE OF SCHOLARSHIP.**—

(1) **TUITION SCHOLARSHIPS.**—A tuition scholarship may be used for the payment of the cost of the tuition and mandatory fees at a public, private, or independent school located within the geographic boundaries of the District of Columbia or the cost of the tuition and mandatory fees at a public, private, or independent school located within Montgomery County, Maryland; Prince Georges County, Maryland; Arlington County, Virginia; Alexandria City, Virginia; Falls Church City, Virginia; or Fairfax County, Virginia.

(2) **ENHANCED ACHIEVEMENT SCHOLARSHIP.**—An enhanced achievement scholarship may be used only for the payment of the costs of tuition and mandatory fees for, or transportation to attend, a program of instruction provided by an eligible institution which enhances student achievement of the core curriculum and is operated outside of regular school hours to supplement the regular school program.

(e) **NOT SCHOOL AID.**—A scholarship under this Act shall be considered assistance to the student and shall not be considered assistance to an eligible institution.

SEC. 5. SCHOLARSHIP PAYMENTS AND AMOUNTS.

(a) **AWARDS.**—From the funds made available under this Act, the Corporation shall award a scholarship to a student and make payments in accordance with section 10 on behalf of such student to a participating eligible institution chosen by the parent of the student.

(b) **NOTIFICATION.**—Each eligible institution that desires to receive payment under

subsection (a) shall notify the Corporation not later than 10 days after—

(1) the date that a student receiving a scholarship under this Act is enrolled, of the name, address, and grade level of such student;

(2) the date of the withdrawal or expulsion of any student receiving a scholarship under this Act, of the withdrawal or expulsion; and

(3) the date that a student receiving a scholarship under this Act is refused admission, of the reasons for such a refusal.

(c) TUITION SCHOLARSHIP.—

(1) EQUAL TO OR BELOW POVERTY LINE.—For a student whose family income is equal to or below the poverty line, a tuition scholarship may not exceed the lesser of—

(A) the cost of tuition and mandatory fees for, and transportation to attend, an eligible institution; or

(B) \$3,200 for fiscal year 1998, with such amount adjusted in proportion to changes in the Consumer Price Index for all urban consumers published by the Department of Labor for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2002.

(2) ABOVE POVERTY LINE.—For a student whose family income is greater than the poverty line, but not more than 185 percent of the poverty line, a tuition scholarship may not exceed the lesser of—

(A) 75 percent of the cost of tuition and mandatory fees for, and transportation to attend, an eligible institution; or

(B) \$2,400 for fiscal year 1998, with such amount adjusted in proportion to changes in the Consumer Price Index for all urban consumers published by the Department of Labor for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2002.

(d) ENHANCED ACHIEVEMENT SCHOLARSHIP.—An enhanced achievement scholarship may not exceed the lesser of—

(1) the costs of tuition and mandatory fees for, or transportation to attend, a program of instruction at an eligible institution; or

(2) \$500 for 1998, with such amount adjusted in proportion to changes in the Consumer Price Index for all urban consumers published by the Department of Labor for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2002.

SEC. 6. CERTIFICATION OF ELIGIBLE INSTITUTIONS.

(a) APPLICATION.—An eligible institution that desires to receive a payment on behalf of a student who receives a scholarship under this Act shall file an application with the Corporation for certification for participation in the scholarship program under this Act. Each such application shall—

(1) demonstrate that the eligible institution has operated with not less than 25 students during the 3 years preceding the year for which the determination is made unless the eligible institution is applying for certification as a new eligible institution under subsection (c);

(2) contain an assurance that the eligible institution will comply with all applicable requirements of this Act;

(3) contain an annual statement of the eligible institution's budget; and

(4) describe the eligible institution's proposed program, including personnel qualifications and fees.

(b) CERTIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), not later than 60 days after receipt of an application in accordance with subsection (a), the Corporation shall certify an eligible institution to participate in the scholarship program under this Act.

(2) CONTINUATION.—An eligible institution's certification to participate in the scholarship program shall continue unless such eligible institution's certification is revoked in accordance with subsection (d).

(c) NEW ELIGIBLE INSTITUTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible institution that did not operate with at least 25 students in the 3 years preceding the year for which the determination is made may apply for a 1-year provisional certification to participate in the scholarship program under this Act for a single year by providing to the Corporation not later than July 1 of the year preceding the year for which the determination is made—

(A) a list of the eligible institution's board of directors;

(B) letters of support from not less than 10 members of the community served by such eligible institution;

(C) a business plan;

(D) an intended course of study;

(E) assurances that the eligible institution will begin operations with not less than 25 students;

(F) assurances that the eligible institution will comply with all applicable requirements of this Act; and

(G) a statement that satisfies the requirements of paragraphs (2) and (4) of subsection (a).

(2) CERTIFICATION.—Not later than 60 days after the date of receipt of an application described in paragraph (1), the Corporation shall certify in writing the eligible institution's provisional certification to participate in the scholarship program under this Act unless the Corporation determines that good cause exists to deny certification.

(3) RENEWAL OF PROVISIONAL CERTIFICATION.—After receipt of an application under paragraph (1) from an eligible institution that includes a statement of the eligible institution's budget completed not earlier than 12 months before the date such application is filed, the Corporation shall renew an eligible institution's provisional certification for the second and third years of the school's participation in the scholarship program under this Act unless the Corporation finds—

(A) good cause to deny the renewal, including a finding of a pattern of violation of requirements described in section 7(a); or

(B) consistent failure of 25 percent or more of the students receiving scholarships under this Act and attending such school to make appropriate progress (as determined by the Corporation) in academic achievement.

(4) DENIAL OF CERTIFICATION.—If provisional certification or renewal of provisional certification under this subsection is denied, then the Corporation shall provide a written explanation to the eligible institution of the reasons for such denial.

(d) REVOCATION OF ELIGIBILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation, after notice and hearing, may revoke an eligible institution's certification to participate in the scholarship program under this Act for a year succeeding the year for which the determination is made for—

(A) good cause, including a finding of a pattern of violation of program requirements described in section 7(a); or

(B) consistent failure of 25 percent or more of the students receiving scholarships under this Act and attending such school to make appropriate progress (as determined by the Corporation) in academic achievement.

(2) EXPLANATION.—If the certification of an eligible institution is revoked, the Corporation shall provide a written explanation of its decision to such eligible institution and require a pro rata refund of the payments received under this Act.

SEC. 7. PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS FOR ELIGIBLE INSTITUTIONS.

(a) REQUIREMENTS.—Each eligible institution participating in the scholarship program under this Act shall—

(1) provide to the Corporation not later than June 30 of each year the most recent

annual statement of the eligible institution's budget; and

(2) charge a student that receives a scholarship under this Act not more than the cost of tuition and mandatory fees for, and transportation to attend, such eligible institution as other students who are residents of the District of Columbia and enrolled in such eligible institution.

(b) COMPLIANCE.—The Corporation may require documentation of compliance with the requirements of subsection (a), but neither the Corporation nor any governmental entity may impose additional requirements upon an eligible institution as a condition of participation in the scholarship program under this Act.

SEC. 8. CIVIL RIGHTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—An eligible institution participating in the scholarship program under this Act shall comply with title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and not discriminate on the basis of race, color, or national origin.

(b) REVOCATION.—Notwithstanding section 7(b), if the Secretary of Education determines that an eligible institution participating in the scholarship program under this Act is in violation of any of the laws listed in subsection (a), then the Corporation shall revoke such eligible institution's certification to participate in the program.

SEC. 9. CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES.

Nothing in this Act shall affect the rights of students, or the obligations of the District of Columbia public schools, under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.).

SEC. 10. SCHOLARSHIP PAYMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) PROPORTIONAL PAYMENT.—The Corporation shall make scholarship payments to participating eligible institutions for an academic year in 2 installments. The Corporation shall make the first payment not later than October 15 of the academic year in an amount equal to one-half the total amount of the scholarship assistance awarded to students enrolled at such institution for the academic year. The Corporation shall make the second payment not later than January 15 of the academic year in an amount equal to one-half of such total amount.

(2) PRO RATA AMOUNTS FOR STUDENT WITHDRAWAL.—

(A) BEFORE PAYMENT.—If a student receiving a scholarship withdraws or is expelled from an eligible institution before a scholarship payment is made, the eligible institution shall receive a pro rata payment based on the amount of the scholarship and the number of days the student was enrolled in the eligible institution.

(B) AFTER PAYMENT.—If a student receiving a scholarship withdraws or is expelled after a scholarship payment is made, the eligible institution shall refund to the Corporation on a pro rata basis the proportion of any scholarship payment received for the remaining days of the school year. Such refund shall occur not later than 30 days after the date of the withdrawal or expulsion of the student.

(b) FUND TRANSFERS.—The Corporation shall make scholarship payments to participating eligible institutions by electronic funds transfer. If such an arrangement is not available, then the eligible institution shall submit an alternative payment proposal to the Corporation for approval.

SEC. 11. APPLICATION SCHEDULE AND PROCEDURES.

The Corporation shall implement a schedule and procedures for processing applications for awarding student scholarships under this Act that includes a list of certified eligible institutions, distribution of information to parents and the general public

(including through a newspaper of general circulation), and deadlines for steps in the scholarship application and award process.

SEC. 12. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—An eligible institution participating in the scholarship program under this Act shall report not later than July 30 of each year in a manner prescribed by the Corporation, the following data:

(1) Student achievement in the eligible institution's programs.

(2) Grade advancement for scholarship students.

(3) Disciplinary actions taken with respect to scholarship students.

(4) Graduation, college admission test scores, and college admission rates, if applicable for scholarship students.

(5) Types and amounts of parental involvement required for all families of scholarship students.

(6) Student attendance for scholarship and non-scholarship students.

(7) General information on curriculum, programs, facilities, credentials of personnel, and disciplinary rules at the eligible institution.

(8) Number of scholarship students enrolled.

(9) Such other information as may be required by the Corporation for program appraisal.

(b) **CONFIDENTIALITY.**—No personal identifiers may be used in such report, except that the Corporation may request such personal identifiers solely for the purpose of verification.

SEC. 13. PROGRAM APPRAISAL.

(a) **STUDY.**—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall enter into a contract, with an evaluating agency that has demonstrated experience in conducting evaluations, for an independent evaluation of the scholarship program under this Act, including—

(1) a comparison of test scores between scholarship students and District of Columbia public school students of similar backgrounds, taking into account the students' academic achievement at the time of the award of their scholarships and the students' family income level;

(2) a comparison of graduation rates between scholarship students and District of Columbia public school students of similar backgrounds, taking into account the students' academic achievement at the time of the award of their scholarships and the students' family income level;

(3) the satisfaction of parents of scholarship students with the scholarship program; and

(4) the impact of the scholarship program on the District of Columbia public schools, including changes in the public school enrollment, and any improvement in the academic performance of the public schools.

(b) **PUBLIC REVIEW OF DATA.**—All data gathered in the course of the study described in subsection (a) shall be made available to the public upon request except that no personal identifiers shall be made public.

(c) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than September 1 of each year, the Corporation shall submit a progress report on the scholarship program to the appropriate committees of Congress. Such report shall include a review of how scholarship funds were expended, including the initial academic achievement levels of students who have participated in the scholarship program.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION.**—There are authorized to be appropriated for the study described in subsection (a), \$250,000, which shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 14. JUDICIAL REVIEW.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall

have jurisdiction in any action challenging the scholarship program under this Act and shall provide expedited review.

(b) **APPEAL TO SUPREME COURT.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any order of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia which is issued pursuant to an action brought under subsection (a) shall be reviewable by appeal directly to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues Senators COATS and BROWNBACK in introducing the District of Columbia Student Opportunity Scholarship Act of 1997, also known as the DCSOS Act.

This legislation is quite similar to the provision that passed the House last year as part of the D.C. appropriations bill but failed to make it through conference. It would create a modest tuition scholarship fund that would enable 2,000 low-income students in the District to attend the public, private, or parochial school of their choice. It would also provide direct aid to an additional 2,000 public school students who want to improve their academic skills through after-school tutoring.

But the circumstances surrounding this proposal have changed dramatically since it was considered last year, and I think it's important to make our colleagues aware of what's happened over the course of the last several months as they consider the bill we're introducing today.

Most immediately, the deeply troubled D.C. school system has now hit rock-bottom. Last fall, the District Control Board officially declared the schools in crisis, stripped the elected school board of its authority, and authorized an emergency board of trustees to take over the city's public schools.

In taking these drastic steps, the Control Board issued a report documenting the utter dysfunction of this school system—test scores ranking among the worst in the Nation, students and teachers subjected to violence at twice the national average, gross mismanagement of budget and personnel, buildings literally falling apart, and a tragic misplacement of priorities that puts job preservation ahead of the job of educating the city's children.

But perhaps the most damning indictment of the D.C. schools came in a single sentence included in the report: the longer students stay in the District's public school system, the Control Board concluded, the less likely they are to succeed educationally. I would urge my colleagues to think about the import of that statement. Instead of helping these children learn more with each passing year, the D.C. schools in many cases have actually become hazardous to the academic health of its students.

This conclusion should not be all that surprising when you take a closer look at the environment in which these kids are trying to learn. For instance, in April we saw a shocking breakdown of discipline at the Winston Education Center. Several fourth-graders slipped unnoticed into a sideroom right out-

side an ongoing class and engaged in oral sex, with two of the children's parents claiming their children were sexually assaulted. When the principal learned of the incident, his first reaction was to judge the sexual activity consensual. And earlier this month, Washington Post columnist Colbert King reported that a fifth-grade class at the Harrison Elementary School had gone without a teacher for the past 4 months. This outrageous situation may well have continued had King not exposed it and put pressure on the administration to correct it.

To force children to attend these schools, where the breakdown is so complete a class can go four months without a teacher, is simply unconscionable. But that is exactly what is happening in the District of Columbia, where thousands of students are trapped in decrepit, dangerous, and disenfranchising schools simply because they cannot afford any alternative.

That is why we believe there is an urgent need to pass the DCSOS Act. That acronym is not an accident, for this program would provide at least 2,000 of the most disadvantaged families in the District with an educational lifeline, a chance to seek out a school that they believe will offer their child a brighter future. It would give these families the same option that thousands of other families have already exercised by pulling their children from the D.C. public schools or moving out of town altogether.

Some defenders of the status quo have tried for some time to get us to believe that the residents of this city don't want that kind of choice. But a poll that was released this week should shatter that misguided myth once and for all. This survey found that nearly two-thirds of public school parents would send their kids to private schools if money weren't an issue. The poll also shows that there is a strong base of support for the scholarship program we're proposing right out of the gate, before we've done anything to educate the public about it. And most important, it shows that the families we're trying to help would welcome this assistance, with 62 percent of low-income parents saying that the kind of choice we're offering would improve the quality of education for District children.

Some of the opponents of this legislation will continue to argue that this program, like other attempts to expand opportunities for poor families, will harm or actually ruin the public schools. To suggest that this modest program could make a school system already in crisis any worse defies common sense. In truth, this is a case of the only thing we have to fear is fear itself—that is, the fear of moving beyond the status quo. Knowing that the D.C. schools have hit rock bottom, we shouldn't be closing off any options,

which is exactly what influential columnist William Raspberry wrote last week when he endorsed giving choice a chance in the District.

We need to get past the red herring argument that we must choose between choice and the public schools. Simply put, supporting this scholarship program is not the same as abandoning the public school system. This is not an either-or equation. And to help prove that to the citizens of the District, we have gone out of the way in this legislation to make sure that the funding for these scholarships does not come at the expense of the city's public schools. This is new money and that point should not be overlooked.

Mr. President, the truth is that we fervently hope that the Board of Trustees and CEO Gen. Julius Becton can rescue this system and make the fundamental reforms necessary to give these students the education they deserve, and we will do what we can to support their efforts. Senator BROWNBACK and I, as chairman and ranking member of the Senate's D.C. Oversight Subcommittee, made that very pledge to General Becton at a hearing we held in April.

But this mission is at a minimum going to take several years, which begs the question, what happens to those many students who have no choice but to attend schools that most parents who could afford it have long since abandoned?

We believe that we have a moral obligation to offer those children a way out. That is why many of us view this question not just as a matter of education, but a question of fairness. This is all about our values, specifically the value we place on giving every child—no matter their income, where they live or how they live—the opportunity to fulfill their God-given promise.

No one is claiming that this scholarship program is a magic bullet. But we strongly believe it will give at least 2,000 disadvantaged students a shot at a better life. We also believe that by providing some competition to the public schools, this program will accelerate the pace of reform within the D.C. school system. Across the country, the growing numbers of charter schools and private scholarship programs are forcing public school systems to confront their failures and building pressure on them to take radical actions to improve the quality of their educational programs. This is starting to happen already in the District, and we are optimistic that this legislation will intensify that movement here.

If nothing else, this legislation will create a program that will help us test what impact choice has on improving the educational opportunities of poor families in urban areas, and thereby help us make informed decisions in the future about whether to expand this kind of initiative to other cities. There have been some promising signs coming out of the choice programs in Milwaukee and Cleveland, but the reality

is we don't know with much certainty whether expanding choice will produce noticeable results. This legislation could establish a national experiment, and provide us with some real answers to the critical questions we've been wrestling with. It's for that very reason we call for a thorough evaluation of the D.C. scholarship program in our legislation.

The bottom line, Mr. President, is that it is time to give choice a chance in the District. We cannot in conscience continue to ignore the plight of these children any longer. They deserve an opportunity to break out of the nightmarish cycle of poverty, dependency, and violence and to live the American dream. This bipartisan legislation will begin to restore hope to some of these families, and I would strongly urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, one of my highest priorities as the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, Restructuring, and the District of Columbia, is to make sure the children in the Nation's capital are receiving the quality education they deserve. The District's public schools, unfortunately, have failed too many students in providing the education they deserve. The District of Columbia Student Opportunity Scholarship Act of 1997 would change this by giving low-income students the chance to get the education they need.

Our subcommittee held a hearing a few weeks ago to explore options to improve public education in the District. Mr. President, I know there are schools which are working and where students are thriving in their learning environment. I had the privilege to visit Stuart-Hobson Middle School. I was impressed by the success of the program at Stuart-Hobson and how the students took pride in their education. This school, however, is one of a few exceptions in the District Public School System.

The facts about the District public schools speak for themselves: only 22 percent of fourth grade students are at or above basic reading achievement levels; students on average consistently score below the national average of the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills; students consistently score below the national Scholastic Aptitude Test [SAT]. We cannot continue to trap these students in an educational system that is failing them.

Gen. Julius Becton, chief executive officer and Superintendent of the District of Columbia Public Schools, and the District of Columbia Emergency Transitional School Board of Trustees have said that they will make significant improvements by the year 2000, and I recognize and respect the work that lies ahead of them. But, Mr. President, the year 2000 is 3 school years away. In 3 school years, a child progresses through grades one through three in which they learn to read,

write, add, subtract, etc. In 3 school years, a high school student gains the skills and preparation they need for college or for a job. These 3 school years are too valuable to trap these students in the public school system that has not delivered.

Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues Senator COATS and Senator LIEBERMAN in introducing this legislation that focuses on the individual student in the District of Columbia Public Schools. By providing up to \$3,200 in individual scholarships to low-income families who will choose the school for their children, this bill would give these students the chance to make sure the next 3 school years do not go to waste. Improving the chances for these children to get the education they need is one of the most fundamental elements to restore the Nation's capital into the shining city the United States deserves.

By Mr. MURKOWSKI (for himself and Mr. BAUCUS):

S. 848. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services, through the Health Care Financing Administration, to expand and strengthen the demonstration project known as the Medicare Telemedicine Demonstration Program; to the Committee on Finance.

THE RURAL TELEMEDICINE DEMONSTRATION ACT
OF 1997

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce, along with my colleague, Senator BAUCUS of Montana, the Rural Telemedicine Demonstration Act of 1997.

The vast potential of telemedicine technology is clearly under-utilized. I believe that the answer to growing concerns regarding access and affordability of quality health care services in rural America is telemedicine. Let me describe just a few of the difficulties of rural health care in my home State of Alaska and explain why telemedicine is our long-awaited answer.

Alaska encompasses 586,412 square miles. It is one-fifth the size of the contiguous United States; 120 times larger than the State of Rhode Island; and larger than the three largest States in the union combined. If a map of Alaska were superimposed on a map of the lower 48 States, Alaska would touch South Carolina, Mexico, California, and the United States-Canadian border. In short, Alaska has 1 million acres of land for every day of the year.

Geography is another defining characteristic of Alaska. My State has a climate characterized by significant season fluctuations in temperature and precipitation and a topography characterized by mountains, wetlands, forests, and rugged coastlines.

Communities and villages are scattered throughout the vast regions of Alaska. And though Alaska contains 586,412 square miles, it only has 12,200 miles of roads. Vast areas are completely unconnected by roads, with access only available by airplane, boat, snowmachine, or dogsled.

Meeting the health care needs of these communities and villages is a daunting task. Residents have difficulty due to geography, lack of providers and poverty. Although excellent medical facilities and tertiary care centers are available in Anchorage, direct connection to these facilities from most of the State is not possible other than by air transportation. Consequently, geographically, 74 percent of the State is in medically underserved areas.

Telemedicine is the cost-effective and practical answer to the Alaska dilemma. Currently, there is an exciting project underway known as the Alaska Telemedicine project. This consortium of Alaskan health care providers and telecommunication carriers has been diligently working to unite health care in Alaska. This project has successfully united the Native health corporations, military medical facilities, and public and private hospitals of Alaska.

The fragmented nature of health care delivery in Alaska and Alaska satellite-based narrow-band telecommunications infrastructure, along with the geography and climate of Alaska, make Alaska an ideal place for the Alaska Telemedicine project to flourish.

In 1995, the Health Care Financing Administration [HCFA], pursuant to a mandate in 42 U.S.C. 1395(b)(1) which directs HCFA to establish demonstration projects that explore innovative methodologies of Medicare cost-savings, developed a telemedicine Medicare reimbursement project for rural America. Five demonstration sites were established in four States: Iowa, West Virginia, North Carolina, and Georgia. The purpose of these programs was to investigate Medicare reimbursement for telemedicine in rural locations.

Unfortunately, the HCFA study of rural telemedicine contains a glaring omission: The study does not include any sites in rural Western locations. The omission of the rural West, which contains extremely remote and frontier locations will result in a deficient and likely inaccurate study for rural telemedicine.

Our legislation will expand the HCFA project to better represent rural America. A site in Alaska and in Montana will be included. Montana, like Alaska, experiences significant difficulties in providing health care services in rural areas. Montana's five independent telemedicine projects that have formed a united alliance will also be included in the HCFA project.

Mr. President, the goal of telemedicine Medicare reimbursement is to ensure that the elderly of America who reside in inaccessible rural areas will be allowed to have access to quality health care in the most cost-effective manner—via telecommunication networks. Establishing Medicare reimbursement stabilizes telemedicine technology, and will likely lead to widespread coverage of telehealth services by private insurers.

Senator BAUCUS and my bill, will merely expand the current demonstration project conducted by HCFA. By this expansion, the HCFA study will better represent rural telemedicine in the Nation. I ask that my colleagues support the Rural Telemedicine Demonstration Act of 1997.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 848

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Rural Telemedicine Demonstration Act of 1997".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Access to health care providers is critically important to improving the health of individuals residing in rural areas.

(2) Individuals residing in the rural areas of the Western United States are severely underserved by both primary and specialty health care providers.

(3) Telecommunications technology has made it possible to provide a wide range of vital health care services to individuals residing in remote locations and over vast distances at a fraction of the costs associated with the provision of such services without such technology.

(4) On February 17, 1997, the General Accounting Office reported that Federal involvement in telehealth systems is needed for the success of such systems.

(5) In order for telehealth systems to continue to benefit rural communities, the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) must eventually reimburse the provision of health care services to remote locations via telecommunication.

(6) The current Medicare telemedicine demonstration program conducted by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, through the Health Care Financing Administration, does not include any sites in rural areas of the Western United States. Without such sites, such demonstration program will not provide accurate indicators of the success of telemedicine.

(7)(A) The fragmented nature of Alaska's transportation infrastructure, as well as extremes in geography, climates, and ethnography create severe problems for health care providers to provide health care services to the individuals residing in Alaska.

(B) The Alaska Telemedicine Project is a statewide telehealth project which overcomes infrastructure problems within Alaska by uniting 40 public and private health care providers across Alaska to provide health care services to the residents of Alaska.

(8)(A) Health care providers in Montana also experience significant difficulties in providing health care services in rural areas. Five independent telemedicine networks in Montana have formed the Montana Healthcare Telecommunications Alliance (MHTA), an association of telemedicine service providers representing not-for-profit and public medical and mental health facilities throughout the State.

(B) The goal of the MHTA is to promote cost effective statewide deployment of telemedicine services thereby supporting public and private health care providers and improving access to quality medical and men-

tal health services for all individuals residing in Montana.

SEC. 3. EXPANSION OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, through the Health Care Financing Administration, shall expand the demonstration project known as the Medicare telemedicine demonstration program to include within such demonstration program the Alaska Telemedicine Project (described in section 2(7)) and the Montana Healthcare Telecommunications Alliance (described in section 2(8)).

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than March 1 of each year that the demonstration project described in subsection (a) is being conducted, the Secretary, through the Health Care Financing Administration, shall submit a report to Congress that contains—

(1) an evaluation of the effectiveness of such demonstration project; and

(2) any legislative recommendations determined appropriate by the Secretary.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$2,000,000 to the Secretary of Health and Human Services to carry out the purposes of the demonstration project described in subsection (a).

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 98

At the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON, the name of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SESSIONS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 98, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a family tax credit.

S. 100

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 100, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide protection for airline employees who provide certain air safety information, and for other purposes.

S. 127

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the names of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DEWINE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY] were added as cosponsors of S. 127, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the exclusion for employer-provided educational assistance programs, and for other purposes.

S. 220

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] was added as a cosponsor of S. 220, a bill to require the United States Trade Representative to determine whether the European Union has failed to implement satisfactorily its obligations under certain trade agreements relating to United States meat and pork exporting facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 224

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. FRIST] was added as a cosponsor of S. 224, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit covered beneficiaries under the military health care system who are also entitled to Medicare to enroll in the Federal Employees Health Benefits program, and for other purposes.

S. 249

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the names of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY] were added as cosponsors of S. 249, a bill to require that health plans provide coverage for a minimum hospital stay for mastectomies and lymph node dissection for the treatment of breast cancer, coverage for reconstructive surgery following mastectomies, and coverage for secondary consultations.

S. 278

At the request of Mr. GRAMM, the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] was added as a cosponsor of S. 278, a bill to guarantee the right of all active duty military personnel, merchant mariners, and their dependents to vote in Federal, State, and local elections.

S. 293

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. FRIST] was added as a cosponsor of S. 293, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the credit for clinical testing expenses for certain drugs for rare diseases or conditions.

S. 335

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. FRIST] was added as a cosponsor of S. 335, a bill to authorize funds for construction of highways, and for other purposes.

S. 370

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 370, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for increased medicare reimbursement for nurse practitioners and clinical nurse specialists to increase the delivery of health services in health professional shortage areas, and for other purposes.

S. 371

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 371, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for increased medicare reimbursement for physician assistants, to increase the delivery of health services in health professional shortage areas, and for other purposes.

S. 375

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] was added as a cosponsor of S. 375, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to restore the link between the maximum amount of earnings by blind individuals permitted without demonstrating ability to engage in substantial gainful activity and the exempt amount permitted in determining excess earnings under the earnings test.

S. 377

At the request of Mr. BURNS, the name of the Senator from Washington

[Mr. GORTON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 377, a bill to promote electronic commerce by facilitating the use of strong encryption, and for other purposes.

S. 381

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM] was added as a cosponsor of S. 381, a bill to establish a demonstration project to study and provide coverage of routine patient care costs for medicare beneficiaries with cancer who are enrolled in an approved clinical trial program.

S. 385

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 385, a bill to provide reimbursement under the medicare program for telehealth services, and for other purposes.

S. 387

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 387, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide equity to exports of software.

S. 398

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 398, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require the use of child restraint systems approved by the Secretary of Transportation on commercial aircraft, and for other purposes.

S. 404

At the request of Mr. BOND, the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] was added as a cosponsor of S. 404, a bill to modify the budget process to provide for separate budget treatment of the dedicated tax revenues deposited in the Highway Trust Fund.

S. 427

At the request of Mr. SHELBY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BREAUX] was added as a cosponsor of S. 427, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore the deduction for lobbying expenses in connection with State legislation.

S. 460

At the request of Mr. BOND, the names of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. FRIST] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SESSIONS] were added as cosponsors of S. 460, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deduction for health insurance costs of self-employed individuals, to provide clarification for the deductibility of expenses incurred by a taxpayer in connection with the business use of the home, to clarify the standards used for determining that certain individuals are not employees, and for other purposes.

S. 472

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the name of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 472, a bill to provide for

referenda in which the residents of Puerto Rico may express democratically their preferences regarding the political status of the territory, and for other purposes.

S. 474

At the request of Mr. KYL, the name of the Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 474, a bill to amend sections 1081 and 1084 of title 18, United States Code.

S. 492

At the request of Mr. SARBANES, the name of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI] was added as a cosponsor of S. 492, a bill to amend certain provisions of title 5, United States Code, in order to ensure equality between Federal firefighters and other employees in the civil service and other public sector firefighters, and for other purposes.

S. 493

At the request of Mr. KYL, the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 493, a bill to amend section 1029 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to cellular telephone cloning paraphernalia.

S. 505

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HAGEL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 505, a bill to amend the provisions of title 17, United States Code, with respect to the duration of copyright, and for other purposes.

S. 509

At the request of Mr. BURNS, the name of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. ASHCROFT] was added as a cosponsor of S. 509, a bill to provide for the return of certain program and activity funds rejected by States to the Treasury to reduce the Federal deficit, and for other purposes.

S. 511

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the names of the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] and the Senator from Louisiana [Ms. LANDRIEU] were added as cosponsors of S. 511, a bill to require that the health and safety of a child be considered in any foster care or adoption placement, to eliminate barriers to the termination of parental rights in appropriate cases, to promote the adoption of children with special needs, and for other purposes.

S. 524

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 524, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove the requirement of an x ray as a condition of coverage of chiropractic services under the Medicare Program.

S. 535

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 535, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a program for

research and training with respect to Parkinson's disease.

S. 537

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM] was added as a cosponsor of S. 537, a bill to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the mammography quality standards program.

S. 598

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG] was added as a cosponsor of S. 598, a bill to amend section 3006A of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the public disclosure of court appointed attorneys' fees upon approval of such fees by the court.

S. 607

At the request of Mr. COATS, the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 607, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for the implementation of systems for rating the specific content of specific television programs.

S. 623

At the request of Mr. INOUE, the name of the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 623, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to deem certain service in the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines and the Philippine Scouts to have been active service for purposes of benefits under programs administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

S. 649

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] was added as a cosponsor of S. 649, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of bone mass measurements for certain individuals under part B of the Medicare Program.

S. 693

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 693, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the value of qualified historic property shall not be included in determining the taxable estate of a decedent.

S. 709

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, the name of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ENZI] was added as a cosponsor of S. 709, a bill to protect private property rights guaranteed by the fifth amendment to the Constitution by requiring Federal agencies to prepare private property taking impact analyses and by allowing expanded access to Federal courts.

S. 716

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 716, a bill to establish a

Joint United States-Canada Commission on Cattle and Beef to identify, and recommend means of resolving, national, regional, and provincial trade-distorting differences between the countries with respect to the production, processing, and sale of cattle and beef, and for other purposes.

S. 718

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON] were added as cosponsors of S. 718, a bill to amend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, and for other purposes.

S. 763

At the request of Mr. HELMS, the name of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 763, a bill to amend the Gun-Free Schools Act of 1994 to require a local educational agency that receives funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to expel a student determined to be in possession of an illegal drug, or illegal drug paraphernalia, on school property, in addition to expelling a student determined to be in possession of a gun.

S. 765

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DEWINE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 765, a bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to further improve the safety and health of working environments, and for other purposes.

S. 766

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the names of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. CLELAND] and the Senator from Illinois [Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN] were added as cosponsors of S. 766, a bill to require equitable coverage of prescription contraceptive drugs and devices, and contraceptive services under health plans.

S. 775

At the request of Mr. JEFFORDS, the names of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. FEINGOLD] were added as cosponsors of S. 775, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude gain or loss from the sale of livestock from the computation of capital gain net income for purposes of the earned income credit.

S. 779

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 779, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase the number of physicians that complete a fellowship in geriatric medicine and geriatric psychiatry, and for other purposes.

S. 785

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 785, a bill to convey certain land to the City of Grants Pass, Oregon.

S. 819

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBB] was added as a cosponsor of S. 819, a bill to designate the United States courthouse at 200 South Washington Street in Alexandria, Virginia, as the "Martin V.B. Bostetter, Jr. United States Courthouse".

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 6

At the request of Mr. KYL, the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BRYAN] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 6, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to protect the rights of crime victims.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 28

At the request of Mr. GLENN, his name was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 28, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency should take immediate steps to abate emissions of mercury and release to Congress the study of mercury required under the Clean Air Act, and for other purposes.

SENATE RESOLUTION 92

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the names of the Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. REED], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE], the Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BRYAN], the Senator from Illinois [Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN], the Senator from Maine [Ms. SNOWE], the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI], the Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM], the Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBB] were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 92, a resolution designating July 2, 1997, and July 2, 1998, as "National Literacy Day."

SENATE RESOLUTION 94

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. FRIST] were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 94, a resolution commending the American Medical Association on its 150th anniversary, its 150 years of caring for the United States, and its continuing effort to uphold the principles upon which Nathan Davis, M.D. and his colleagues founded the American Medical Association to "promote the science and art of medicine and the betterment of public health."

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 31—CONCERNING THE PAL-ESTINIAN AUTHORITY

Mr. D'AMATO (for himself, Mr. BOND, Mr. MACK, and Mr. SPECTER) submitted

the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 31

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

Whereas the Palestinian Authority Justice Minister Freih Abu Medein announced last month that anyone selling land to Jews was committing a crime punishable by death;

Whereas since this announcement three Palestinian individuals were murdered in the Jerusalem and Ramallah areas for, what would anywhere else in the world be considered normal business activity—selling real estate;

Whereas recently Israeli police managed to foil the attempted abduction of a fourth person;

Whereas Israeli security services have acquired evidence indicating the intelligence services of the Palestinian Authority were directly involved in at least 2 of these murders;

Whereas subsequent statements by high-ranking Palestinian Authority officials have justified these murders which have further encouraged this intolerable policy;

Whereas the Palestinian Authority has failed to condemn the policy of murdering people for business transactions;

Whereas this policy is in direct contravention to the peace agreements already reached between the Palestinian Authority and the State of Israel; and

Whereas credible evidence exists that the Palestinian Authority has played an active role in these murders and in enforcing this policy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the Clinton administration should thoroughly investigate the Palestinian Authority role in enforcing this racist policy and should immediately report to the Congress its findings;

(2) the Palestinian Authority, with Yasser Arafat as its chairman, must immediately issue a public and unequivocal statement denouncing these acts and this policy;

(3) this policy is an affront to all those who place high value on peace and basic human rights; and

(4) the United States should not provide foreign assistance to the Palestinian Authority until this policy is reversed.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today, along with Senators CONNIE MACK, KIT BOND, and ARLEN SPECTER to introduce a concurrent resolution condemning the Palestinian Authority for the killing of Palestinians for selling land to Israelis. This legislation is being offered concurrently in the House by my colleagues, Congressmen JON FOX and JERRY WELLER.

Mr. President, we are offering this resolution because it is appalling that Yasir Arafat, to whom we provide millions of dollars in aid, is allowing his so-called police officers from the Palestinian Authority to carry out assassinations of Arab land dealers for their sales of land to Jews. Arafat terms these dealers "isolated traitors" for their actions and has thereby given his approval to these killings.

Thus far, three land dealers have been killed, execution style with a bullet to the back of the head, all by Palestinian Authority police officers. The Israeli police have already arrested one

man in the killing of the first land dealer, Farid Bashiti, and earlier in the week they arrested four Palestinian officers attempting to kidnap another land dealer. According to a story in today's Ha'aretz (a newspaper in Israel) the detained Palestinian police officers have given information that links Tawfik Tirawi, the head of security in Ramallah, under Palestinian Authority control.

At this time, I would ask unanimous consent that the text of this article be included in the RECORD.

This is an interesting state of affairs that we have here. The United States provides funding to the Palestinian Authority, they violate the agreements they have signed with the Israelis, and we go about our way as if nothing has happened. Arafat's Palestinian Authority mismanages the funds it has and we provide more. This is outrageous and unfortunate.

The world must realize that Israel, while keeping its agreements with the Palestinians, is held to a different standard, harassed, criticized, and denigrated for building condominiums at Har Homa, on territory that is its own, perfectly legal according to the Oslo agreement but nevertheless condemned as flagrantly violating the peace. Yet where is the criticism of the terrorism practiced by the Palestinians? Where are the U.N. resolutions condemning these summary executions by the Palestinian police? Yasir Arafat pushed for the U.N. to condemn the building at Har Homa, yet he brands extrajudicial killings as justifiable for traitors. What a despicable contradiction.

Mr. President, we offer this resolution to call attention to these horrible killings by Palestinian police sanctioned by the PLO in violation of every standard of international human rights, and to call attention to the fact that Yasir Arafat's PLO has not changed its spots; it has not reformed. Why, we ask, does the United States continue to allow these acts to take place?

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution as well as to examine this issue to understand Yasir Arafat's behavior.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Ha'aretz, June 5, 1997]

PALESTINIAN SECURITY OFFICIAL DETAINED IN ISRAEL: COLONEL TIRAWI ORDERED LAND DEALERS MURDERS

(By Eitan Rabin and Amira Hass)

Israeli security officials rejected the claims of their Palestinian counterparts that no Palestinian agents were involved in the recent murders of land dealers.

"The Palestinians have made a political decision to kill anyone who sells land to Jews, and in recent days they have even added names to their list of suspected dealers," a senior security source said.

Three land dealers were killed in the past month following the declaration of the Palestinian Authority official in charge of justice, Freih Abu-Meddien, that selling land to Jews is a crime punishable by death.

The Palestinian Authority has repeatedly denied any involvement in the murders. The head of Palestinian intelligence, Amin al-Hindi said reiterated this at a Ramallah news conference yesterday. Commenting on reports that Israel had issued a warrant for the arrest of a Palestinian Authority official, Al-Hindi said the Palestinians had not received any information to this effect. But he warned of a grave escalation in the situation if any senior Palestinian was detained.

Al-Hindi added that the Palestinian security branches are investigating the land dealer murders, even though the killings took place in areas under Israeli security responsibility.

Al-Hindi charged Israel of using the murders to cover up its own failure to fulfill its commitments in the peace accords and to deflect debate over settlement policy.

From questioning Palestinian security officials detained in Israel, Israeli security forces have obtained testimony linking the Palestinian Authority to the murders. One testimony points to specific involvement of Tawfik Tirawi, the head of security in Ramallah. According to questioning of the detainees, orders to security forces to act came in part from Abu-Meddien.

In one case, security forces met with a land dealer from East Jerusalem, and forced him to pay a ransom to save his life.

In a related development, a Nazareth-based weekly put out by the Democratic Front for Peace and Equality, headed by Knesset member Azmi Beshara, has published a list of names of well-known Palestinians who are believed to have sold land to Jews between 1918-1945.

The list includes the name of Palestinian Arab leaders from the period. The Voice of Palestine radio sharply attacked the article, primarily because the list included the name of the grandfather of Faisal Husseini, who holds the Jerusalem portfolio in the Palestinian Authority.

SENATE RESOLUTION 96—PROCLAIMING NATIONAL SAFE PLACE WEEK

Mr. CRAIG submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 96

Whereas today's youth are vital to the preservation of our country and will be the future bearers of the bright torch of democracy; and

Whereas youth need a safe haven from various negative influences such as child abuse, substance abuse and crime, and they need to have resources readily available to assist them when faced with circumstances that compromise their safety; and

Whereas the United States needs increased numbers of community volunteers acting as positive influences on the nation's youth; and

Whereas the Safe Place program is committed to protecting our nation's most valuable asset, our youth, by offering short term "safe places" at neighborhood locations where more than 2,500 trained volunteers are available to counsel and advise youth seeking assistance and guidance; and

Whereas Safe Place combines the efforts of the private sector and non-profit organizations uniting to reach youth in the early stages of crisis; and

Whereas Safe Place provides a direct means to assist programs in meeting performance standards relative to outreach/community relations, as set forth in the federal runaway and homeless youth guidelines; and

Whereas the Safe Place placard displayed at businesses within communities stands as a beacon of safety and refuge to at-risk youth; and

Whereas currently 34 states and more than 6,000 business locations have established Safe Place programs; and

Whereas increased awareness of the program's existence will encourage communities to establish Safe Places for the nation's youth throughout the country: Now, therefore, be it;

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) Proclaims the week of March 15 through March 21, 1998, as "National Safe Place Week"; and

(2) Requests that the President issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States and interested groups to promote awareness of and volunteer involvement in the Safe Place organization, and to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 97—TO DESIGNATE GEORGE C. MARSHALL MONTH

Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. ROBB) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 97

Whereas 1997 marks the fiftieth year since the European Recovery Program, or what came to be called the Marshall Plan, was first conceived and proclaimed by General George Catlett Marshall while he was serving as Secretary of State of the United States.

Whereas the Marshall Plan has been hailed by leaders of World War II allied and enemy countries alike as the most magnanimous act by Americans in history;

Whereas the Marshall Plan made possible new measures of trans-Atlantic cooperation through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and other institutions;

Whereas these institutional developments have profoundly enhanced the security, freedom, and prosperity of the United States and the Atlantic Community generally;

Whereas new challenges have arisen which call for recommitment to and reinvigoration of these institutions and for their continued viability;

Whereas creative thought and rededication to the ideals and principles undergirding the Marshall Plan are now necessary in order to assure the preservation and perfection of these institutions; and

Whereas the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the Marshall Plan provides a fitting opportunity for rededication of commitments to these institutions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate—

(1) that magnanimity underlies the Marshall Plan, the dedication to public service and integrity of its author, and the efforts by the Marshall Foundation in Lexington, Virginia, the Marshall International Center in Leesburg, Virginia, and the Friends of Marshall, Uniontown, Pennsylvania, to continue in American life the values for which General George Catlett Marshall stood;

(2) that all Americans should rededicate themselves to the ideals of public service, hard work, integrity, and compassion which General Marshall represents to this day in American society; and

(3) that the values that inspired the initiation of the Marshall Plan should continue to be cherished by the people of the United States.

SEC. 2. It is, further, the sense of the Senate that the President should issue a proclamation designating the month of June 1997 as "George C. Marshall Month" and calling upon the people of the United States to observe George C. Marshall Month with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I would like to announce for information of the Senate and the public that a hearing of the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources will be held on Tuesday, June 10, 1997, 9:30 a.m., in SD-430 of the Senate Dirksen Building. The subject of the hearing is Divided Loyalties: The Impact of Salting in the Workplace. For further information, please call the committee, (202) 224-5375.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES—SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, HISTORIC PRESERVATION, AND RECREATION

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that an oversight hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will take place on Thursday, June 12, 1997, at 2 p.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

The purpose of this hearing is to review the preliminary findings of the General Accounting Office concerning a study on the health, condition, and viability of the range and wildlife populations in Yellowstone National Park.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to the Subcommittee on National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, 364 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510-6150.

For further information, please contact Jim O'Toole of the subcommittee staff at (202) 224-5161.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management.

The hearing will take place Wednesday, June 18, 1997 at 2:00 p.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

The purpose of this hearing is to receive testimony on the following general land exchange bills: S. 587, a bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to exchange certain lands located in Hindsdale County, CO; S. 588, a bill to provide for the expansion of the Eagles Nest Wilderness within the Arapaho

National Forest and the White River National Forest, CO, to include land known as the Slate Creek Addition; S. 589, a bill to provide for a boundary adjustment and land conveyance involving the Raggeds Wilderness, White River National Forest, CO, to correct the effects of earlier erroneous land surveys; S. 590, a bill to provide for a land exchange involving certain land within the Routt National Forest in the State of Colorado; S. 591, a bill to transfer the Dillion Ranger District in the Arapaho National Forest to the White River National Forest in the State of Colorado; 541, a bill to provide for an exchange of lands with the city of Greeley, CO, and the Water Supply and Storage Co. to eliminate private inholdings in wilderness areas, and for other purposes; S. 750, a bill to consolidate certain mineral interests in the National Grasslands in Billings County, ND, through the exchange of Federal and private mineral interests to enhance land management capabilities and environmental and wildlife protection, and for other purposes; and S. 785, a bill to convey certain land to the City of Grants Pass, OR.

Those who wish to submit written statements should write to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510. For further information, please call Judy Brown or Mark Rey at (202) 224-6170.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, HISTORIC PRESERVATION, AND RECREATION

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that an oversight hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will take place on Thursday, June 19, 1997 at 2 p.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

The purpose of this hearing is to receive testimony regarding entrance and special use fees for units of the National Park System and the status of the Fee Demonstration Program implemented by the National Park Service in 1996.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to the Subcommittee on National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, 364 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510-6150.

For further information, please contact Jim O'Toole of the subcommittee staff at (202) 224-5161.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that the Committee on Energy and

Natural Resources will hold a workshop to review reform of the Public Utility Holding Company Act.

The hearing will take place on Tuesday, June 24, in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building starting at 9:30 a.m. Those who wish to participate or submit written statements should write to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510. For further information please contact Shawn Taylor at (202) 224-6567.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL
RESOURCES

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management.

The hearing will take place Thursday, June 26, 1997 at 9:30 a.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

The purpose of this hearing is to receive testimony on S. 783, the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness Accessibility and Fairness Act of 1997.

Those who wish to submit written statements should write to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510. For further information, please call Judy Brown or Mark Rey at (202) 224-6170.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, HISTORIC
PRESERVATION, AND RECREATION

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will take place on Thursday, June 26, 1997 at 2 p.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

The purpose of this hearing is to receive testimony on S. 308, a bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study concerning grazing use of certain land within and adjacent to Grand Teton National Park, WY, and to extend temporarily certain grazing privileges; and S. 360, a bill to require adoption of a management plan for the Hells Canyon National Recreation Area that allows appropriate use of motorized and nonmotorized river craft in the recreation area.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to the Subcommittee on National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, 364 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510-6150.

For further information, please contact Jim O'Toole of the subcommittee staff at (202) 224-5161.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO
MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND
FORESTRY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be allowed to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 5, 1997, at 9 a.m. in SR-328A to receive testimony regarding contaminated strawberries in school lunches.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN
AFFAIRS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 5, 1997, to conduct a markup on S. 621, the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1997, and of certain pending nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND
TRANSPORTATION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet on June 5, 1997, at 9:30 a.m. on Asia trade.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC
WORKS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full Committee on Environment and Public Works be granted permission to meet to consider pending business Thursday, June 5, 9:30 a.m., hearing room (SD-406).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Human Resources Subcommittee on Aging be authorized to meet for a hearing on Challenges of Alzheimer's Disease: The Biomedical Research That Will Carry Us Into the 21st Century during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 5, 1997, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Human Resources Subcommittee on Children and Families be authorized to meet for a hearing on Pre-to-3: Policy implications of Child Brain Development during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 5, 1997, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL SECURITY,
PROLIFERATION, AND FEDERAL SERVICES

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of the

Governmental Affairs Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation, and Federal Services to meet on Thursday, June 5, 1997 at 2:00 p.m. for a hearing on Proliferation: Russian Case Studies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet on Thursday, June 5, 1997, at 9:30 a.m. in open session, to receive testimony on gender integrated training and related matters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TAXATION AND IRS
OVERSIGHT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, the Finance Committee Subcommittee on Taxation and IRS Oversight requests unanimous consent to conduct a hearing on Thursday, June 5, 1997, beginning at 2 p.m. in room 215 Dirksen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO GIRL SCOUT GOLD
AWARD RECIPIENTS

• Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to salute an outstanding group of young women who have been honored with the Girl Scout Gold Award. The Gold Award is the highest achievement a Girl Scout can earn and symbolizes outstanding accomplishments in the areas of leadership, community service, career planning, and personal development. The award can be earned by girls aged 14-17, or in grades 9-12.

The young ladies from the Kentuckiana Council who will receive this honor are: Jodi M. Akin, Millie M. Cook, Miranda S. Der Ohanian, Alicia M. Franken, Julie W. Goodwin, Meghan K. Horan, Jean E. Hiter, Tricia J. Johnson, Casey J. Lightfoot, Susan D. Martin, Sarah J. Pershke, Leslie A. Rowland, Amy E. Shelton, Tiffany L. Skeens, Melissa C. Smith, Whitney A. Sylvester, Molly D. Taylor, Catherine T. Tomasseti, and Andrea D. Warwick.

The young ladies from the Licking Valley Council are: Kelly Buten, Mary Jane Hendrickson, Alyssa Hensley, Mandy Radle, and Becky Thomas.

The young ladies from the Wilderness Road Council are: Carlye Ann Burchett, Stephanie Ann Eads, Ericka Lee Harney, Adrienne Mira Winkler, Cassie Domek, Tina Gelgeln, Lela Nichole Woods, Sabra Goble, Valerie Ann Petty, Tracey Lynn Isaacs, and Elizabeth Anne Van Orden.

Girl Scouts of the U.S.A., an organization serving over 2.5 million girls, has awarded more than 20,000 Girl Scout Gold Awards to senior Girl Scouts since the inception of the program in 1980. To receive the award, a

Girl Scout must earn four interest project patches, the Career Exploration Pin, the Senior Girl Scout Leadership Award, and the Senior Girl Scout Challenge, as well as design and implement a Girl Scout Gold Award project. A plan for fulfilling these requirements is created by the Senior Girl Scout and is carried out through close cooperation between the girl and an adult Girl Scout volunteer.

Mr. President, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to these outstanding young ladies. They deserve recognition for their contributions to their community and their country, and I wish them continued success in the years ahead.

SMALL BUSINESS WEEK 1997

• Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, as we mark the annual celebration of Small Business Week, I take great pleasure in acknowledging the achievements of the estimated 22.1 million small businesses in this country. Small businesses play an integral role in the American economy, generating half the gross domestic product, and driving America forward in terms of product development, employment, and ingenuity.

Small businesses employ more than 50 percent of our private work force and have been credited with the creation of two out of every three jobs. Studies have also shown that they produce more than twice as many significant innovations per employee as large firms. But beyond the statistics, the successes of small businesses continue to prove that the American dream is still a reality.

Small businesses provide most American workers with their first jobs. And for each job that a small business creates, one more American has the opportunity to prosper. Small businesses also play a major role in moving our economy forward, creating jobs, generating revenue, and developing new products and services that keep American business on the cutting edge.

In my own State of Maryland, we have seen the extraordinary things that can be accomplished when creative entrepreneurs are determined to succeed. I want to share just a few of those stories.

The 1997 Maryland Small Business Person of the year is Jamie Clark, who began his Internet service company, ClarkNet, out of a family barn in Ellicott City, MD. Jamie is deaf, and recognized the Internet as a powerful resource, a place where he and other deaf people could conduct business as easily as the hearing. With a \$35,000 loan and three volunteers, who were also deaf, Jamie built a company that today employs well over 30 people and had sales totaling \$2.5 million last year, up from less than \$60,000 when ClarkNet began just 4 years ago.

As someone with deep roots in Maryland—Jamie's grandfather was a circuit court judge in Howard County and his father a State senator for 24 years,

4 of those as president of the Senate—Jamie is an active member of the community, serving on the Deaf and Hard of Hearing Entrepreneurs Council, the Howard County Chamber of Commerce, the Better Business Bureau, and the Baltimore-Washington Venture Group.

Maryland's Small Business Exporter of the Year last year, Bruce Lawson of Finksburg, MD, has turned a hobby into a business that is an industry leader. Bruce started his company, Brass Instruments, after helping his father—a retired french horn player in the Baltimore Symphony Orchestra—repair his friends' musical instruments. Appalled at the quality of the horns they were repairing, Bruce started making horns himself. Today, Brass Instruments is the top french horn maker in the world.

Another former Maryland Small Business Person of the Year is Dorothy White, of Columbia, MD, who started cleaning houses when her husband fell ill. Dorothy's work was so impressive that her employers began asking her to clean their offices as well. What evolved was Dorothy's multimillion-dollar business, Miracle Services. Like many Maryland businesses, Dorothy's company also has flourished under the 8(a) program, through which she has received numerous Government contracts.

The 1995 Regional Small Business Exporter of the Year also hails from Maryland. After immigrating from Poland to Baltimore, Jon Sakowski realized that plastic piping could make all the difference in Poland's plumbing system. When he could not find a Polish buyer who could afford the product, Jon began installing the piping for free in Poland's churches, schools, and hospitals. Then, taking a major financial risk, Jon exported the piping to Poland—without a buyer—and warehoused it himself, selling the piping off piece by piece rather than in bulk.

We in Maryland are very proud of individuals like Jamie Clark, Bruce Lawson, Dorothy White, Jon Sakowski and the many other operators of small businesses in our State who, often beginning with very little, have accomplished so much. More than 97.8 percent of Maryland's full-time firms have fewer than 500 employees, and there are an additional 131,000 individuals who are self-employed. The significance of these businesses to Maryland's economy is evident in study after study, such as the Small Business Administration's recent report that Maryland firms with fewer than 20 employees increased employment by 10.4 percent between 1991 and 1995.

Minority-owned businesses also have made great strides in recent years. Between 1987 and 1992, Maryland's number of women-owned businesses rose by 48.7 percent, its number of African-American owned firms rose 65 percent and its number of Hispanic-owned firms rose 148.7 percent.

Yet despite this progress, much remains to be done. Minority-owned

firms in Maryland are selling 30 percent below the national average, and bankruptcies and failures have increased. Given the important economic and social roles played by minority-owned businesses, it is essential that we strengthen our efforts to help these underserved markets succeed.

Mr. President, as someone who has benefited personally from the opportunities afforded to small business in this country—I spent my youth working in my parents' Greek restaurant on Maryland's Lower Eastern Shore—I know how important it is to small business owners, employees, and customers that they continue to thrive. Small business success not only translates into jobs and economic growth, it also translates into a sense of pride and self-respect on the part of owners and workers and the heartening affirmation that the American dream is still alive.●

THE CONGRESSIONAL AWARD

• Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, in 1979, Congress created an award which is specifically designed for young people. This special program, the Congressional Award, recognizes young Americans who make commitments to community service and self-improvement. I would like to take a few moments of Senate business to discuss this program and the important role it plays in promoting volunteerism.

The Congressional Award is a non-partisan, public-private partnership which teaches young people that they can make a difference in their communities. The program is noncompetitive. Participants set individual goals based on their own abilities. Once these goals are achieved, they can earn bronze, silver, or gold medals. I would emphasize that each Congressional Award is earned—not won. Any 14- to 23-year-old, regardless of their life circumstances or physical and mental abilities, can earn the award.

Mr. President, this program truly promotes community service. Since the first award was presented in 1982, 1.5 million hours have been attributed to volunteerism. In the last 12 months alone, recipients of the Congressional Award throughout the country performed more than 63,000 hours of community service. Some examples of the volunteer projects include assisting elderly shut-ins, distributing food for the needy, producing a handbook of volunteer opportunities at the United Way, and donating a narcotics K-9 to a sheriff's department.

Recently, I have chartered the Congressional Award Program in my own State, along with the other members of the Pennsylvania delegation. I encourage each of my colleagues to promote this valuable program. The Congressional Award benefits everyone involved—the participants, their adult sponsors, and the communities at large. I would also note that while this program is a public-private partnership, it does not receive its funding

from the Government. It is funded entirely through the private sector.

Not long ago, I had the honor of participating in the Volunteer Summit in Philadelphia, PA. The success of this event suggests that Americans are eager to help those in need. They simply need more information about how to do so.

Mr. President, I am a strong advocate of volunteerism, and I sincerely believe that this program inspires a sense of civic responsibility in our young people. The Congressional Award is an effort Congress can be proud it initiated on behalf of our next generation. By working together, we can make this volunteer opportunity and learning experience available to all young Americans.●

THE "BILL AND SHEL SHOW" CELEBRATES 40 YEARS ON THE AIR

● Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to two men who have become an institution in my hometown of Crowley, LA.

For 40 years now, Bill Williams and Shel Kanter have hosted the very popular "Bill and Shel Show" on radio station KSIG-AM. Each weekday morning, Bill and Shel have entertained and informed thousands of listeners throughout Acadia Parish and the surrounding area. For most listeners of the "Bill and Shel Show," it's hard to imagine starting the day without them and their reports of the latest local news, community events, and the all-important school updates, including the school lunch menus.

As anyone who has tried to raise funds for a charitable cause in Crowley knows, a kind or encouraging word from Bill and Shel can sometimes make the difference between success or failure. Bill and Shel, of course, have always been most generous with kind words for the various worthy causes in and around Crowley.

It wasn't too long ago that the "Bill and Shel Show" was threatened with extinction. When KSIG Radio changed ownership, the new owners briefly considered canceling the show. Of course, as one might imagine, the enormous outcry of protest from the community quickly persuaded the station's new management that its initial decision had been perhaps hasty and unwise. Today, I am happy to report that Bill and Shel continue to entertain and inform their many listeners and, presumably, will continue to dominate the local airwaves for many years to come.

In this day and time when all of us decry the decline in the spirit of community and cohesiveness that once was the hallmark of small towns all across our land, the "Bill and Shel Show" serves as a reminder of a time when small towns like Crowley—where neighborliness, community spirit, and civic pride still thrive—were the norm, not the exception. It is people like Bill Williams and Shel Kanter who help

make Crowley a place where people are truly connected by a common purpose and a sincere concern for the well-being of the entire community.

I congratulate the owners and management of KSIG Radio for their decision to keep Bill and Shel on the air. And I congratulate Bill and Shel for 40 years of broadcasting excellence.●

THE EIGHTH ANNUAL REMEMBRANCE OF THE TIANANMEN SQUARE MASSACRE

● Mr. MACK. Mr. President, on June 4, 1989, the People's Republic of China perpetrated a bloody massacre against her own people. Thousands of freedom-seeking people took to the streets only to be put down violently by the long arm of the Chinese Government. Today, 8 years later, what has changed with that Government to reassure us that such atrocities will not happen again? Not much. Those in power remain in power, and they express no remorse. The only significant change is that every major dissident in China today is imprisoned.

Today, those same rulers in Beijing, their princeling children, and the military leaders of the People's Liberation Army strengthen themselves through operating commercial activities in the United States. We allow a regime willing to use violence against its own people, surely capable of directing that violence outwardly, to develop and strengthen through profits obtained in the United States. This is intolerable and must be stopped.

On the occasion of the eighth annual remembrance of the Tiananmen Square massacre, I call upon the President and Congress to work together to address this gross error in U.S. policy which threatens even our own national security. This must be an essential element of a new China policy which creates effective ways to address U.S. trade, human rights, and security concerns.

We have the opportunity of the 1997 MFN debate to address our concerns with, and even support for, China. We must use this opportunity to engage in an earnest debate over the proper form of engagement. We should not accept the simple refrain, engagement is better than containment as a substitute for a substantive policy.●

TRIBUTE TO THE TINNER HILL HERITAGE FOUNDATION

● Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the Tinner Hill Heritage Foundation. This Saturday, just across the Potomac River in Falls Church, VA, a street festival will celebrate the birth of the modern civil rights movement in Virginia.

In the late 1800's, Charles and Mary Tinner bought the top of a hill in Falls Church and it has been known as Tinner Hill ever since. Currently, the seventh generation of Tinnners now live on the hill that bears the family name. While the longevity of the Tinner fam-

ily in and of itself is impressive, what transpired in June 1915 is what will be celebrated this weekend. That year, the Falls Church Town Council adopted an ordinance to segregate the residences of the town. This would mean that many families of African ancestry would have to give up the homes they owned. Dr. E.B. Henderson, a resident of Tinner Hill, organized the Colored Citizens Protective League and filed a suit to prevent enforcement of the ordinance. Dr. Henderson then called a meeting to form the first rural branch of the NAACP in the Nation. Joseph Tinner, son of Charles, became its first president. As a result, the town council reversed the ordinance. Over the next 50 years, the Hendersons, Tinnners, and others organized civil rights activities that set a precedent and a model for the rural South.

Today, the Tinnners and the Hendersons share the hill with a diverse mix of businesses that represent many cultural backgrounds. We all owe a great debt to the brave former inhabitants of Tinner Hill who risked their lives and livelihoods to defend the Bill of Rights and to start a movement that has had far reaching consequences.●

TRIBUTE TO THE NORTHEAST PEANUT LEAGUE

● Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, the Northeast Peanut League [NEPL] will celebrate its annual All-Star Day on June 8. I would like to take a few moments of Senate business to recognize the NEPL and to discuss the opportunities it offers to more than 7,000 boys and girls between the ages of 5 and 16 in the Philadelphia area.

Founded in 1981, the NEPL provides recreational activities for children who are not as advanced in their athletic abilities. This organization is based on the concept of simply having fun. The league makes sports a positive learning experience by enhancing the emotional, physical, social, and educational well-being of children. These teams allow children to realize their potential in elaborate all-star events, playoff games, and league awards. In short, the NEPL provides a nurturing environment where all children—regardless of their physical or mental abilities—can play, develop a sense of pride, and receive the fanfare previously reserved for the "A" leagues.

Another important service the NEPL provides is substance abuse education. Each year, the league distributes thousands of drug prevention brochures to the children and their parents. Moreover, the league sponsors essay contests which encourage children to express their concerns about the drug epidemic. Winners of this essay contest and the Youth Work Award receive their prizes on the annual All-Star Day.

Mr. President, I commend the Northeast Peanut League for the athletic and educational opportunities it offers to the children of Philadelphia. I ask

my colleagues to join me in extending the Senate's best wishes for continued success to the children, coaches, parents, officials, staff, and sponsors of the Northeast Peanut League.●

THE POLITICS OF THE YEAR 2000 COMPUTER PROBLEM

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I spoke on Tuesday of this week about recent findings on the technological dimension of the year 2000 computer problem. I rise today to warn of the yet unseen political dimension of the problem.

Newsweek's June 2d cover story, "The Day the World Shuts Down," offered a telling scenario in which Vice President GORE, while campaigning for President in 2000, spends all of his time trying to justify why he hadn't addressed this issue. To wit: "imagine Al Gore's spending the entire election campaign explaining why he didn't foresee the crisis."

Vice President GORE is not alone here. Imagine 4 to 500 Congressmen doing the same. Come 2000, each of us will be held accountable if we have failed to deal effectively with the "Y2K" problem. Not a single Member of Congress right now, excepting those who can successfully pass the blame, will be absolved. Both parties will face a wholesale clearing of the decks. The deluge of blame will occur in the legal community, as well. Newsweek cited a conservative estimate of 1 trillion dollars worth of litigation resulting from this crisis—more than three times the yearly cost of all civil litigation in the United States.

Make no mistake, almost all experts agree there will be no "silver bullet" fix. Correcting this problem is labor intensive and very time consuming. Millions of lines of computer code have to be reviewed and changed—in many computer languages so outdated they are foreign to younger programmers. And as Newsweek stated, the bug "affects everything from ATM's to weapons systems. Virtually every government, State, and municipality, as well as every large, midsize, and small business in the world, is going to deal with this—in fact, if they haven't started already it's just about too late."

If American families are overtaxed by the IRS, improperly charged by their creditors, denied Social Security benefits, and faced with a constantly malfunctioning civil infrastructure, the blame will fall squarely on the shoulders of their Representatives in Washington.

As Samuel Johnson observed, the prospect of hanging concentrates the mind. This prospect—the political repercussions—could finally get us up and running. We are not now. I have a first day bill, S. 22, creating a joint commission to take on the task as a national emergency. It is just that. No movement on my bill thus far. At this rate be ready to be out of a job in 2001.●

THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF COURTNEY WHEELER

● Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate Courtney Wheeler of Beckley, WV, who celebrated her 100th birthday on May 29, 1997.

Courtney Wheeler was born in 1897 in Summers County, WV, the oldest of 13 children born to Thomas Joseph and Rosa Belle Berkley. She married her husband, Roy Wheeler in 1913 and the two of them had six children before he passed away in 1936. Courtney has shown tremendous courage in life in dealing with the loss of her husband at an early age and the loss of four of her children. She has been an inspiration to all who know her on how to deal with life's tragedies in a strong and graceful manner.

In addition to her six children, Courtney Wheeler has a total of 94 descendants. She has 22 grandchildren, 36 great grandchildren, 29 great-great grandchildren and 1 great-great-great grandchild. She has definitely been blessed with a large and loving family.

Throughout her life, Courtney has been a loving and caring person to her family and friends. She has always maintained a cheerful spirit and has been an example to all. She has been an avid gardener of both flowers and vegetables her entire life, and is known far and wide for her cooking skills. I encourage my colleagues to join with me in congratulating Courtney Wheeler on this milestone birthday.

THE FISCAL YEAR 1997 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION CONFERENCE REPORT AND THE FISCAL YEAR 1998 BUDGET RESOLUTION CONFERENCE REPORT

● Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I am entering this statement into the RECORD because I am unable to return to Washington for the votes on the fiscal year 1998 supplemental appropriation conference report and the fiscal year 1998 budget resolution conference report due to my son's out-of-town college graduation today. Had I been there, I would have voted for the budget resolution and against the supplemental appropriation because of the automatic continuing resolution and other extraneous provisions in the bill.●

TRIBUTE TO ALICE LIEBERMAN

● Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition today to pay tribute to Alice Lieberman, the mother of my former executive secretary Sylvia Nolde. Alice Lieberman is a woman of grace and strength and a role model for all ages. In testament of her service to her community and her positive impact on the youth of our Nation, I am submitting "A Senior Portrait", written by Ms. Abby Altshul. The following was written by Abby for her essay on her college admissions application to Cornell University, where she was accepted.

A SENIOR PORTRAIT

With Congress pushing for cuts in Medicare and the baby boomers struggling to stay young, irreverence for old age seems to be at an all time high. Fortunately, a few teenagers, who have at one point lived in Charlottesville, Virginia still hold great respect for their elders. The reason for this is Alice Lieberman, an 85-year-old Jewish grandmother who has become the matriarch for the city's Jewish community. These teens fondly remember chicken dinners at her house and Friday night services by her side at congregation Beth Israel. She had been a role model as a long-time active member of Hadassah (a Jewish women's organization), even assuming the presidency at the age of eighty. Her fifty plus year marriage to Myer Lieberman and commitment to her family has been an inspiration in this age of high divorce rates and dysfunctional families. Her care for her husband when he went to a nursing home led the way to her volunteer work at Cedars Nursing Home. Alice even influenced a girl named Abby to join her and work at the Cedars for her bat mitzvah community service project and to continue to visit the elderly friends they had made after the bat mitzvah. Alice inherited this sense of duty from her mother and passed it on to her two daughters, a teacher and a congressional aide, who continue to volunteer while retired.

For many of her "young friends" it became a threat rather than a chore to go to synagogue on Friday night and sit quietly next to her. She transmitted the comfort and tranquility she received from the prayers to Abby and anyone else who was lucky enough to be seated beside her. One of Abby's earliest memories is of sitting in services and drawing a picture of her best friend, Alice, who sat next to her. Alice still proudly displays the drawing next to Abby's senior photo in her dining room. Ever since Abby moved away two years ago, services haven't been as meaningful or enjoyable without Alice. Her devotion is an inspiration to many Jews especially the young people whom she effects.

The vitality Alice displays brings a whole new meaning to the phrase "aging gracefully." She goes everywhere and does everything on her own without fear, even after a fall a few years ago that resulted in a broken hip and landed her in a nursing home for a few weeks. She entertains often and continues to be an important part of Hadassah as head of their ongoing and most successful fundraiser. Some people use their golden years to relax and let the world serve them, but for Alice Lieberman it is a chance to imbue the next generation with motivation.●

RURAL DEMONSTRATION ACT OF 1997

● Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, today Senator MURKOWSKI and I introduced a bill called the Rural Telemedicine Demonstration Act of 1997.

As the Senate knows, Senator MURKOWSKI and I represent States where a good number of our constituents live in rural areas. Individuals living in States like Montana often live in counties that are underserved by specialty health care providers.

Due to new technology made possible by advances in fiber optics, it is now easier for rural citizens to be seen by specialty health care providers.

Using this technology, a person living in Culbertson, MT, who would normally drive 300 miles for specialty

medical care in Billings, can now be "seen" by a physician via telemedicine. But, in order for telemedicine systems to be a success in rural States like mine, Medicare must eventually reimburse telemedicine providers. This bill is the first step in that direction.●

REMARKS OF FORMER SENATOR ROMAN L. HRUSKA (R-NE) AT THE DEDICATION OF THE NEW FEDERAL COURTHOUSE IN OMAHA, NE

● Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, last Friday a distinguished former Member of the United States Senate, Roman Hruska, was honored during a groundbreaking ceremony for a new Federal courthouse to be constructed in downtown Omaha. This new Federal facility will be named the Roman L. Hruska United States Courthouse.

I had the honor of knowing Senator Hruska when I served as administrative assistant to former Congressman John Y. McCollister (R-NE), my friend and mentor, in the 1970's. Senator Hruska served on the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Senate Judiciary Committee as its ranking member. Several of my colleagues still serving today no doubt recall Senator Hruska and his contributions to our work here in the Senate. He is still going strong at 92 years of age and continues to stay involved in the Omaha community.

Much of his work on the Senate Judiciary Committee remains with us today. Whether it was the creation of the Legal Services Corporation, revision of the Federal bankruptcy laws, reform of the Federal criminal code or amendments to the Federal antitrust laws, his imprint can be found. Senator Hruska always considered himself a work horse rather than a show horse and his numerous contributions to our Federal legal and justice system bear that out.

That is why it is so fitting that the new Federal courthouse in Omaha has been named after him. His lifelong work as a public servant and lawyer was dedicated to making our system of laws fair, just, and workable for all citizens not just a privileged few. This is especially true with the Federal judiciary. Senator Hruska worked tirelessly to ensure that the Federal court system and the judiciary would be run by people of integrity, intellect, courage, and empathy for all the people—traits that he exhibited throughout his career.

Mr. President, the new Hruska Courthouse is a welcome addition to downtown Omaha. It will meet the immediate needs of the Federal judiciary and other agencies that support the judicial system like the U.S. Marshals Service, U.S. Attorneys Office, U.S. Probation Service, U.S. Pretrial Service and several other Federal agencies. The complex is designed to permit future expansion if needed. It will fit the traditional solid architecture of down-

town Omaha but have new technology to meet the demands of the 21st century.

Mr. President, I ask that the remarks delivered by Senator Hruska at the groundbreaking ceremony be printed in the RECORD.

The remarks follow:

REMARKS BY SENATOR ROMAN L. HRUSKA

It is with great humility that I thank my friends for their many kind remarks here this afternoon. In particular, I wish to single out the graciousness of my friend Jim Exon for his selfless contribution to this special honor I receive today. I also thank Senator Kerrey for his kind remarks.

For me, there is no better way to join together my love for Nebraska, the City of Omaha, and a commitment to our system of justice and the federal judiciary than being honored by having my name associated with the new federal courthouse to be built on this site.

Throughout my many years of service in Washington, DC, my heart still remained in Omaha. As I addressed the business of the U.S. Senate, the interests of Nebraska were always foremost in my mind. Since retiring from the Senate more than twenty years ago, I have tried to continue that commitment to our community.

During my years as a public servant, I tried to follow a simple set of principles which I believe also represent the basic beliefs and feelings of my fellow Nebraskans.

I believed then and still believe in less government, not more. I believed then and still believe that the courts should defer to the legislatures in the matter of law-making. I believed then and still believe that a truly independent judiciary of the highest order of excellence is essential to enforcement of the expressed will of the majority and the protection of the fundamental rights of those in the minority. I believed then and still believe that our judicial system is the last bulwark against attacks on individual liberty and freedom.

Democracy and individual freedom are sometimes fragile things. Fortunately, they are now on the march around the world. Gratefully, they have become our birthright and will be further nurtured by this new complex.

But, the challenge remains great. Crime, breakdown of the family, corruption and civil disorder are still present in our society; even here in Omaha. We need to support actively our police, prosecutors and judges as they carry out their important responsibilities to uphold the law.

Looking at all of you assembled here and thinking about the many years I have devoted to public service, I am heartened for our future. Young leaders are emerging—many gathered here today—who will carry on the principles I believe in and who represent the best of our nation and state.

I am gratified and truly humbled by this occasion. Thank you all for being here. Thank you all for your many kindnesses and courtesies over the years. Thank you all for this wonderful honor which you have bestowed upon me.

God bless the State of Nebraska and God bless America.●

THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RHODE ISLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY

● Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to recognize the Rhode Island Historical Society on the occasion of its 175th anniversary.

Founded in 1822, the Rhode Island Historical Society was established for the purpose of rescuing artifacts and records pertaining to the history of our State and spreading the legacy of Rhode Island history. The society today represents the fourth oldest historical society in the United States and remains as one of the noble guardians of American history and culture. Over the years the society's repository of Rhode Island history and culture has grown under the stewardship of generations of knowledgeable scholars, dedicated staff, and the generosity of gracious benefactors.

From its humble beginnings, the society has served as a haven for precious artifacts which serve to record and preserve the rich history of Rhode Island. Today, we mark not only the past accomplishments of the Rhode Island Historical Society, but we pause at an exciting threshold as we embark upon the creation of Heritage Harbor.

Housed at the site of a former power plant at the head of Narragansett Bay, the historical society will lead a consortium of museums and cultural organizations in forming Heritage Harbor. The new community will bring together the stories and treasures of the Ocean State through entertainment and enlightenment. Remaining true to Rhode Island's founder Roger Williams, this new endeavor will be a lively experiment. It will teach, entertain, and inspire. The Heritage Harbor promises to bring together the diverse cultures and communities of Rhode Island to celebrate the time, traditions, and our many contributions to collective greatness of this Nation.

Mr. President, I would ask that my colleagues join me in applauding the Rhode Island Historical Society as we mark this milestone of 175 years, celebrating its legacy, both past and future.●

TRIBUTE TO VINCENT MARCONI JR., PORTSMOUTH STUDENT, AND WINNER OF THE NATIONAL PEACE ESSAY CONTEST

● Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Vincent Marconi Jr., a Portsmouth Senior High School student, on winning the first place in the State-level competition of the 10th annual National Peace Essay Contest sponsored by the United States Institute of Peace. This is certainly an accomplishment of which he should be very proud and I salute him for his achievement.

The contest, which is open to students in all American high schools, is designed to encourage serious and realistic thinking about issues of international conflict resolution. Vincent was asked to write an essay on managing and implementing peace agreements.

Vincent will receive a \$750 college scholarship and will compete for national awards of up to \$5,000. Vincent has also been invited to represent the

Granite State in a special program for State-level winners in Washington, DC.

I congratulate Vincent Marconi Jr. on his outstanding accomplishments. I commend his hard work and perseverance and wish him luck in competition for national awards.●

CONNECTICUT STUDENTS' ESSAYS ABOUT ELIMINATING RACISM

● Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize a group of outstanding students from my home State of Connecticut. Each of these young people has been recognized by the greater Hartford regional YWCA for essays they wrote on the elimination of racism. As authors of the winning essays, these young people attended the second annual "In the Company of Women" luncheon with featured speaker Maya Angelou. I was privileged to attend that luncheon and meet some of the essay contest winners. Their words have inspired me and I am proud to share some of their insight with you today.

Danalyn Elder of Weaver High School in Hartford, says "I do not consider color (except perhaps if I am saying it is beautiful.)" Courtney Yuen of Hall High School in West Hartford talks about dreams " * * * that offer a glimpse of a world without racism * * *" Richardo Solomon of Bloomfield High School quotes Dr. Martin Luther King in considering whether people can " * * * search deep down in their hearts to see a world without racism."

In her winning essay, Julie Meslin explains that "A world without racism would not be an easy place to live." Julie concludes, however, that " * * * we would be pioneers in a movement that the human soul has longed for since the beginning of time. And it would be worth it." Frederick Jelks of Bloomfield High School describes the pursuit of a world without racism as a collective effort of individuals regardless of race or heritage. This effort, he explains, "will not happen over night. The change will come about gradually * * * we may speed up that day when we can all kiss the glass of equality."

In his essay entitled "Color Me This," Greg Binstock of Hall High School considers the innocence of a young girl who loves all the colors of the rainbow equally and sees no reason to segregate the black and red pieces in a checkers game. In a moving biographical sketch, Radmila Khamzina shares her experiences with racism in her home country of Azerbaijan, and her insights on racism here in America.

Cheryl Vasquez of Wethersfield High School also uses personal experiences to share her thoughts on a world without racism. As a Puerto Rican girl, Cheryl has felt the pain of racism. In the end, she concludes that "A world without racism would be a world of more hope, a world of more dreams and a world of equality as God intended it to be." Samantha Allaire of Manchester High School discusses a world

without racism in which all employees receive equal opportunity and equal pay. This would produce a "more efficient and productive workforce altogether."

In his short story about a world without racism, Jamilla Deria of Weaver High School imagines a scenario in which his "Little Africa" is inhabited by people of every nationality, living in harmony. In this world, Jesus has "an afro and piercing black skin instead of having blonde hair and blue eyes." This seemingly mixed up world is, in the end, "groovy man, real groovy." Simshindo Msola of Weaver High School talks about the devastating effects that racism has had on members of the black community. The elimination of racism would enable African-Americans and indeed all people to perform to their fullest potential and "People would begin to have a positive and good attitude about themselves, and society at large would benefit and improve."

Nayoka Rose of Weaver High School sees a world without racism at "... the time of birth and death." Infants lay side by side in a nursery, regardless of color, creed or heritage, and at death we lay side by side as "... death knows no color or race." Michelle Davis of Weaver High School imagines a world without racism in which we would not have war, fewer people would be incarcerated and more people would have jobs. This world, Michelle says, does not have to be a dream.

Mizzara Belton of Weaver High School says that "The thought of excluding racism from my world is a joy." She envisions a society where the color of one's skin would not affect the treatment you receive in a department store, your educational opportunities or prospects for employment. Finally, Kelly Citroni of Bolton High School considers those who have died as a result of racism. The holocaust and slavery might never have happened, there would be no Ku Klux Klan, and Dr. Martin Luther King would not have been killed at the hands of a "... person prejudiced against his skin color." Our world, Kelly concludes, would experience "dramatic change for the better" without racism.

I am extremely proud of these young people and their thought-provoking essays. Each student is able to describe the beauty of a world without racism while sharing personal experiences and dreams.

These Connecticut students are well aware of the effects of racism. Most of them have experienced first-hand the pain of hatred and prejudice. Their essays, however, illustrate the hope that lies in each and every city throughout our great country. One must only stop to listen to the dreams of our youth to see that blossoms of hope and optimism are flourishing among us. These young people can help us appreciate that we do not have to live with racism. If we close our eyes and imagine all people are one, we can envision the joy of a world without racism.●

RECOGNIZING DAVID GIULIANI

● Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, it is no secret to my colleagues that perhaps the greatest contributor to our Nation's economic success is the hard work, perseverance and entrepreneurial spirit of America's small businessowners. It is, therefore, appropriate that the U.S. Small Business Administration has honored Washington State businessman, Mr. David Giuliani, as the National Small Business Person of the Year. Mr. Giuliani is president and chief executive officer of the Bellevue, WA, based Optiva Corp. which manufactures the Sonicare brand of toothbrushes. Starting Optiva as a technology transfer project from the University of Washington in 1988, Mr. Giuliani has overseen the company's progression from a startup business to an employer of 250 with sales of over \$50 million in 1995. With growth of this kind it is not surprising that, last October, Inc. Magazine recognized Optiva as the second-fastest growing private company in the entire nation. To celebrate its success at the production of its millionth toothbrush last year, Mr. Giuliani's company gave away more than 1,000 Sonicare toothbrushes to individuals who couldn't afford them on their own.

Mr. President, I am proud to represent a State that is home to such an outstanding businessman and citizen. Mr. Giuliani certainly deserves the title of Small Business Person of the Year.●

COMMENDING MARK D. CHAMBERLAIN FOR HIS ACT OF BRAVERY

● Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I recently received a letter that remarked upon the bravery and fortitude of a former U.S. Coast Guard member, Mark D. Chamberlain.

On a chilly, rainy winter day, three generations of the Chamberlain family, Dale, Mark, and Justin set out on snowshoes in a wooded area of Lyndonville, VT. After 5 hours of trekking in the woods, the eldest Chamberlain, Dale, attempted to forge an ice-covered river when the ice gave way and dragged him under. Mark, his son, managed to grab a hold of his coat and pull him back to safety amid the chunks of ice and strong river currents. Despite the fact that Dale was numb with cold, Mark assured his father that he would be fine and convinced him to begin walking. Mark led the party back to their vehicle and the three Chamberlains returned safely to the warmth of their home.

Mark Chamberlain, not only set an heroic example for his son, Justin, to admire and follow, he also demonstrated the strength of the bonds that tie families together.

Mr. President, I ask that an article about this experience which appeared in the Caledonian-Record be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Caledonian-Record, March 10, 1997]

ST. JOHNSBURY—FATHER CREDITS RESCUE TO DARING SON

(By Andrew Turner)

Dale Chamberlain knows a thing or two about life, now that he's looked death in the face and survived to tell about it.

On March 2, Chamberlain was snowshoeing with his son Mark and grandson Justin on his property in Lyndonville when tragedy nearly struck.

As Chamberlain tells it, the weather was about 45 degrees and drizzly that day, the kind of mid-winter thaw that deceives snow travelers so often.

Chamberlain, his son and grandson, had been trekking the woods near the South Wheelock River for about five hours, he estimated, before coming to the river.

"We were making tracks back to the river. I could hear the roar of the water draining into channels in the ice. Arriving at the river, I could see a possible way to cross," Chamberlain stated.

He said he began the attempt to cross and the way was slippery. Water covered the ice to roughly 6 inches deep in parts and he was able to use his ski poles to stabilize himself, poking the ice ahead of him to make sure that it was solid.

"I punched a hole in one area (and) the ice let go in the whole area around me. I went into the water and under the ice," Chamberlain recounted.

Chamberlain floundered in the water helplessly, his head just above the surface as ice continued to break away, making it impossible to grasp onto anything firm. Hindering him was the fact that his snowshoes had become tangled around each other. He couldn't move his arms or legs.

"My muscles were going numb. The only thing I was really aware of was the roar of the rushing water," he said.

The next thing that he remembered was the feeling of his son's hand on the back of his waterlogged jacket, tugging him out of the current of the water and eventually to the shore.

"He talked to me and assured me I was OK. He said he was going to stand me up. He said it wouldn't do me any good to just lie there," Chamberlain said.

Eventually they were able to get to their cars and make it home, and to warmth. Chamberlain never received medical treatment but was comforted by the fact that he had a son who challenged adversity to save his father's life.

"Thanks to the quick thinking and strength of my son I am still among the living. I now know that no matter how much experience you have in the woods the unex-

pected can always happen. I just thank God for Mark's ability to analyze the situation and spring into action immediately," he said.●

NATIONAL RACE FOR THE CURE

● Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I want to lend my voice today to the thousands of women and men who are supporting the search for a cure to breast cancer.

Breast cancer is still the leading cause of mortality among American women between the ages of 35 and 54. In fact, odds are that one in every eight women will develop breast cancer in her lifetime.

The encouraging news is that early detection is very effective in curbing this disease. At the same time we continue efforts to find a cure, we must be equally diligent in our efforts to educate women about the importance of regular clinical and self examinations for breast cancer.

On June 7, Americans all over the country will again have the opportunity to show their concern by participating in the 1997 National Race for the Cure. The race is a series of 5k runs and a 1-mile walk sponsored by the Susan G. Komen Breast Cancer Foundation in Dallas.

I urge all of my colleagues, their spouses and staff to support the Capitol Hill Race for the Cure on June 7, where more than 50,000 are expected to participate. This event will help raise money for breast cancer research and education and bring us all closer to the day when a cure is found. ●

TRIBUTE TO MERCYMOUNT COUNTRY DAY SCHOOL, 1997 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION BLUE RIBBON SCHOOL

● Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the achievement of Mercymount Country Day School of Cumberland, RI, which was recently honored as a U.S. Department of Education Blue Ribbon School.

As I think all in this chamber know, it is a highly regarded distinction to be named a Blue Ribbon School, since these schools represent some of the

cream of our educational crop. Through an intensive selection process beginning at the State level and continuing through a Federal Review Panel of 100 top educators, many of the very best public and private schools in the Nation are identified as deserving of this honor. These are schools that are particularly effective meeting local, State, and national goals. But, Mr. President, this honor is not about determining who is best, it is about learning what works in educating today's children—the leaders of tomorrow.

Now, more than ever, it is important that we make every effort to reach out to students, that we truly engage and challenge them, and that we make their education come alive. At the Mercymount Country Day School in Rhode Island, partnerships between parents and teachers have made an enormous difference in the education of their students. They have understood that the quality of education depends not only upon the efforts of schools and government; it also depends upon the ideas and innovation of parents and community. At Mercymount, parent-teacher cooperation has brought computers into the classroom, and their "Pull the Plug" on TV initiative has helped students get away from television sets and into reading and other challenging activities. Mercymount has also developed a wonderful fine arts program, and as research has shown, the pursuit of education in the arts at an early age improves a child's cognitive ability. Again, Mercymount is making a huge difference in the lives of its students.

Mr. President, the Blue Ribbon School initiative shows us the very best we can do for students, and the techniques that can be replicated in all schools to help all students learn. I am proud to say that in Rhode Island we can look to a school like Mercymount Country Day. Under the leadership of its principal, Sister Martha Mulligan, its capable faculty, and its improved parents, Mercymount will continue to be a shining example for years to come.●

FOREIGN CURRENCY REPORTS

In accordance with the appropriate provisions of law, the Secretary of the Senate herewith submits the following report(s) of standing committees of the Senate, certain joint committees of the Congress, delegations and groups, and select and special committees of the Senate, relating to expenses incurred in the performance of authorized foreign travel:

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 1997

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Jeff Bingaman:									
Singapore	Dollar		311.29						311.29
Malaysia	Dollar		143.02						143.02
Taiwan	Dollar		846.00						846.00
United States	Dollar				4,429.85				4,429.85
Patrick Von Borgen:									
Singapore	Dollar		1,003.50						1,003.50
Malaysia	Dollar		228.00						228.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 1997—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Taiwan	Dollar		846.00						846.00
United States	Dollar				4,429.85				4,429.85
Steve Clemons:									
Singapore	Dollar		1,003.50						1,003.50
Malaysia	Dollar		228.00						228.00
Taiwan	Dollar		846.00						846.00
United States	Dollar				4,429.85				4,429.85
Marshall Salter:									
Guatemala	Dollar		378.00						378.00
El Salvador	Dollar		191.00						191.00
Nicaragua	Dollar		263.00						263.00
Panama	Dollar		139.00						139.00
United States	Dollar				1,001.95				1,001.95
Senator John McCain:									
Guatemala	Dollar		378.00						378.00
El Salvador	Dollar		191.00						191.00
Nicaragua	Dollar		263.00						263.00
Panama	Dollar		139.00						139.00
United States	Dollar				1,522.87				1,522.87
Richard D. DeBobs:									
Belgium	Franc		20.00						20.00
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Dollar		257.00						257.00
Richard D. DeBobs:									
Croatia	Dollar		185.00						185.00
Serbia	Dollar		236.00						236.00
Serbia	Dollar						48.00		48.00
Senator Carl Levin:									
Belgium	Franc		20.00						20.00
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Dollar		250.00						250.00
Croatia	Dollar		169.00						169.00
Serbia	Dollar		220.00						220.00
Serbia	Dollar						68.00		68.00
Marshall Salter:									
Bulgaria	Dollar		810.00						810.00
United States	Dollar				4,119.75				4,119.75
Senator John McCain:									
Bulgaria	Dollar		603.00						63.00
United States	Dollar				4,119.75				4,119.75
Frederick M. Downey:									
Hong Kong	Dollar		548.00						548.00
China	Dollar		996.00						996.00
United States	Dollar				4,699.95				4,699.95
Senator Joseph I. Lieberman:									
Hong Kong	Dollar		548.00						548.00
China	Dollar		996.00						996.00
United States	Dollar				4,699.95				4,699.95
Lucia Monica Chavez:									
Belgium	Franc	10,083	292.00						292.00
Poland	Zloty	1,604	526.00						526.00
Hungary	Forint	43,341	247.00						247.00
Hungary	Dollar		247.00						247.00
United States	Dollar				3,418.75				3,418.75
Senator James M. Inhofe:									
Belgium	Dollar		614.00						614.00
United States	Dollar				1,496.27				1,496.27
Total			15,181.31		38,368.79		116.00		53,666.10

STROM THURMOND,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, May 8, 1997.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 1997

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Mark Ashby:									
Switzerland	Franc	1,552.89	1,090.74					1,552.89	1,090.74
United States	Dollar				909.75				909.75
Kenneth I. Levinson:									
Switzerland	Franc	1,520.51	1,068.00					1,520.52	1,068.00
United States	Dollar				899.95				899.95
Carl W. Bentzel:									
Panama	Dollar		537.00						537.00
United States	Dollar				628.00				628.00
France	Franc	5,209.50	906.00					5,209.50	906.00
United States	Dollar				794.85				794.85
TOTAL			3,601.74		3,232.55				6,834.29

JOHN MCCAIN,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, Apr. 28, 1997.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 1997

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
David K. Garman:									
Russia	Roubles		847.00						847.00
United States	Dollar				1,753.55				1,753.55

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 1997—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
New Zealand	Dollar	3,484.84	2,334.90	3,484.84	2,334.90
Western Samoa	Dollar	218.00	218.00
Judith Brown:									
Puerto Rico	Dollar	1,640.67	142.74	1,783.41
Senator Frank Murkowski:									
New Zealand	Dollar	3,484.84	2,334.90	3,484.84	2,334.90
Western Samoa	Dollar	218.00	218.00
Senator Daniel Akaka:									
New Zealand	Dollar	3,484.84	2,334.90	3,484.84	2,334.90
Western Samoa	Dollar	218.00	218.00
Senator Slade Gorton:									
New Zealand	Dollar	3,484.84	2,334.90	3,484.84	2,334.90
Western Samoa	Dollar	218.00	218.00
Senator Craig Thomas:									
New Zealand	Dollar	3,484.84	2,334.90	3,484.84	2,334.90
Western Samoa	Dollar	218.00	218.00
James O'Toole:									
New Zealand	Dollar	3,484.84	2,334.90	3,484.84	2,334.90
Western Samoa	Dollar	218.00	218.00
Kira Finkler:									
New Zealand	Dollar	3,484.84	2,334.90	3,484.84	2,334.90
Western Samoa	Dollar	218.00	218.00
Total	20,357.97	1,753.55	142.74	22,254.26

FRANK H. MURKOWSKI,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, May 1, 1997.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1, TO MAR. 31, 1997

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator John Chafee:									
England	Pound	319.52	533.42	319.52	533.42
Germany	Mark	466.40	286.52	466.40	286.52
Bosnia	Dollar	172.00	294.00	466.00
Italy	Lire	275,250	163.45	275,250	163.45
United States	Dollar	1,246.25	1,246.25
Daniel J. Corbett:									
England	Pound	389.52	636.98	389.52	636.98
Germany	Mark	566.40	348.32	566.40	348.32
United States	Dollar	1,095.85	1,095.85
John E. Seggerman:									
Germany	Mark	175.20	116.64	175.20	116.64
Bosnia	Dollar	172.00	294.00	466.00
Italy	Lire	363,260	215.71	363,260	215.71
United States	Dollar	1,079.75	1,079.75
Total	2,645.04	3,421.85	588.00	6,654.89

JOHN H. CHAFEE,
Chairman, Committee on Environment and Public Works, April 30, 1997.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FINANCE FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1, TO SEPT. 30, 1996

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator William V. Roth, Jr.:									
Canada	Dollar	535.55	387.15	75.60	535.55	462.75
United States	Dollar	629.00	629.00
Daniel Bob:									
Canada	Dollar	440.98	318.18	440.98	318.18
United States	Dollar	671.40	671.40
Total		705.33	1,300.40	75.60	2,081.33

WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.,
Chairman, Committee on Finance, Feb. 28, 1997.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 1997

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Joseph R. Biden, Jr.:									
Russia	Dollar	800.00	800.00
Czech Republic	Dollar	282.00	282.00
Hungary	Dollar	247.00	247.00
Slovenia	Dollar	125.00	125.00
Italy	Dollar	556.00	556.00
United States	Dollar	3,141.85	3,141.85
Steve Biegun:									
Slovenia	Dollar	191.00	191.00
Austria	Dollar	217.00	217.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 1997—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Slovakia	Dollar		166.00						166.00
Romania	Dollar		495.00						495.00
United States	Dollar				2,211.15				2,211.15
Germany	Mark	695.31	407.91					695.31	407.91
United States	Dollar				3,048.15				3,048.15
Michael Haltzel:									
Russia	Dollar		450.00						450.00
Czech Republic	Crown	4,418	150.17					4,418	150.17
Hungary	Forint	20,161	118.00					20,161	118.00
United States	Dollar				3,359.85				3,359.85
Gina Marie Hatheway:									
Canada	Dollar	387.81	295.55					387.81	295.55
United States	Dollar				884.10				884.10
Beth Wilson:									
Slovenia	Dollar		191.00						191.00
Austria	Dollar		217.00						217.00
Slovakia	Dollar		166.00						166.00
Romania	Dollar		495.00						495.00
United States	Dollar				2,211.15				2,211.15
Senator Charles S. Robb:									
Saudi Arabia	Dollar		142.00						142.00
Egypt	Pound	768.40	232.84					768.40	232.84
Bosnia	Dollar		314.00						314.00
Italy	Lira	503,700	300.00					503,700	300.00
United States	Dollar				5,281.85				5,281.85
Peter Cleveland:									
Saudi Arabia	Dollar		142.00						142.00
Egypt	Pound	768.40	232.84					768.40	232.84
Bosnia	Dollar		314.00						314.00
Italy	Lira	503,700	300.00					503,700	300.00
United States	Dollar				5,281.85				5,281.85
Total			7,547.31		25,419.95				32,967.26

JESSE HELMS,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, Apr. 28, 1997.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 1997

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Richard Durbin:									
United States	Dollar				4,426.75				4,426.75
Lithuania	Lita	3,721.30	935.00					3,721.30	935.00
Poland	Zloty	572.10	190.70	1,239.72	413.24			1,811.82	603.94
Dan O'Grady:									
United States	Dollar				1,714.75				1,714.75
Lithuania	Lita	3,721.30	935.00					3,721.30	935.00
Poland	Zloty	725.82	241.94	1,239.69	413.23			1,965.51	655.17
Trina Vargo:									
United States	Dollar				1,145.95				1,145.95
United Kingdom	Pound	298.13	477.00	143	229.60			441.13	706.60
Ireland	Pound	421.88	675.00	19	30.40			440.88	705.40
Total			3,454.64		8,373.92				11,828.56

ORRIN HATCH,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Apr. 14, 1997.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 1997

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Alfred Cumming			852.00						852.00
Randall Schieber			804.00						804.00
Senator Bob Graham			274.15						274.15
Senator Richard Bryan			153.45						153.45
Total			2,083.60						2,083.60

RICHARD SHELBY,
Chairman, Select Committee on Intelligence, May 5, 1997.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE FOR TRAVEL FROM JANUARY 1 TO MAR. 31, 1997

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Janice Helwig:									
United States	Dollar				3,092.65				3,092.65
Austria	Dollar		12,682.53						12,682.53
Marlene Kaufmann:									
United States	Dollar				1,307.85				1,307.85
Germany	Dollar		430.00						430.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE FOR TRAVEL FROM JANUARY 1 TO MAR. 31, 1997—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Austria	Dollar		422.00						422.00
Total			13,534.53		4,400.50				17,935.03

ALFONSE D'AMATO,
Chairman, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, Apr. 2, 1997.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY THE MAJORITY AND DEMOCRATIC LEADERS FROM NOV. 21 TO NOV. 23, 1996

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator William V. Roth, Jr.: England	Pound	552.32	927.00					552.32	927.00
Senator Howell Heflin: England	Pound	487.43	814.00					487.43	814.00
Senator Ernest Hollings: England	Pound	552.32	927.00					552.32	927.00
Senator Orrin Hatch: England	Pound	552.32	927.00					552.32	927.00
Senator Charles Grassley: England	Pound	506.00	897.00					506.00	897.00
Senator Frank Murkowski: England	Pound	552.32	927.00					552.32	927.00
Senator John Breaux: England	Pound	552.32	927.00					552.32	927.00
Senator Daniel Akaka: England	Pound	552.32	927.00					552.32	927.00
Julia Hart: England	Pound	552.32	927.00					552.32	927.00
Ian Brzezinski: England	Pound	552.32	927.00					552.32	927.00
Virginia Koops: England	Pound	494.15	877.00					494.15	877.00
Barry Phelps: England	Pound	552.32	927.00					552.32	927.00
Delegation expenses: ¹ England							3,355.00		3,355.00
Total:			10,931.00				3,355.00		14,286.00

¹ Delegation expenses include direct payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of Public Law 95-384.
TRENT LOTT, Majority Leader, and TOM DASCHLE, Democratic Leader,
May 23, 1997.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY THE MAJORITY LEADER FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 1996

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Christopher S. Bond: Indonesia	Rupiah	2,197.56	946.00			924.72	398.07	3,122.28	1,344.07
Malaysia	Dollar	906.48	359.00			922.28	365.26	1,828.76	724.26
Philippines	Peso	17,204.23	655.00			14,791.44	563.14	31,995.67	1,218.14
United States	Dollar				4,901.85				4,901.85
Senator Bill Frist: Indonesia	Rupiah	2,295.12	988.00			924.74	398.08	3,219.86	1,386.08
Malaysia	Dollar	1,530.15	606.00			922.28	365.26	2,452.43	971.26
United States	Dollar				6,286.85				6,286.85
Mark Tippetts: Indonesia	Rupiah	2,295.12	988.00			924.72	398.07		1,386.07
Malaysia	Dollar	1,340.78	531.00			922.28	365.26	2,263.06	896.26
United States	Dollar				6,179.95				6,179.95
Total			5,073.00		17,368.65		2,853.14		25,294.79

TRENT LOTT,
Majority Leader, May 17, 1997.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY THE MAJORITY LEADER FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 1997

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Connie Mack: Morocco	Dirham	2,677.83	305.34					2,677.83	305.34
Israel	Dollar		14.00						14.00
Randy Scheunemann: United States	Dollar				1,732.05				1,732.05
Slovenia	Dollar		229.00						229.00
Hungary	Forint	81,263.52	468.00					81,263.52	468.00
Romania	Dollar		497.00						497.00
Senator Connie Mack: Hong Kong	Dollar	4,698.18	607.00					4,698.18	607.00
China	Yuan	5,928.48	716.00					5,928.48	716.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY THE MAJORITY LEADER FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 1997—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Japan	Yen	22,376.90	182.00	348,540	2,834.81	370,916.90	3,016.81
United States	Dollar	2,689.00	2,689.00
Gary Shiffman:									
Hong Kong	Dollar	3,939.66	509.00	3,939.66	509.00
China	Yuan	5,787.72	699.00	5,787.72	699.00
Japan	Yen	67,622.50	550.00	348,540	2,834.81	416,162.5	3,384.81
United States	Dollar	2,672.00	2,672.00
Total			4,776.34		12,762.67				17,539.01

TRENT LOTT,
Majority Leader, Apr. 28, 1997.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER FROM JAN. 1, TO MAR. 31, 1997

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Jack Reed:									
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Dollar	267.00	267.00
Croatia	Dollar	165.00	165.00
Serbia	Dollar	269.00	269.00
United States	Dollar	2,692.15	2,692.15
Total			701.00		2,692.15				3,393.15

TOM DASCHLE,
Democratic Leader, Apr. 28, 1997.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination on the Executive Calendar: Calendar No. 115, Elizabeth Moler, to be Deputy Secretary of Energy. I further ask unanimous consent that the nomination be confirmed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and statements relating to the nomination appear at this point in the RECORD, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then return to legislative session.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I will be brief because I know a lot of Senators want to depart, this will be the only opportunity we will have to express the hope that we could do better than what we have done this week, as good as it has been. The President has indicated tonight that he would be prepared to return the bill, the supplemental bill, to us tonight. There is no reason why, given that we could not vote on it tomorrow and send it back in time for him to sign it before the end of the week, because we are not going to be in—that is the announcement made by the majority leader—many of us believe that we need to vote against adjournment simply because it is our hope to stay in until the President returns the bill, giving us the opportunity to vote on it one more time this week.

I thank the majority leader for yielding. I have no objection to the unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nomination considered and confirmed is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Elizabeth Anne Moler, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Energy.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, Elizabeth Anne (Betsy) Moler brings a strong record to the Deputy Secretary of Energy position. She has performed very ably in her previous leadership of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and her past background with the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee will stand her in good stead in dealings with Congress. Two of her many accomplishments with FERC involved crafting order 636, which unbundled and largely deregulated the natural gas pipeline industry. And since 1992, she has led the Commission's deregulation of electricity utility markets—and she can now continue that leadership through her role within the Department. In all her previous assignments, Betsy Moler has demonstrated a keen analytical approach to complex issues. The Department will benefit from her abilities.

She has a formidable task ahead of her, together with Secretary Peña, to attack the stifling bureaucratic foundations of the Department and root out the serious inefficiencies that plague the Department's operations. Quickly moving to external safety and health regulation of the national laboratories, on a time scale far shorter than the leisurely one proposed by the Department, and slashing the micro-management of the Department will be challenges exceeding those that she faced at FERC.

I look forward to working with Deputy Secretary Betsy Moler and Secretary Peña to help shape the Department into a critical and highly valued contributor to national priorities.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will return to legislative session.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1997—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I will observe that I am expecting and hoping that the President will sign the bill, and therefore there would be no necessity for further action. But if he does not, we will act further as soon as we get that information.

I might also note that the House has not yet acted, and I do not know when that may be, although I presume it will be sometime later on in the evening. As soon as they act, we will move expeditiously to get the enrollment and send the package down to the President.

GEORGE C. MARSHALL MONTH

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 97 submitted earlier today by Senator WARNER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 97) expressing the sense of the Senate that the President

should designate the month of June 1997, the 50th anniversary of the Marshall Plan, as George C. Marshall Month, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, on June 5, 1947—50 years ago today—Gen. George Catlett Marshall, delivered remarks at Harvard University's commencement exercises which would change the course of history. In that speech, General Marshall outlined the necessity for and goals of what would later be known as the Marshall plan.

In 1947, 2 years after the end of World War II, Europe was struggling to recover from the devastation of the war. Millions were dead, 5,000 cities had been destroyed, and countless industries laid in ruin. Yet, while recognizing the very apparent physical destruction, Marshall remarked during his speech that, "this visible destruction was probably less serious than the dislocation of the entire fabric of European economy."

Marshall continued, "It is logical that the United States should do whatever it is able to do to assist in the return of the normal economic health in the world, without which there can be no political stability and no assured peace."

In the following years, over \$13 billion in economic relief and technical assistance was provided to the 16 European nations which chose to participate in the program. From 1948 to 1951, the 4 years of the Marshall plan, industrial production in Europe increased 36 percent.

With the return of economic stability, political stability throughout Western Europe soon followed. As a result, Europe—and indeed the entire Western World—has enjoyed an unprecedented period of peace and prosperity.

For his vision and commitment, General Marshall received the Nobel Peace Prize in 1953.

Several years after the enactment of the Marshall plan, Winston Churchill wrote, "Succeeding generations should not be allowed to forget his achievements and his example." I am proud to say that two organizations in the Commonwealth of Virginia are dedicated to preserving and promoting in society Marshall's ideals and values of disciplined selfless service, hard work, integrity and compassion. They are the George C. Marshall Foundation and the George C. Marshall International Center.

The George Marshall Foundation, located in Lexington, VA, overlooks the campus of Marshall's alma mater, the Virginia Military Institute. In addition to a memorial to a great American leader, the George Marshall Foundation building contains a museum, archive and library for research concerning his life and times. The foundation's programs include scholarly pub-

lications and conferences and public education on U.S. military and diplomatic history in the 20th century.

The George C. Marshall International Center is located in Leesburg, VA, at the Dodona Manor, the home of George Marshall. The George Marshall International Center seeks to ensure that Marshall's vision and legacy are not forgotten by preserving Dodona Manor for posterity and fostering educational programs. "The Marshall Plan: Against All Odds," a documentary film underwritten by the center will air on PBS on Saturday, June 6 at 9 pm.

Tonight, the George Marshall International Center and George Marshall Foundation will host a gala dinner honoring the Soldier-Statesman and his influence on the 20th century.

On April 23, 1997, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 27 to designate the month of June 1997, the 50th anniversary of George Marshall's speech, as George C. Marshall Month. The resolution recognizes the efforts of the George Marshall Foundation in Lexington, VA, the George Marshall International Center in Leesburg, VA, and the Friends of Marshall in Uniontown, PA, to continue in American life the values for which Gen. George Catlett Marshall stood.

Further, this resolution calls upon all Americans to rededicate themselves to the ideals of public service, hard work, integrity, and compassion which General Marshall represents to this day in American society.

Senate Joint Resolution 27 was favorably reported out of the Judiciary Committee on June 3 and is before the full Senate today. I ask my colleagues to support this important resolution today as a fitting tribute to an extraordinary American.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the resolution appear at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 97), with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 97

Whereas 1997 marks the fiftieth year since the European Recovery Program, or what came to be called the Marshall Plan, was first conceived and proclaimed by General George Catlett Marshall while he was serving as Secretary of State of the United States.

Whereas the Marshall Plan has been hailed by leaders of World War II allied and enemy countries alike as the most magnanimous act by Americans in history;

Whereas the Marshall Plan made possible new measures of trans-Atlantic cooperation through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and other institutions;

Whereas these institutional developments have profoundly enhanced the security, freedom, and prosperity of the United States and the Atlantic Community generally;

Whereas new challenges have arisen which call for recommitment to and reinvigoration of these institutions and for their continued viability;

Whereas creative thought and rededication to the ideals and principles undergirding the Marshall Plan are now necessary in order to assure the preservation and perfection of these institutions; and

Whereas the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the Marshall Plan provides a fitting opportunity for rededication of commitments to these institutions: Now, therefore, be it.

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate—

(1) that magnanimity underlies the Marshall Plan, the dedication to public service and integrity of its author, and the efforts by the Marshall Foundation in Lexington, Virginia, the Marshall International Center in Leesburg, Virginia, and the Friends of Marshall, Uniontown, Pennsylvania, to continue in American life the values for which General George Catlett Marshall stood;

(2) that all Americans should rededicate themselves to the ideals of public service, hard work, integrity, and compassion which General Marshall represents to this day in American society; and

(3) that the values that inspired the initiation of the Marshall Plan should continue to be cherished by the people of the United States.

SEC. 2. It is, further, the sense of the Senate that the President should issue a proclamation designating the month of June 1997 as "George C. Marshall Month" and calling upon the people of the United States to observe George C. Marshall Month with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, may I just express my appreciation to the distinguished leadership and to the Members of the Senate.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until the hour of 12 noon on Monday, June 9, and that on Monday, immediately following the prayer, the routine requests through the morning hour be granted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DASCHLE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

VOTE ON MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I move the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon on Monday, June 9.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. JEFFORDS], the Senator from Pennsylvania

[Mr. SANTORUM], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. JEFFORDS] would vote “yea.”

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced, yeas 51, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 97 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Abraham	Faircloth	McCain
Allard	Frist	McConnell
Ashcroft	Gorton	Murkowski
Bennett	Gramm	Nickles
Bond	Grams	Roberts
Brownback	Grassley	Roth
Burns	Gregg	Sessions
Campbell	Hagel	Shelby
Chafee	Hatch	Smith (NH)
Cochran	Helms	Smith (OR)
Collins	Hutchinson	Snowe
Coverdell	Hutchison	Specter
Craig	Kempthorne	Stevens
D'Amato	Kyl	Thomas
DeWine	Lott	Thompson
Domenici	Lugar	Thurmond
Enzi	Mack	Warner

NAYS—45

Akaka	Byrd	Feingold
Baucus	Cleland	Feinstein
Biden	Coats	Ford
Bingaman	Conrad	Glenn
Boxer	Daschle	Graham
Breaux	Dodd	Harkin
Bryan	Dorgan	Hollings
Bumpers	Durbin	Inouye

Johnson	Leahy	Reid
Kennedy	Levin	Robb
Kerrey	Mikulski	Rockefeller
Kerry	Moseley-Braun	Sarbanes
Kohl	Moynihan	Torricelli
Landrieu	Murray	Wellstone
Lautenberg	Reed	Wyden

NOT VOTING—4

Inhofe	Lieberman
Jeffords	Santorum

The motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JUNE 9, 1997

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 12 noon Monday next.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:09 p.m., adjourned until Monday, June 9, 1997, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 5, 1997:

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE U.S. AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM J. BEGERT, 0000

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE U.S. ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. ERIC K. SHINSEKI, 0000

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE U.S. ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. ROBERT S. COFFEY, 0000

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE U.S. ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

MAJ. GEN. JOHN W. HENDRIX, 0000

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

ROBERT R. BOTTIN, JR., 0000

JAMES E. LOUIS, 0000

DIANE P. ROUSSEAU, 0000

THE JUDICIARY

ROBERT CHARLES CHAMBERS, OF WEST VIRGINIA, TO THE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA VICE ELIZABETH V. HALLANAN, RETIRED.

CHRISTOPHER DRONEY, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT VICE ALAN H. NEVAS, RETIRED.

JANET C. HALL, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT VICE T.F. GILROY DALY, DECEASED.

KATHARINE SWEENEY HAYDEN, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY, VICE H. LEE SAROKIN, ELEVATED.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate June 5, 1997:

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

ELIZABETH ANNE MOLER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF ENERGY.

THE ABOVE NOMINATION WAS APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE NOMINEE'S COMMITMENT TO RESPOND TO REQUESTS TO APPEAR AND TESTIFY BEFORE ANY DULY CONSTITUTED COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

H.R. 1795, RESCIND DOLLAR LIMITATION ON POLICE AND FIRE-FIGHTER BENEFIT PLANS

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce H.R. 1795, legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to remove the dollar limitation on payment of benefits from a defined benefit plan maintained by a State or local government for the benefit of employees of the police department or fire department.

I am introducing this bill in an attempt to be fair to our local and State fire and police officials—those who day in and day out place their lives on the line for our protection.

As my colleagues may know, police officers and firefighters throughout most of the country are eligible to retire under certain defined benefit plans which generally allow for retirement after a fixed number of years of service. Typically, such services entails 20 or 25 years, regardless of age. Retirement benefits generally are based on a percentage of the retiring officer's highest 3-year salary average, and start at about 50 percent of that average. The average in most instances increases with additional years of service but usually does not exceed 65 to 75 percent.

Accordingly, many officers, living along the east coast or in large metropolitan and surrounding suburban areas throughout the country, are forced to work past their general retirement age in order to afford the high cost of living in these areas.

If we are going to continue to expect these men and women to protect our neighborhoods, we should at least allow them the opportunity to collect the money they have paid into their own pension. After all, under the Tax Code we allow those participants in private pension funds to collect the money they have paid, once vested. Why then don't we allow those who risk their lives and protect our streets on our behalf to collect the money they have both paid and earned?

H.R. 1795, does not provide any loss in Federal tax revenue dollars and, in fact, will increase revenue. Under current practice the moneys paid into these municipal pension funds are not required to be accounted for by the IRS unless collected by the retiree. Should we repeal these special provisions, under section 415, tax revenue would now be collected on the funds dispensed to retired police officers and firefighters.

H.R. 1795 is an issue of fairness.

I urge all of my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation and support our police and fire officials' efforts to collect their full pension benefits upon retirement.

H.R. 1795

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REMOVAL OF DOLLAR LIMITATION ON BENEFIT PAYMENTS FROM A DEFINED BENEFIT PLAN MAINTAINED FOR CERTAIN POLICE AND FIRE EMPLOYEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (G) of section 415(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking "participant—" and all that follows and inserting "participant, subparagraphs (C) and (D) of this paragraph and subparagraph (B) of paragraph (I) shall not apply."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to years beginning after December 31, 1996.

CONGRATULATING PHIL FRIEDMAN ON HIS RECEIVING THE LIFETIME ACHIEVEMENT AWARD FROM THE EMANUEL FOUNDATION FOR HUNGARIAN CULTURE

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mr. Phil Friedman, founder of Computer Generated Solutions [CGS], who is receiving on June 8, 1997, the Lifetime Achievement Award from the Emanuel Foundation for Hungarian Culture. This richly deserved recognition highlights the outstanding accomplishments of a remarkable man.

An immigrant from the Soviet Union in 1976, Phil came to the United States with his wife, Rose, a few hundred bucks, even fewer English words, and a determination to succeed. In this new chapter of his life, Phil became a model immigrant and lived the American dream. From his business success to his impressive charitable and philanthropic commitments to his community, he has become an inspiration to all who know him.

Although he was trained in both electronic engineering and in accounting and finance, Phil discovered that the first requirements of life in America were learning both the language and cutting edge skills. He went to school to learn English and study computers, while Rose studied accounting. Much to his surprise, his first job lasted only 6 months before he was laid off for lack of work. Although the shock of unemployment was a new sensation to a man from the Soviet Union, Phil landed on his feet as a programmer, and then director of management information systems, in a major apparel firm. From his experience integrating software for the firm, he developed the innovative idea that would change his life yet again.

In 1984, Phil discovered that the systems integration software and techniques he had mastered could serve the entire fashion industry and not just one firm. He formed CGS and immediately landed a number of major companies as clients. In 1994, he bought out the software company on which his business depended and has invested millions to upgrade the products and remain competitive.

Today CGS employs nearly 1,000 people with offices in seven major cities and business partnerships throughout Europe, North America, and East Asia. Phil's 5-year plan to expand his operations and dramatically increase CGS revenues is well underway.

Mr. Speaker, Phil Friedman is a man who started with virtually nothing but the determination to not only survive, but succeed, in a new, unfamiliar, and highly competitive country. From his spectacular success he has sought to return as much as possible to his community and adoptive country. I am proud to invite my colleagues to join me in congratulating Phil and celebrating his lifetime of achievement.

SUPPORT FOR AUTISM FUNDING

HON. STEVEN R. ROTHMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share some facts about a disease that is very close to my heart—as it is to thousands of other Americans—autism. My nephew, Jack, the son of my twin brother, is afflicted with this disease and his illness has educated our entire family about how little is known, and how much still needs to be learned, about autism.

I want to tell my colleagues a few things about autism that will not be learned from watching the movie "Rain Man." Autism is not rare. It affects 400,000 people in the United States. One in 500 children born today will be autistic. Though 5 percent will make strides with early intervention, 95 percent of those affected will never marry, have a meaningful job, or live on their own. More than half will never learn to speak.

Autism affects more people than multiple sclerosis, cystic fibrosis, and childhood cancer combined, yet autism still receives less than 5 percent of the research funding of these other diseases. Autism costs America over \$20 billion dollars each year, yet just last year the NIH spent only \$31 per child on autism research, significantly less than what is spent on other diseases which affect fewer individuals.

Until very recently, there was no hope for people with autism. For 30 years, psychiatrists mistakenly thought of autism as an emotional problem, the fault of bad parenting. As a result of this tragic mistake, parents did not organize, no medical research was funded, no scientists were encouraged to enter the field, no progress was made and another generation of autistic children was lost.

But while the world ignored people with autism, science marched on, largely through the support Congress has given to the National Institutes of Health. The strides that science has made in neurology, immunology, and genetics are unbelievable. We have gone from penicillin to gene therapy in the span of a single lifetime. We live in a world of miracles and wonders. In an age when important discoveries

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

are being made in other diseases every day, we cannot let another generation of children slip away.

I have recently met with the parents and professionals of a group called CURE AUTISM NOW, and they have let me know that there is hope for people with autism. The top neurologists and geneticists in the country say that autism will yield to medical research, there will be prevention, treatments, and maybe even a cure. It is only a question of time, energy, money, and will.

Sick children are at a special disadvantage in this world. They cannot raise money for research, they do not vote, they have no political access. Their voices are small and soft. This is even more so for autistic children, many of whom have no voice at all and whose parents are distracted and depleted by the challenges of caring for them, fighting for insurance coverage, fighting the State for services, and fighting exhaustion, disillusionment and despair. It is, therefore, no surprise that pediatric illnesses are funded at a level far below diseases that affect adults.

Recently, the parents of autistic children have visited me and many other Members and their staffs to inform us about autism and the deficiency in current spending. We hope that Congress will support strong report language encouraging the NIH to redouble its efforts in the fight against autism. In particular, I encourage my colleagues to support Centers of Excellence for Autism modeled after the very successful center program for Alzheimers.

I know that every disease is worthy and every parent's pain is deep. Human suffering is not a competitive sport to be ranked or rated. But in autism we have been so behind for so long, and there is so much progress to be made at this critical moment. I ask all of my colleagues to give us a helping hand, and find a cure for autism.

STATEMENT BY KRISTINA SWEET,
HARWOOD UNION HIGH SCHOOL,
REGARDING CHILD POVERTY

HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues I would like to have printed in the RECORD this statement by a high school student from Harwood Union School in Vermont, who was speaking at my recent town meeting on issues facing young people.

Ms. SWEET. The instances of young children, children under age of 6 living in poverty in the United States has risen dramatically over the last two decades. Child poverty is a problem that encompasses urban, suburban, and rural areas and affects children of all ethnic backgrounds.

Between the years of 1975, 2 years after the lowest recorded child poverty level, 11.1 percent, the rate increased 39 percent, so that by 1994, one in four young children lived in poverty in the United States. Forty-five percent of all children under the age of 6 lived in poor or nearly poor families.

Because poverty has proved to be more detrimental to young children than to any other age group, because poverty often means hunger, poor health care, poor education, and even because of the economic problems of a future ill-prepared work force

the issue of child poverty is one that necessitates immediate action.

Why the great rise in child poverty? Over the past two decades and especially since the beginning of the 1980's there has occurred an increasing gap between the rich and poor in this country. The average workers wages have declined since 1970 while the wealthiest fifth of the population has seen their incomes increased. This small distribution of wealth significantly affects the poverty of children when 62 percent of all poor children live with at least one working relative.

Even more important than reforming the welfare system will be the reform of an economy that has created the largest gap between the rich and the poor in any industrialized nation. In the past 2 years because of the increased funding of the welfare system and other programs, poverty rates have made a moderate decline. With the new welfare reform bill passed in 1996, loss of funding may cause another increase in child poverty. The work requirement of the new welfare bill will not be affected until backed up with adequate child care and health care programs and a reform of the economy.

Many welfare recipients also because they are unable to find work for a living wage and unable to care for their children while at work, single parents especially need to be provided with access to affordable and adequate child care and health services if they are to work outside of the home.

Children are the future leaders, the future work force, the future citizens of the United States of which one in four even today is living in poverty or near poverty or without many of the opportunities needed to live successfully as citizens of the United States.

Congressman SANDERS, I thank you for your time and urge you to consider the children of the Nation as much as possible in the future.

Poverty gives young children, especially young mothers, pregnant mothers, children can end up with low-birth weight and are more—after they are born—are more susceptible to disease and malnutrition and other health problems and are also more unable to get a good education as children of welfare.

It generally impacts the future of a child who grows up poor who has considerably less access to a good education, is less motivated in school and doesn't really see a way out of poverty.

Considering that welfare only takes up 2 percent of the Federal budget I think that more funding could be put into helping people who have children who are unable to make a decent wage, to help the children get a better education and get decent health care.

Most people that are receiving welfare are unable to make a decent wage and even if they are unable to pay for education that would provide them with a better job.

The percentage that I found was that only 2 percent of the population is receiving Federal aid and is entirely unemployed, so 62 percent of all families with four children are working, have at least one relative that is working, so I think that we need to provide people with better jobs, with better pay.

With the new computer technology there are a lot of jobs predicted but I do not think most people who are poor are properly educated to go in those sorts of fields.

CONGRATULATIONS TO ADAM
JAMES

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is truly my pleasure to rise today to congratulate Mr. Adam James on winning the 1997 Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary Voice of Democracy broadcast script writing contest for Indiana. A resident of Hobart, IN, Adam is one of 54 high school students Nation wide to win a college scholarship for his script on the topic, "Democracy—Above and Beyond."

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary is now in its 50th year of sponsorship for the Voice of Democracy audio-essay scholarship competition. The program requires high school student entrants to write and record a 3- to 5-minute essay on an announced patriotic theme. Adam James was sponsored by VFW Post 5365 and its Ladies Auxiliary in Hobart, IN. He was named the recipient of the \$1,000 Department of Arizona and Auxiliary Harry A. Kosht Memorial Scholarship Award earlier this year. A junior at Hobart High School, Adam aspires to pursue a career in law.

Adam's winning broadcast script reads as follows:

Living in the United States, the one thing that I cherish is democracy. Waking every morning and not donning this cloak of freedom is a notion I cannot fathom. Many Americans, myself included, often take our freedom for granted. We treat it as a right instead of the privilege that it is. Fortunately for us, in our democratic society, freedom is a right.

I wish that I could praise my ancestors for providing me with freedom, but I cannot. I am not related to any of the soldiers who fought or played a part in the American Revolution. My father's family were immigrants who came here in the 1800s. My mother's side of the family came to the states after World War II.

Although they did not fight for America's freedom, my grandparents on my mother's side are subjects of a story that truly demonstrates what democracy is. My grandfather Nikola was a leader of a European underground movement against the Communist government. He used to tell stories about having to carry a semi-automatic pistol with him whenever he took my grandmother on a date. In fact, on the day he died, three years ago, he was still wanted dead or alive in the former Yugoslavia. In the 1940s, my grandfather was fighting against his government when Adolf Hitler invaded Eastern Europe. Being a high-ranking soldier, my grandfather knew that Hitler would imprison him, so he and my grandmother packed up their few possessions and escaped. They made it back on foot to middle Italy, where they were captured by German soldiers and placed in a work camp. Held as prisoners there, they slaved until the United Nations freed Europe from the grasp of the demoniacal Hitler. After the war, my grandparents were put in a detention camp, where my mother was born. Later, they moved to America, settled in the Midwest, and my grandfather became a steelworker. Here they bought a home and raised five children.

This is what makes democracy what it is. In their former country, my grandparents had to hide to prevent being killed and would

have been lucky to live to the age of thirty. In America, they had a choice of how they wanted to live their life, and how they wished to raise a family. Few countries of this world would allow this to happen. Many countries claim to be democratic but impose laws similar to those of a third world dictatorship. If these and all other countries had a government like the one in the United States, the world would not carry the burden of wars, both civil and global. These disputes claim thousands of lives and ruin the families of those who die. Besides wars, millions of people die each year from starvation because of dictators withholding food from the poor citizens. If these people lived in the United States, they would still be alive today.

A democracy has many benefits for its citizens. Those who live in a democratic system are allowed to make choices that those in a communist or socialist society are not allowed to make. We are allowed to choose what career to pursue, and the amount of education we need in order to train for this career. Communist societies choose careers for their people at an early age and force them to endure the government's choice. Even if the people are successful with this venture, they cannot keep all profits made. These governments take all money earned by their subjects, then dole out an equal amount to each of them.

Although this provides a proverbial safety net for people, this monotonous equality cannot make for an enjoyable life. Under the quilt of democracy, people are allowed to choose their livelihood. People are allowed to strive to be better and not worry about giving extra earnings to the government. Democratic societies are fertile fields of hopes and aspirations.

Democracy is a way of life that all people should respect, although some people do not. I often become angry when I see images of people burning American flags or building militias against our government. I cannot comprehend how anyone could disagree with the concept of democracy. Then I have to stop and think of why this angers me. These people are just expressing themselves as our democracy allows them to do. This ability to express ourselves freely is what makes democracy so great. Burning the symbol of freedom that thousands of men have given their lives for is ignorant and wholly disrespectful, but these people are entitled to their opinion in a country such as America. The human mind has no boundaries in democracy. People can choose to do what they please, even if it is disrespecting the very idea that allows them to be free. This is what first attracted my grandfather to this great country. I am proud to live in a country where democracy is the type of government practiced.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to once again extend my most heartfelt congratulations to Mr. Adam James on his receipt of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its Ladies Auxiliary "Voice of Democracy" national scholarship. His parents, Doug and Zagorka James, can be proud of their son for the tenacity he has displayed in achieving this most noteworthy accomplishment. This young man has a promising future ahead of him, which will undoubtedly include improving the quality of life in Indiana's First Congressional District.

IN HONOR OF ELLSWORTH G.
STANTON III

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ellsworth G. Stanton III. Tonight, the James N. Jarvie Commonwealth Service will be celebrating his ministry in New York City.

Mr. Stanton, an Illinois native who is currently living in New York, has dedicated his life to serving others. As a ruling elder in the Presbyterian Church, he is the executive director of the James N. Jarvie Commonwealth Service, an endowment administered by the church to provide services and financial assistance to elderly people in the New York area. Before joining the Commonwealth Service, Mr. Stanton served the National Council of Churches of Christ, UNICEF and CARE, Inc.

Mr. Stanton's contributions to the community touch a wide variety of people. Among his many affiliations, he is a trustee of the New York Theological Seminary, the director of the New York City Mission Society, president of the John Milton Society for the Blind, president of the Brookwood Child Care Agency, president of the Third Street Music School Settlement and a delegate to the White House Conference on Aging.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join with me in saluting Ellsworth G. Stanton III. He has made innumerable contributions to many people in need in the New York metropolitan area. It is with gratitude that we honor him.

CONGRATULATING AMBASSADOR
RONALD S. LAUDER ON BEING
HONORED BY THE EMANUEL
FOUNDATION FOR HUNGARIAN
CULTURE

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in congratulating Ambassador Ronald S. Lauder who is being honored June 8, 1997, at the annual dinner of the Emanuel Foundation for Hungarian Culture. Each year the Emanuel Foundation honors outstanding individuals whose service to the community and whose dedication to teaching current and future generations the history and lessons of the Holocaust deserve the highest recognition. Ambassador Lauder's unparalleled efforts toward these worthy goals merit our praise. I am delighted that the Emanuel Foundation has chosen to honor him this year.

Ambassador Lauder demonstrates his active support for culture and education in the United States through his leadership positions in some of our most distinguished institutions. He was elected chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Museum of Modern Art in New York, serves as a trustee for the New York Landmarks Conservancy and the World Monuments Fund, and is a member of the Board of Governors of the Joseph H. Lauder Institute of Management and International Studies at the University of Pennsylvania and the Visiting Committee of the Wharton School.

Ambassador Lauder's commitment to advancing our Nation's democratic and free market principles is underscored by his activities to assist in the economic, social, and political transformation of Central and Eastern Europe. A leading proponent of private enterprise in that region and in the former Soviet states, he is chairman of the Central European Development Corp. chairman and primary stockholder of Central Media Enterprises, Ltd., and has formed RSL Communications, Inc., a company involved exclusively in telecommunications investments. He has been involved in such projects as the privatization of Hungary's oldest bank, the development of the American Business Center at Checkpoint Charlie, and the opening of NOVA TV in Prague, which is the first privately owned television station in a former Communist country. Through his active involvement the economies of the former Soviet bloc and his efforts to build free and private media resources in those societies, Ambassador Lauder is making a tremendous contribution to the future prosperity and freedom of millions of people in Central and Eastern Europe.

Ambassador Lauder is being honored also for his passionate commitment to protecting and teaching Jewish culture and history, and preserving the Jewish legacy to the world. He serves as president of the Ronald S. Lauder Foundation which he founded in 1987 in response to the need to revitalize Jewish life across Central and East Europe where it has been devastated by the Holocaust. The foundation supports Jewish schools camps and community centers stretching across Eastern Europe from Austria to Ukraine.

Ambassador Lauder has further demonstrated his commitment to Jewish education and cultural prosperity by this leadership activities in some of the most important Jewish organizations and institutions in American and around the world. He is chairman of the International Public Committee of the World Jewish Restitution Organization and treasurer of the World Jewish Congress. He serves as President of the Jewish National Fund, chairman of the Jewish Heritage Council, director of the International Board of Governors of the International Society of Yad Vashem, member of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, member of the Board of Directors of the Jewish Theological Seminary, member of the Board of Directors of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, member of the Board of Trustees of the Anti-Defamation League Foundation, member of the Board of Trustees of the Abraham Fund, chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Sakharov Archives at Brandeis University, and member of the International Board of Governors of the Tel Aviv Museum.

Mr. Speaker, Ambassador Ronald Lauder is a man of outstanding commitment and accomplishment in the noblest of pursuits. His contributions to culture, education, and the spreading of democratic and free market principles is truly awe inspiring. Through his vast commitments to preserving and nurturing Jewish communal life both in the United States and in Eastern Europe, Ambassador Lauder has made a tremendous and enduring contribution to the education of future generations about the Holocaust. I applaud the Emanuel Foundation for choosing to honor this remarkable American citizen and I invite my colleagues to join me in applauding Ambassador Lauder's continuing mission.

THE PERSONAL INFORMATION
PRIVACY ACT

HON. GERALD D. KLECZKA

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Personal Information Privacy Act, a bill to protect individual privacy.

My legislation amends the Fair Credit Reporting Act to make it illegal for credit bureaus to release or sell Social Security numbers, unlisted phone numbers, birth dates, and mothers' maiden names. It also revises the Social Security Act and the Drivers' Protection Act of 1994 to ban the commercial use of Social Security numbers. Under the bill, victims can sue willful violators for up to \$50,000 for damages and attorneys' fees. Businesses have 2 years after the date of enactment to comply with the new provisions.

This legislation is the House companion bill to the bi-partisan Personal Information Privacy Act, S. 600, introduced by Senators FEINSTEIN and GRASSLEY.

It's no secret that it is easier than ever before to learn private details about your friends, neighbors, strangers and even Members of Congress, whether from the Internet, credit bureaus, governments, or a variety of other sources. Time magazine has a story about it in this week's issue—it's called "No Privacy on the Web."

Nor can we soon forget the public uproar that resulted when the Social Security Administration put its earnings data on the World Wide Web. Thousands of users flocked to the site, knowing they could access personal data by just a Social Security number, birth date, mother's maiden name, and a few other bits of information. I was among those in Congress who urged the agency to discontinue the practice, which, thankfully, it did.

Few will dispute that the crime of identity fraud is on the rise. Criminals steal their victims' account numbers, run up debts and even rent apartments in their name, then leave the victims with bad credit reports and a lengthy battle to reclaim their good name. Polls show that the number of Americans who are concerned about privacy is at an all-time high.

Unfortunately, this problem does not end with simple fraud. Stalkers can easily gain access to a person's unlisted phone number and home address. Before the passage of the 1994 Drivers Privacy Protection Act, there were no rules preventing any kind of personal information from being sold by State departments of motor vehicles. Now, over 40 States have laws preventing DMVs from selling this information. However, stalkers and other criminals can still access private information from DMVs in many States in order to find their victims much more easily.

Robert John Bardo, an obsessed fan of actress Rebecca Schaeffer of the television show, "My Sister Sam," wanted to find out her home address. When he got it, he went to her home and shot her to death. How did he get this unlisted address? From the California Department of Motor Vehicles, which included this information on its database.

As the Time magazine article pointed out, a little effort and ingenuity is all that is needed to access personal information about Members of Congress. The reporter was able to

quite easily obtain information about Senator FEINSTEIN, including her driving record, lawsuits in which she is involved, her unlisted phone number, current and past addresses, campaign donations, and even her credit report.

Mr. Speaker, the Personal Information Privacy Act transcends party lines. Democrats and Republicans are equally at risk of having their identities stolen on their lives threatened. I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting this legislation.

IN TRIBUTE TO RECIPIENTS OF
THE GIRL SCOUT WOMEN OF DISTINCTION AWARD

HON. LARRY COMBEST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure to rise today to give tribute to the three women of the Permian Basin who have been presented with the Girl Scout Women of Distinction Award. Shatzie Tighe of Midland, Betsy Triplett-Hurt of Odessa, and Kathlyn Dunagan of Monahans have distinguished themselves as positive role models for young women in their respective areas, and have been honored and recognized for their efforts both locally and now at the State level.

In our uncertain world, having positive influences in young people's lives is essential, but making time to spend with young people is not always easy for adults when demands are great. In touching these young women's lives, in helping them to grow into responsible and giving adults, and in giving them the best possible example to follow wherever they live in the future, these Texas women are truly women of distinction and I salute them.

I congratulate Shatzie Tighe, Betsy Triplett-Hurt, and Kathlyn Dunagan for their extraordinary efforts and for all they have done for their neighbors, their community, their State, and our Nation.

STATEMENT BY MARK OLSON,
CHAMPLAIN VALLEY UNION
HIGH SCHOOL, REGARDING COLLEGE FUNDING

HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues I would like to have printed in the RECORD this statement by a high school student from Champlain Valley High School in Vermont, who was speaking at my recent town meeting on issues facing young people.

Mr. OLSON. Yes, hello. I am here today, Representative SANDERS and classmates, to talk about an issue that is very pressing for most of us high school students, the increase in college financing and the troubles around it.

If we look at the last ten years, since 1995 actually, at the money that has been put into the cost of college financing it has for the most part stayed the same. Government funding toward financial assistance has for

the most part stayed the same. I know there was in a projected budget next year a \$27 million increase, but that is not—for a national figure that is not a large increase whereas the costs of going to college since 1985 have been 2½ times that of inflation which is over 10 percent.

If you look at the people who applied for financial aid in the 1985 and received the funds compared to what their tuition costs were and then did a cost comparison today, the comparison will be hard to make. We need to increase educational funding at the equal rate of the rising college expenses if we plan to send students who are talented and motivated, ambitious and want to go to college. And I think it is the duty of the Government to not necessarily directly fund but at least provide a means so that a student who is college bound in the sense, literal sense that he is able to go to college.

I know that finance is certainly a contributing factor to a college decision, but in 1985 there were students who were deciding to go to one university or college over another because of financial reasons and there is nothing wrong with that competition, but now it has become not just a persuading factor, but I know there are a lot of students who apply to college and are forced to go to universities or colleges strictly because of unmet financial need, and I am curious about how we plan to remedy that situation.

I think that any student who has the potential to be a college graduate and is unable to finance their way there should not be held back, and it needs to be allowed and the Federal Government is certainly involved in that as it is now, but needs to allow it to happen, whether it needs to come out of their budget or needs to come out of a program.

There is a difference there because pleasure and—I do not want to say extra things, postsecondary school but a higher education right now is not a right, it is not, but I think it needs to be considered that we should not as a nation, not just the Government but as a nation discriminate against the less financially advantaged.

My problem is that my kids are smarter than yours, they work harder than yours, and they are being born into a life that is less fortunate and it is a cycle that has been repeating in this Nation for a long period of time and needs to stop.

I think that they should invest in me because I am an investment that is going to pay off and I am going to pay for their Social Security and I am going to undoubtedly—I mean, the students who are going to go to college have put in the hard work and are going to graduate are not just—I mean that money is not disappearing, it is being invested.

In the last 10 or so years a lot of these programs, like corporate welfare, national defense, they have not stayed the same and there have been in the last—if you look at the last 10 years every year there has been slight increases, increases, increases, and I want to know why those same moneys didn't go to VSAC Program and TRIO?

There has to be initiative taken because while these things were increasing, they were increasing with inflation so in order to have the military and the corporate welfare slowly increase year to year it is sort of like putting it on autopilot in some ways.

They were going up every year and that was actually considered traditional, regular, accepted where it should have stayed the same, so someone had to have gone out of their way to make the initiative to make sure it didn't grow.

TRIBUTE TO JOYCE BAYNES

HON. STEVEN R. ROTHMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Joyce Baynes from Teaneck—a woman from my district who represents all that we aspire to be.

Her life story was told in a newspaper from my district, The Bergen Record, in its weekly "Inspirations" column.

Ms. Baynes did not quit when her husband died 2 days after her third child was born. She did not quit when she only had one salary and some survivor benefits to feed four hungry mouths. She did not quit when one of her children was diagnosed with Tourette's syndrome.

She persevered. She did all the things that a mother should do. And she did all the things a father should do. She is an example which we all should follow. Her success and that of her children is humbling to all.

Instead of using the challenges she faced as excuses for failure, Ms. Baynes used them as motivations to excel. She is unique and worthy of our mention on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives today.

I submit the news article for the RECORD so that my colleagues, present and future, can draw inspiration from her.

The article follows:

[From the Bergen (NJ) Record, Apr. 27, 1997]

HARDSHIP ONLY DEEPENS A MOM'S LOVE

(By Caroline Brewer)

March 6, 1978, found Joyce Baynes reveling in one of the happiest days of her life. Her third son, Marcus, had just been born.

Two days later, she was writhing in the pain and sadness of one of the worst days of her life. Her 31-year-old husband, Walter Jay Baynes, had just died of systemic lupus disease.

The awesome collision of a son's birth and a husband's death left Joyce Baynes crushed. It was the end of the world she knew and loved and had hoped to spend the rest of her days delighting in.

"I felt totally helpless. Everything became just a fog," she recalled.

But with four mouths to feed on one salary and survivors' benefits, Baynes didn't have the luxury of disappearing into the fog. So she created a new world in the two-parent-flush suburb of Teaneck, a world centered on devotion to her sons.

Nearly 20 years later, Baynes basks in the light of three well-rounded young men—one a graduate of Dartmouth, one a junior at Princeton, and one a freshman at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

She's sure their father would have been proud. After all, Walter had degrees in physics and medicine from Dartmouth and Harvard and worked as an ophthalmologist and emergency room doctor.

Baynes herself has math degrees from Swarthmore and Harvard. A longtime educator, she joined Teaneck schools in 1988 as mathematics supervisor and in 1995 was promoted to assistant superintendent of curriculum and instruction.

She managed to juggle career and parenthood only by staying organized.

"I shopped on the weekends and cooked enough meals on Sundays to last the whole week," said Baynes, who is 50. "If you're going to try to beat all these odds, you have to plan."

Her plan was to keep sons Jeffrey, Jason, and Marcus busy. They were taught piano

and played midget league baseball and basketball. They also sang in the choir of Christ Episcopal Church in Teaneck and were acolytes.

Despite Baynes' own hectic schedule, she was in the bleachers for all of the boys' sporting events, and, like a lot of fathers, coached them on their performance. "Arch it up! Bend your legs!" the tall, curly-haired mom would cry out during basketball games, to her sons' embarrassment.

Baynes' consistent presence made an impression.

"I remember one time I was supposed to play in a baseball game, and she got dizzy [from exhaustion] and had to go to the hospital. I wasn't going to go to the game, but she told me to go. Then, she came, too!" said Jason, now 21.

"I see how a lot of parents put their jobs first. But not my mom. Sometimes I'd call her and she'd be in an important meeting and she'd come to the phone," he added.

When she did come to the phone, Jeffrey, always a worry-wart, was struck by how she never seemed stressed.

"She could have a paper due Tuesday, a board meeting Wednesday, and be dealing with seven employees," he said. "But she would seem very calm and have a plan for how she's going to handle each thing."

Looking like a force of calm in the midst of a storm was just one way Baynes mothered by modeling the behavior she expected from her children.

"They didn't hear me cursing or lying or see me smoking. They also saw that the rules I set up for myself, I followed," Baynes explained.

"I remember Jason asking me how it is that [they] never had a desire to smoke or do drugs. It was just kind of our existence that we never had those desires," she elaborated.

Baynes' sons didn't have those desires, but they don't pretend to be angels. Jeffrey battles selfishness. Jason believes he's kin to Mario Andretti; one night two years ago, he was caught speeding down a highway at 100 mph.

Marcus had a long bout of immaturity, but now says his mother's integrity is so powerful, it haunts him hundreds of miles away at Cambridge, Mass.

"She's turned us into such honest people. I have some people say, 'Your mom's at home, you can do whatever you want.' But I won't. The respect for her is so great," Marcus said.

When Marcus turned 5, doctors confirmed that he had a mild case of Tourette's syndrome, which causes facial and vocal tics, jerking, and, in some people, involuntary uttering of obscenities.

Marcus displayed compulsive behavior, such as rewinding taped songs dozens of times to catch the lyrics. But he never cursed. Baynes believes that's because she didn't.

The Tourette's did boost Marcus' already high energy level, which in turn made the job of raising the three boys that much more difficult.

They argued, wrestled, and banged holes in the walls. Jason would scream and holler when it was time to go to bed. During their younger years, Baynes couldn't even take a bathroom break until her sons were in bed.

By day's end, she was drained.

"I used to just think I had bright kids, but when I reflected on all that I did, I realized I did play a big part in this," she laughed.

A big part, indeed. Even though the boys were intelligent, the eventual Teaneck High graduates weren't always motivated. Though Jeffrey was a fixture on the honor roll, Marcus and Jason didn't really focus on academics until their sophomore years. It was not any lecture from their mother, but her years of setting high standards, that eventually brought them around.

After graduation, Jeffrey, the oldest, tallest, and most reserved son, walked in his father's shoes to Dartmouth. He graduated in 1993 with a degree in math and works at the agricultural firm of American Cyanamid in Parsippany. He's also pursuing a master's degree.

Jason, the middle son, whose face and personality are most like his father's, is a junior at Princeton. Like Walter, the self-assured Jason plans to be a doctor, specializing in the study of the brain.

Marcus, the youngest son, who with his mother's love and patience mastered his academics as well as his Tourette's, is winding up his freshman year at Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

As for Joyce Baynes, the struggle is not over. Her income was too high for the boys to qualify for full scholarships to college. So she footed the \$20,000-a-year bill for Jeffrey's stay at Dartmouth and still shells out more than \$20,000 a year for schooling for Jason and Marcus.

Yet no one in the Baynes quartet would trade the creature comforts they've sacrificed, or even a new dad, for the new world that was forced on them when fate took an unexpected and agonizing turn.

"It would have been nice to have remarried," Baynes said, "but after three or four years of dating and nothing working or feeling right, I felt I had built such a relationship with the boys that it would have been hard to bring in someone new."

Jason, a toddler when his father died, always felt secure with just his mom. "I didn't even know people had two parents until maybe I was 9. I thought my life was great with just one parent," he said with the deep, throaty laugh the Baynes' boys share.

Marcus, too, likes his family as it is. He, most of all, used to pine for a father figure. "Sometimes I would get jealous when I'd see commercials and TV shows with kids playing with their father. We never got to do that."

"But," Marcus concluded, "I've lived a happy life. When people say a child needs a father and a mother, it depends on who you have. Not every child has a mother as wonderful as Joyce Baynes."

A SPECIAL SALUTE TO ARTISTIC DISCOVERY WINNERS

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute young students from the 11th Congressional District of Ohio who participated in the annual An Artistic Discovery competition. Later this month, student artwork from around the Nation will be placed on display in a special corridor of the U.S. Capitol. I take special pride in sponsoring the Artistic Discovery competition for students in my congressional district. The art contest provides an important means for recognizing the creative talent of our Nation's youth.

I am proud to report that An Artistic Discovery is enjoying great success in the 11th Congressional District. This year, students from 12 schools submitted a record 403 art entries. Our judge had the difficult task of selecting a winning entry from this outstanding collection of artwork.

Mr. Speaker, I want to offer a special salute to Monica Grevious, who is a 12th grade student at Bedford High School. Monica's work, a

charcoal piece entitled "Mr. Armstrong" was judged Best-in-Show and the winner of the 1997 art competition. This represented another important stepping-stone for this young artist. I was pleased to learn that Monica also had two pictures commissioned for the new wing at Rainbow Babies and Children's Hospital in Cleveland. In addition, Monica plays the flute in the Cleveland Orchestra's Youth Orchestra and will study music next year at the Conservatory of Music in Cincinnati. I look forward to welcoming Monica to Washington, DC, for the grand opening of the Artistic Discovery national exhibition.

As we conclude the districtwide 1997 Artistic Discovery competition, I want to express my appreciation to Carol Edwards, mayor of the City of Cleveland Heights; Ted Sherron, vice president for student affairs at the Cleveland Institute of Art; Ernestine and Malcolm Brown, owners of the Malcolm Brown Gallery; and the Cleveland Institute of Art. I also want to thank the Cleveland Museum of Art; Richard J. Bogomolny and First National Supermarkets, Inc.; and the Cleveland Foundation. I am indebted to these individuals and others who have continued to support our annual competition.

Mr. Speaker, the 1997 Artistic Discovery competition was a tremendous success. As a supporter of the arts, I recognize the need to invest in our artists at a very early age. I offer my personal congratulations to students throughout the 11th Congressional District who participated in the art competition. Each student is a winner and should be saluted.

1997 ARTISTIC DISCOVERY COMPETITION
PARTICIPANTS
BEAUMONT SCHOOL

Elise Birkmeier, Missy Blakely, Jennifer Bockmuller, Kim Cunningham, Cathy Davenport, Mary Katherine Fejes, Carol Ferkovic, Kit Gabele, Laura Golombek, Roberta Hannibal, Meredith Harger, Chrissy Havach, Sara Jenne, Molly Kohut, Raina Kratky, Quinn Kucia, Natalie Lanese, Megan Lewicki, Carmen Licate, Lindsay Maurath, Lisa Mawby, Aurora Mehlman, Christine Miller, Julie Miller, Hafzah Mueenuddin, Erin Oldenburg, Kristyn Rainey, Jennifer Reali, Jamie Reynolds, Christine Schneider, Carly Small, Daniela Tartakoff, Tracie Tegel, Jennifer Traverse, Julia Wadsworth, Lisa Wilke, Maggie Wojton; and Lisa Yafanaro.

Art Teachers: Kim Bissett, Ellen Carreras, and Sr. M. Lucia, O.S.U.

BEDFORD HIGH SCHOOL

Joe Allie, Dan Apanasewicz, Shannon Bakker, Wendy Bascombe, Antoine Bates, Jashin Bey, Shakhir Warren Bey, Robert Boone, Roxanne Boyce, Bryan Braund, Jessica Bruening, Karen Certo, Robert Cooper, Stacie Cooper, Melissa Day, Heather Duber, Sarah Etling, Becky Frank, Dionysios Giatis, Monica Grevious, Angela Gschwind, Brenna Halloran, Holly Hegedes, Bryan Howard, Aaron Hulin, Richard Jastrzebski, John Jones, William Keenan, Jabaar Keyes, Chris Lawrence, Mario Levy, Aurora Mallin, Maria Mecone, Becky Miklos, Antoinette Moss, Misty Neal, Cormaic O'Melia, Kevin Osei-Kofi, Jennifer Palicka, Kelly Patton, Melissa Petro, Sarah Pinto, Erin Posanti, Quiana Redd, Cheryl Ress, Kristen Roberts, Marc Roberts, Rachel Roberts, Ariel Robinson, Nik Rongers, Stephani Rowe, Kareem Sharif, Farryn Shy, Sabrina Simpson, Jarrod Skinner, K.C. Skufca, Cernel Sledge, Kendra Tence, Talia Thomas, Mark Tyler, Trudy Whitt, Kevin Williams, and Maurice Wright.

Art Teachers: Robert Bush, Dagmar Clements, and Lou Panutsos.

CLEVELAND HEIGHTS HIGH SCHOOL

Jo Anna Adorjan, Aria Benner, Demetrius Carter, Keith Cavey, Pei Chen, Rebecca Chizeck, Jennie Coyle, Evan Currey, Liza Goodell, Melissa Hancock, Katie Heile, Ronald Jackson, Lauren Kalman, Jessica Lee, Abby Maier, Sarah Mansbacher, Kelsey Martin-Keating, Leland Mays, Elise McDonough, Corinne Miller, Robert Peacock, Alisha Pickering, William Smalls, Katie Thurmer, Rachel Christina Truitt, Rebecca Turbow, Theresa Vitale, and A'ja Wainwright.

Art Teacher: Susan Hood-Cogan.

CLEVELAND SCHOOL OF THE ARTS

Amy Ankrom, Erin Bryson, Lateta Burns, Andrea Teri Buzeman, Erica Dye, and Albert Hale III. Ricardo Jackson, Michael Manning, Davonne Mitchell, Phillip Roberts, Joseph Sellers, and Sahara Williamson.

Art Teacher: Andrew Hamlett.

COLLINWOOD HIGH SCHOOL

Derek Cleveland, Cortez Corley, Timothy Gee, Edwin Jeffry, Harold McQueen, Damon Murphy, Vincent Purnell, and Cornell Vernon.

Art Teacher: Jerry Dunnigan.

EAST HIGH SCHOOL

William Thomas Green, Anthony Johnson, LeAnna Kennedy, and Jeffrey Lewis.

Art Teacher: Jaunace Watkins.

GARFIELD HEIGHTS HIGH SCHOOL

Bill Baczkowski, Amanda Bujak, Anthony Evers, Jen Fields, Jan Greathouse, Lauren Harper, Jon Jackson, Michael Johnson, Suzanne Jones, Leslie Kloefer, Chris Stiles, Mike Yates, and Amy Zmarowski.

Art Teacher: Christine French.

JOHN HAY HIGH SCHOOL

Lakisha Belford, George Booth, Arneisa Collins, Charles Cooper, Shalana Davenport, J.D. Davison, Phillip Dillard, Quan Duong, Anita Gamble, Marquitta Hubbard, Phuong Huynh, Isabel Irizarry, Gregory Jackson, Johnny Kaye, Elicia King, Lakeya Lipscomb, Lung Luong, Jennifer Mash, Shawnta McMillian, Jason Moorman, Letletta Newson, Frances Nguyen, Crystal Pemberton, Kenneth Roberts, DeQuana Robinson, John Smith, Jessica Vigilante, Kenneth Wallace, and Andre Whittingham.

Art Teachers: Richard Chappini, Harriet Goldner, and Kathleen Yates.

MAPLE HEIGHTS HIGH SCHOOL

Ricky Arnold, Rahan Bogley, Emily Bryant, Jason Brynak, Matthew Burdyslaw, Karen Curtis, Kimberly Filipic, Jennifer Gedeon, Christine Jones, Maria Kopec, Alex Mismas, Stacy Perry, Brent Peters, Jesse Ruffin, Carla Ruffo, Henry Sharpley, Otis Thomas, Manjot Tukhar, and Dan Wintrich.

Art Teachers: Karen Mehling-DeMauro, and Jody Trostler.

SHAKER HEIGHTS HIGH SCHOOL

Geof Agneberg, Elizabeth Cooperman, Shannon Cunningham, McCarthy Elea, Ambreese Hill, Destiny Irerere, Rebecca Lynne Jones, Jennifer Kaufman, Djenaba Lewis, Erica Manley, Tim McLoughlin, Jonathan Munetz, Emily Phillips, William Stenson, and Max Wolf.

Art Teachers: Malcolm Brown, James Hoffman, and Susan Weiner.

SHAW HIGH SCHOOL

David Black, Shalisha Brown, Nicole Greene, Faceta McMichael, Vance McKissack, Dionne Moton, Donna Parker, Marvin Washington, Katrell Williams and Brian Wright.

Art Teacher: Susan Lokar.

WARRENSVILLE HEIGHTS HIGH SCHOOL

Donald Hayes.

Art Teacher: James Evans.

CELEBRATING THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF FRANKFORD TOWNSHIP NEW JERSEY

HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Frankford Township on the 200th anniversary of its founding along the southern ridge of the Kittatinny Mountains in Sussex County, NJ. There are few places that can equal Frankford Township as a place to live and raise a family.

The earliest settlers from German, France, and Holland arrived in what is now Frankford in 1797, among them the Price, Hagerty, McDanolds, Pellett, Roe, Stoll, Stivers, and Wyker families.

The early years of the settlement found the Frankford with few of the modern amenities we take for granted today. The dire condition of the earliest roads, for example, made an overseer of roads one of the earliest local government officials appointed. Improvement of roads was often left to the families who lived along them. It was not until the widespread use of the automobile in the beginning of the 20th century that good roads were common.

Churches were among the earliest community buildings to follow the construction of individual homes. One of the oldest was the Frankford Plains Church, which served many denominations.

Many schools dotted the landscape, with as many as 13 in operation at one point. The number had declined to six before the Frankford Township Consolidated School was created. The Augusta School remains in use as the Frankford Township Municipal Building.

The first named villages within the township included Wykertown, named for the Wyker brothers; Augusta, where Col. John Gustin built a stagecoach inn, and Pelletstown, later known as Coursenville and eventually Papakating.

Colonel Gustin, proprietor of the stagecoach inn, was one of the community's great entrepreneurs of his day. He built not only the inn and his own home but a store and post office as well.

Farming was the area's first industry, as necessitated by subsistence. Dairy farms came to flourish in later years, with as many as 89 in operation at the peak of the dairy industry. Two railroads allowed farms and creameries to transport their product to city markets. A wide variety of mills also thrived, making use of the area's many brooks and streams for water power.

Hotels also became successful as Frankford found its place as a tourist destination thanks to Lake Owassa and Culver Lake.

There are many others, of course, who contributed to Frankford's history. I cite these as only a few examples of the wealth of history in a small town that might easily be overlooked by the pages of history books.

Frankford today is one of the best places in New Jersey to call home. A strong, diversified local economy, sound schools, strong public safety programs, and an outstanding sense of community are clearly evident. With a population of 5,100, it is the type of town where you know your neighbor's name, the clerk at the store is a friend, and people speak to one another on the streets.

Frankford's importance in our State's history cannot be ignored. I congratulate Frankford on its history and accomplishments, and wish all the people of Frankford an equal amount of success in the town's future.

LETTERS OF PRESIDENT CLINTON
ON THE STATE VISIT OF PRESIDENT
ARPAD GONCZ OF HUNGARY
TO ROMANIA AT THE INVITATION
OF PRESIDENT EMIL CONSTANTINESCU

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, last week an event of historic international importance took place in Bucharest, Romania. The President of the Republic of Hungary, His Excellency Arpad Goncz, paid a state visit to Romania at the invitation of His Excellency Emil Constantinescu, the President of Romania. This visit marks a new milestone in the efforts of both countries to reconcile historical differences that have divided the two for most of this century.

I have been a strong and consistent advocate and supporter of the efforts of Hungary and Romania to improve their relations. The expansion of democracy in both countries since the collapse of the Soviet Union and the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact six years ago has been an important element in the reconciliation that we have witnessed over the past few years. Changes in Romania have permitted that government to recognize the civic rights of the minority of ethnic Hungarians which live within the borders of that country. The recently elected Romanian Government includes, as one of the partners in the governing coalition, representatives of the Union of Democratic Hungarians in Romania.

Last year, in September of 1996, the Governments of Romania and Hungary signed a "Treaty of Understanding, Cooperation and Good Neighborliness" in the most significant concrete realization of this reconciliation to that point. These steps set the stage for the recent visit of President Goncz to Romania.

It is important to note, Mr. Speaker, that this reconciliation began under the previous government of Romania led by former President Ion Iliescu, and it has continued and expanded under the present government led by President Constantinescu. This reflects the broad national consensus in Romania in support of this effort.

I congratulate the leaders of both countries on their continuing efforts to improve the relationships between their countries.

Mr. Speaker, I had the honor of meeting in Bucharest with the two presidents—President Goncz of Hungary and President Constantinescu of Romania—during the historic visit to Romania. On the occasion of the state dinner, which was the formal highlight of the visits, at the request of President Clinton, I read and delivered to the two presidents letters from our own President commending the two leaders for their efforts and their contribution to this unprecedented reconciliation. Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD the text of the letter from President Clinton to the Presidents of Hungary and Romania:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
WASHINGTON,
May 22, 1997.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Please accept my congratulations and profound support on the occasion of your historic meeting with President [Constantinescu/Goncz].

The reconciliation and strengthened friendship that Hungary and Romania have pursued in recent months are an inspiration for Europe and the world. We have all witnessed too many rivalries the world over, conflicts that are not resolved but become endless cycles of recrimination and bitterness. Today, Romania and Hungary are showing that with wise leadership, democracies can chart a better course; that the values of tolerance, understanding, and common purpose can overcome division, with benefits for all.

Through your meeting and the other steps being taken to cement the growing friendship between your two nations, Romania and Hungary are demonstrating that they share the deepest values of our common Western civilization and have the strength and conviction to put these values into practice to the benefit of all their citizens. I know that the governments and peoples of both nations are determined to continue on this path as they move toward joining an undivided Europe.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

IN TRIBUTE TO RECIPIENTS OF
THE GOLD AWARD

HON. LARRY COMBEST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great pride to give tribute to the three young ladies who have earned the highest award possible for a Girl Scout. The Gold Award is awarded for distinguished achievement and has been presented to Ms. Miranda Peek, Ms. Jacque McAnally, and Ms. Elena Pearce.

The Gold Award is notable in that its award recognizes those special young women who display great spirit and deep commitment to themselves, their troop, their community, and their Nation. In reaching this Gold Award level, they affirm that they possess two important characteristics which will serve them well in years to come—setting goals and working hard to achieve them. This achievement further recognizes that they have chosen to rise beyond expectations by assuming the responsibility of leadership roles.

I wish to congratulate them, their families, and their fellow Scouts, and I wish them nothing but success in any endeavor they undertake in the future.

STATEMENTS BY KAREN RICE
AND DANIELLE INKEL, CANAAN
HIGH SCHOOL, REGARDING
CHILD ABUSE

HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues I would like to have printed

in the RECORD this statement by high school students from Canaan High School in Vermont, who were speaking at my recent town meeting on issues facing young people.

Ms. Inkel: Good morning, Congressman SANDERS. We would like to bring your attention to the issue of child abuse. Child abuse is a serious problem in today's society. We need to focus on it and we need to fight it.

One specific thing that we feel needs to be done is to start a child safety network. This is sort of like a criminal network. As of right now when there is a complaint of child abuse to Child Protective Services, a case is opened and an investigation is begun. If this family moves to another State the case is closed. The former State can warn the new State, but because of confidentiality, the case stays closed. This means that the abuse will most likely continue.

We feel that all the States should work as one to unite to fight this problem. Across the United States why cannot we unite to fight this problem.

Ms. Rice: In order to start this child safety network we need to come up with something for funding. We suggest that we increase alcohol, tobacco and other consumption-based taxes by about 0.5 percent. The money generated from these taxes would be used to start up a child safety network.

If this program were started the lives of many innocent children would be saved. We understand that a few people will lose their incentive to buy, but there are still many other users willing to buy at any cost. Therefore, we believe that there will still be left money earned to go into a desperately needed program, one that protects the wellbeing of children.

Child abuse is wrong and it is a disgrace that so many cases go undetected and unpunished. It is time that the government do something about this atrocious problem.

Child abuse is a very serious problem. Last year there were 200,000 cases of child abuse reported. One female in every three or four is likely to be sexually victimized before she is 18 years old. Data for males is more scarce and less reliable, but it is 1 in 10 and 1 in 6, and 2 percent of Americans will be sexually victimized in childhood; child abuse is one of the most unreported of all crimes.

It is a problem everywhere. There is child abuse in every State, and what we really want to—first of all, we need more money because there are some caseworkers that are getting 50 or 60 kids a week to have to take care of and that doesn't give them much time to actually sit down and work with these kids, so more money needs to be put to that. And we wanted money for this program of the child safety network because of these families who are just moving out of the State and the cases are just being closed because they cannot say anything because of confidentiality and these kids are just going to be moved everywhere and nothing is being done about what is going on.

Ms. Inkel: I have no idea really why someone would ever imagine hitting a child. Some say it is because they were abused when they were younger, some blame it on alcohol and drugs.

TRIBUTE TO MICKEY AND WILMA
HIRNI FOR 40 YEARS OF MARRIAGE

HON. GEORGE P. RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mickey and Wilma Hirni

on the occasion of their 40th wedding anniversary. The event will be celebrated on June 19, 1997.

Attending Exeter High School in Exeter, CA, these high school sweethearts, discovered their love was strong enough to last a lifetime, prompting their marriage on June 19, 1957. The Hirnis continued to pursue their individual interest after getting married, never letting the importance of their relationship escape them. They have three children: Marlene, Karrie, and Mark; all of whom are married and have children themselves.

Agriculture has always surrounded the life of Mickey Hirni. Following his graduation from Exeter High School he continued his education and agricultural interest at California State Polytechnical University. He has now become a prominent figure in the community with the success of his business, Sierra Western Agricultural Services, Inc. and his membership on the school board. As president of the Exeter Lyons Club, Mickey Hirni is respected for his adherence to moral values and hard work. Among all of his achievements and responsibilities, he reflects on his family as the most important aspect of his marriage, both past and present.

Credit for the success of this 40-year anniversary also belongs to Wilma Hirni. Having graduated from Exeter High School in 1956, Mrs. Hirni pursued her interest in nursing at Fresno City College and is currently an operation room registered nurse at the Visalia Center for Ambulatory Medicine and Surgery. Her dedication and hard work in the area of nursing has made it possible for her to become operating room director. Her feelings about her marriage mirror that of Mr. Hirni, and during the course of all her responsibilities she has upheld her devotion to the marriage.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I pay tribute to the 40th wedding anniversary of Mickey and Wilma Hirni. Their commitment to each other serves as a model for all men and women and should be held in the highest respect. I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing Mickey and Wilma Hirni my best wishes for future success.

IN MEMORY OF THE GOLDEN
TEMPLE MARTYRS

HON. PETER T. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, on this 15th anniversary of the massacre of over 20,000 Sikhs at the Golden Temple in Amritsar, I join many of my colleagues in rising to remember and condemn that terrible act.

How could anyone not condemn such a brutal act?

It is ironic that June 6, the last day of this military assault, was the 40th anniversary of D-day, the day on which the Allies began the invasion of Europe which ultimately destroyed the Nazi empire. The Golden Temple massacre, called Operation Blue Star, kicked off a campaign of state terror against the Sikh Nation which is still going on.

According to estimates from the Punjab State Magistracy and a coalition of human rights groups and journalists, more than a quarter of a million Sikhs have died at the

hands of the Indian regime since 1984. Christians in Nagaland, Kashmir's Muslim community, and many others have also been subjected to this brutality.

American support for freedom in South Asia is essential. The best thing that this country can do to honor the victims of the Golden Temple massacre is to use our strength to see to it that the people of South Asia can live in freedom. We can do this by cutting United States aid to India, and declaring our strong support for the people of Khalistan. These are reasonable measures that will induce India to begin observing the basic principles of democracy and human rights so that freedom and stability can reign all through South Asia. We should move now to enact these measures in memory of the Golden Temple martyrs.

A TRIBUTE TO THE ST. MAXIMILIAN MARIA KOLBE SCHOOL OF RIVERHEAD

HON. MICHAEL P. FORBES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the St. Maximilian Maria Kolbe School of Riverhead, Long Island as it celebrates its 25th year of keeping the Polish language and culture alive on the east end of Long Island. In just a quarter century, St. Maximilian Maria Kolbe School has established an integral role in Long Island's Polish tradition, and as a beacon of pride to the Polish community around the world. The school educated 99 students this past year, all of whom have benefited from the simple dream of parents in 1972—to instill the language and culture of the Polish people in their children.

The school's patron saint gave his life in the Oswiecim concentration camp during World War II, and the school was aptly named in honor of a man who sacrificed so much for his people. It is a great and worthy honor of his memory that Feliksa Sawicka, the school's principal since its inception, has made it her goal to create an environment in which children of Polish descent can be instilled with the pride and the storied legacy of their ancestors. Ms. Sawicka has been honored on numerous occasions for her work on behalf of Polish-American children. Just last year, Poland's President Aleksander Kwasniewski bestowed upon her the honorable Gold Cross of Merit, and she has received a commendation from the Polish Institute of Education.

St. Maximilian Maria Kolbe School has taken in students and educators around the world in pursuit of greater cultural and historical knowledge. In 1982, students journeyed to Rome, where they witnessed the canonization of St. Maximilian Maria Kolbe. The school's teachers participate in Polish American Congresses throughout the United States, where they have reached out to members of the Polish community from different walks of life, and have enriched their own cultural awareness. Students toured Ellis Island, where they traversed the same ground where their ancestors first stepped foot on America—and envisioned the educational opportunities for their grandchildren and great-grandchildren that so many are receiving at the St. Maximilian Maria Kolbe School.

Students are introduced to traditional Polish dances and songs, and participate in cultural events such as Manhattan's annual Pulaski Parade. Furthermore, they learn the importance of community involvement while performing traditional Polish dances and songs at Long Island nursing homes, fairs, and schools, parents and students volunteer to represent the school at Polish fairs throughout the year. The St. Isidore's School in Riverhead has displayed great and contagious generosity by allowing the Polish school to operate within its own facilities for the past 25 years.

On the occasion of the school's 25th year in educating Polish students, I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in applauding the efforts of Ms. Sawicka, of her fellow educators, and of the parents who have enrolled their children in the St. Maximilian Maria Kolbe School, keeping their culture and language alive through the next generation of Long Islanders.

TRIBUTE TO MAYOR BRADLEY,
DOLORES HUERTA, ABE LEVY

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to Tom Bradley, Dolores Huerta, and Abe Levy, who this year are each receiving awards from the Jewish Labor Committee, western region. It is impossible to exaggerate the impact Tom, Dolores and Abe have had on the lives of working men and women. They are three people who truly made a difference.

I have been fortunate to benefit from their friendship and learn from their efforts. As an attorney, Abe Levy has fought for the rights of workers and their unions throughout the legal system, including arguing before the Supreme Court. He has also appeared on their behalf before the National Labor Relations Board, the Agricultural Labor Relations Board, and the Railway Labor Board. Abe has devoted his professional life to fighting for decency and justice in the shops, factories and workplaces. Abe also had the great wisdom to hire me for his labor law firm—and the patience to keep me.

As time goes by, Tom Bradley's many accomplishments seem even more impressive. His first successful campaign for Mayor of Los Angeles, in 1973, was a model effort which brought together people from all races and ethnic groups in pursuit of a common goal. It is the rare politician who can reach across communities and transcend barriers as effectively as Tom.

I have worked with my dear friend Dolores Huerta for over 20 years. When I think of Dolores, words such as courageous, compassionate, and determined come easily to mind. As a member of the California Legislature, we worked closely to create the Agricultural Labor Relations Act in 1975. For the first time, farmworkers were given the right to organize and vote for a union. This remains among my most cherished political memories—in no small part because of Dolores.

Our collaboration continued when I went to Congress. Literally since the moment I arrived in 1983, we have worked together to fight continual attempts by growers to bring back the

bracero program, or to create a new guest worker program. Dolores simply never lets up in her efforts to improve wages and working conditions for farmworkers—the poorest workers in the country.

I ask my colleagues to join me today in saluting Tom Bradley, Dolores Huerta, and Abe Levy, who have dedicated themselves to bringing a sense of dignity and a feeling of hope to those in need of both. Their lives and achievements inspire us all.

STATEMENTS BY MATTHEW
NESTO AND LUCASS HERSEY,
ESSEX HIGH SCHOOL, REGARD-
ING SOCIAL SECURITY

HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues I would like to have printed in the RECORD this statement by high school students from Essex High School in Vermont, who were speaking at my recent town meeting on issues facing young people.

Mr. Nesto: Good morning, Congressman Sanders. Social Security first began August 14, 1935 when President Franklin Delano Roosevelt signed the Social Security Act. Social Security was started because people began facing the uncertainty of debt in old age. After Social Security numbers were signed the first taxes were collected beginning in January 1937, and until 1940 Social Security paid benefits in the form of single lump sum payments.

In January of 1940, Ida Mae Fuller became the first person to receive new monthly Social Security benefits. She received \$22.54 payment per month for the rest of her life.

In 1950, there was new legislation to increase the checks to offset the increase in the price of living and inflation.

In the 1960s the age requirement for Social Security was lowered to 62. Also Medicare was added so that people age 65 years and older could receive health care.

In the 70s it became clear that Social Security was having a problem. Programs were run by the state and local government. The programs became more complex and inconsistent with each other. They decided to convert over three million people from state control to federal control to solve the problem, but in the '80s more problems formed. Social Security ran into long-term financial problems which led to many cut-backs.

Today many believe that Social Security—some people believe that Social Security is in trouble. People who have reached the age for benefits expect to be paid what they have put into the system all their lives. During the month of December, 1996, \$28,147,981 was paid out nationally. In Vermont there was \$6,280,000 paid out. There is currently 43,557,700 people who receive money nationally. This right here shows the breakdown of different people that receive payments. It is broken down into widowers and retired people, too. 98,316 people receive that in Vermont.

Mr. Hershey: According to the Social Security Administration there is currently more money going in than there is being paid out. This is to create a surplus for baby boomers.

The problem we foresee is the amount of money we receive. 7.65 percent of your paycheck goes to Social Security, and your employer pays out 7.65 percent. Out of that 15.3 percent, 10.5 percent goes to retirement, sur-

vivor's, dependents and trust fund insurance. the total reserve for that category for one year is \$416 billion. 1.7 percent goes to disability insurance which has a reserve of \$6 billion. 2.9 percent goes to Medicare and we reserve \$127 million and currently we have a .02 percent that is unaccounted for.

For retired workers per month average payout is \$745. Disabled workers will have about \$704 and nondisabled widows and widowers will have \$707. Even the maximum of \$725 a month is not enough for a person to live. This is our biggest concern. Many retired people have many problems because Social Security doesn't pay enough, plus added to the problem is the government needs more money; Social Security is an easy target.

Our solutions are short and simple. The easiest thing is for Social Security to be set aside like a piggy bank making it a law for the Government not to take out of it. The other is that a person who works for about 50 years should have built up enough money to pay for themselves for at least a half of that time. We recommend that the taxes be put in a fund that gains interest over the time they work. A certain amount will go to a fund for disabled people who have had to stop work earlier. If the first taxes are left alone and allowed to make interest over 50 years we should be able to have every two or three working months to pay for one month of retirement.

There is a chart here, it sort of maps out the government mandates savings which go to a direct fund and basically it will be there for you when you retire. We hope you will take our ideas into consideration and practice.

Mr. Nesto: Right now the Social Security Administration is taking in more money than they are giving out right now and so they do not have any problems right now. But speculation in the upcoming years, people believe, and I do not necessarily believe that there is going to be a problem but it is speculation because as the baby boomers age, pretty soon as those people are going to be retiring and that's why we are taking in more money now so we can give them back their funds. So when that money is used for the baby boomers is there going to be enough money to pay for our retirement?

Right now there is not really any education on this. A lot of people believe that the Social Security Administration is going bankrupt and stuff like that, but they do not really—if they research the subject they wouldn't really—they'd find out it is not really a problem right now.

Mr. Hersey. I have seen a lot of like news shows where people are living on Social Security where there is a company that is creating insurance funds so people pay for it and perhaps those companies are creating that impression so they can make more money in their fund.

HONORING REV. DICKSON MARSHALL FOR HIS SERVICE TO THE PEOPLE OF LAWRENCE COUNTY

HON. RON KLINK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an exceptional individual from my community, Rev. Dickson Marshall of New Castle.

Reverend Marshall enlisted in the U.S. Navy to serve in World War II. Afterward, he attended Northwestern Bible College for 2 years before he was ordained in the Gospel Ministry

on April 15, 1949. Since then, Reverend Marshall has selflessly devoted himself to providing food and shelter to those in need of assistance.

Working through the city rescue mission of New Castle, Reverend Marshall succeeded in making a difference. In 1965, Reverend Marshall opened the Ira D. Sankey Memorial Youth Center to provide a place where boys and girls from crisis homes can go and play sports and games, go camping, and experience the joys of childhood.

In 1982, Reverend Marshall began the Inter-Church Food Bank, which helps provide food and counseling for families who have fallen upon hard times. Reverend Marshall's work has done much for those in need of help. Each year the ministry provides a helping hand to some 9,000 people.

We need people like Reverend Marshall, who work tirelessly so that people in need of temporary relief will always find a helping hand. Reverend Marshall's efforts are part of a proud tradition our Nation has for aiding those who find themselves in need of assistance. His deeds serve as a shining example that people today can make a difference in their local community.

Mr. Speaker, once again I want to thank Reverend Marshall for his years of service to the people of New Castle and I sincerely hope that he will continue with many more. He is a credit to the people of New Castle and an inspiration to all citizens of the Fourth Congressional District of Pennsylvania. I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing the extraordinary work of a truly extraordinary man.

HONORING MR. JAMES C.
CLEVELAND

HON. THOMAS M. DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today and pay tribute to Mr. James Cleveland, who is an outstanding member of the Reston community. James is retiring as president of Mobil Land Development Corp., Virginia Region.

Jim is a native of Arlington, VA. After college James remained in the area to help develop the virtually untouched Western Fairfax County. He began working for the residential sales staff of Reston, Virginia Inc. in the summer of 1967, several months prior to the purchase of the project by the Gulf Oil Corp. For the next 11 years, James served in all facets of Gulf Reston's, Inc. home and land sales management. In July, 1978 James joined the newly formed Reston Land Corp. Reston Land is wholly-owned subsidiary of the Mobil Land Development Corp., Mobil Corporation's real estate development affiliate. After serving as director of marketing, and marketing vice president, he was promoted to executive vice president and general manager in April 1981. Jim assumed his duties as regional president and president of the operating companies in June, 1984.

His dedication to the community has proven instrumental to the achievement of many important developments in the Reston area. The Reston Land Corp. is a growing 7,400 acre community with over 55,000 residents and

20,000 homes. Jim Cleveland is responsible for the evolution of the Reston Town Center, a bustling retail and industrial plaza filled with fine restaurants, an ice skating rink, and multiplex theater, located in the heart of downtown Reston. One of the best aspects of Reston Town Center's numerous amenities are their summer concerts which draw thousands of citizens each weekend.

A dynamic real estate professional, Jim has become an active community participant and leader by contributing his endless energy and vast knowledge to many civic organizations, services and local legislative bodies. He is a founder and past president of the Northern Virginia Chapter of the National Association of Industrial & Office Properties. He is a life member of the Million Dollar Circle of the National Association of Home Builders' Sales and Marketing Council. Jim is also a charter member of the board of directors of the Washington airports task force, which promotes the growth of Washington Dulles and National Airports. Jim's community involvement extends to the arts as well as youth programs. He has given his incredible skills and talents to these special programs by serving on the board of directors of the Greater Reston Arts Center and the YMCA of Metropolitan Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues join me in honoring and thanking Jim Cleveland for his achievements in nurturing and developing the Reston area. We appreciate all the hard work he has done in making Reston one of the finest places in American to live and work, and we wish him all the luck in his future endeavors.

INTRODUCTION OF THE DOE RESEARCH CONSOLIDATION ACT

HON. MICHAEL F. DOYLE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, as we move forward with the glidepath towards a balanced budget, it is essential that the Federal Government make every possible effort to decrease costs and increase efficiencies in its operations. This must be done in a way which does not harm the important functions of government.

The Science Committee has certainly taken this view to heart, and has served as an example of responsible governance. Chairman SENSENBRENNER should be congratulated for moving forward with authorization bills for all the programs in the jurisdiction of Science Committee. And Ranking Member GEORGE BROWN has demonstrated through his investment budget that it is possible to fund programs that provide pivotal support for education and R&D while remaining true to the constraints of a balanced budget.

Today, I am pleased to announce the introduction of another initiative in this spirit of responsible investment. Along with Chairman CALVERT of the Energy and Environment Subcommittee, I am introducing the Department of Energy Research Consolidation Act. This bill will combine the administrative functions of the Office of Fossil Energy [FE] and the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy [EE].

This consolidation will achieve budgetary savings while preserving the programmatic ef-

forts of these offices. This merger can be achieved with little disruption to the core R&D initiatives of the two offices as they have similar missions which overlap in areas such as advanced materials, biomass, alternative fuels, high-temperature superconductivity, and hydrogen.

More importantly, a unified organizational structure provides opportunities to eliminate duplicate work, improve program integration, and achieve savings in such crosscutting areas as program planning, policy analysis, external communications, and administrative services. For example, there is little need to preserve two autonomous press operations for the scope of work undertaken by FE and EE.

A consolidated office would allow reductions in administrative staff in a manner which should not adversely impact our commitment to meeting our future energy needs. This legislation eliminates one assistant secretary position at DOE and would reduce by 25 percent administrative positions at DOE headquarters.

When DOE was originally formed, the research conducted by FE and EE were all located under the jurisdiction of a single assistant secretary for energy technology. While at one time there may have been a reason for having two separate offices, that time has clearly passed. Not only have trends in energy R&D policy led towards this consolidation, political developments have also contributed to the need to unify the management of energy technology R&D.

In the past, there has been a politically-motivated rivalry between congressional support of FE and EE, one that is based on labels rather than fact. This has been detrimental to both programs. This bill eliminates that rivalry, so we can make decisions about our priorities within this area without being saddled with counterproductive rhetoric.

This legislation is another example of the recognition that we all have a responsibility to tighten our belts. Energy R&D is very important to my district, and there are agencies in which it would be a lot easier for me to seek cuts. But having been closely involved with the DOE R&D budget during my time on the Science Committee, I believe that this consolidation is both realistic and necessary.

I recognize that downsizing is not an easy task. Last year, a DOE facility in my district combined with a similar facility in West Virginia. While the transition has required both commitment and sacrifice by all those involved, it was a necessary step given current budgetary constraints. The combined entity, the Federal Energy Technology Center, is the best example of what Secretary O'Leary had hoped to achieve with the Strategic Alignment Initiative.

In conclusion, let me say how pleased I am with the cooperation and support I have received from Members of both parties and all across the political spectrum. Chairman CALVERT has been indispensable in helping garner support for this initiative. He has run our subcommittee in a fair and unbiased manner, which has created the climate which allows for this type of consensus bipartisan initiative. He, and Ranking Member TIM ROEMER have provided a shining example of how, when we take the time to listen to one another, we can work together on initiatives that are to the benefit of everyone.

CONGRATULATIONS AND GOD SPEED

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend a group of explorers from our Ninth Congressional District who are on the verge of an extraordinary accomplishment: becoming the first expeditionary group ever to traverse the length of the Indus River.

Led by D.S. Amjad Hussain, professor of surgery at the Medical College of Ohio and a writer and photographer, this expeditionary team last year reached the headwaters of the Indus River in the Kailas Mountain range in western Tibet.

This year, the group plans to complete the Ladakh segment of their expedition and will then become the only expedition in history to have covered the entire length of the Indus River.

Other members of the expedition team from Toledo included: Qarie Hussain, a student at the Royal Academy of Dramatic Art in London, England; Monie Hussain, a student at the University of Michigan; and, James Adray, a practicing attorney, along with his son, Sam, a high school student. The team was privileged to carry the flags of the United States, Pakistan, and the prestigious Explorers Club on their expedition.

The Indus, one of the largest rivers in the world, arises in Tibet and winds 2,400 miles through Tibet, India, and Pakistan before emptying into the Arabian Sea near Karachi. It carries twice the annual flow of the Nile and three times that of the Tigris and Euphrates combined. Like those other great rivers, the Indus also cradled a glorious civilization along its banks as long as 5,000 years ago.

From their base camp, the expedition team traveled on foot and by yak to reach the river's source. Despite mountain sickness due to the extremely high altitudes, the team also endured a blizzard while crossing the 18,500-foot Tseti Lachen pass. They also had to cross numerous rivers swollen with late summer rains while traveling on yaks.

The team offered prayers of thanksgiving when they arrived at Senge Kabob, 17,000 feet above sea level, a sacred site for Buddhists. Only two previous visits to this sacred site have been recorded.

The team now has four difficult expeditions behind them, including a photography trip on or along the Indus and its surroundings and a 2,000-mile trek in 1994 through the length of Pakistan. After completing the Ladakh segment later this year, the group will earn its place in the history books.

Congratulations and Godspeed.

TEAM INDUS

Team Indus is a series of Indus river expeditions designed to study and photograph the river and its inhabitants along its entire length. In 1987 the team travelled on rafts from Attock in the north to Karachi on the Arabian Sea in the south for a distance of 1400 miles. During that expedition the team also carried out depth survey of the river for Planning Commission of the Government of Pakistan.

During the second expedition in 1990, the team trekked the river from Jaglot (near Gilgit) to Tarbela for a distance of 400 miles,

part of it along the north-south Silk Route, now the Karakoram Highway.

In 1994, the team trekked the remaining part of the river in Pakistan from the line of control in Baltistan to Jaglot for a distance of 170 miles. On that expedition the team carried the coveted flag of the Explorers Club.

The team explored the headwaters of the river (called Senge Kabob or the mouth of the lion in Tibetan) in the Kailas mountain rangers in Western Tibet in July-August, 1996. The team covered the river close to the point where it enters Ladakh, India. On this expedition the team also carried the flag of the Explorers club.

Team Indus V, scheduled for 1997-98, will cover the remaining 200 miles of the river in Ladakh.

The team has already achieved a landmark in covering the Indus River in its entirety in Pakistan and trekking to the headwaters of the river in Tibet. With the completion of the segment in Ladakh, Team Indus would be the first in history to have accomplished trekking and photographing the entire 2400 miles of the Indus.

Team Indus I, Attock to Karachi, December 1987. S. Amjad Hussain, Maj. Syed Azam, S. Waqaar Hussain, Syed Azhar Ali Shah, S. Sardar Hussain, Najamuddin, Tony Glinke, Bahu S. Shaikh, Shehzad Nazir, Nasim Zafar Iqbal, and Ron Euton.

Team Indus II, Jaglot To Tarbela, July 1990. S. Amjad Hussain, Maj. Syed Azam, James Adray, S. Waqaar Hussain, S. Osman Hussain, and Syed Azhar Ali Shah.

Team Indus III, Line of Control to Jaglot, August 1994. S. Amjad Hussain, Lt. Col. Syed Azam, S. Waqaar Hussain, S. Osman Hussain, and Syed Azhar Ali Shah.

Team Indus IV, Headwaters of Indus to near the Ladakh border, July-August 1996. S. Amjad Hussain, Syed Azhar Ali Shah, S. Waqaar Hussain, S. Osman Hussain, James Adray, and Sam Adray.

ARTICLES AND TELEVISION PROGRAMS ABOUT TEAM INDUS EXPEDITIONS

Articles by S. Amjad Hussain:

1. Adventure on the Indus, Toledo Magazine, April 9, 1988. (Cover Story).
2. People of Indus, Toledo Magazine, April 9, 1988.
3. The Lost Civilization of the Indus, Toledo Magazine, May 28, 1988 (Cover Story).
4. Adventure on the Indus, HUMSAFAR, November/December, 1988. (Cover Story).
5. My 1400 Mile Journey Through 5000 Years of History, Medical Economics, February 6, 1989.
6. The Mound of the Dead, HUMSAFAR, May/June, 1990.
7. A Day in the Life of Indus Valley Inhabitants, HUMSAFAR, July/August, 1990. (Cover Story).
8. A Journey to the roof of the World, Toledo Magazine, January 20, 1991. (Cover Story).
9. The People of the Hindu Kush Mountains, Toledo Magazine, January 20, 1991.
10. A Journey on the Roof of the World, The Explorers Journal, Summer 1992. (Cover Story).
11. Pilgrimage Turns Dream into Reality, Sunday Blade, Op-Ed section. September 8, 1996. (Column).

By Steve Pollick, Outdoors Editor, The Blade:

12. Toledo Surgeon Operates as River Explorer, Sunday Blade, July 7, 1996.

Television Programs:

1. Pakistan Television, Islamabad, Pakistan. "INDUS RIVER EXPEDITION 1987" (1/2 hour interview). January 1988.
2. Pakistan Television, Peshawar, Pakistan. "TEAM INDUS EXPEDITIONS" (1/2 hour interview). April 15, 1995.

A TRIBUTE TO THE QUOGUE LIBRARY ON THE CELEBRATION OF ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MICHAEL P. FORBES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Quogue Library, a haven of literature in the small south shore Long Island village of Quogue, that is celebrating its 100th anniversary this year.

From modest beginnings as a single shelf of books in the local general store, the Quogue Library has grown to become a cornerstone of this tight-knit, seaside village. Save our houses of worship, there is no more important community pillar than libraries, these wondrous storehouses of tales of Biblical heroes, historical figures, corruptible rogues, and honest men and women who achieved greatness in their lifetimes. The village of Quogue would be a poorer place, indeed, had its founders not had the foresight to build their library 100 years ago.

The effort to create a local library started in 1897 with 20 local women of the Quogue Library Association, each of whom donated \$1 and a book. Soon they had collected 200 more books, that they shelved at Jessups General Store using just record book and a pencil on a string to allow library patrons to check books out themselves in an era when the honor system prevailed.

In just 1 year the library's burgeoning collection could not be contained on Jessup's shelves. Thankfully, local benefactor Abram S. Post and his family donated the property and funds needed to construct a library building. In the summer of 1897, the new library opened with its collection of 500 works. Described at the time as "a neat wooden structure of much beauty," the library was introduced to the Quogue community at a July 29 reception attended by many in the village. On the front lawn of the library lay a large anchor that came from the ship *Nahum Chapin*, which went down with all hands in January 1897. The anchor was a gift from library patron Selden Hallock of Quogue.

Through its first 60 years, the small library served the Quogue community well, charging its members just \$3 annual fees and relying on the generosity of patrons. Unable to contain its growing collection anymore, on July 8, 1978, the library dedicated the Mary Sage Williams Room, in honor of the woman who served as library president for 11 years. At the same time, office space was added for the Quogue Historical Society, whose 1822 Schoolhouse Museum occupies the same property.

Few in the Quogue community have been better served than the children who have found adventure, world travel, romance, and history among the stacks of books at the local library. For the past 100 years, the Quogue Library has opened a vast world of knowledge to the youth of this small east end village, instilling in them a lifelong love for literature and learning.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in honoring the Quogue Library on its 100th anniversary. With the grace of God, I am certain our great-grandchildren will celebrate the Quogue

Library's bicentennial in another 100 years. Congratulations.

TRIBUTE TO CATHERINE M. MARINO

HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of a highly respected, singularly effective, and most popular educator, Catherine M. Marino. Cathy Marino is retiring this June as principal of the Henrietta Hawes Elementary School in Ridgewood, NJ, after a long and distinguished career as a highly respected and beloved teacher, spanning three decades.

Cathy Marino, one of my closest and dearest personal friends, is a dedicated and caring educator who has committed her life to helping young people and truly has the best interests of children at heart. She has been in the forefront of innovation and progress, improving the standards of public education at every turn. As a former teacher myself, I can tell you she has always put the individualized social and educational needs of each student first. She has been at the cutting edge of educational innovation and is truly "a teacher for all seasons." She always put children first.

Cathy's career began as a teacher of mentally retarded children at Travis Air Force Base in California, immediately after her graduation from Russell Sage College in Troy, NY, with a bachelor's degree in elementary education. She later worked with blind, deaf, and physically handicapped children in Colorado before returning to the East Coast in 1970, as a special education teacher in Saratoga, NY.

Cathy came to New Jersey in 1972, as a resource room teacher at Tenakill Elementary School in Closter. She served at Tenafly Middle School as a special education teacher before joining the Ridgewood school system in 1974, as a first grade teacher at Hawes Elementary.

Cathy taught first grade until 1977, when she switched to kindergarten and split her time between the Hawes, Glen, and Willard elementary schools. In September 1996, she returned to Hawes Elementary School as principal.

As principal, Cathy has been responsible for supervision of planning, development implementation, and evaluation of all school programs and activities under a site-based management structure. She supervised 42 certificated and 8 non-certificated staff members, provided leadership for staff development and community relations, prepared and implemented budgets, led efforts to accomplish school and district goals, and supervised monitoring of students' social, emotional, and academic progress.

In addition, she has worked as an adjunct professor at William Paterson College and as a consultant on educational videos for young children.

Cathy's commitment cannot be fully conveyed by her employment history alone, however. To begin with, she believes strongly that learning never ends and has constantly worked to extend her own education. In addition to her bachelor of arts degree in elementary education from Russell Sage College, she

holds a master's degree in learning disabilities from Fairleigh Dickinson University, where she graduated summa cum laude. She has taken graduate courses at William Paterson College, Syracuse University, the University of Auckland and Adelphia University. She has attended lectures, workshops and other special programs at Harvard and Yale universities.

Recognizing the need to prepare others to carry on after her retirement, Cathy has been active in sharing her knowledge with fellow and future educators through a variety of forums. For more than a dozen years, she has served on panels at the annual Renaissance Weekend Program in Hilton Head, SC, including the landmark "A Nation at Risk" panel with president Clinton. She has spoken at Columbia University, the State University of New York, and before the New Jersey Kindergarten Teachers Association, to name a few. She has led countless staff development programs in the Ridgewood school system and in other school systems as well. She is the author of *The Wonderful World of Kindergarten: A Handbook for Parents and Connections, Problem Solving and Thinking Skills for Young Children*.

Cathy has been the recipient of a large number of awards and honors, including the Governor's Award for Outstanding Teachers. She was chosen as a member of the President's National Teachers Advisory Council during the Reagan administration.

Throughout her years of innovative teaching, Cathy was always looking ahead to keep education contemporary and relevant to the current needs of families and the community—she was a true pioneer.

Recognizing the changing responsibilities that challenged working families and putting her knowledge of the developmental needs of children to use, Cathy in 1982 founded New Jersey's first child care program for infants and toddlers. In partnership with Valley Hospital, this school-based program was open to workers in the local community. Cathy staffed the facility with highly qualified personnel trained to serve the needs of children from the earliest months of life. This was not merely "custodial" child care. This was an early childhood education center before most communities were aware of these innovational needs and long before the Federal Government adopted Early Start as an adjunct to the much-heralded and well-established Head Start.

Recently, extensive documentation has been advanced by the National Institute of Mental Health and other research centers that proves the importance of proper care and development during early childhood. Proper nurturing during the first few months can improve IQ and academic performance later, for example. Positive playtime activities lead to an improved ability to make friends and function socially as an adult.

So you can see why I call Cathy not only a role model for American educators but "an educator for all seasons."

Cathy and her husband, Ben, make their home in Ridgewood. They have a loving and close-knit family that includes their children, Michael, Christopher, and Stephen, and grandchildren, Mitchell and Katherine.

Members of the Ridgewood school system staff, members of the community and count-

less former students and their parents all have fond memories and are deeply indebted to the dedication of this outstanding educator. I wish her much-deserved health and happiness in her retirement. But, knowing Cathy's inquiring mind and sense of dedication to children, I doubt that this will be a true retirement. I am certain she will continue to find ways to serve children and make our world a better place for all.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. EARL POMEROY ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 84

HON. JOHN R. KASICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting the views of Representative EARL POMEROY for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Representative POMEROY submitted his views in a timely manner and in accordance with the provisions of House Rule XI, clause 2(l)(5). Unfortunately, the Government Printing Office inadvertently omitted his name from the views that he submitted, which were printed on page 123 of House Report 105-100, the report to accompany House Concurrent Resolution 84. To remedy this oversight, the views of Representative POMEROY are submitted for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE HONORABLE EARL POMEROY FISCAL YEAR 1998 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RESOLUTION ADDITIONAL VIEWS—MAY 17, 1997

I want to commend the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee for their outstanding efforts in forging this bipartisan balanced budget agreement. I am pleased to support this agreement that balances the federal budget in five years while protecting important national priorities including the education of our children and quality health care for our senior citizens. Importantly, the agreement also provides tax relief for middle income working families.

While I support this budget resolution, I am seriously concerned about the lack of funding allocated to the discretionary account for agriculture, function 350. The resolution assumes a cut of \$1.4 billion below a freeze for agriculture over the next five years. Without adjusting for inflation, agriculture spending will be \$400 million lower in 2002 than in 1997. In real dollar terms, discretionary funds for agriculture will be cut by more than 22 percent under this budget agreement. Unfortunately, several additional factors will constrain agriculture investment even further.

In 1994, Congress enacted sweeping reforms of the federal crop insurance program by providing catastrophic crop failure coverage to all producers and deleting the authority for congressional provision of ad hoc disaster assistance. As part of this crop insurance agreement, the federal reimbursement to private companies for the sales and service of crop insurance was to be provided for three years from the crop insurance fund, a mandatory expenditure account in the federal budget. Previously, half of the reimbursement had been provided in the agriculture appropriations bill as a discretionary expenditure.

Under the 1994 agreement, provision of the traditionally discretionary half of the deliv-

ery cost reimbursement was to be resumed by the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee in the 1998 appropriations bill. The problem we now face is that the Congressional Budget Office baseline contains no projection for this delivery cost reimbursement because it was not provided in the 1997 appropriations act.

The Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee is further burdened in 1998 with requirements to offset \$350 million of expenditures in the food stamp program that was displaced by prior enactment of last year's welfare reform bill. In addition, there is an expectation that \$375 million more will be required for the WIC program.

Adding together the \$350 million for foods stamps, \$375 million for WIC and \$200 million needed to provide the sales and service of crop insurance, the Agriculture Subcommittee is expected to be \$900 million over their 1997 allocation, which would be the basis for establishing the 1998 allocation. To reflect the 1994 crop insurance agreement, the discretionary expenditure in function 350 would have to be increased by \$200 million in FY98 and by \$1.1 billion through FY02.

Agriculture programs have already been reduced more than any other function of government. I would like to remind my colleagues that American agriculture provides this nation with the safest, most abundant, and most affordable food supply in the world. In addition, agriculture exports contribute more toward a positive trade balance than any other sector of the economy. It is vitally important that we not abandon federal investment in agriculture research, trade and other programs to the detriment of American farmers, consumers and our national economy.

A GREAT PLACE TO CALL HOME

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my congratulations to the residents of a beautiful municipality, the Village of Pinecrest, for its first successful year of incorporation. Over a year ago, on March 12, 1996, the Village of Pinecrest became the 29th municipality of Dade County.

As a result of this anniversary, the Village of Pinecrest is celebrating many firsts this year, including the first anniversary of its first mayor, Mayor Evelyn Greer, and the first meeting of the Pinecrest Village Council. The council members include Cindie Blanck, Barry Blaxberg, Leslie Bowe, and Robert Hingston. In addition, the citizens of the Village of Pinecrest recently inaugurated the Village Hall of Pinecrest.

I was pleased to be a participant in the Founders Day Parade of the Village of Pinecrest on March 15 of this year where I witnessed the pride of the residents of the village, as well as the unity and cooperation that they possess as a community.

My sincerest and deepest congratulations to the Village of Pinecrest, its mayor, village council, and most of all, its residents, for making the village a great place for many to call home.

H.R. 531—A BILL TO AMEND THE GENERATION-SKIPPING TRANSFER TAX LAW

HON. AMO HOUGHTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. MATSUI and I, introduced H.R. 531 on February 4, 1997. The legislation will add two amendments to the generation-skipping tax [GSTT] law which we believe were unintentionally omitted by Congress at the time the original provisions were enacted. The changes recommended by H.R. 531 were adopted by Congress as section 11074 of the Balanced Budget Act of 1995 which was eventually vetoed by the President. The legislation concentrates on the "predeceased parent exclusion" of the GSTT law, which provides that GST tax is not applied to direct gifts or bequests made by a grandparent to a grandchild where the grandchild's parent—the transferor's child—is deceased at the time of the transfer. When this situation occurs, there is no generation-skipping, since the child—grandchild's parent—is dead; therefore, it is not appropriate to add GST tax on top of ordinary estate or gift taxes, and the predeceased parent exclusion properly excludes such transfers from the GST tax.

Our bill would expand the predeceased parent exclusion to apply to gifts by persons without lineal descendants and to trust gifts.

First, gifts or bequests by a childless individual to collateral descendants would be treated as the same as transfers by persons with lineal descendants. Accordingly, the exclusion would be extended to apply to transfers made by a childless individual to his or her grandniece and grandnephew in the situation where the individuals siblings and nieces and nephews are all deceased at the time of transfer.

Second, the bill applies the predeceased parent exclusion to transfers made through a trust. Under current law, the predeceased parent exclusion is limited, unintentionally, we believe, to direct gifts and bequests, and does not apply to trusts gifts even if the parent of the receiving beneficiary was deceased at all relevant times. In addition to other trusts, this provision particularly affects certain charitable trusts where the charity would have an interest for a period of years before distributing property to the individual beneficiaries. In the situation where the beneficiary's parent is dead, and was dead when the trust was created, there is certainly no generation skipping involved which would justify the levy of an additional tax. It is important to note that these trusts are significant sources of financial support for many charities, and should not be discouraged, unintentionally, where not necessary for the policy of underlying tax provisions. The bill would remove this obstacle.

The terminations, distributions, and transfers to which this bill would apply are those occurring on or after the date of enactment, which would be generation-skipping transfers as defined in section 2611 of the Internal Revenue Code and subject to the GST tax, except for the application of the predeceased parent exclusion as amended by this legislation.

The proposed legislation has substantial support from charities, both large and small, and of all types, such as: social services pro-

viders, museums, libraries, hospitals, and universities, from around the country. We urge our colleagues to join us in support of this legislation.

TRIBUTE TO 1997 HONOREES OF BLACK WOMEN OF ACHIEVEMENT

HON. MAXINE WATERS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, we often hear the complaint that people just don't care anymore; that the "I've got mine, you get yours" mentality permeates all segments of our society. People who say that, obviously, haven't crossed the path of Black Women of Achievement. This volunteer, professional women's organization has spent 14 years quietly working to raise funds to support the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund and honor black women for outstanding achievements and significant contributions to their communities. The NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund is an organization that uses the law to pry open the doors of opportunity for African-Americans, other people of color, women, and the poor.

BWA has been on a mission, and it has succeeded over and over and over. In just the last 3 years, the organization has raised over \$500,000 for LDF. In addition, some 200 African-American women have been honored at its annual fund raising luncheons.

On June 20, 1997, BWA will honor 16 extraordinary African-Americans. It is my pleasure to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, this tribute to Black Women of Achievement and its 1997 honorees. They represent the best of America. I commend them for their tenacity, determination, and spirit. They are blazing a trail that gives future generations hope for a world of equality, fairness, and justice.

The 1997 honorees are: actress/minister Della Reese; actress JoMarie Payton-Noble; renowned entrepreneur-artist Synthia Saint James; Rachel Marie Burgess, division chief, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department; Adrienne Y. Crowe, regional senior vice president, Bank of America; Shirley Douglas, vice president, business development, Bechtel Infrastructure Corp.; Sheila Frazier, producer, Black Entertainment Television; Angela Gibson, public affairs director, Pacific Telesis; Carolyn L. Green, director of government and public affairs, Ultramar Diamond Shamrock Corp.; Rae Franklin James, executive officer, customer relations and communications, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transit Authority; Jacqueline E. Massey, administrator, network design, GTE; Iris Stevenson, teacher/director, Crenshaw High School Elite Choir; Debra J. Williams, program manager, Southern California Edison; Rhonda Windham, general manager, LA Sparks; and Della Walton York, district sales manager, AVON.

BWA also pays special recognition to the outstanding achievements of others who support the goals of the organization and their communities. Special recognition has gone to such notables as actor-activist Ossie Davis and veteran news anchor Pat Harvey. The 1997 special recognition award will go to John W. Mack, president of the Los Angeles Urban League.

The 1997 luncheon will be opened with an invocation by Rev. Dr. O.C. Smith, City of Angeles Church of Religious Science.

BWA Committee members are: Beverly Whitaker, 1997 chair, Occidental Petroleum Corp.; Betty A. Johnson, 1997 cochair, Department of Water & Power; Pat Johnson, 1997 cochair, Health Point Services of America; Josephine Alexander, Chi Eta Phi; Berlinda Fontenot-Jamerson, Pacific Enterprises/The Gas Co; Carolyn J. Fowler, AT&T; Angela Gibson, Pacific Telesis; Jackie Hempstead, Bank of America; Karen (Kay) Hixson, Karen Hixson & Associates; Beverly A. King, King & Wright Consulting; Doris LaCour; Office, Supervisor Yvonne Brathwaite Burke; Jackie Massey, GTE; Gloria Pualani, Northrop Grumman; Natalie L. Sanders, M.D., Association of Black Women Physicians; Rose Mary Spriggs, consultant; Sylvia Swilley, M.D., Kaiser Permanente; Pat Watts, Edison International/retired; and Linda Young, public relations consultant.

REGARDING THE ASIAN ELEPHANT CONSERVATION ACT

HON. JIM SAXTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I introduced the Asian Elephant Conservation Act which would set up a special elephant fund for the Interior Department to administer and would authorize \$5 million annually over the next 5 fiscal years to be spent on Asian elephant conservation.

At an educational event held yesterday on the Capitol Grounds, I was able to share with other Members all the majesty and wonder of the Asian elephant. It was evident that these creatures are formidable, and one would think they are invincible. Sadly they are not. Indeed, the Asian elephant is in grave danger of extinction. And that is why the United States, as a world leader in conservation, must step forward and assist in Asian elephant conservation.

Unlike the African elephant whose recent decline has been caused by the dramatic large-scale poaching for ivory, the Asian elephant is faced with more diffuse threats. The increasing pressures of human population growth, along with the necessary changes in land use, has caused habitat destruction that now has elephants and people in direct competition for resources.

Because of incremental habitat loss and degradation, Asian elephant populations are highly fragmented. Drastic fragmentation has increased chances of extinction to each fragmented population. Our hope is that this bill will reverse this trend.

For the record, I am including statements on the Asian elephant by Dr. Raman Sukumar, chairman of the IUCN/SSC Asian Elephant Specialist Group; Mr. Douglas H. Chadwick, a wildlife biologist, and author of "The Fate of the Elephant"; Ms. Ginette Hemley, director of international wildlife policy for the World Wildlife Fund; Dr. Mary Pearl, executive director of the Wildlife Preservation Trust International, Inc.; Dr. Chris Wemmer, associate director for conservation and research at the Smithsonian Institution; and Ms. Shanthini Dawson, wildlife

ecologist and steering committee member on the IUCN Species Survival Commission.

THE ASIAN ELEPHANT—AN APPEAL TO SAVE A FLAGSHIP IN DISTRESS

(By Dr. Raman Sukumar—Chairman, IUCN/SSC Asian Elephant Specialist Group, and Author of "Elephant Days & Nights," 1994)

The Asian elephant has enjoyed an intimate relationship with people for over 4000 years. It has carried our heaviest burdens, and transported us across the widest rivers and over the steepest mountains. Kings have used the elephant as a machine of war and an ambassador of peace. It has been worshipped by Hindus in the form of Ganesha, the elephant-headed god, while the Buddha himself is considered to be the reincarnation of a sacred white elephant. No other relationship between man and beast equals the splendor of the elephant-human relationship.

More important, the elephant is a key-stone species across the tropical forests of South and Southeast Asia, arguably one of the biologically most diverse regions in the world. The elephant is thus the ultimate flagship for conserving the biodiversity of the Asian region.

Yet, ironically the Asian elephant faces a crisis that is largely hidden from the international community. Its population in the wild is under 50,000 individuals, perhaps as few as 35,000, a level which is less than 10% of that of its more publicized African cousin. Its range once stretched widely from the Tigris-Euphrates basin in West Asia through the Indian sub-continent eastward up to the Yangtze River and beyond in China. Today, it has been wiped out entirely from West Asia and has virtually disappeared from China. In 13 Asian countries the elephant is found, with few exceptions, as a series of small populations, isolated from each other through habitat fragmentation or even low density.

Fewer than 10 populations, 6 of them of India, have over 1000 elephants. The rest have much fewer numbers, often less than 100 or 50 individuals each.

The reasons for the decline of this Asian giant are many. Historically, the elephant has been captured in large numbers for taming and use by man. During the past century alone up to 100,000 elephants have been captured in Asia. Most countries have stopped capturing elephants now, but some illegal capturing still continues in Southeast Asia. The most serious threat faced by the elephant is the loss of habitat through clearing of tropical forest for traditional and commercial agriculture, and developmental projects. Whether it be rubber and oil plantations in Malaysia and Indonesia, tea and coffee plantations in India, sugar cane in Sri Lanka or shifting agriculture in Indo-China, the result is practically the same—a loss of space for elephants. Added to this developmental projects—roads, railway lines, dams, mines, and industries—burgeoning across Asia threaten to further fragment the elephants' habitat. Elephant-human conflict is increasing in many regions. Crops are trampled and eaten by elephants, and several hundred people killed each year. The traditional tolerance of farmers towards the elephant is disappearing in a world undergoing a rapid socio-economic transformation.

Equally alarming today is the wave of ivory poaching sweeping across Asia, to feed the demand from the rich East Asian countries. India has been hit hard by the lust for white gold, and so have many other countries. As the number of male elephants with tusks declines, the sex ratios become more unequal, genetic variation is lost, and the health of populations threatened.

Seventeen years ago, I began my tryst with this magnificent animal, a symbol of

what my country stands for and has to offer to the world. During this short time I have witnessed the elephant decline rapidly in Thailand and Indo-China, lose its traditional migratory routes in India, and killed for its ivory. I have also been privileged to watch the elephant lead its natural life, courting, giving birth, feeding, playing, bathing and enjoying life in general. This tryst with the elephant is a passion and an addiction, which one does not have to apologize for. Just as we cannot imagine an India without the Himalaya, the Ganges or the Taj Mahal, I cannot imagine an India without the elephant. I am sure that many from my neighboring Asian countries would feel the same about the elephant.

I make this appeal to friends of the elephant in the United States to join hands with us to save one of the most magnificent of our fellow creatures on earth. Surely, the trumpet of the elephant should continue to echo through the hills and forests of Asia in the decades and centuries to come.

STATEMENT OF DOUGLAS H. CHADWICK, WILDLIFE BIOLOGIST AND AUTHOR OF "THE FATE OF THE ELEPHANT," SUPPORTING THE ASIAN CONSERVATION ACT

Elephants are one of those animals by which we define the grandeur of creation. No larger life forms walk our earth, and precious few are more intelligent—or more emotional. Elephants live 60 to 70 years, learning and storing knowledge the entire time. They maintain close, complex bonds with other family members throughout that human-length span. They are also intimately tied to the cultures of many nations. And now they are in danger of disappearing. The question is whether or not there is still room for giants among us. On my own behalf, and for the sake of people everywhere, including generations yet to come, I urge you to answer Yes by making the Elephant Conservation act part of the species' life support system.

The American public and Congress have worked hard to reverse the decline of African elephants, *Loxodonta africana*. And the effort has succeeded in many respects, helping boost the population to more than half a million. In the meantime, however, Asian elephants, *Elephas maximus*, have declined to one-tenth that number. Where they once inhabited a range that swept from southern China to the Middle East, they find themselves confined to fragments of countryside too small and scattered to guarantee survival. I have seen three-legged elephants whose last homeland was laced with explosive mines, elephants whose trunk had been claimed by snares, and elephants patterned by bullet scars and acid hurled at them by angry farmers.

Others have probably pointed out to you the value of Asian elephants as an umbrella species. That is, by safeguarding forest tracts large enough to sustain these giants, we ensure sufficient habitat for countless smaller fauna from tigers and sloth bears to peacocks and emerald doves. But elephants are more than just part of the extraordinary variety of plants and animals found in Asia's tropical forests. Elephants are one of the main reasons that genetic bounty is there in the first place with the potential to provide humanity with new sources of food, fiber, and pharmaceutical products.

You see, elephants distribute the seeds of perhaps one-third of all tropical trees. In some cases, elephants are the only known agents of dispersal. Plants germinate in elephant dung at twice the rate found in ordinary forest soil. Through their grazing and trampling, elephants create openings dominated by monocots—grasses, and certain

starchy herbs—throughout dense woodlands. Those patches in turn host a special array of animals from insects to Asian rhinos. Used wisely, the same forests essential to elephant survival already provide a perpetual source of raw materials, food, and traditional medicines for local people. Those woodlands also absorb and slowly release a reliable supply of good water. Deforested, the landscape offers rapid runoff followed by drought and withered crops instead.

To save Asian elephants is to save one of the principal shapers of biological diversity. To maintain Asian elephant habitat is to maintain the resources that enrich human communities over the long run. To pass an Asian Elephant Conservation Act would be one the most foresighted and yet practical, cost-effective things we could do for the benefit of Americans, people throughout Asia, and the world we all share. Thank you for taking the time to listen.

WORLD WILDLIFE FUND,
Washington, DC, May 23, 1997.

On behalf of World Wildlife Fund and its 1.2 million members in the United States, I am writing to enlist your support for one of the world's most endangered large mammals—the Asian elephant.

Few species capture the public's imagination as do elephants. And few species are as intimately tied to the cultures of so many nations. Yet the Asian elephant faces extinction in the wild today. The combined impact of habitat loss, poaching for ivory, meat, and hides, and increasing conflicts with people threaten the species' survival in the next century. With a total wild population of 35,000 to 50,000, the Asian elephant (*Elephas maximus*) numbers less than one-tenth of its African counterpart. Although the Asian elephant did not suffer the ravages of excess poaching that reduced African elephant numbers by half in the 1980s, the erosion of its habitat over the past century has fragmented populations to the point that fewer than ten populations comprising more than 1,000 individuals are left throughout the species' range, greatly diminishing long-term viability.

The Asian elephant urgently needs your help. Securing its survival requires stronger protection measures for remaining herds in the 13 countries where the species lives, establishing corridors and linkages between existing forest reserves to allow for natural migration, stopping illegal killing for ivory, and integrating protection measures with the development needs of local people. Addressing these broad needs requires financial and technical assistance from the international conservation community.

Congress has shown important global leadership in protecting endangered species such as the African elephant, rhinos, and tigers, through landmark legislation that has provided modest yet critically-needed financial support for conservation projects. We now call on Congress to extend that leadership to the Asian elephant by enacting the Asian Elephant Conservation Act. Representatives JIM SEXTON and NEIL ABERCROMBIE plan to introduce this legislation on June 4. We ask you to consider cosponsoring this important legislation as an emergency response to helping one of the world's most endangered species.

Living in the world's most densely populated region presents daunting challenges for the Asian elephant. But because elephant herds range over such large areas, protection is more difficult than for tigers and other imperiled species. At the same time, protection measures for the Asian elephant provide

broad benefits for countless other species that share its habitat. The Asian elephant is not only ecologically significant as a keystone species in Asia's tropical forests, it is truly a flagship for conservation of the region's tremendous biological diversity.

As the world's largest wildlife conservation organization, WWF is committed to helping save the Asian elephant through projects in Thailand, Vietnam, China, India, Sri Lanka, Indonesia, Bhutan, Nepal, and Malaysia. We look forward to working with Congress and the U.S. government to further these conservation activities. Passage of the Asian Elephant Conservation Act is one important and practical step toward securing the future of this magnificent species for generations to come.

Sincerely,

GINETTE HEMLEY,
DIRECTOR,
International Wildlife Policy.

WILDLIFE PRESERVATION TRUST
INTERNATIONAL, INC.

WILDLIFE PRESERVATION TRUST INTERNATIONAL SUPPORTS THE ASIAN ELEPHANT CONSERVATION ACT OF 1997

The worldwide population of Asian elephants is down to around 50,000 animals, isolated in small pockets in India, Myanmar, Sri Lanka, Nepal, Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, Malaysia, Indonesia, and Vietnam. The Chinese population is dying out. Up to one-third of remaining elephants live in captivity.

The endangered status of Asian elephants is poignant, because for thousands of years, they have lived in close association with humans, as an integral part of religions and cultures. In the United States, working and zoo Asian elephants have inspired awe, respect, and affection for generations.

WPTI, in cooperation with the India-based Asian Elephant Conservation Centre and the Asian Elephant Specialist Group of the World Conservation Union, has adopted a program to ensure the survival of this species. We have begun surveys in habitat nations, preparations of national plans for elephant conservation in each country, work towards resolution of human-elephant conflicts in agricultural areas, and management strategies for the captive population of elephants for the species' conservation. We are training veterinarians, elephant care givers, and wildlife officials in wild elephant health care.

We have the professionals in place and ready to work, but financial resources to accomplish the important task of rescuing elephants are stretched very thin. The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation has sponsored surveys, and the Liz Claiborne Art Ortenberg Foundation has underwritten the costs of finding some solutions to elephant-human conflicts over agricultural lands. Our many members from all over the United States have pitched in with their contributions. But the small amount from private sources cannot address the overwhelming and urgent need. The Asian Elephant Conservation Act will provide the additional assistance that those of us working to save the elephant need to ensure their survival.—Mary C. Pearl, Ph.D., Executive Director, May 1997.

CONSERVATION AND RESEARCH CENTER,
Front Royal, VA, May 9, 1997.

Hon. JIM SAXTON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife and Oceans, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SAXTON: We understand that you are preparing legislation designed to ensure the conservation of the Asian Elephant.

Beginning in the late 1960's the National Zoo undertook several field studies in Sri Lanka (then Ceylon) which resulted in the first ecological information of its kind. Since the early 1980s, the National Zoo's Conservation & Research Center has pursued several collaborative Initiatives on Asian Elephants with the assistance of the USAID's Program in Science and Technology Cooperation. Some of these projects have aimed at getting a better understanding of the man-domestic elephant relationship, while others attempt to find solutions to the human-elephant conflict. We have trained local wildlife officers how to survey elephant populations, and have examined the population genetics throughout the geographic range. We are currently using satellite telemetry to evaluate the success of translocating crop-raiding elephants to protected areas in Malaysia. In India's southern state of Kerala, we just initiated a study to examine the economics of rural elephants. We have also been seeking funds to complete a study of stress levels in work elephants. In all of these projects we have worked closely with government agencies and non-governmental organizations in different elephant range countries.

No matter where one travels in wild Asia, the tenuous situation of wild elephants is apparent to the critical observer. Relentless human population growth and timber exploitation have fragmented and degraded most forested areas. Ironically, the loss of these vast green spaces will ultimately have dire consequences for people too. The immediate result is competition with people for the same forest and agricultural resources. The reverence with which rural people held elephants in the past to suffice to overcome these conflicts. Human life and livelihood are in danger, and elephant populations are in retreat. Many populations are simply doomed, but large areas can be conserved for the benefit of elephants, wildlife, and people who rely upon ecosystem services such as watersheds, and forest products, etc.

The legislation you are sponsoring is likely to generate public awareness and much needed funds which could be used to solve the recurrent management problems in the conflict areas. Great strides could be made towards the conservation of this magnificent animal on the Asian continent.

We very much hope you are successful in pursuing this legislation and encourage you in your efforts. Please feel free to contact us at any time for any information you may need in putting the bill together.

Respectfully,

CHRIS WEMMER, Ph.D.,
ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR FOR
CONSERVATION.

HANOI, VIETNAM,
May 3, 1997.

Hon. DON YOUNG,
Chairman, Resources Committee, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you in my capacity as a member of the Steering Committee of IUCN's Species Survival Commission (SSC). The SSC is one of six volunteer Commissions with IUCN—The World Conservation Union. The SSC's mission is "to conserve biological diversity by developing and executing programs to study, save, restore and manage wisely species and their habitats". The SSC is made up of over 100 Specialist Groups comprising more than 7,000 scientists, field researchers, natural resources managers, government officials and conservation leaders from almost every country in the world. This global network represents the single greatest source of scientific knowledge about species conservation

in existence. At a regional and national level, the SSC provides advice to governments and NGOs about species conservation needs and helps in identifying priorities.

My own area of specialisation, deep concern and commitment is the conservation of the Asian elephant and its habitat. Over the last 10 years my work in south and south-east Asia has led me to see first hand the enormous problems being faced by this magnificent animal. The species is on the brink of extinction in a vast proportion of its range. This is primarily due to the increasing loss of tropical forests and competition for the remaining resources between growing human populations and elephants. This competition invariably leads to destruction of crops, homes and human lives by elephants wandering out of their limited forest homes, and enraged people retaliating by killing elephants.

We have heard and seen the dramatic decline in numbers of the African elephant in recent years. It is now on the road to recovery due to the tremendous international support given to its plight and the numerous conservation initiatives. The US Government through an Act of Congress has been very much a part of this support mechanism, which is highly commendable. I would urge that a similar initiative on behalf of the Asian elephant be considered by yourself and your eminent colleagues at the Resources Committee. The challenges ahead for us in the field are overwhelming. In spite of the almost intractable problems, many national and international agencies have taken up the challenge and developed strategies to protect this mighty species and its habitat. The support and commitment of your committee to these and other initiatives would be invaluable to the conservation of the Asian elephant.

Yours faithfully,

SHANTHINI DAWSON,
Wildlife Ecologist.

COMMENDING READER'S DIGEST FOR HELPING PARENTS

HON. STEVE LARGENT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to commend Reader's Digest for the April 1997 article "How to Raise Drug-Free Kids." Authors Per Ola and Emily D'Aulaire focus on the vital role that parents play in preventing teenage drug use. I am encouraged by Reader's Digest's positive piece to help parents and encourage others in the media to follow suit.

The authors of the article point out that the love and guidance that parents show toward their children have a profound impact on their children's development and potential drug use. As children go through the normal stages of growth from infancy to adolescence, they develop relationships with their peers that are based on the early bonds that they have formed with their parents. To help prevent drug use, parents need to take an active role in their children's lives and establish strong bonds of love, dedication, and honesty.

Again, I commend Reader's Digest and authors Per Ola and Emily D'Aulaire and encourage others in the media to follow their example. I believe we should encourage parents toward positive solutions to help our kids.

A GOOD BEGINNING

(By Per Ola and Emily D'Aulaire)

When Lauri and Ted Allenbach of Redding, Conn., were married in 1975, they talked about how their kids should be raised. Ted, then 33, had grown up before the drug culture of the '60s. But Lauri, 25, had seen drugs all around her in high school. One girl, high on marijuana, was involved in a near-fatal auto accident. Another got pregnant while stoned on pot. A single evening of "experimentation" would alter her life forever. Together, Ted and Lauri made a commitment to do whatever it took to raise their children to be drug-free.

Early Steps. A parent's actions even before a child's birth are critical to helping that child stay off drugs in later years. Drugs, including nicotine and alcohol, can cross the placental barrier and damage a fetus as early as three weeks after conception. And some research suggests that babies born to addicted mothers may be at higher risk of addiction later in their lives.

In addition, experts agree that loving attention is important in developing lifelong self-worth—and that lack of self-worth is a major reason for drug use. Long before your children are ready for school, establish family guidelines for behavior: honesty, fairness, respect for others and for the law.

First Lessons. As soon as they're old enough to understand, teach your children that some products found around the house, including household cleaners, aerosols and medicines, can be poisonous.

As an adult, Ted Allenbach learned he had diabetes. As part of his treatment, he took prescription medication. He explained to his children—Danna, born in 1978, and Mark, born in 1981—that though the pills were good for him, they could be bad—for them. Drill it into your child: "Don't ever swallow anything new without talking to me first."

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Children five to nine years old still learn mainly by experience. They can slide from fact to fantasy and back again without even realizing it. What they see, however, is very real to them.

Though teachers often achieve herolike status, it's what children encounter at home that counts the most.

"With young children, what's important is not what parents say but what they do," says Ruth-Ann Flynn, a grade-school teacher from Ridgefield, Conn. "If children see their parents drinking and smoking, they're more likely to follow that example."

Most experts agree that it is okay if your kids see you having an occasional drink. But if they see you using alcohol as a regular coping mechanism, it is not. Moreover, don't let your children be involved in your drinking by having them make you a cocktail or bring you a beer.

Good Choices. Now is when to begin teaching your children to make decisions on their own, and to impart "don't be a follower" lessons.

Says Flynn, "I try to make children understand that just because someone tells them to do something, that doesn't mean it's the right thing to do. If they're in doubt, they should ask someone they trust."

By the late elementary-school years many children know of classmates who have begun to smoke, drink or use drugs.

Sniffing Danger. Now is also when kids begin to encounter inhalants: pressurized aerosol products such as paints and cooking sprays or model glue. Kids inhale these volatile substances in order to experience a high. The fact that the momentary "buzz" can cause permanent brain damage, even death, doesn't occur to these youngsters.

One of the most important lessons parents can teach their children at this age is how to

say no. Lauri Allenbach advised her kids to give reasons, such as: "I signed an agreement with my coach that I won't smoke or drink." If all else fails, she told Danna and Mark to make her the villain: "No way. My mom would kill me."

Escape Routes. Help kids stay away from places where they may be pressured to use illegal drugs. If there's a party, they should ask, "Who else is coming?" and "Will your parents be home?" As a last resort, tell your kids if they sense trouble brewing, just get out. Says Viola Nears, a mother of a youngster at an inner-city school, "I tell him if he smells pot in the bathroom at school, leave. Go to another bathroom fast."

Teach your children to be aware of how drugs and alcohol are promoted. Kids nearing their teens are increasingly tuned in to TV, movies and music that bombard them with images of drug and alcohol use. Donna Bell, a Wichita, Kan., coordinator of community participation for the Koch Crime Commission and mother of two drug-free children, kept tabs on what they were watching and listening to. "Just telling me they were going to the movies wasn't enough. My husband and I would ask what movie and check it out. It's work, but you've got to do it."

She also took advantage of "teaching moments." As she says, "If we were watching Saturday TV together and saw an anti-drug commercial, I'd use that as a jumping-off point. You can't start talking to your kids too soon—and as long as you're not badgering or threatening them, and you keep your message brief and upreaching, you can't do it too often."

How do you talk to your kids about drugs? Start anywhere, advises the Partnership for a Drug-Free America, a national coalition. Don't worry about how you kick off the discussion, and don't get discouraged if it seems your kids aren't listening. Make one thing crystal clear: you feel strongly that drugs are dangerous, and you do not want your child to use them.

MIDDLE-SCHOOL MANIA

This is probably the most vulnerable period in a child's life, a time when peer pressure hits with a vengeance. Their hair gets longer or maybe disappears. Their clothes are bizarre, their music funky. Hormones bubbling, kids this age are curious about everything—and willing to try just about anything that makes them look cool.

"This is a vital time for parents to keep all lines of communication open," stresses Caitlin Sims, science teacher and head of the after-school drug program at Usher Middle School in Atlanta. "Too often parents relax their guard, thinking the kids are on their own now. But rushing them into freedom is a recipe for disaster."

Sims advises parents to think of the first year of middle school as a new kindergarten. "There're starting over, suddenly thrown in with older, more sophisticated students," she explains. "Check their book bags. Ask to see their homework. Let them earn their new middle-school responsibility."

Facts, Not Fear. Sims and other educators believe that if kids this age are going to resist the peer pressure and temptations around them, they need to be armed with information—not scare tactics.

"Many messages kids hear are designed to frighten them," notes Lauri Allenbach. "If you drink, you'll become an alcoholic; anyone who does drugs is bad." Then, guess what? They see a friend smoking a little pot at parties, and she's still getting A's. They see a basketball player take a drink, and he's still playing well. The contradiction makes them question the whole message."

One teen reported coming home after having smoked some pot at a party. "My par-

ents were like, 'You're going to be a drug addict and die.' They didn't have a clue about drugs." Without intending to do so, his parents had closed the door to further discussion.

"Most kids today know more about drugs than their parents," says Alan Leshner, director of the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA). "That's why parents need to do their own research and speak accurately about what drugs do."

Keep advice in the here and now. At middle-school age, talking about long-term health threats doesn't have much effect. Kids are concerned with looking good to their peers. Point out that cigarette smoking causes bad breath and could give them yellow fingers, or that if they drink, they might become ill and throw up in front of their friends.

Setting Limits. Many young people use drugs simply because their friends do. To reinforce a child's ability to resist, get to know your child's friends and their parents, and monitor your child's whereabouts.

Steering children toward the right crowd is not always easy. Declaring a friend "off limits" may only make that person more appealing. Says Wichita's Donna Bell: "I advised my girls to choose their friends wisely. 'You lie down with the dogs,' I'd say, 'you're going to get up with fleas.' They'd laugh—but they knew exactly what I meant."

Keeping Busy. Research has shown that when teens are unsupervised and have little to do, they are more likely to experiment with drinking and drugs. Keep children involved and busy.

When Atlanta's Caitlin Sims first began teaching, her principal gave a friendly warning: "If you don't give them something to do, they'll give you something to do."

As Sims recalls, "It was good advice for me, but in truth it's good advice for the parents of any middle-school child." Extracurricular activities and chores at home keep kids busy and add to their sense of responsibility.

Staying Involved. "Twenty years of scientific research have shown that direct parental involvement in the life of the child is the most protective factor in increasing the odds that a kid will remain drug-free," says NIDA's Alan Leshner.

Lithangia Murray, an Atlanta mother of two, puts involvement at the top of her list of ways to raise a drug-free child. "Parents aren't a key—they're the key," she says. "You have to be a part of your children's lives and be aware of any changes in their behavior."

U.S. Secretary of Education Richard W. Riley urges parents to visit their child's school and talk to teachers and administrators. Find out what you can do to improve drug-prevention programs.

HIGH-SCHOOL TESTS

Peer pressure still holds sway. Being accepted as one of the gang is a top priority. And though susceptibility to influence may be less than it was during the middle-school years, exposure to drugs and alcohol is even greater—especially once a teen gets a driver's license.

Kids this age need to be reminded that as bad as drugs and alcohol are for their bodies, what those substances can make them do can be equally dangerous. Joseph A. Califano, Jr., former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare and now president of The National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University in New York City, notes that getting involved in an automobile accident when high can result in being killed or maimed, or killing or maiming someone else. "Smoking marijuana," he warns, "is like playing Russian roulette."

Some kids are going to get hit with the bullet in the chamber and have their lives permanently affected."

A hot question among baby-boomer parents today is: "What can I say to my kids if I smoked pot when I was younger?" If confronted by your children, be open and honest. Author Peggy Noonan, who experimented with pot in college, offers this advice to other parents: "You did it, and it was wrong—be an adult and say so. It's one thing to be ambivalent about your own choices. It's another to be ambivalent about your child's."

To every parent the U.S. Department of Education offers these words of advice: "Setting rules for a child is only half the job. Parents must be prepared to enforce the penalties when the rules are broken." Experts recommend:

Be specific. Make sure your child knows what the rules are, the reasons for them and what the consequences will be if they're broken. When Mark and Danna Allenbach neared driving age, their father told them, "If either of you ever drink and drive, you can say goodbye to anything to do with our cars. There will be no second chances. Once, and it's over. You're too important to lose."

Be consistent. "Just saying no" can be as hard for parents as it is for a kid. Sometimes caving in to a persistent request is the path of least resistance. But if the answer to a request should be no, stick to it.

Be reasonable. Don't add new consequences after a rule is broken, and make sure the punishment is appropriate. "Consequences are most effective when they fit the infraction," says Olive O'Donnell, education director of the National Family Partnership, a substance-abuse prevention group in St. Louis. "Grounding may be appropriate for a broken curfew, but it's meaningless when applied to something such as not making the bed."

Keep Listening. According to the Partnership for a Drug-Free America, it's important that parents "don't do all the talking." If you listen carefully to your children and read between the lines, you can learn a lot about what they think about drugs—and help them avoid the pitfalls.

To keep children away from drugs, one thing is clear: schools, community, religious institutions, the police—all of them can help. But no one can replace the family.

Lauri and Ted Allenbach invested a lot of time fulfilling their commitment to raise their children to be drug-free. It has paid off—neither child has been involved with alcohol or drugs. "You have to have control over your life," says Danna, now a freshman at James Madison University in Harrisonburg, VA. Mark, a high-school sophomore, has no interest in drugs. "I'm pretty confident," he says. "I don't think I'm going to fold."

The work that parents do is critical. Experts agree it is highly likely that youngsters who don't do drugs as teens will not do drugs as adults.

Talk to your children. Listen to them. Set standards of right and wrong. Keep in mind that they learn by example. Love, support and praise them so they will have a sense of self-worth. Keep them busy. Be involved with—and on top of—their lives. Educate yourself about drugs.

Remember, don't let your silence be acceptance.

TRIBUTE TO EDWARD A. CARTER

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Edward A. Carter, a man who believes in working within his community as though it is his home, and with his neighbors as though they are his family. Mr. Edward A. Carter was born in Richmond, VA. At the age of 2 he moved to the Bensonhurst section of Brooklyn where he attended public school and graduated with honors.

Mr. Carter enlisted in the military services in 1950 and served in the 715th AA Battalion. After receiving his B.S. degree at LaSalle University, Mr. Carter enlisted in the U.S. Air Force and served overseas. Edward Carter received several commendations of merit and four honorable discharges, one from the U.S. Army, and three from the U.S. Air Force.

After retiring from the Armed Forces, he moved to the Fort Greene section of Brooklyn where he has participated in many social, civic, and fraternal organizations. As the executive director and founder of the Fort Greene Youth Patrol Inc., Mr. Carter serves the needs of hundreds of inner city youth, young adults, and senior citizens. As a founding board member of the Brooklyn Navy Yard, he served as chairman of the Parks and Public Safety Committee for 20 years. Mr. Carter is also the co-founder and vice chairman of the Fort Greene Senior Citizens Council which serves 900 or more senior citizens, Greene Community Corp.

Mr. Carter is extremely active in veterans affairs and simultaneously works with Cumberland Neighborhood Family Clinic and the Veteran Association. Mr. Carter is a 20-year board member for the Selective Services No. 145 in Brooklyn, and a member of the American Legion.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in saluting Mr. Edward A. Carter for his outstanding contribution to the Armed Forces and to the people of the Fort Greene community in Brooklyn.

TRIBUTE TO REV. JAMES L. GLEESE

HON. HAROLD E. FORD, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to remember and pay tribute to the late Reverend James L. Gleese. Reverend Gleese's recent passing will result in a tremendous void in our community. He was a selfless and giving man, seeking to serve rather than be served, to praise rather than be praised, and to glorify rather than be glorified.

After entering the ministry in 1945, Reverend Gleese acted in the benevolent service of his fellow man. In 1954, he founded and operated the Beale Street Mission, which housed homeless men, giving them counseling, employment assistance, and spiritual guidance. He devoted his evenings to the Youth For Christ Ministry, an outreach to young people in the Beale Street area of Memphis. Reverend Gleese led the A.M.E.

Church as presiding elder of the North Memphis district. Through his vision, hard work, and determination, he founded Pearl Street A.M.E. Church and West Point A.M.E. Church. He also fulfilled his service to the greater community by involving himself extensively in civic affairs.

Reverend Gleese will be remembered as a noble spirit and fearless warrior, one who stood tall among his peers and who stood firm in his beliefs. His work in the church and the community and his devotion to his family and friends will be his enduring legacy. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues join me in honoring and remembering this paragon of inspiration and decorated soldier of the cloth, the late Reverend James L. Gleese.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO RAISE THE INDIVIDUAL LIFETIME CAP ON HEALTH INSURANCE

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased today to introduce legislation to raise the individual cap on lifetime health insurance payments to \$10 million for group insurance coverage.

The current standard lifetime cap is like a dinosaur from Jurassic Park—a relic from another age that can still be hazardous to those who get in its way. A million dollar cap was fine when it was established in the early 1970's. But inflation has sent medical costs skyrocketing and forced thousands of Americans to bump up against that payment ceiling. As a result, some patients who desperately require medical attention are plowing through their savings and ending up on public assistance just to pay their doctor bills. Since anyone can be hit at any time with a disabling disease or traumatic injury—resulting from everything from AIDS to car accidents—this initiative will benefit a wide range of people.

The legislation would amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act and the Public Health Service Act to raise the lifetime cap from the typical existing limit of \$1 million to \$5 million in 1998 and \$10 million in 2002. It would exclude employers with fewer than 20 workers. Over 150 national health-related non-partisan groups have endorsed the measure.

At present, approximately one quarter of employer-sponsored health plans have no lifetime limit. Unfortunately, many people don't realize that their health insurance policies have a lifetime cap that could be easily exceeded if a catastrophic illness or injury occurred. If the industry standard of a \$1 million cap were indexed for medical inflation since 1970, it would be worth between \$10 million and \$15 million today. The American Academy of Actuaries found that raising the lifetime cap on large employers would likely require a premium increase of only \$7 per year per adult to cover between \$500,000 and \$1 million.

According to the accounting firm of Price Waterhouse, 1,500 people exhaust their lifetime payments under their private health insurance each year and have no choice but to impoverish themselves and their families to qualify for Medicaid. The firm estimates that an additional 10,000 people will reach their lifetime

payment limits in the next 5 years. Lifetime caps are particularly devastating to those who become seriously ill, disabled, or injured at an early age. Some children born with certain cancers or hemophilia reach their lifetime cap by the time they are 10 years old.

Raising the payment cap will not only provide more payments for patients, but also save money for the Federal Government. Price Waterhouse estimates that raising the caps would save approximately \$7 billion for the Medicaid program over 7 years because people would not be forced to turn to the Federal Government as the health-care provider of last resort.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

IN MEMORY OF JOE MAYER

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the memory of Joe Mayer, whose radio show and personality were known to many admirers in Cleveland, the rock 'n' roll capital of America.

Joe was born in Cleveland and went to high school in Fairview Park. He served in the U.S. Navy as a radioman during World War II.

Joe's radio career spanned more than 34 years. He made his debut in 1953 at WEOL in Elyria. He grew in popularity along with rock 'n' roll at stations WHK and WGAR.

When the Beatles came to Cleveland in 1964, Joe put them up in his home. He was master of ceremonies for the Rolling Stones' first Cleveland concert.

Joe and rock 'n' roll were bound together in Cleveland's music consciousness.

His voice, energy, and personality will be greatly missed.

CELEBRATING THE LEGACY OF ADOLPHUS ANTHONY "DOC" CHEATHAM

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to pay tribute to Adolphus Anthony "Doc" Cheatham who died Monday, June 2, at age 91, at George Washington University Hospital in Washington, DC. A native of Nashville, TN, Cheatham would have celebrated his 92nd birthday on June 13. He had just completed an engagement at Blues Alley, a world renowned jazz club.

The Nation and the African-American community have lost a major cultural figure. Cheatham was one of the few musicians still active whose career reached all the way back to the beginnings of the jazz revolution in American music. He could count the legendary Joe "King" Oliver as a mentor, and the even more legendary Louis "Pops" Armstrong as a peer.

It was remarkable and quite wonderful that "Doc," as he was affectionately known, was still performing on so demanding an instru-

ment as the trumpet at 91. At the time of his passing, Cheatham was touring with 23-year-old trumpet phenomenon Nicholas Payton. Their performances, as well as their recently released recording, were widely praised in both the general and the jazz press.

Washington Post writer Richard Harrington characterized their efforts as a "cross-generational communion full of timeless verve and abundant joy." His colleague Geoffrey Himes noted that "despite their immense age difference Cheatham and Payton find common ground in their shared affection for Louis Armstrong." Whitney Balliet of the New Yorker described Cheatham's playing as "complete and jubilant."

Early in his career, Cheatham played saxophone, in addition to cornet and trumpet. In fact, on one of his earliest recordings he accompanied the classic blues singer Ma Rainey exclusively on soprano saxophone. Accompanying blues and jazz vocalists was one of Cheatham's strengths. He was a favored accompanist for such outstanding vocal stylists as Bessie Smith, Ethel Waters, and Billie Holiday.

For most of his career, Cheatham was highly regarded as a first chair trumpeter. At one point or another Cheatham was associated with just about every significant big band, including those of Chick Webb, Cab Calloway, Teddy Wilson, Benny Carter, Benny Goodman, and Count Basie. He was also active in Latin Jazz, performing with the likes of Perez Prado, Tito Puente, Ricardo Rey, and the great Machito. His small group associations included stints with the Eddie Heywood Sextet, Herbie Mann, and the Wilbur DeParis' "New" New Orleans Jazz Band.

Late in his career, Cheatham remade himself as a jazz soloist, vocalist stylist, and raconteur. He became a regular on the festival circuit. Among the club venues he frequently played was New York City's Sweet Basil, where he held forth at Sunday Brunch nearly every Sunday for 17 years. He was fond of telling his audiences that he had earmarked on his second career.

Cheatham was one of the most beloved figures in Jazz and a true national treasure. He was a link to the beginning, a first person witness who had also been an important practitioner from the very early days of Jazz. He breathed the essence of Jazz through his horn and did so with a great sweetness and humility. The jazz world was fortunate that he was active for so long and that he was able to pass along his knowledge and understanding to artists who will carry the flame of Jazz into the next century.

SALUTE TO THE MAYOR'S CHARITY BALL

HON. MICHAEL PAPPAS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize this year's 5th annual Township of Marlboro Mayor's Charity Ball. The ball will take place tomorrow at the Robert B. Meyner Reception Center at the P.N.C. Arts Center in Holmdel, NJ.

The mayor's ball was an initiative that Mayor Scannapieco first began working on

some years ago. The ball is the largest annual event to raise funds for the Marlboro Improvement and Cultural Fund, Inc.

The fund is a charitable, nonpartisan organization which raises money, instead of utilizing tax dollars, to have some of the community needs met. In the past, this innovative fund has assisted by purchasing needed equipment, supporting summer concerts, supporting the Memorial Day parade, little league, the young ambassador program, soccer activities, Pop Warner football, Holocaust programs, and other special projects.

At a time when so many townships and local governments must stretch every dollar, it is reassuring to see such innovative measures by the Township of Marlboro to find ways of providing for the needs of the Township and its residents.

This year, the honoree for the ball is Nancy Horowitz, chairperson and founder of the Marlboro Township Municipal Alliance, a group that works to combat substance abuse.

Nancy is a 22-year resident of Marlboro Township and she has been a volunteer for 21 of those years. A teacher for 33 years and a drug and alcohol abuse counselor for 12 years, Nancy has brought to Marlboro Township her expertise, concern and dedication to the welfare of others. In 1990, Nancy founded and continues to chair the Marlboro Township Alliance for the Prevention of Substance Abuse.

Nancy has raised the consciousness of the people of Marlboro Township from school children to senior citizens, making them aware of the effects of drugs and alcohol and of their responsibility to make the right choices for themselves and the community at large. Nancy has helped to continue Marlboro's commitment of taking care of its own.

I applaud the efforts of those involved that have worked so hard on the mayor's ball, Nancy Horowitz, this year's honoree, the Marlboro Township Municipal Alliance, and the citizens involved with the Marlboro Improvement and Cultural Fund.

TRIBUTE TO DARREN K. PEARSON

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend an established entrepreneur, Darren K. Pearson. He developed and is currently running three businesses in Brooklyn and Queens, NY.

Mr. Pearson's businesses include a full-service real estate firm, apartment building management, and construction and maintenance. Before becoming involved in real estate, Darren worked as an account executive for Amergold Corp. He also worked for Vanguard Oil as a fuel salesman in the commercial and barge departments. His duties included fuel sales to Con Edison, PSE&G, and LILCO. He was subsequently promoted to director of public relations for Vanguard and was responsible for the home oil transfer program, which provided oil to needy families at either a discount or no cost. His success in that position led to his promotion to vice president of procurement and industrial sales for Vanco Oil Co., a subsidiary of Vanguard.

Darren is the chairman of the Men's Caucus for Congressman TOWNS, a member of 100 Black Men, Inc., and senator David Patterson's Progressive Professional Network. As a young businessman, Darren hires and trains college-bound students as trainees in real estate management and office administration. I am pleased to introduce him to my House colleagues.

IN COMMEMORATING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VILLAGE CONDOMINIUM

HON. JOSEPH P. KENNEDY II

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Village Condominium.

In 1910, the site of the Village Condominium was a working farm and piggery. It was not until 1947 that 308 apartments were built on the site of this farm. In 1971 these apartments became condominiums in the largest condominium conversion in Massachusetts. No one could have imagined that 25 years later, the Village Condominium would set standards for other condominiums statewide.

The Village Condominium pressed for certain rights which they were entitled to, thus providing strong leadership for all other condominiums in the area. The Village Condominium Association is an example of citizens working together to achieve a common goal. The result is an affordable, efficiently run condominium.

I am pleased to join my colleagues in commemorating the 25th anniversary of the Village Condominium.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN H. SENGSTACKE

HON. HAROLD E. FORD, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to remember and pay tribute to the late John Herman Henry Sengstacke, a pioneer in journalism and an ardent defender of the first amendment.

As founder of the Chicago Defender and the National Newspaper Publishers Association and publisher of the Tri-State Defender in Memphis and many other African-American newspapers, John Sengstacke made African-American journalism a potent force in journalism, as well as social and political change in the United States. Through his coverage of and participation in the major civil rights issues of his day, Mr. Sengstacke created opportunities for hundreds of thousands of Americans.

During the Roosevelt administration, he became the first African-American journalist to gain press credentials to cover the White House. He was a war correspondent in Europe during World War II and played an influential role in integrating the Armed Forces by convincing Eleanor Roosevelt to visit the Tuskegee Institute, leading to the establishment of the Tuskegee Airmen. After World

War II, President Harry S. Truman appointed Mr. Sengstacke to serve on the Presidential committee to end segregation in the military. He served on a subsequent committee overseeing military integration in the Kennedy administration.

Mr. Sengstacke was highly respected by all of his colleagues as a newspaperman and a journalist. He was the first African-American member of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, the American Newspaper Publishers Association, and the Pulitzer Award Committee.

Mr. Speaker, President Lyndon B. Johnson once said our "freedom is fragile if citizens are ignorant." John Sengstacke, through his commitment to getting facts to the public, strengthened freedom in the United States. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring and remembering him.

TRIBUTE TO THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MS. FOUNDATION

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in tribute to the Ms. Foundation for 25 years of championing the rights and needs of women and girls. The Ms. Foundation celebrated this milestone on Thursday, May 29, 1997, with a gala dinner and awards ceremony in New York City.

The Ms. Foundation for Women is a national, multi-issue, public fund. It was founded in 1972 and supports the efforts of women and girls to govern their own lives and to influence the world around them. The mission of the foundation is to fund and assist women's self-help organizing efforts, and pursue changes in public consciousness, law, philanthropy, and social policy. In the 1996 fiscal year, the Ms. Foundation awarded a total of \$1,665,700 in grants and technical assistance to programs in the areas of economic security, leadership for young women and girls, and health and safety. I am pleased to add that the Ms. Foundation is the creator of the Take Our Daughters to Work Day campaign.

This year the Ms. Foundation honored nine 1997 Women of Vision Awardees. Those honored for organizing work were Justine Andronici, Nohelia Canales, and Dee Martin for a project of the Feminist Majority Foundation; Ellen Bravo of the National Association of Working Women, Frances Kissling from Catholics for a Free Choice; Rinku Sen of the Center for Third World Organizing. For philanthropy, Ann R. Roberts, the Ford Foundation and the American Express Company were each honored.

It is my great pleasure to acknowledge the 25-year anniversary of the Ms. Foundation. With the very capable stewardship of Marie Wilson, executive director and the dedicated board of trustees, the Ms. Foundation will continue to provide an essential resource for those who strive to improve the lives of women. I ask my colleagues in this Chamber to rise with me in honor of the extraordinary contribution the Ms. Foundation has made.

HAPPY ANNIVERSARY TO RAUL AND MINA BESTEIRO

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the 40th anniversary of two truly great Americans, Raul and Mina Besteiro of Brownsville, TX, on June 8, 1997.

I cannot begin to tell you how much the Besteiros have given to Brownsville, the greater south Texas area, and our country. Raul Besteiro, an adjunct professor with the Alternative Certification program at the University of Texas-Brownsville, was recently elected president of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, a 101-year-old educational institution. Mr. B began his teaching career in 1958, moving quickly up through the leadership of the Brownsville Independent School District, eventually becoming superintendent and introducing a new educational concept at the State's largest high school.

Mr. B, as Raul is known affectionately known around south Texas, has spent his entire life working to make our community a better place. He has made our community a better place by serving as a consultant to the Port of Brownsville, making the local concerns of the community and the port authority known to lawmakers. His expertise is focused on matters relating to the Gulf of Mexico and the south Texas rail system. He has served as a member of the Brownsville Rio Grande International Railroad and the Texas Turnpike Authority.

The love and strength of his wife, Mina, has made all these things possible. Without her constant support and understanding, he would not be able to do the demanding work he does on behalf of the community. Mina is also an educator, starting as a school teacher at BISD. She has dedicated her life to her children and her family. Her long-term commitment has enabled her husband and her children to be so wildly successful.

People say the measure of a family's character is most evident in their children. The Besteiro children are a tribute to the loving foundation built by their parents. Mr. B and Mina raised children, all of whom are professionals and many of whom have following in their father's footsteps and chosen education as a vocation. All the Besteiro children—Mina, Pila, Lucy, Adriana, Cess, and Raul III—are valuable citizens in the south Texas community.

I ask my colleagues to join me in commending Raul and Mina for their long-lasting journey of marriage and family.

SALUTING NEW YORKERS WHO SUPPORT ISTEAL

HON. MAURICE D. HINCHEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise today to applaud and thank a group of bicyclists from New York State who I had the pleasure of meeting with yesterday. They had

biked from Hastings, NY, to Washington, DC, to demonstrate their commitment to alternative transportation—most especially to the bicycle and pedestrian provisions which are currently contained in the intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act [ISTEA].

I especially want to salute one of my constituents, Dave Gordon, who was injured on the bike ride to Washington. Because of his injury, Dave could not complete his mission, but I for one do not doubt his commitment to a cleaner environment and to transportation alternatives. We need more people like him in this world.

Mr. Speaker, because of the example and fortitude of these bicyclists I would like to urge all of my colleagues to seriously consider renewing our commitment to transportation alternatives and to a cleaner environment, for ourselves and for future generations, as we debate the reauthorization of ISTEA this summer.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR STROM THURMOND

HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, on May 25, Senator STROM THURMOND became the longest serving U.S. Senator in the history of our Nation. It is a pleasure for me to join those who are honoring him on his distinguished career.

Senator THURMOND is a truly amazing person. He has served the people of South Carolina as a teacher, athletic coach, county superintendent of education, city attorney, county attorney, State senator, State circuit judge, Governor, and U.S. Senator. He has also been a candidate for President of the United States, carrying four States and receiving 39 electoral votes, and he is the first person in the history of our country to be elected to a Federal office as a write-in candidate, in his election to the U.S. Senate in 1954. He volunteered for active duty in World War II on the day that war was declared by the United States against Germany, serving with distinction in the American, European, and Pacific Theaters, and he participated in the "D-Day" invasion in Normandy. He also served in the U.S. Army Reserve for 36 years, retiring as a Major General.

Throughout his outstanding career, Senator THURMOND has tirelessly dedicated himself to helping others. So many people have benefited from his efforts on their behalf. Also, Senator THURMOND has an extraordinary legislative record. During his service in the Senate, he has crafted volumes of key legislation and he has led the debate to keep our country strong and free.

Senator THURMOND is a true patriot, a valiant Army officer, a statesman of the highest order, and a true friend to all who know him. Our Nation has been blessed with his leadership and stewardship. Senator STROM THURMOND is a great American hero. He is wished much continued success.

HONORING BARBARA FAISON

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Barbara Faison who is a hard worker and is dedicated to her family, friends, and community.

Barbara Faison started her community in the late sixties, when East New York was experiencing a race riot. She worked with the Congress of Racial Equality [CORE], under the leadership of Roy Innis. She also worked for former New York Mayor John Lindsey who asked her to serve as a youth liaison in the East New York community.

Barbara became a union representative of Local 144 and a housing activist where she assisted homeowners who were confronted with eviction. She also established "hot lines" for abused children and served on the area policy board. Her community work at St. Gabriel's Church also included efforts to feed sick, poor, and homeless people in the surrounding neighborhoods. Additionally, Ms. Faison is a member of the Rosetta Gaston Club. Barbara has remained active in both youth and senior citizen issues. I am pleased to recognize her many contributions.

RECOGNIZING THE DELHAVEN COMMUNITY CENTER ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 25th ANNIVERSARY

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Delhaven Community Center of La Puente, CA, on the occasion of its 25th anniversary. On Saturday, June 7, 1997, Delhaven will celebrate its 25th annual volunteer recognition dinner, honoring those who have helped in Delhaven's growth and service to the San Gabriel Valley.

Delhaven's successful growth is a result of the exemplary services the center provides and offers to area residents. Founded in June 1972 by Barbara and Wyatt Seal, Delhaven serves the greater La Puente community through numerous services at no or low cost to residents. Programs for the developmentally disabled, for children, and for youth are the central focus of Delhaven's efforts. These services include after school activities, a social service club, assistance programs for at risk children, and social welfare programs which include emergency food and clothing assistance programs. The growth of these programs is testimony to the successful efforts of the Seal family and the thousands of volunteers who give selflessly of their time.

Among its many offerings, Delhaven's summer camp program exemplifies the tremendous growth the center has undergone over the past 25 years. In 1972, Delhaven began a 2-week summer camp with 23 participants. Since that time, it has grown to 14 weeks of summer camp with over 900 participants. It has also grown from just 6 volunteers to over 600, and has increased the programs it offers

from 6 to over 20. Additionally, Delhaven has grown from 2 volunteer staff members to 28 full- or part-time paid staff.

Delhaven has been able to provide these services over the past 25 years because of its volunteers. Throughout the years, over 3,500 selfless individuals have helped Delhaven in its efforts to meet the community's needs. I commend each and every one of the volunteers who, over the past 25 years, have helped to make Delhaven a model community center.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask my colleagues to join me in saluting the spirit of voluntary service that has flourished at Delhaven Community Center under the leadership of the Seal family over the past 25 years, and to join me in congratulating Delhaven on its 25th anniversary.

INTRODUCING THE FAMILY EDUCATION FREEDOM ACT

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Family Education Freedom Act of 1997, a bill to empower millions of working-and-middle class Americans to choose a non-public education for their children, as well as making it easier for parents to actively participate in improving public schools. The Family Education Freedom Act accomplishes its goals by allowing American parents a tax credit of up to \$3,000 for the expenses incurred in sending their children to private, public, parochial, other religious school, or for home schooling their children.

The Family Education Freedom Act returns the fundamental principal of a truly free economy to America's education system; what the great economist Ludwig von Mises called "consumer sovereignty." Consumer sovereignty simply means consumers decide who succeeds or fails in the market. Businesses that best satisfy consumer demand will be the most successful. Consumer sovereignty is the means by which the free market maximizes human happiness.

Currently, consumers are less than sovereign in the education market. Funding decisions are increasingly controlled by the Federal Government. Because "he who pays the piper calls the tune," public and even private schools, are paying greater attention to the dictates of Federal educators while ignoring the wishes of the parents to an ever-greater degree. As such, the lack of consumer sovereignty in education is destroying parental control of education and replacing it with state control.

Loss of control is a key reason why so many of America's parents express dissatisfaction with the educational system. According to a study by the well-respected public opinion firm Fibrizio, McLaughlin and Associates, Americans want Congress to get the Federal bureaucracy out of the schoolroom and give them more control over their children's education.

Today, Congress can fulfill the wishes of the American people for greater control over their children's education by simply allowing parents to keep more of their hard-earned money to spend on education rather than force them

to send it to Washington to support education programs reflective only of the values and priorities of Congress and the Federal bureaucracy, not the parents.

The \$3,000 tax credit will make a better education affordable for millions of parents. Mr. Speaker, many parents who would choose to send their children to private, religious, or parochial schools are unable to afford the tuition, in large part because of the enormous tax burden imposed on the American family by Washington.

The Family Education Freedom Act also benefits parents who choose to send their children to public schools. Although public schools are traditionally financed through local taxes, increasingly, parents who wish their children to receive a quality education may wish to use their credit to improve their schools by helping financing the purchase of educational tools such as computers or extracurricular activities such as music programs. Parents of public school students may also wish to use the credit to pay for special services for their children.

Greater parental support and involvement is surely a better way to improve public schools than funneling more Federal tax dollars, followed by greater Federal control, into the public schools. Furthermore, a greater reliance on parental expenditures rather than Government tax dollars will help make the public schools into true community schools that reflect the wishes of parents and the interests of the students.

The Family Education Freedom Act will also aide those parents who choose to educate their children at home. Home schooling has become an increasingly popular, and successful method, of educating children. According to recent studies, home schooled children outperform their public school peers by 30 to 37 percentile points across all subjects on nationally normed, standardized achievement exams. Home schooling parents spend thousands of dollars annually, in addition to the wages foregone by the spouse who foregoes outside employment, in order to educate their children in the loving environment of the home.

Ultimately, Mr. Speaker, this bill is about freedom. Parental control of child rearing, especially education, is one of the bulwarks of liberty. No nation can remain free when the State has greater influence over the knowledge and values transmitted to children than the family.

By moving to restore the primacy of parents to education, the Family Education Freedom Act will not only improve America's education, it will restore a parent's right to choose how best to educate one's own child, a fundamental freedom that has been eroded by the increase in Federal education expenditures and the corresponding decrease in the ability of parents to provide for their children's education out of their own pockets. I call on all my colleagues to join me in allowing parents to devote more of their resources to their children's education and less to feed the wasteful Washington bureaucracy by supporting the Family Education Freedom Act.

THE IMPORTANCE OF OUR BILATERAL RELATIONSHIP WITH THE REPUBLIC OF THE MARSHALL ISLANDS: A 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing House Concurrent Resolution , a resolution that reconfirms the importance of our bilateral relationship with the Republic of the Marshall Islands.

April 2, 1997 was the 50th anniversary of a special political relationship and strategic partnership between the United States and the people of the Marshall Islands. On that date in 1947, the Security Council of the United Nations approved the Trusteeship Agreement for the Former Japanese Mandated Islands.

This agreement was negotiated by the Truman administration and gave the United States strategic control of a vast area of the Pacific formerly held by Japan as a League of Nations Mandate. What became known under U.S. law as the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands [TTPI] was the only U.N. trusteeship out of eleven created after WWII classified by the Security Council as "strategic."

Recognition of the strategic nature of the U.S. administration of the TTPI was appropriate in light of the fact that in 1946, while the islands were still under military occupation following the end of hostilities that ended Japanese rule, the U.S. already had commenced its vital nuclear weapons testing program at Bikini in the Marshall Islands.

In 1946 President Truman had sent a young Congressman from Montana on an inspection trip to the region. Mike Mansfield came back and argued eloquently on the floor of the House that the Congress should approve the trusteeship agreement with the United Nations because the U.S. national interest would be served by strategic control of the islands. He was right.

The 2,000 Marshall Islands became the focal point of the U.S. strategic program. In addition to the nuclear testing program at Bikini and Enewetak from 1946 to 1958 the United States has maintained one of its most vital military installations anywhere on earth in the Marshall Islands throughout the second half of this century; the Mid-Pacific Missile Testing Range at Kwajalein Atoll.

Thus, while the U.S. also has maintained relations with the other island groups in the region, the relationship with the Marshall Islands has been a special strategic partnership. This was recognized in the bilateral agreements between the U.S. and the Marshall Islands which were concluded at the time the U.N. trusteeship was terminated based on entry into force of the Compact of Free Association.

For example, the separate bilateral agreements with the Republic of the Marshall Islands included not only the military base rights at Kwajalein, but the agreement establishing the framework within which the U.S. would continue after termination of the trusteeship to address the effects of the nuclear testing program on the people of the Marshall Islands and their homelands. For these island peoples, the nuclear testing program is a legacy that looms as large in their lives as WWII does in the American experience.

In other words, it is a legacy of fortitude in the face of a threat to survival itself. The U.S. nuclear testing program in the cold war era, far more than the fact that major battles of WWII itself had taken place in the Marshalls, was the defining experience of the Marshallese people in this century.

Obviously, there have been legal claims and controversies arising from the intrusion of the nuclear age into the world of the islanders. But this resolution recognizes that out of the adversity there was also forged an alliance that has been sustained throughout the years. The Marshallese people had the wisdom to recognize that the United States was playing a vital role in the maintenance of international peace and security, and although they demanded justice and the redress of injuries as all people have the right to do, the Marshallese people and their leaders never turned their back on the U.S. when we needed them as a strategic partner.

During the twilight years of the cold war the Marshall Islands stood by the United States even though they had far more reasons—if they had wanted them—to move out of alignment with this nation than many of those governments which did just that. The Marshalls, however, never viewed the close political and strategic partnership with the U.S. as an unmanageable constraint on their cultural and political identity as a nation.

Thus, the relationship between the Republic of the Marshall Islands and the United States represents not only a successful strategic partnership, but a successful process of decolonization consistent with the goals of the U.N. trusteeship system. This is a foreign policy success of which the Congress and the people of the United States should be proud. Understanding and sustaining this success may have significance for the U.S. in its relations with other peoples and nations as well, and this should not be overlooked.

This is a special relationship which we cannot allow to be neglected or unduly diminished as a result of ill-conceived policies which do not take into account the legacy of the past and the prospects for the future. Narrow thinking based on short-term priorities should not control the determination of how this relationship will be managed as the first term of the Compact of Free Association comes to an end. Congress must take responsibility to exercise oversight with respect to the formulation of a long-term policy for our bilateral relationship with the Marshall Islands.

As an ally and strategic partner, the Republic of the Marshall Islands has paid a uniquely high price to define its national interest in a manner that also has been compatible with vital U.S. national interests. That is what an alliance is in its most essential form, and that is what Congress will recognize by adopting this resolution. I urge my colleagues to support House Concurrent Resolution .

REPORT FROM INDIANA—RON CLARK

HON. DAVID M. MCINTOSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to give my Report from Indiana.

In the Second Congressional District of Indiana there are so many good people.

Good people doing good things.

In my book, these special individuals are Hoosier Heroes.

Hoosier Heroes because they have dedicated their lives to helping others.

Mr. Speaker, Ron Clark of Anderson, IN, is a Hoosier Hero.

For the past 31 years of his life, he has dedicated himself to the admirable profession of teaching.

He taught honors English and drama with passion that inspires.

This senior thespian enthusiastically directed lives on and off the stage, offering guidance to the young men and women of Highland High School.

He touched young lives in their formative years, building up their self-confidence and nurturing their love for theater. Ron left an indelible impression on all those who took his class.

He took kids with special needs and nurtured them with an unconventional teaching style, engaging children at their own level.

Principal Brown of Highland High School called him an "exemplary teacher and excellent role model."

Mr. Brown told the tale of how Mr. Clark took a troubled child who was misguided and got him on the right path by involving him with acting.

Ron inspired a number of students to pursue theater in college. But regardless of whether they pursued theater or not, each developed a special appreciation of the stage, giving them a taste of the magic that so many dream of.

Former drama department chair and colleague Linda Trout remarked, "He always picked challenging plays and put on two a year, which is one more than people usually do. And he got students involved with everything from directing to making the props. He even wanted to get kids from the junior high school involved."

Ron was always going out of his way to help the students, conducting numerous workshops for the local junior high school. In fact, he took students to New York every year for workshops and Broadway plays. This is the kind of man he was.

He was given the "Hoosier Teacher of the Year" award by the Indiana Teachers of English in recognition for his excellence in teaching.

At the farewell production, a play of Dickens' "A Tale of Two Cities" was performed to an audience of grateful students, parents, and alumni.

Former students from across the country embarked on the pilgrimage back to their old high school, just to see their beloved mentor.

They brought gifts and congratulations, thanking Ron for making such an impact on their lives. His wife, Sandra, compiled a book of letters written by appreciative faculty, staff, and students.

This was the last play in the career of Ron Clark—the final act in a rich and memorable life of teaching children.

On the final day at school, he said to Principal Brown, "I'm retired but I'm not done. If you ever need me to come and help at school, just let me know."

And for that reason, Ron Clark of Anderson, IN, is a Hoosier Hero.

Mr. Speaker, that is my Report from Indiana.

TRIBUTE TO WES BISGAARD

HON. DUNCAN L. HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the remarkable dedication and contributions of a constituent in my district, Mr. Wes Bisgaard of Holtville, CA. Wes is the manager of the Imperial County Farm Bureau, but he will soon be retiring and I would like to take a moment to commend his devoted service to his community.

The Bisgaard family's move to California reads like the "Grapes of Wrath". After the dust bowl the family moved from their farm in North Dakota to California where they joined other family members in operating a dairy farm. Later, the family members began their own farm in Holtville, CA, where they remain today.

During World War II, Wes worked for Douglas Aircraft on the new DC-3, and later became a quality control supervisor as the DC-4, the first pressurized aircraft, was developed. This plane was later appropriated by the Federal Government as a war transport plane and renamed the C-54. During this period Wes met and married Mildred "Millie" Eppelman.

In 1952, Wes and Millie along with their two children, Karen and Christopher, moved to Imperial Valley to join his brother and once again take up his first love: farming. The Bisgaard brothers farmed 1,000 acres in alfalfa, lettuce, cotton, sugar beets, barley, cabbage, and later wheat for seed.

Agriculture is of critical importance to Imperial Valley. Since he arrived in Holtville, Wes has been a very active member of the local and State farming community, serving on a number of advisory boards and commissions. Wes has been a director of the Imperial County Farm Bureau for over 40 years. During that time he served as president of the bureau early in its history, then again from 1990 through 1994, and is now its manager. He served as director for District 1, San Diego and Imperial Counties, of the California Farm Bureau Federation for 11 years, as well as director for its Cal-Farm Insurance Bureau and the Cal-Farm Life Insurance Co. Wes is a 30-year member, and first chairman, for the Cotton Pest Control Board of the California Department of Food and Agriculture. On the international front, Wes has served for nearly 30 years as cochairman of the International Cotton Pest Work Committee, which coordinates scientific information developed by both the United States and Mexico.

Salinas Lettuce Marketing Coop helped Imperial Valley farmers form the Highline Lettuce Coop with Wes as one of the founding directors. During a time when farm workers were often sacrificed in favor of increased profits, Wes successfully encourage Highline to build for the Bracero Mexicans a permanent labor camp constructed of block, with showers, a walk-in cooler, air conditioning, etc. These are just a few of Wes Bisgaard's accomplishments.

Although Wes is formally resigning from the management of the Imperial County Farm Bu-

reau, his contributions to our community and our State will be long remembered. In fact, if I know Wes, his gifts of time to and his love for our Valley are far from over. I am joined by the many families involved in the farming community of Imperial Valley when I say thank you for all that you have done, and we look forward to working with you in the future. Although the Farm Bureau will miss him, I am certain that he will continue to fight for the needs of the Valley.

THE HONORABLE CARRIE P. MEEK
HONORS MR. ODELL JOHNS,
SOUTH DADE'S GREAT COMMUNITY LEADER

HON. CARRIE P. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a distinct honor to pay tribute to one of Miami's unsung heroes, Mr. Odell Johns. His untimely demise from the scourge of diabetes last Monday, June 2, 1997 will truly leave a deep void in our community.

Mr. Johns, 65, represented the best and the noblest of our community. Having dedicated a major portion of his life to the civil rights movement since the early sixties, he tirelessly continued his historic struggle to ensure the creation of employment services and equal educational opportunities for our South Dade residents, regardless of ethnic background, creed, or gender.

"He was known in his community as the man to turn to when a job needed to get done in South Dade," said Col. Brodes Hartley, president of Community Health Initiative. "Whether it was public housing, economic development for local business or the health care needs of the community, he always found time to get involved."

A meticulous father and a firm believer in the centrality of God in his family and his community, he was driven by his Christian stewardship on behalf of others, especially those who could least fend for themselves. Because of his missionary zeal of consecration to the well-being of others, many of South Dade's impoverished residents can now have access to primary health care and mental health services. His brand of leadership was genuinely anchored on his sterling integrity and resilient initiative. Most of my district's South Dade constituency has credited him with virtually every major improvement that is now benefiting the community for which he cared so deeply.

In 1953 Mr. Johns graduated from my Alma Mater, Florida A&M University, with a political science degree. He subsequently responded to his country's calling by joining the U.S. Army, serving as an officer with the rank of lieutenant in the Artillery Corps.

During the civil rights movement the acumen of his intelligence and the longevity of his commitment was felt at a time when our community needed someone to put in perspective the pains and agonies of disenfranchised African-Americans and other minorities yearning to belong and participate in the American dream. Along with Col. Hartley, he was one of the leaders in the bus boycott in Tallahassee, FL, that subsequently followed the landmark

boycott involving Rosa Parks and Martin Luther King, Jr., in Montgomery, AL.

He demonstrated that same dogged tenacity to the people of South Dade. He thoroughly understood the accouterments of power and leadership, and he wisely exercised them alongside the mandate of his conviction in hastening the emergence of equal opportunity and justice for all.

Our community was immensely touched and comforted by his undaunted leadership, kindly compassion, and personal warmth. To his daughters, Kim and Linda Joyce, to his sons Ricardo, Odell III, Dyke Earl Martin, along with his 11 grandchildren and the rest of his South Dade family, he preached and lived by the adage that, with God's help, the quest for personal integrity and professional achievement is not beyond the reach of those willing to dare the impossible and advocate for the well-being of the least fortunate and the disenfranchised.

This is the great legacy Mr. Odell Johns has bequeathed to our community. I am greatly privileged to have earned his friendship and to have been given the opportunity to learn and live by his noble credo.

HUMAN RIGHTS IN INDIA ACT

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, this weekend will mark a tragic turn of events in the history of the Sikh Nation. Thirteen years ago this Saturday, June 7, more than 20,000 Sikhs were massacred in Punjab at the Golden Temple and 38 other Sikh temples by India's military.

India's genocide against the Sikh Nation has taken the lives of a staggering 250,000 Sikhs. I rise today to introduce legislation that will send a clear message to a government that has spent years practicing the torture of its own people. However, when you go home and turn on the evening news, good luck trying to find any story that reveals the plight of the Sikhs—the plight of the Kashmiris—the plight of Christians—and the plight of the untouchables, the lowest group in India's caste system.

In Congress, we speak of the many tragedies that occur all over the world, especially around this time of year when this legislative body deals with the foreign aid legislation. We talk about the ongoing violent struggles between the people in Bosnia, Croatia, and Serbia. We reprimand China for its draconian abortion policies. We admonish Cuba for its human rights abuses. We threaten to withhold international military and educational training [IMET] money from Indonesia for its brutal treatment of the citizens of East Timor.

Mr. Speaker, the Indian Government is one of the worst human rights abusers in the world. You might say, if that is happening, why does the world not know about it? Because since the 1970's, India has barred monitoring organizations like Amnesty International from entering the country. In fact, they are the only democracy in the world that refuses to allow Amnesty International to operate independently within the country. Mr. Speaker, what does the Indian Government have to hide? There are a half-million Indian soldiers occu-

pying the province of Punjab and another half-million occupying Kashmir. This is a recipe for disaster my friends.

For the last 15 years, I have been coming to this well to call attention to Punjab, where Indian forces have received cash bounties for the murder of innocent civilians. To justify their actions, the police label these individuals, sometimes young children, as "terrorists". Also in Punjab, Sikhs are picked up in the middle of the night, only to be found floating dead in canals with their hands and feet bound together. Some Sikhs are not so fortunate, because many of them are never found after their abduction. Recently, India's Central Bureau of Investigation [CBI] told the Supreme Court that it had confirmed nearly 1,000 cases of unidentified bodies that were cremated by the military.

And it does not get any better in Kashmir. Women, because of their Muslim beliefs, are taken out of their homes in the middle of the night and are gang-raped, while their husbands are forced to wait inside at gunpoint.

These military forces operate beyond the law with complete impunity. America should not be supporting a government that condones these widespread abuses with United States tax dollars. Now is the time for India to be held accountable for its continued violation of basic human rights. Mr. Speaker, the Sikhs, Muslims, Christians, "Untouchables", and women of India are desperately looking to this Congress for help. The time has come for action, it is time for America to take a stand.

The Human Rights in India Act, introduced by me along with my good friend and colleague GARY CONDIT of California, will bar development aid to India unless the government releases prisoners of conscience, ends the practice of torture by police and military forces, permits impartial investigations of reported torture and disappearances of those in custody, brings to justice police forces responsible for human rights abuses, and permits critics of the government to travel abroad.

My colleagues, from this well of the House of Representatives you will hear many stories of human abuses from all around the world. Today, I ask that you think of the hundreds of thousands suffering in India. Please do not turn your back on the innocent. Give them a flicker of hope and send a strong message to the Government of India. I urge my colleagues to give the Human Rights in India Act their full consideration, and their strong support.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. PETER T. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Lt. Col. Noreen Holthaus of the U.S. Army Congressional Liaison Office. Noreen will be leaving Capitol Hill next week for a new assignment in the Pentagon.

Over the past 3½ years I have had the pleasure and privilege of working with Colonel Holthaus as she has tirelessly assisted both my New York and Washington offices on numerous occasions. Whether it was constituent casework, defense legislation, an overseas trip itinerary or a phone number for an obscure Deputy Assistant Secretary in the Pentagon,

Colonel Holthaus always did her level best to solve the problem at hand.

The services provided by our Armed Forces liaison offices are truly invaluable to our constituents and our staffs and should not be taken for granted. We are very fortunate to have their vast knowledge and technical expertise at our disposal.

Throughout Colonel Holthaus' tour here in the House of Representatives she has consistently performed her duties in a superb manner. I believe I can speak for all the Members of Congress who have had the honor to work with Colonel Holthaus when I say that she will indeed be missed.

ON THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE MARSHALL PLAN, A SALUTE TO COLD WAR VETERANS

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 50th anniversary of former Secretary of State George Marshall's commencement address to the graduating class at Harvard University. In that address, Secretary Marshall laid the foundation for the historic foreign aid program that would come to be known as the Marshall plan.

Mr. Speaker, most historians would agree that the Marshall plan was the most dramatically successful peacetime foreign policy implemented by the United States. However, when our Nation moved so swiftly and sincerely to assist the war-ravaged landscape, economy and political structure of Europe in the late 1940's, it also marked the beginning of the United States' role as worldwide peacekeeper and protector of democracy.

Beginning with the Yalta Conference in 1945—when some argued that President Franklin Delano Roosevelt had given away Eastern Europe to Joseph Stalin—the world entered a new arena of confrontation unlike any before. When Winston Churchill referred to the borders of the Eastern Bloc Communist countries as the "Iron Curtain", the stage had been set for the cold war.

The Revolutionary War brought us our independence; the Civil War gave us our national identity; the First World War made us players in the international arena; and the Second World War turned America into a superpower. For those veterans, there can be no doubt. Their participation in the combat theater ensures that their selflessness and contribution to our great Nation will never be overlooked or be taken for granted.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, for those veterans who gave just as selflessly to this country, but may have never looked directly into the eyes of the enemy, there is honor for them as well. From the policy of containment in the late 1940's to detente in the 1970's to confrontation in the early 1980's to the revolution in 1991, the veterans of the cold war stared unwaveringly into the depths of communism, and they did not blink for an instant. Rather, these veterans made it manifestly clear that democracy—that government by, of, and for the people—would be secure not only for America, but also for the entire world.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, from Capt. Gary Powers to every sailor who stood ready off the

shores of Cuba, I salute all cold war veterans, and thank them for their service to our great Nation.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE
SOUTHWEST GUILFORD HIGH
SCHOOL WOMEN'S SOCCER TEAM

HON. HOWARD COBLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, this year, women's high school soccer was extremely exciting in the Sixth District of North Carolina. For the second time in 3 years, the Southwest Guilford High School women's soccer team captured the 1A/2A/3A State championship. Southwest Guilford High School, located just outside of Greensboro, NC, secured the women's soccer state championship with a 1-0 win over Charlotte Catholic High School.

This win could not have come at a better time. Just 2 days before the title contest, two Southwest classmates Emily Parker and Sharon Thoma were tragically killed in a car accident which also injured two others. However, the Cowgirls resolved to attain victory, despite their sorrow. The girls dedicated the game to the memory of the two students who were killed and to those who remain injured.

This victory momentarily helped the team to forget about the loss of their friends and classmates. But this year's win most certainly made them forget about the loss they had last season against Northwest Guilford in a playoff game. At the final moment, the team pulled together to win the one game that could destroy the memory of last year's defeat.

To cap an impressive 24-1 record this season, Freshman Sheconda Douglas scored the game-winning goal in the last 4 minutes of the championship match. Ironically, the Cowgirls won the game after rebounding a Charlotte Catholic free kick.

Senior Kelly Allison, named the MVP, played an integral part in the game and credited the win to hard work and the realization of goals the team had set earlier in the season. Allison, a defensive player helped to capture the win by sticking close to Catholic player Carrie Hughes, 36-goal scorer this season.

Kelly Allison's two sisters Abbie and Bree, also contributed to the successful season, ensuring that the game would be a family affair. Southwest players Catey Conner, Shannon Ratcliff, Kristen Carter, Charlotte Acker, Meredith Ledwell, Brooks Gonzalez, Cori Ray, Erin Moran, Brianna Balliet, Holly Hunter, Lauren

Gaster, Shana Stephens, Ashley Trexler, Karen Davis, and Kathleen Haver all aided in Southwest Guilford's successful season and their final victory against Charlotte Catholic. Overseeing this group are head coach Chris Glover, coach Eric Lewis, managers Ken Murray and Josh Edwards, athletic director Richard Kemp, and principal Wayne Tuggel.

On behalf of the citizens of the Sixth District of North Carolina, we congratulate Southwest Guilford's women's soccer team for winning the State 1A/2A/3A championship.

REPORT FROM INDIANA—MISTY
AND MYRA YOUNG

HON. DAVID M. MCINTOSH

OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give my report from Indiana.

In the Second Congressional District of Indiana there are so many good people. Good people doing good things. In my book, these special individuals are Hoosier Heroes. Hoosier Heroes because they have dedicated their lives to helping others. Mr. Speaker, Myra and Misty Young of Pendleton, IN, are Hoosier Heroes. They are proof that there is no age too young to make our community a better place.

Myra and Misty bring joy and kindness to the seniors of the nursing homes in Pendleton, IN. These young girls share with seniors love and friendship. They put smiles on their faces. These Pendleton Elementary School students, and other kids from throughout Madison County, are no strangers to lending a helping hand where one is needed. After school and on weekends, they volunteer their time at Pet-a-Pal, an organization that livens the spirits in nursing homes throughout Pendleton. Dressed in costume, these wonderful girls and their canine friends entertain seniors with cheerful parades and dances.

Twelve-year-old Myra is an excellent student. She volunteers her time to the nursing homes so she can share her youth with others. In her free time she enjoys playing volleyball. Today she is recovering from a debilitating ankle injury. When asked about the time spent at the senior homes, Myra will humbly confess that "it's really fun, and neat to see the peoples' expressions when we bring the dogs in."

Misty, only 7 years old, is an honor student and a member of the Pendleton Garden Club in addition to her efforts with Pet-a-Pal. During Misty's first few times at Pet-a-Pal she was

quiet and withdrawn during the parades, a bit fearful of her role in the events. One day, she and her canine companion both dressed as brides in wedding gowns and became the hit of the parade.

During a silence in the event, Misty threw the leash over her head and danced in circles with her dog in sync not far behind. The audience erupted with pleasant laughter and were warmed by Misty's adorable youthfulness and innocence. Misty now tells her grandmother Julane Shepard that she wants to go everyday to entertain, make new friends, and laugh.

Myra and Misty Young may not fully appreciate the benefits the senior and hospital patients reap as a result of their efforts. But in their hearts they must know that they are responsible for the smiles on faces and the dancing eyes of all the patients they so graciously entertain. As they ride to the parades on those special Tuesdays and Thursdays with their grandmother, Julane, the girls think not of the service they give to the Pendleton community, but the enjoyment they have in doing so. And for that reason, Myra and Misty Young of Pendleton, IN are Hoosier Heroes.

Mr. Speaker that is my report from Indiana.

TRIBUTE TO JONNA LYNNE
CULLEN

HON. JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I take this moment to pay tribute to J.L. Cullen, who passed away this morning. Over the past few weeks, a number of my colleagues here and in the Senate have taken the floor to recall her many accomplishments and qualities in personal terms. It is a small measure of the respect with which she is held by Members of this institution. I got to know J.L. when she was a senior staffer on the House Rules Committee. She could master the arcane rules and procedures just as easily as she could bring laughter and lightness to sometimes difficult situations. She did her job as a partisan without once losing the respect or friendship of those of us who sat on the other side of aisle. J.L. was talented, dedicated, principled, and—as we all learned—a courageous fighter. I want to extend my prayers and condolences to her family. We will all miss her.

Thursday, June 5, 1997

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

House and Senate agreed to Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Conference Report and Concurrent Budget Resolution Conference Report.

House agreed to the conference report on H. Con. Res. 84, FY 1998 Budget Resolution.

House agreed to the conference report on H.R. 1469, FY 1997 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S5293–S5386

Measures Introduced: Nineteen bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 830–848, S. Res. 96–97, and S. Con. Res. 31. **Pages S5341–42**

Measures Reported: Reports were made as follows: S. 289, to designate the United States courthouse to be constructed at the corner of Superior Road and Huron Road in Cleveland, Ohio, as the “Carl B. Stokes United States Courthouse”.

S. 347, to designate the Federal building located at 100 Alabama Street NW, in Atlanta, Georgia, as the “Sam Nunn Federal Center”.

S. 478, to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 475 Mulberry Street in Macon, Georgia, as the “William Augustus Bootle Federal Building and United States Courthouse”.

S. 628, to designate the United States courthouse to be constructed at the corner of 7th Street and East Jackson Street in Brownsville, Texas, as the “Reynaldo G. Garza United States Courthouse.”

S. 681, to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 300 Northeast First Avenue in Miami, Florida, as the “David W. Dyer Federal Courthouse”.

S. 715, to redesignate the Dublin Federal Court-house building located in Dublin, Georgia, as the “J. Roy Rowland Federal Courthouse.”

S. 819, to designate the United States courthouse at 200 South Washington Street in Alexandria, Vir-

ginia, as the “Martin V.B. Bostetter, Jr. United States Courthouse”. **Page S5341**

Measures Passed:

George C. Marshall Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 97, expressing the sense of the Senate that the President should designate the month of June 1997, the fiftieth anniversary of the Marshall Plan, as George C. Marshall month. **Pages S5384–85**

Emergency Supplemental Appropriations—Conference Report: By 67 yeas to 31 nays (Vote No. 95), Senate agreed to the conference report on H.R. 1469, making emergency supplemental appropriations for recovery from natural disasters, and for overseas peacekeeping efforts, including those in Bosnia, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, clearing the measure for the President. **Pages S5309–25, S5338**

Concurrent Budget Resolution—Conference Report: By 76 yeas to 22 nays (Vote No. 96), Senate agreed to the conference report on H. Con. Res. 84, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1998 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, clearing the measure for the President. **Pages S5326–39**

Motion to Adjourn: By 51 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 97), Senate agreed to a motion to adjourn. **Pages S5385–86**

Messages from the President: Senate received the following messages from the President of the United States:

Transmitting the report concerning the national emergency in response to the threat posed by weapons of mass destruction; referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM-45).

Page S5339

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

Elizabeth Anne Moler, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Energy.

Pages S5384, S5386

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Robert Charles Chambers, of West Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of West Virginia.

Christopher Droney, of Connecticut, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut.

Janet C. Hall, of Connecticut, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut.

Katharine Sweeney Hayden, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey.

1 Air Force nomination in the rank of general.

3 Army nominations in the rank of general.

A routine list in the Army.

Page S5386

Messages From the President:

Page S5339

Messages From the House:

Page S5339

Communications:

Pages S5339-40

Petitions:

Pages S5340-41

Executive Reports of Committees:

Page S5341

Statements on Introduced Bills:

Pages S5342-68

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages S5368-70

Notices of Hearings:

Pages S5372-73

Authority for Committees:

Page S5373

Additional Statements:

Pages S5373-79

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total-97)

Pages S5338, S5385-86

Adjournment: Senate convened at 12 noon, and adjourned at 7:09 p.m., until 12 noon, on Monday, June 9, 1997. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S5385.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

SCHOOL LUNCH SAFETY

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee concluded hearings to examine issues with regard to the recent outbreak of Hepatitis A as a result of the consumption of contaminated frozen

strawberries in school lunches in the State of Michigan, and the Department of Agriculture response, after receiving testimony from Senators Abraham; Representative Nick Smith; Mary Ann Keffe, Acting Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services, and Lon Hatamiya, Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, both of the Department of Agriculture; David R. Johnson, Michigan Department of Community Health, Lansing; Thomas W. Schimm, Bay City, Michigan; and Susan Doneth, Marshall, Michigan.

NEUROLOGICAL AND COMMUNICATION DISORDERS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies concluded hearings to examine progress reports on research with regard to neurological and communication disorders, after receiving testimony from Geraldine Fox, National Organization for Hearing Research, Narberth, Pennsylvania; Josef Miller, Kresge Hearing Research Institute, Ann Arbor, Michigan; Christopher Reeve, West Chester, New York; and Caitlin Parton, New York, New York.

APPROPRIATIONS—LOC/GPO/GAO

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on the Legislative Branch held hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1998, receiving testimony in behalf of funds for their respective activities from James H. Billington, Librarian of Congress; Michael F. DiMario, Public Printer, Government Printing Office; James F. Hinchman, Acting Comptroller General of the United States, General Accounting Office; and former Representative Bill Orton and Janet S. Zagorin, Stroock & Stroock & Lavan, New York, New York, both on behalf of the Standing Committee on the Law Library of Congress.

Subcommittee will meet again on Tuesday, June 10.

GENDER INTEGRATED BASIC TRAINING

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Personnel concluded hearings to examine the extent to which military services have integrated men and women in basic training services and the effect this has on their performance, after receiving testimony from Gen. William W. Hartzog, USA, Commanding General, United States Army Training and Doctrine Command; Vice Adm. Patricia A. Tracey, USN, Chief of Naval Education and Training; Lt. Gen. Paul K. Van Riper, USMC, Commanding General, Marine Corps Combat Development Command; Gen. Lloyd W. Newton, USAF, Commander, Air Education and Training Command; Staff Sgt. Mary M. Wilson, USMC; Sgt. First Class Allison Smith, USA;

Staff Sgt. John F. McNeirney, USA; Senior Master Sgt. Harry E. Creacy, Jr., USAF (Ret.); Donna Carson, Woodbridge, Virginia; and Michelle Danko, Newport News, Virginia.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 621, to repeal the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 and transfer residual regulatory authority from the Securities and Exchange Commission to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and State public service commissions, with an amendment; and

The nominations of James A. Harmon, of New York, to be President, and Jackie M. Clegg, of Utah, to be First Vice President, both of the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

CHINA-UNITED STATES TRADE

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee held hearings to examine emerging trade issues in China, focusing on United States-China trade imbalances and China's restrictive trade practices and the renewal of China's Most-Favored-Nation status, receiving testimony from Henry Kissinger, New York, New York, former National Security Advisor and Secretary of State.

Hearings were recessed subject to call.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 797, to authorize the design and construction of additions to the parking garage and certain site improvements at the John F. Kennedy Center in Washington, D.C.;

S. 289, to designate the United States courthouse to be constructed at the corner of Superior Road and Huron Road in Cleveland, Ohio, as the "Carl B. Stokes United States Courthouse";

S. 347, to designate the Federal building located at 100 Alabama Street NW, in Atlanta, Georgia, as the "Sam Nunn Federal Center";

S. 478, to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 475 Mulberry Street in Macon, Georgia, as the "William Augustus Bootle Federal Building and United States Courthouse";

S. 628, to designate the United States courthouse to be constructed at the corner of 7th Street and East Jackson Street in Brownsville, Texas, as the "Reynaldo G. Garza United States Courthouse";

S. 681, to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 300 Northeast

First Avenue in Miami, Florida, as the "David W. Dyer Federal Courthouse";

S. 715, to redesignate the Dublin Federal Courthouse building located in Dublin, Georgia, as the "J. Roy Rowland Federal Courthouse";

S. 819, to designate the United States courthouse at 200 South Washington Street in Alexandria, Virginia, as the "Martin V.B. Bostetter, Jr. United States Courthouse"; and

The nominations of Brig. Gen. Robert Bernard Flowers, USA, to be a Member and President of the Mississippi River Commission, and Michael J. Armstrong, of Colorado, to be an Associate Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

SMALL BUSINESS TAXATION

Committee on Finance: Subcommittee on Taxation and IRS Oversight held hearings on S. 460, to increase the deduction for health insurance costs of self-employed individuals, to provide clarification for the deductibility of expenses incurred by a taxpayer in connection with the business use of the home, and to clarify the standards used for determining that certain individuals are not employees, and S. 570, to exempt certain small businesses from the mandatory electronic fund transfer system, receiving testimony from Senators Bond and Snowe; Donald C. Lubick, Acting Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Tax Policy; Stephen Kenda, KENDA Systems, Inc., Salem, New Hampshire; Randy Mason, Mason Mechanical Laboratories, Inc., Salem, Virginia; Susan Thomas, Best of Service and Sales International, Annandale, Virginia, on behalf of the National Association for the Self-Employed; Debbi-Jo Horton, DJ Horton & Associates, East Providence, Rhode Island; John Satagaj, Small Business Legislative Counsel, and Deborah Walker, American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, both of Washington, D.C.; and Frederick S. Oyer, International Piping Systems, Inc., Schiller Park, Illinois, on behalf of the Mechanical/Electrical/Sheet Metal Alliance.

Hearings were recessed subject to call.

RUSSIAN WEAPONS PROLIFERATION

Committee on Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation, and Federal Services concluded hearings to examine cases of Russian weapons proliferation, focusing on Russia's exports of weapons of mass destruction components and technologies and missile delivery systems to certain countries, including Iran, Iraq, and India, after receiving testimony from Robert J. Einhorn, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Nonproliferation/Bureau of Political-Military Affairs; William C. Potter, Monterey Institute of International Studies, Monterey, California; and Richard H. Speier, McLean, Virginia.

ALZHEIMER'S RESEARCH

Committee on Labor and Human Resources: Subcommittee on Aging concluded hearings to examine challenges for treating Alzheimer's disease, focusing on biomedical research options, after receiving testimony from Richard J. Hodes, Director, National Institute on Aging, National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services; Zaven S. Khachaturian, Potomac, Maryland, on behalf of the Alzheimers' Association; Ronald and Nancy Reagan Research Institute; Allen D. Roses, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, North Carolina; Sam Sisodia, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, Maryland; Stephen Gracon, Warner-Lambert/Parke-Davis, Ann Arbor, Michigan; and Eric B. Larson, University of Washington Medical Center, Seattle.

CHILD BRAIN DEVELOPMENT

Committee on Labor and Human Resources: Subcommittee on Children and Families concluded hearings to examine the status of medical and scientific findings into prenatal and postnatal brain development and implications that federal policies have on childhood development, after receiving testimony from Harry Chugani, Children's Hospital of Michigan/Wayne State University, Detroit; Benjamin S. Carson, Sr., Johns Hopkins University Hospital, Baltimore, Maryland; Anthony DeCasper, University of North Carolina, Greensboro; Diane Fisher, Kensington, Maryland, on behalf of the Independent Women's Forum; Carlie Sorensen Dixon, Lawyers at Home and Mothers First, Arlington, Virginia; and Edward Zigler, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action**Bills Introduced:**

30 public bills, H.R. 1795-1824; 1 private bill, H.R. 1825; and 3 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 92-94, were introduced.

Pages H3566-68

Reports Filed: Reports were filed as follows:

H. Res. 162, waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany H.R. 1469, making emergency supplemental appropriations for recovery from natural disasters, and for overseas peacekeeping efforts, including those in Bosnia, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997 (H. Rept. 105-120); and

H.J. Res. 54, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States (H. Rept. 105-121).

Page H3566

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he designated Representative Ney to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Page H3479

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest Chaplain, the Rev. Steve Kummernuss of Doylestown, Ohio.

Page H3479

Foreign Relations Authorization Act: The House resumed consideration of amendments to H.R. 1757, to consolidate international affairs agencies and to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1998 and 1999.

The House completed all debate and began consideration of amendments on Wednesday, June 4.

Pages H3481-99, H3516-19

Agreed To:

The Smith of New Jersey amendment that prohibits population planning assistance to any foreign organization until the organization certifies that it will not perform abortions in any foreign country except where the life of the mother would be endangered or in cases of rape or incest and certifies that it will not engage in any activity to alter the laws or policies of any foreign country concerning the circumstances under which abortion is permitted, regulated, or prohibited; and prohibits any funds to the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) unless the President certifies that UNFPA has terminated all activities in the People's Republic of China or during the 12 months preceding such certification there have been no coerced abortions associated with the family planning policies of the People's Republic of China (agreed to by recorded vote of 232 ayes to 189 noes Roll No. 168); and

Pages H3481-95, H3517-18

The Brown of Florida amendment that expresses the sense of Congress relating to the rights of prisoners, timely legal procedures, and international standards of due process in the Andean countries of Peru, Ecuador, Bolivia, Colombia, and Venezuela;

Page H3497

Rejected:

The Campbell amendment to the Smith of New Jersey amendment that sought to prohibit the use of population planning assistance for abortions in any

foreign country except where the life of the mother would be endangered or in cases of rape or incest; prohibit the use of funding to lobby for or against abortion; and prohibit any U.S. funding to the United Nations Population Fund to be used for a country program in the People's Republic of China and imposes a dollar-for-dollar reduction of U.S. contributions to the U.N. Population Fund for any amounts used on future programs in China (rejected by a recorded vote of 200 ayes to 218 noes Roll No. 167);

Pages H3482–95, H3517

Vote Postponed:

The Nethercutt amendment that seeks to express the sense of Congress relating to the abduction and detention of Donald Hutchings of the State of Washington by Al-Faran, a militant organization that seeks to merge Kashmir with Pakistan was debated and a recorded vote was postponed.

Pages H3495–96

On Wednesday, June 5, the House agreed to H. Res. 159, the rule that provided for consideration of H.R. 1757.

Pages H3281–91

Order of Business—Foreign Relations Authorization Act: It was made in order that during further consideration of H.R. 1757, in the Committee of the Whole, that each further amendment and all amendments thereto, shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, except for the following amendments: Amendments en bloc offered by the chairman of the Committee on International Relations pursuant to this unanimous consent agreement; Representative Kennedy of Rhode Island regarding Indonesia; Representative Miller of California regarding Cuba; Representative Schumer regarding Egypt; Representative Paxon or Engel regarding Palestinian land transactions; Representative Ney regarding Libya; Representative Sanford regarding authorization levels; Representative McKinney regarding arms transfer code of conduct; Representative Capps regarding Tibet; Representative Gilman regarding counternarcotics authorities; Representative Hamilton; and Representative Gilman. It shall be in order at any time for the Chairman of the Committee on International Relations or a designee, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member of that committee or a designee, to offer amendments en bloc. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this unanimous consent agreement shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to amendment, shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole, and may amend portions of the bill previously read for amendment. The original proponent of an amendment included in such amendments en bloc may insert a statement in the Congressional Record

immediately before the disposition of the amendments en bloc.

Pages H3519–20

Recess: The House recessed at 12:50 p.m. and reconvened at 1:30 p.m.

Page H3520

Budget Resolution for FY 1998: By a yea-and-nay vote of 327 yeas to 97 nays, Roll No. 166, the House agreed to the conference report on H. Con. Res. 84, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1998 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002.

Pages H3501–16

Earlier, agreed to H. Res. 160, the rule that waived points of order against the conference report on H. Con. Res. 84, by a yea-and-nay vote of 373 yeas to 47 nays, Roll No. 165.

Pages H3499–H3500, H3501

Recess: The House recessed at 4:07 p.m. and reconvened at 5:14 p.m.

Page H3501

Emergency Supplemental Appropriations: By a yea-and-nay vote of 220 yeas to 201 nays, Roll No. 169, the House agreed to the conference report on H.R. 1469, making emergency supplemental appropriations for recovery from natural disasters, and for overseas peacekeeping efforts, including those in Bosnia, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997.

Pages H3520–44

Earlier, it was made in order that at any time today to consider a conference report to accompany H.R. 1469, that all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration be waived, and that the conference report be considered as read when called up.

Page H3520

Presidential Message—National Emergency re Nuclear, Biological, and Chemical Weapons: Read a message from the President wherein he transmitted his report concerning the national emergency with respect to the threat posed by the proliferation of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons and of the means of delivering such weapons—referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered printed (H. Doc. 105–94).

Page H3545

Meeting Hour—Saturday, June 7: Agreed that when the House adjourns on Friday, June 6, it adjourn to meet at 10:00 a.m. on Saturday, June 7.

Page H3548

Meeting Hour—Tuesday, June 10: Agreed that when the House adjourns on Saturday, June 7, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, June 10 for morning hour debate.

Page H3548

Calendar Wednesday: Agreed that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, June 11.

Page H3548

Senate Messages: Messages received from the Senate today appear on page H3548.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes and two recorded votes developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H3501, H3516, H3517, H3517-18, and H3544. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: Met at 10:00 a.m. and adjourned at 9.45 p.m.

Committee Meetings

FOREST HEALTH—SCIENTIFIC REVIEW

Committee on Agriculture: Held a hearing on Scientific Review of Forest Health. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LABOR-HHS-EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education held a hearing on Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, on the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission and on the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. Testimony was heard from Stuart E. Weisberg, Chairman, Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission; Mary Lu Jordan, Chairman, Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission; and the following officials of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service: John Calhoun Wells, Director; C. Richard Barnes, Deputy Director, Field Operations; Wilma B. Liebman, Deputy Director, National Office Operations; and Fran Leonard, Director, Budget and Finance.

BUDGET RECONCILIATION

Committee on Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy and Power approved for full Committee action the following budget reconciliation recommendations: Title III, Subtitle A—NRC User Fees; Title III, Subtitle—Lease of Excess Strategic Petroleum Reserve Capacity; and Title III, Subtitle C—Sale of DOE Assets.

BUDGET RECONCILIATION

Committee on Commerce: Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Trade, and Consumer Protection began markup of the following budget reconciliation recommendation: Title III, Subtitle D—Communications.

Will continue June 10.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth and Families held a hearing on proposed Vocational Education legisla-

tion. Testimony was heard from Patricia McNeil, Assistant Secretary, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, Department of Education; Robert Bartman, Commissioner of Education, Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, State of Missouri; and public witnesses.

HIGHER EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENTS

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, Training, and Lifelong Learning continued hearings on H.R. 6, Higher Education Act Amendments of 1998. Testimony was heard from Representative Fattah; and public witnesses.

HEALTH INFORMATION—AIR INFORMATION PRACTICES

Committee on Government Reform and Oversight: Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology held a hearing on H.R. 52, to establish a code of fair information practices for health information, to amend section 552a of title 5, United States Code. Testimony was heard from Representatives Condit, Green and Stearns; and public witnesses.

BLOOD SAFETY—FDA REGULATION

Committee on Government Reform and Oversight: Subcommittee on Human Resources held a hearing on FDA Regulation of Blood Safety: Notification, Recall, and Enforcement Practices. Testimony was heard from Bernice Steinhardt, Director, Health Services Quality and Public Health Issues, GAO; and the following officials of the Department of Health and Human Services: Thomas D. Roslewicz, Deputy Inspector General, Audit Services, Office of Inspector General; Michael Friedman, M.D., Lead Deputy Commissioner, Jay S. Epstein, M.D., Director, Office of Blood Research and Review and Ronald G. Chesemore, Associate Commissioner, Regulatory Affairs, all with the FDA.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE; BUDGET RECONCILIATION

Committee on Government Reform and Oversight: Subcommittee on Postal Service approved for full Committee action the following: H.R. 1254, amended, to designate the U.S. Post Office building located at Bennett and Kansas Avenue in Springfield, Missouri, as the "John N. Griesemer Post Office Building"; and Budget Reconciliation recommendations relating to the U.S. Postal Service.

The Subcommittee also approved for full Committee action Budget Reconciliation recommendations.

OVERSIGHT—FBI

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Crime continued oversight hearings regarding the activities of the FBI. Testimony was heard from Louis J. Freeh, Director, FBI, Department of Justice.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Committee on National Security: Subcommittee on Military Personnel approved for full Committee action amended H.R. 1119, National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1998 and 1999.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Committee on National Security: Subcommittee on Military Readiness approved for full Committee action amended H.R. 1119, National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1998 and 1999.

CONFERENCE REPORT—EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a rule waiving all points of order against the conference report on H.R. 1469, making emergency supplemental appropriations for recovery from natural disasters, and for the overseas peacekeeping efforts, including those in Bosnia, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and against its consideration. The rule also provides that the conference report shall be considered as read. Testimony was heard from Chairman Livingston.

OVERSIGHT—SMALL BUSINESS REGULATORY ENFORCEMENT FAIRNESS ACT

Committee on Small Business: Held a hearing on Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act (P.L. 104-121), including the amendments to the Regulatory Flexibility Act contained therein. Testimony was heard from Representatives Skelton and Ewing; and public witnesses.

GREAT LAKES AVIATION GROUNDING

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Aviation held a hearing on Grounding of Great Lakes Aviation. Testimony was heard from Barry Valentine, Acting Administrator, FAA, Department of Transportation; and public witnesses.

TVA FUTURE

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment held a hearing on The Future of TVA and its Non-power Programs. Testimony was heard from Representatives Wamp, Bryant, Clement and Gordon; the following officials of the TVA: Craven Crowell,

Chairman; Johnny H. Hayes and William H. Kennoy, both Directors; and public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT—GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE AND RESULTS ACT

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Benefits held an oversight hearing to review the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) strategies for both the Education Service and the Vocational Rehabilitation and Counseling Service (VR&C) within the Department of Veterans Affairs. Testimony was heard from Cynthia M. Fagnoni, Acting Associate Director, Veterans' Affairs and Military Health Care Issues, GAO; and the following officials of the Department of Veterans Affairs: Celia Dollarhide, Director, Education Service; Jeffrey T. Goetz, Operations Manager, Vocational Rehabilitation and Counseling Service; and Robert Gardner, Chief Financial Officer, Veterans Benefits Administration.

BUDGET RECONCILIATION

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Human Resources approved for full committee action budget reconciliation welfare recommendations.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Met in executive session and ordered reported amended H.R. 1775, Intelligence Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1998.

Joint Meetings**EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS**

Conferees: On Wednesday, June 4, agreed to file a conference report on the differences between the Senate- and House-passed versions of H.R. 1469, making emergency supplemental appropriations for recovery from natural disasters, and for overseas peacekeeping efforts, including those in Bosnia, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997.

BUDGET RESOLUTION

Conferees: On Wednesday, June 4, agreed to file a conference report on the differences between the Senate- and House-passed versions of H. Con. Res. 84, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1998 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST p. D558)

H.R. 5, to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Act. Signed June 4, 1997. (P.L. 105-17)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR
FRIDAY, JUNE 6, 1997

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Environment and Public Works, Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure, to resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act, focusing on the replacement of the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge, 9:30 a.m., SD-406.

House

No committee meetings are scheduled.

Joint Meetings

Joint Economic Committee, to hold hearings to examine the employment-unemployment situation for May, 9:30 a.m., 1334 Longworth Building.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of June 9 through 14, 1997

Senate Chamber

During the week, Senate expects to consider the veto message on H.R. 1469, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations, and consider further emergency supplemental appropriations legislation.

Also, Senate may consider H.R. 867, Adoption Promotion Act, and consider any cleared executive and legislative business.

(Senate will recess on Tuesday, June 10, 1997 from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. for respective party conferences.)

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: June 10, business meeting, to consider recommendations which it will make to the Committee on the Budget with respect to spending reductions and revenue increases to meet reconciliation expenditures as imposed by H. Con. Res. 84, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1998 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, 9:30 a.m., SR-332.

Committee on Appropriations: June 10, Subcommittee on Defense, to hold hearings on proposed budget estimates

for fiscal year 1998 for the Department of Defense, 10 a.m., SD-192.

June 10, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, to hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1998 for the Senate Office of Compliance, and the Offices of the Secretary of the Senate, Senate Sergeant at Arms, and the Architect of the Capitol, 10 a.m., S-128, Capitol.

Committee on Armed Services: June 9, Subcommittee on Readiness, closed business meeting, to mark up those provisions which fall within the subcommittee's jurisdiction of a proposed National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, 2 p.m., SR-222.

June 9, Subcommittee on Personnel, closed business meeting, to mark up those provisions which fall within the subcommittee's jurisdiction of a proposed National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, 4 p.m., SR-232A.

June 10, Subcommittee on Airland Forces, closed business meeting, to mark up those provisions which fall within the subcommittee's jurisdiction of a proposed National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, 10:30 a.m., SR-222.

June 10, Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, closed business meeting, to mark up those provisions which fall within the subcommittee's jurisdiction of a proposed National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, 2:30 p.m., SR-232A.

June 10, Subcommittee on SeaPower, closed business meeting, to mark up those provisions which fall within the subcommittee's jurisdiction of a proposed National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, 4 p.m., SR-222.

June 10, Subcommittee on Acquisition and Technology, closed business meeting, to mark up those provisions which fall within the subcommittee's jurisdiction of a proposed National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, 6 p.m., SR-232A.

June 11, Full Committee, closed business meeting, to mark up a proposed National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, and to receive a report from the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence on the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, 10 a.m., SR-222.

June 12, Full Committee, closed business meeting, to continue to mark up a proposed National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, 10 a.m., SR-222.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: June 11, to hold hearings on S. 629, to declare that the Congress approve the Agreement Respecting Normal Competitive Conditions in the Commercial Shipbuilding and Repair Industry (Shipbuilding Agreement), a reciprocal trade agreement resulting from negotiations under the auspices of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, entered into on December 21, 1994, 9:30 a.m., SR-253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: June 10, Subcommittee on Water and Power, to hold hearings on miscellaneous water and power measures, including S. 439, H.R. 651, H.R. 652, S. 725, S. 736, S. 744, and S. 538, 9:30 a.m., SD-366.

June 11, Full Committee, business meeting, to consider pending calendar business, 9 a.m., SD-366.

June 11, Full Committee, to hold oversight hearings on the State-side of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, 9:30 a.m., SD-366.

June 12, Full Committee, to resume a workshop to examine competitive change in the electric power industry, focusing on the benefits and risks of restructuring to consumers and communities, 9:30 a.m., SH-216.

June 12, Subcommittee on National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation, to hold oversight hearings to review the preliminary findings of the General Accounting Office concerning a study on the health, condition, and viability of the range and wildlife populations in Yellowstone National Park, 2 p.m., SD-366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: June 10, to hold oversight hearings on the relationship between the Federal and State governments in the enforcement of environmental laws, 9:30 a.m., SD-406.

June 12, Subcommittee on Clean Air, Wetlands, Private Property, and Nuclear Safety, to hold hearings on recent administrative and judicial changes to Section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, 9:30 a.m., SD-406.

Committee on Finance: June 10, to hold hearings on the renewal of China's Most-Favored-Nation (MFN) trade status, 9 a.m., SD-215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: June 10, Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, to hold hearings on religious persecution, 2 p.m., SD-419.

June 12, Full Committee, business meeting, to mark up proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 for foreign assistance programs, including

the State Department, the United States Information Agency, the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, United Nations reform and reorganization of foreign affairs agencies, 10 a.m., SD-419.

Committee on Governmental Affairs: June 11, Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation and Federal Services, to hold hearings on proliferation and United States export controls, 9:30 a.m., SD-342.

Committee on the Judiciary: June 9, Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts, to hold hearings on conserving judicial resources, focusing on the appropriate allocations of judgeships in the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth and Eleventh Circuits, 2 p.m., SD-226.

June 11, Subcommittee on Constitution, Federalism, and Property Rights, to hold hearings to examine judicial activism and its impact on the court system, 10 a.m., SD-226.

Committee on Labor and Human Resources: June 10, to hold hearings on proposed legislation relating to national labor relations, 9:30 a.m., SD-430.

June 11, Full Committee, business meeting, to mark up proposed legislation to reform the Food and Drug Administration, and to consider pending nominations, 9:30 a.m., SD-430.

June 12, Full Committee, to resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Higher Education Act, focusing on opportunity programs, 10 a.m., SD-430.

Committee on Small Business: June 12, to hold oversight hearings to review the Small Business Administration's microloan program, 9:30 a.m., SR-428A.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

12 noon, Monday, June 9

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate's program is uncertain.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Friday, June 6

House Chamber

Program for Friday: No Legislative Business.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Berman, Howard L., Calif., -E1130
 Burton, Dan, Ind., -E1145
 Coble, Howard, N.C., -E1146
 Combest, Larry, Tex., -E1126, E1129
 Conyers, John, Jr., Mich., -E1140
 Davis, Thomas M., Va., -E1131
 Doyle, Michael F., Pa., -E1132
 Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., -E1139
 Forbes, Michael P., N.Y., -E1130, E1133
 Ford, Harold E., Jr., Tenn., -E1139, E1141
 Gilman, Benjamin A., N.Y., -E1123, E1143
 Hinchey, Maurice D., N.Y., -E1141
 Houghton, Amo, N.Y., -E1135

Hunter, Duncan, Calif., -E1144
 Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, -E1132
 Kasich, John R., Ohio, -E1134
 Kennedy, Joseph P., II, Mass., -E1141
 King, Peter T., N.Y., -E1130, E1145
 Kleczka, Gerald D., Wisc., -E1126
 Klink, Ron, Pa., -E1131
 Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, -E1140
 Lantos, Tom, Calif., -E1123, E1125, E1129
 Largent, Steve, Okla., -E1137
 McIntosh, David M., Ind., -E1143, E1146
 Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., -E1125, E1141
 Meek, Carrie P., Fla., -E1144
 Moakley, John Joseph, Mass., -E1146
 Ortiz, Solomon P., Tex., -E1141

Pappas, Michael, N.J., -E1140
 Paul, Ron, Tex., -E1142
 Radanovich, George P., Calif., -E1129
 Ros-Lehtinen, Ileana, Fla., -E1134
 Rothman, Steve R., N.J., -E1123, E1127
 Roukema, Marge, N.J., -E1128, E1133
 Sanders, Bernard, Vt., -E1124, E1126, E1129, E1131
 Saxton, Jim, N.J., -E1135
 Smith, Christopher H., N.J., -E1145
 Spence, Floyd, S.C., -E1142
 Stokes, Louis, Ohio, -E1127
 Torres, Esteban Edward, Calif., -E1142
 Towns, Edolphus, N.Y., -E1139, E1140, E1142
 Visclosky, Peter J., Ind., -E1124
 Waters, Maxine, Calif., -E1135-



Congressional Record

provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶Public access to the Congressional Record is available online through *GPO Access*, a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the Congressional Record is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available on the Wide Area Information Server (WAIS) through the Internet and via asynchronous dial-in. Internet users can access the database by using the World Wide Web; the Superintendent of Documents home page address is http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs, by using local WAIS client software or by telnet to swais.access.gpo.gov, then login as guest (no password required). Dial-in users should use communications software and modem to call (202) 512-1661; type swais, then login as guest (no password required). For general information about *GPO Access*, contact the *GPO Access* User Support Team by sending Internet e-mail to gpoaccess@gpo.gov, or a fax to (202) 512-1262; or by calling Toll Free 1-888-293-6498 or (202) 512-1530 between 7 a.m. and 5 p.m. Eastern time, Monday through Friday, except for Federal holidays. ¶The Congressional Record paper and 24x microfiche will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, \$150.00 for six months, \$295.00 per year, or purchased for \$2.50 per issue, payable in advance; microfiche edition, \$141.00 per year, or purchased for \$1.50 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly Congressional Record Index may be purchased for the same per issue prices. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, directly to the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.

The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate